Subject: Some observations on my relations with the press, with publishers, with correspondents, and on the influence of the press and controls thereon exercised in various countries.

Preliminary Note.—The following memorandum covers such a wide scope and observations in a good many countries and places, and as I'm dictating it without any notes whatever it will have even less continuity than some of the notes which I've already dictated and require more careful revision.

I have often referred to the many satisfactions which have come to me during the many years that I was in the service of our government. The very substance of the relationships with other countries, the actual carrying through of these relationships in small details and in matters of major importance, the daily work of a diplomatic mission or a consulate abroad, or of a post in the Department of State in Washington, all mean contact with all sectors of our people at home and in other countries. These human relationships have always interested me and out of them I have got a great deal of satisfaction. I have had no greater pleasure out of any phase of my work than the association which I had with the press, with those who make the news and those who gather it, and those who make it available to the reading public. While I am not altogether a modest man I believe that I have few pretentions. I do believe, however, that because of the broad interest which I took in my work in so many countries and in our problems at home there are few, if any, foreign service officers who had more intimate, continuous and close contact with our press at home and in a good many countries abroad. These associations had over the years, I hope, a certain value to my country. I know that they had a certain value to me and I should like to believe that they had some value to those who gather and print the news. I do not pretend that any observations which I may make in these
notes shall be very profound or that they may have a great deal of value. I know that I shall have a great deal of pleasure in re-living a very interesting part of my past in writing about these papers and those who have made and, in some cases, still make them. I would like to think that any young people who may be thinking of the Foreign Service as a profession may find in what I shall write at least a signpost - a few ideas pointing to the necessity of close association between a Foreign Service officer who knows the broad responsibilities of his post, and those who gather the news and print it - and that this relationship has to be on a reciprocal give and take basis.

Random Notes on the News.

A Few Thoughts on the Influence of the Press.

I am not one of those who has ever underestimated the influence of the press, and by this I mean the daily newspapers in our country and in other countries. I am not forgetting the increasingly large number of weekly and monthly publications in our country and the unfortunately too small number of the same kind of publications in other countries which are devoting themselves to the making available of important background information on developments in our own country in every phase of our life and in other countries. When I was a young man the Atlantic Monthly and the Literary Digest, and a few publications of that kind of rather limited circulation, served an extraordinarily useful purpose in our country. With the extraordinarily increased interest of our people in all that is going on at home and in the world, realizing the significance it may have in their own lives, we have developed serious weeklies whose circulation runs into the half million for each issue. I am not underestimating their importance; they supplement but do not take the place of the daily newspaper.

I am not forgetting the radio and television, nor the commen-
tators who cover over the radio and through television the news and their interpretation of it. In spite of the tremendous development of radio and, in these later years, of television, and in spite of this increasing number of excellent weeklies and monthlies, our people in the United States are still most omnivorous newspaper readers in the world.

The people whom we put into high place in the federal government in Washington, whether it be in the executive departments or in the Congress, those who occupy the highest places of responsibility in our state and municipal governments, while they do not disregard the radio and television and weekly and monthly publications, are the most eager and avid readers of our newspapers. The first thing they want to see in the morning, even if it means hurrying through their breakfast, is their morning paper.

If there ever was a little period in which I began to doubt the influence of the press it was when I heard the election returns in the 1948 presidential election. I think about 95 percent of the important press in the United States had been favoring the election of Dewey. Most of them had covered the developments in the electoral campaign objectively in their news columns but they overwhelmingly in their editorial columns favored strongly the election of Dewey. We soon realized, however, that any doubts concerning the influence of the press did not have any real basis, for the extraordinary results of that election find their explanation in many other factors.

When I think of the influence of the press I recall the difficulties of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, particularly during the years 1935 to 1937. They saw the war clouds gathering on the horizon in Europe and in the Far East. They realized the implication of what was happening almost every day for us and that if conflict came
the principal burden before the end would eventually fall on us for the attainment of victory. I know how desperately anxious they were to bring before our people the implications of these developing events. There were a large number of the publishers of our responsible newspapers who realized this situation and who were willing to help. In view, however, of our disillusionment following the first World War, in view of the feeling of so many of our people that we were far away from these events and that they could not touch us, and in view of the violent attitudes of certain demagogues who attacked any responsible public official or anyone who endeavored to interpret events as they were, it was almost impossible for them to do the things which they knew they had to do. I recall as though it were yesterday so many discussions on this point and the heartburnings and disappointments, one after another forward speech by the President or by Mr. Hull, a Father Coughlin or some other demagogue blasted them as warmongers. It seemed in those days that every forward step we tried to take in informing public opinion led to a step backward. I do know, however, that it was the constant accurate reporting by our newspapers in the United States of what was taking place throughout the world which formed, slowly but definitely, the public opinion in the United States and gave it the facts on which the realization of what before us pressed itself in on our minds.

When I think of the influence of the press I think of other circumstances as well. I recall Goebbels in early 1933 telling me that no matter how untrue something might be if you told it often enough to the people ninety-nine percent would end in believing it. Goebbels had been telling me in the conversation under reference about how the government, that is, the Nazi government, would control all public opinion forming means in the country. It is significant that he mentioned first the newspapers and all kinds of publications, weekly and monthly. He
spoke of how they would control the radio, the theater, the schools, the church, the universities, in fact, every possible public opinion forming means. When I observed to him that I could quite appreciate where he got this idea but that I thought he was making a great mistake when he believed that it would be possible to do the same thing in Germany, where a good part of the population was so much more intelligent and informed than that of Russia, that he remarked to me that I was quite naive about this whole matter and that with the wall that they were going to build around the country everyone would end in believing what was told to them no matter how untrue it might be. As I saw that wall built around Germany, as a wall has never been built around any other country before, and as I saw the fiendish cleverness with which the newspapers and the schools and other public opinion forming means were controlled by the Nazi government, I came to the realization that even in a country in which there is a fairly high level of instruction among the masses, when such an impermeable wall is built, fiendish genius can accomplish its ends as Goebbels so cynically observed.

When I see, in so many countries in which public instruction has not yet reached the levels or anything like the approximate levels that we have reached in the United States, and in which a good part of the population are still illiterate and in which because of the preoccupation with occupation and the making of a miserable existence there is little interest in what goes on beyond the borders and sometimes even not much interest in what goes on beyond the village, how governments can influence public opinion in major matters, I realize the enormous influence of the press. It seems an anachronism but it is correct, as I have seen from experience that in countries in which there is still considerable illiteracy governments can shape the attitudes of the country and its
people through open or half concealed control and direction of the press.

**Random observations on the freedom of the press.**

Free speech is assured to us in our Constitution. We are so accustomed to complete freedom of speech and expression in our own country that I found that it is at times a little difficult for us to understand the various degrees of limitation which there are placed, as well as complete suppression, on the freedom of speech and the press in so many countries. I do not like to make broad generalizations but I believe the Anglo-Saxon countries - our own, England, Canada, Australia, New Zealand - are perhaps the only countries today in which there is absolutely no control attempted by the government on the press. There is almost complete freedom of the press in the Scandinavian countries and in Holland and in Belgium. I believe, however, there is greater susceptibility of the press in those countries, even if it may be in a slight measure and in a greater measure in many others, to indications which the government may give from time to time to the press as to the line it should take on a matter which may seem to be of particular importance to the special interests of the country.

In Soviet Russia today there is practically no such thing as a newspaper press as we understand it in the United States and England and so many other countries. The newspapers are few and completely government organs and of limited circulation. In China there is even less of what we think of as the daily press and what there is is as rigidly controlled. In Spain and in Argentina there is open, avowed, and complete control of the press by the government. In the countries in which there is real freedom of the press and the complete absence of government control, there is also usually a complete lack of venality on the part of the press. Wherever controls over newspapers and other publications exist, even if in the most indirect form, they give rise
to other controls than those by the government. Special interests find their way, through the use of money or favor, in presenting their case to the public in the form that they wish it presented. In some respects this venality of the press or sectors thereof in certain countries is almost as dangerous and as vicious as the direct or indirect control exercised by government. It is difficult for us in the United States to believe that it should be possible for any government of one country to exercise a predominant influence in the policy and in the expression and in the slant given to the news in a newspaper in another country. There are established cases of this kind and in some cases in countries which have prided themselves on their intellectual leadership and in the arts and sciences and even in the political field.

I have made mention of these unpleasant aspects because we in the United States and in England are so unaccustomed to this sort of thing that it is difficult for us to believe that it exists. We have learned to recognize that there are such things as direct and indirect controls and even suppression of the press in certain countries. It is difficult for us to believe that these venal practices in connection with the handling of the news in some places may be as vicious and as dangerous for the interests of the country and perhaps even for neighboring countries in the world as direct and indirect controls by a government.

Types of Direct and Indirect Controls of the Press.

As the freedom of the press is so important for the maintenance of the rights of free peoples, and as it is so vital for the security of a nation and of the world, I would like, out of my experience, in direct these notes to set forth some observations which I have unhappily had the opportunity of making, on direct and indirect controls of the press. It would not, however, I believe, be germane to this notes to go into too
great detail except to note that it does exist. I would like to make this observation,-that I've seen perhaps more cant and hypocrisy with regard to the so called freedom of the press in certain countries than on any other subject. There are countries in which we all know that there is this direct control by the government of the press, such as Soviet Russia, Communist China, Spain and, unfortunately, still in Argentina. There are other countries, however, in which the government and the press itself speak glowingly of the complete freedom of the press. In such countries it is the vogue to speak disparagingly of the controls exercised over the press in other countries and, unfortunately, in many countries where this direct and indirect controls by the government over the press exist, the great mass of the public is unaware of it.

May be too broad a general statement but, from my observation, I am inclined to the opinion that these direct or indirect controls of the press exist in countries where the government is not sure of itself nor of political stability or economic or financial stability and even social stability. We know that direct controls of the press are undertaken in those countries where the government considers it indispensable in order to maintain itself in power to exercise this control over the press as well as over certain public opinion forming means. In countries where the indirect controls are exercised, and there are many, it is my observation that the degree of indirect control depends upon the degree of political, financial, economic, and social stability in the country. In, for example, the Scandinavian countries, Holland and Belgium, one may say that the press is independent and free, and the same applies to Switzerland, but there are times when in the national interest I have seen the government give a slant to the press, that is, to the news as well as to editorial policy, on the basis of the public interest.
This intervention of the government in some countries is so seldom exercised and exercised in such a prudent and often really in a correct way that one cannot say that real freedom of the press is interfered with. In the countries just mentioned there is political, economic, financial, and social stability. The government, therefore, seldom finds a need for a slant to the news and to editorial comment.

If a government went too far and did this sort of thing too frequently in certain countries, it would defeat its own purposes, because it would find definite resistance from the press. Further, it would defeat its own ends because in such countries the level of intelligence and general information is so high that any intervention by the government in giving a slant to the news or comment is readily and quickly discernible.

The degree of freedom which exists in the press in many countries varies from time to time. The weaker the government the more indirect controls it will exercise over the press; the weaker the economy, the financial situation or the social situation, the more frequent and the more real will be these interventions and directives. It is for this reason that it is particularly difficult to speak of where there is freedom of the press and where there is not and where there is intervention by the government and where it does not exist. One cannot say, for example, that in a country like Chile there is freedom of the press or there is not freedom of the press. I can recall when for years the press in Chile was practically absolutely free; today there is, because of the weakness of the general situation in the country, very little free press as we know it in the United States and in England and in some other countries. I sometimes think that the degree of intervention by the government in the press has a direct relation to the degree of development of democracy and really democratic institutions in a country.
In many respects democracy has made more real progress in the Uruguay than in any other of the Latin American countries. There have been for years, and I believe there are today, real elections in the country. There are really parties which have platforms of their own. There is no party which can be called the official party which imposes itself, not only so far as candidates but elections are concerned.

It would be difficult, indeed, to name any of the American countries, outside of the United States and Canada, in which there is complete and absolute freedom of the press. In the Argentine there is open and direct control. In Uruguay, as I have observed, there is practically complete freedom of the press and of expression. While in the other countries of Latin America there is freedom of expression, so far as speech is concerned, there are relative degrees of control and intervention of the press depending upon the situation in the country and the position of the government. When the government feels itself strong and the situation generally good, the intervention is limited, occasional, and gentle. When the government finds itself weak, the situation bad, the intervention becomes direct, definite, and can even be brutal.

I know that it is a dangerous and unpleasant thing to make certain comparisons, but I would say that the press in Mexico and in Cuba is as near a free press, and an absolutely free press, as one can expect realistically in any of the countries of Latin America. I think it is because industrial, social, economic, and financial progress has made greater steps forward in Mexico and in Cuba than in most of these countries, which have not yet begun to attack realistically their basic economic problems and social problems. From my observation I would say that there is practically complete freedom of the press in Mexico, just as there is certainly complete freedom of expression of personal opinion; of the latter there is no doubt whatever. The explanation, I think, is
found in the circumstance that over a period of years Mexico has resolutely attacked some of her principal economic, financial, and social problems. While it has not solved all of these problems, it has made great progress. A degree of political stability has been arrived at in the country which is certainly as great, if not greater, than that of any of the other Latin countries of American today with the possible exception of Uruguay. When I say that political stability has been arrived at, I do not mean in a relative sense only as compared with the political situation in other countries of Latin America, but I mean a degree of absolute political stability. The day of revolutions in Mexico is over. For this reason I think the position in Mexico, so far as the freedom of the press is concerned, is very much similar to that of certain countries of Europe to which I have made reference, where from time to time the government, in what it conceives the public interest, may suggest to the newspapers that a certain slant be given to the news and to editorial comment. This suggestion, which does take the form of a mild, indirect control, does not grow out of weakness, it does not grow out of that weakness which leads to suppression of news, the suppression of newspapers, the suppression of free speech, or direct orders to the press. I've often reflected that in the last decade there is practically the same freedom of the press in Mexico as there is in our own country.

I have indulged in some broad generalizations on this matter of the freedom of the press and the character which government intervention may take. Any such broad generalizations are open to criticism and may arouse resentment. I have made these reflections in a friendly way because the matter is one which has intrigued me very much believing, as I do, so sincerely in the freedom of the press, that is, absolute freedom. It is rather a practice for us in the United States and in
England as well, to make too broad generalizations with regard to the presence or absence of freedom of the press in the Latin American countries. We are apt to call some Presidents in the Latin countries of America dictators and others we speak of as though they were not dictators. As a matter of fact, there are countries in which there is open dictatorship in Latin America. On the other hand, there are countries in which the President, whom we do not think of as a dictator, is just as much in absolute control as in the countries where we recognize the head of state as a dictator. In the very nature of things and until political progress towards democracy takes greater strides forward, practically every president in Latin America is a court of last resort. The issues with which he has to deal may not be as great as those of the heads of more important states, but the power which he exercises in reaching those decisions is greater in many instances than the hands of the President of the United States. In the very nature of things and until political progress, real elections, make more definite strides forward in most of the Latin American states, this great power which rests in the President is an essential part of the structure of the country. Just as we must discriminate a little bit more carefully as to where there is and is not real freedom of the press, so we have to discriminate a little bit more carefully as to where there is and is not real dictatorship.

All in all looking backwards over the last three or four decades during which I have followed developments in Latin America, I think that great steps forward have been made in the freedom of the press and in the better information of the literate people of the country in what is happening in their own and other countries. There has certainly been progress rather than any retrograde movement.
Observations on some of the principal newspapers in the United States.

From my observation I would say that there is no country in the world which has better and more newspapers than the United States. We are the greatest newspaper reading people in the world. There is no country in the world in which literacy is higher. There is no country in the world in which there are better public schools, more public libraries and such wide opportunities for full and free and adequate information on what is happening everywhere. I am not going into the reasons why we have the best and the most newspapers; it is, I believe, an accepted fact.

During the many years that I was in the Foreign Service, I had the opportunity to know many of our leading publishers and editors throughout the country. There is an extraordinary sense of responsibility which is immediately obvious among our publishers and editors. When one considers the difficulties which have faced newspaper publishers and editors in recent years, it is extraordinary that the high level of our newspapers has, in general, been so successfully maintained. The constantly increasing cost of newsprint and the necessity of keeping the cost of the paper as low as possible has presented very real problems to newspaper publishers and owners. It is not only the higher cost of newsprint but practically everything which enters into the cost of a newspaper has greatly increased. Even the problems of administration and management have become complicated through newspaper guilds and various labor and other problems which the newspapers have to contend with. The newspapers have a very special problem and a very special situation. While there has been a deterioration in the quality of the newspapers in some of our larger cities in general, our more important newspapers have kept up the high standards they have main-
tained for years and increasingly in smaller cities the quality of the newspapers has gone up instead of down. It is a great tribute to the genius and capacity of these publishers to have been able to maintain their traditions under increasingly difficult economic and other problems.

I would like to say a few words concerning some of the newspapers which I have known best and of some of the publishers whom I have had the privilege to know as well as editors.

The New York Times remains the greatest newspaper in the world today. It has always been a great newspaper. Under the direction of Arthur Sulzberger, aided by Colonel Adler, and the most capable staff on the whole possessed by any newspaper in any country in the world today, it has been possible to maintain all of the high traditions which the New York Times has held to from its inception.

I know of no newspaper anywhere which has so imposing a physical establishment as The New York Times. The capital investment is tremendous. The making of a reasonable return on this investment has, I believe, been a secondary consideration with the ownership and management of the Times since its inception. Aside from the very considerable cost of the actual production of the paper in New York, the Times has a staff of able correspondents throughout the United States. It has maintained for some time, and has today, the largest staff of foreign correspondents of any newspaper in any country. It is no easy task to find the men for these posts of correspondents abroad. They must be men of real capacity; they must be men of certain personal qualities, for in order to get the news, and the real news, they have to be able to keep in touch with not only secondary but high officials of the governments of the countries in which they are working. They have to be able to establish broad contacts not only in political and govern-
mental circles but in financial, industrial, and commercial circles, and have a keen sense of the ferments which are working under the surface in practically every aspect of the life of the country. The maintenance of such a large staff of correspondents throughout the world is extremely expensive. It can only be done by a newspaper with wide circulation and financial stability. Unfortunately, in view of the pressures of a financial character and other factors, some of the important and influential newspapers in our country have been obliged not only to reduce but in some cases to cut out their foreign correspondents.

The achievement of Sulzberger and his associates is in many ways unique. He himself is a man of fine culture with a keen sense of the news and with a complete objectivity. Sulzberger does not permit himself to be persuaded to be controlled by any passions or prejudices. He wants to see the Times publish the news and sees that it publishes it without color. The primary obligation of a newspaper is to publish the facts; this is not an easy thing to do. While the Times has been able to maintain a strong staff, the personal leadership which Arthur Sulzberger has given to this great newspaper and this great American institution is outstanding in journalism, not only in our country but in the world.

Birschell, who was for many years the editor of the Times, I did not know while he was in that position. I first learned to know him in Europe after he had retired from the post of editor and was acting as a roving correspondent for the Times in Europe. Birschell was a small, wiry man of great energy and unusual capacity. He was a man of very keen perception. He had a reddish-brown beard and I can see him as though it were yesterday sitting in my office in Berlin and in Vienna, contemplatively stroking his beard, and making some very acute
observations on developments in Central Europe and on individuals, and putting to me as searching and as penetrating questions as have ever been put to me by any correspondent. Just a few weeks ago (1955) I read about his passing; with his passing we lost one of our greatest foreign correspondents we've ever had. Eddy James, who was the first Managing Editor of the Times whom I knew well, was an entirely different kind of personality, but had the same energetic approach and, in many respects, the same penetration. The friendship which I was able to enjoy with him for so many years is a very pleasant memory. The present editor of the Times, Turner Cattledge, I have known but not as well as Birschell and James. He is a great newspaper man and will carry on the tradition of the Times.

The editorial policy of the Times has been, like its news policy, one of its extraordinary elements of strength and prestige. For many years Charles Merz has been the principal editorial writer of the Times. He has many able associates. The editorials of the Times are read more widely than those of any other newspaper. The one newspaper that one is sure to find in the editorial office of every important newspaper in the United States and even in our smaller cities and towns is the Times. It is there not only for the news but because of the editorial policy. Many an editor, who does not have the benefit of outside correspondents in the United States and abroad, is a close student of the editorials in the Times and its attitudes on fundamental questions of foreign and internal policy are with many of our editors a determining factor. The articles by Ann O'Hare McCormick for many years added prestige even to so important a paper as the Times. We were able to enjoy over many years a very pleasant and for me stimulating friendship. She travelled a great deal, particularly in Europe. She knew the political
developments in Europe and the leading figures in the political scene over a long period of years almost as well as probably any American. She was a quiet, unassuming, extremely intelligent woman of sound judgment. She took extraordinary pains to inform herself before she wrote on anything. Her recent passing was not only a great loss to the Times and its many readers in our country but a real distress for so many of her personal friends who enjoyed, whenever they had the opportunity to sit down with her and to discuss leisurely the background of developments in various countries of Europe. When she passed away in 1954 I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that more important people in various parts of the world and in our own country had a sense of personal loss.

The New York Times, like many others of our important newspapers at home maintains a Washington bureau. For many years the Washington bureau was in charge of Arthur Krock. I think that one can sum up Arthur in a few words by saying that he is a great newspaper man. The head of the Washington bureau of the Times is an important man even in that city of so many important people. He has access everywhere. It would have been very easy for Arthur's head to be turned and for him to become imbued with a sense of self importance and lesser men would have fallen into this error. While Krock speaks with authority when he writes he has not fallen into the error of some other really great correspondents whose head has been turned by the access they have and the position which their paper gives them and who like to speak like a god from the top of Olympus. He writes with authority but not with presumption. After the many years of his arduous work as head of the Washington bureau he has retired recently but is continuing his column occasionally in the Times and there are many people like myself, in our own country and in other
parts of the world, who hope that Arthur may live many years to continue to give us the benefit not only of the news but of his interpretation of it in view of his long background. He has been succeeded as head of the Washington bureau of the Times by Jimmy Reston. He and his wife are a charming couple and he had long won his spurs, although a relatively young man, before he was made the head of the Washington bureau.

In my opinion the Christian Science Monitor, published in Boston, is next to the Times one of the best edited and most responsible newspapers published in our country. While no newspaper is disinterested in the matter of circulation, because circulation means usually broader profits and influence, the Christian Science Monitor has from the outset been more interested in accurate, impartial presentation of the news than in profits. It has behind it a very wealthy church, but the Christian Science Monitor, as a newspaper, cannot be considered as an organ of the Christian Science church. The newspaper carries very little advertising. Aside from the high quality of the news and its broad coverage of internal and external problems of our country, its editorial policy is conservative, considered, and, of course, to my way of thinking, sound. The Monitor, like some of the best European newspapers, carries in practically every issue important articles devoted to political, economic, financial, and literary, as well as social problems. The importance of the Monitor cannot be judged by its circulation but it has a broad influence as it reaches so many people in practically every important city and town of our country. My closest touch with the Monitor was during the years 1933 to 1937, with its correspondents in Berlin and Vienna who were very high class men. I recall with great respect and appreciation Markham, who was correspondent of the Monitor in Vienna during the years that I was in the Legation there.
The Chicago Daily News is one of the great newspapers of our country. When Frank Knox became the editor and owner of the paper he greatly strengthened its foreign correspondents. During his time the Chicago Daily News had, I believe, next to the New York Times, the broadest and most able coverage of news from abroad, particularly from Europe, through its own correspondents. We first learned to know Frank Knox in Berlin after the Hitler regime came in. He and Mrs. Knox came to Berlin in 1933 or 1934. I think he wished to see for himself what was really happening. While the News had in Berlin as its correspondent Edgar Mowrer, who was one of the finest correspondents I have ever known, and one of the most conscientious and perceptive, Mowrer’s dispatches to the News, which were so frank, fearless and accurate, must have at times caused Knox to wonder whether Mowrer had lost his objectivity.

I recall that during his first visit to Berlin we had many conversations and one evening we had dinner in the Adlon in his apartment. Knox was very greatly disturbed by what he saw actually happening in Germany. He was not only appalled at what was happening but he was understanding of the eventual consequences in Germany and in Europe and for us. This little dinner in his apartment in the Adlon took place after Knox had been in Germany long enough to get the feel of things himself. There were, I believe, only Mrs. Knox and he, ourselves, and the Mowrers. We began to talk in intimate detail with regard to some of the individuals in control of the regime. Knox, who knew what was happening to so many people of all kinds in Germany, was nervous because he felt pretty sure that his sitting room was wired and that our conversation was being listened to. Mowrer was a marked man by the Nazis in Berlin who hated him perhaps more than they did any other foreign correspondent. At one point I recall Knox insisting that we endeavor to see whether any dictaphones
had been installed and we examined thoroughly the living-room and the bedroom. I told Knox that in many ways it would be a good thing if the apartment was wired for it would be well for Hitler, and Goering, and some of the rest to know just what we were talking about; it might have a good effect. The reporting of the Chicago Daily News of developments in Europe and its editorial policy during the difficult period preceding the war were excellent.

It took a good deal of not only moral but physical courage to be an accurate reporter in those early years of the Nazi regime. Edgar Mowrer was one of the most fearless reporters I have ever known. While he was a man of very fine and high ideals and felt deeply and passionately about what was happening in Germany, in so many ways, these deep feelings did not find expression in his articles other than in their accuracy and adequacy. Nevertheless, he became the most hated of the foreign correspondents in Germany, and one day Dr. Diehls, the then head of the Gestapo, spoke to me about Mowrer. He said he was afraid that something might happen to him. He said that some of the high ranking people in the government, like Hitler, simply were furious whenever Mowrer's name was mentioned. He feared that some physical harm would come to Mowrer. For that reason he had assigned Gestapo men of responsibility to discreetly protect Mowrer. He wanted me to know that with the passions which existed and with the remarks which were being made by Hitler and Goering and others, some fanatic or fanatics in the Party would knock off Mowrer or do him physical injury towards to eliminate him from the picture. He doubted whether this would happen but one had to remember that with fanatics in the picture anything could happen. He had found it necessary to put more and more men on the protection of Mowrer but he wanted me to know that while he was taking these adequate measures
as far as anyone could take them, that he could not assure me that no-
thing would happen to him. He was extremely interested that nothing
should happen to him because he knew what the outside repercussions
would be. It was shortly after this conversation that Knickerbocker
and another of the American correspondents in Berlin, who were both very
close friends of Mowrer, came to see me and told me that they were of
the opinion that Mowrer should leave Berlin and Germany. They were not
so much afraid that he would be actually killed but that he would be
attacked and physically maimed. They not only feared for Mowrer but
they knew what it would mean for his wife and children if anything hap­
pened to him. Much as they disliked the idea of anyone getting out,
the matter had, in their opinion, become so acute, that it was not only
what would happen to Mowrer and his family but the repercussions of it
would be so serious. They had tried to persuade Mowrer to leave; he
refused to do it. They said that they thought I was the only person
who could influence him to leave. I told them that I thought it was
useless for me to endeavor to do anything. In the first place I didn't
even like to speak to Mowrer about it. I admired him so much and what
he was doing that it went against the grain to do a thing of this kind.
Knickerbocker finally said that if Mowrer wished to take these risks so
far as he himself was concerned, he was not justified in taking them so
far as his family was concerned. I told them that I would speak to
Mowrer. When Edgar came in to see me in the next few days I talked to
him about this. When he saw that I was joining his other friends in
trying to persuade him to leave, tears came into his eyes and he looked
at me reproachfully. He said he could not understand my taking this
position. I told him I wasn't thinking of him only but of his family.
It was one of the most difficult conversations I ever had because Mowrer
and I felt so alike about these things, but I felt it was my duty to
persuade him to leave. Finally he gave up with a gesture of despair
and said that he would talk it over with his wife. Knox, in Chicago,
already realized the danger in which Mowrer was and, of course, was en-
tirely sympathetic. Mowrer decided to leave. Most of the American
 correspondents went to the station when he left by train with his family.
It was a sad parting because we all had so many mixed feelings. We did
not want him to go and we knew it was better that he go. I shall never
forget, as the train was about to move out and Edgar was entering the
train, he said to me: "And you too, Brutus". I felt miserable and de-
pressed. I knew it was the thing for him to do to leave and yet I hated
the part that I had played in his leaving. I'm frank to say that if I
thought that his leaving in any way would affect the coverage of the
accurate reporting and adequate reporting from Germany, whatever the
physical risks involved were for Mowrer, I would have had no part in
persuading him to go.

When I went to Vienna in 1934 I found there the correspondent
of the News was Fodor, a Hungarian, who I learned soon was one of the
finest correspondents in Europe. As a Central European and who knew
all of southeastern Europe so well from first-hand knowledge and obser-
vation, he was I'm sure as helpful to me in the many conversations I had
with him during the years that we were in Vienna together, as I was to
him in giving him such intimate background as I could on developments
as I saw them and knew them. Fodor too was a man of great courage and
he took great risks in those days, even in Austria, in his fearless re-
porting, for the long arm of the Nazis in those days went far beyond
the German frontiers. Fodor is now living in our country and has, I
believe, been a professor of journalism in one of the Middle West univer-
sities for some years. He was also the Vienna correspondent in those
days for the Manchester Guardian in England, which was taking such a
fine attitude in reporting on the European situation, in marked contrast
to its greater colleague the London Times.

When Frank Knox came to Washington on the invitation of the
President to become a member of the Cabinet at the same time that the
President invited Mr. Stimson to join the Cabinet, we saw each other
frequently and he is one of those men for whom, as I knew him better,
my respect and admiration grew. He was a great and fine citizen besides
being a great newspaperman and he was one of the most useful influences
in Washington in the years immediately preceding the war. He was one
of the few in high place in Washington who really understood what the
implications of what was happening throughout the world meant for our
country.

While the Chicago Tribune, from the point of view of circula-
tion, is one of the important newspapers of our country, its isolationist,
narrow, and prejudiced attitudes I believe never carried much influence
limited
beyond the radius of its circulation outside of Chicago. I was never
able to understand Colonel McCormick. I met him first in Berlin when
he came there after 1933. We soon found that we could not agree on any-
thing. The attitudes which he and his paper took with respect to En-
gland are well known. On what these deep-seated prejudices which Colonel
McCormick had were based I do not know. Whatever he said about England
and our relations with England had, I believe, not great weight in our
country. It was too obvious that so many of his attitudes in that res-
pect grew out of prejudice and our people are a discerning people. In
the few conversations that I had with Colonel McCormick in Europe and
before the outbreak of the war, I found that it was useless to try to
discuss basic situations in Europe, and particularly in Central and southeastern Europe, with him. He had formed his ideas. There was no changing them. Whatever facts, obvious as they were, one presented to him, he simply put aside. Talking with him was like talking with Neville Chamberlain, or with Neville Henderson in Berlin. I've often thought that the kindest thing one can say about Colonel McCormick is that he may have been sincere in his prejudices.

The Kansas City Star, the St. Louis Post Dispatch, the Louisville Courier Journal, and some of the newspapers in Boston, Providence, Hartford, New Orleans, Richmond, have been and are great papers. Their attitudes in the difficult days preceding the war were almost invariably constructive and responsible. Pulitzer, the owner and editor of the St. Louis Post Dispatch, was a great newspaperman. One of his passions was accuracy in the news. Haskell, who for so many years until his death recently, was one of the great editorial writers in our country, made an extraordinary contribution to the Kansas City Star during his lifetime and through constructive and understanding thinking in our country. His editorials in the Kansas City Star until his death were widely read, not only by a certain discerning public, but in editorial offices throughout our country. We had a very pleasant association over many years as he travelled a good deal in Europe, where we frequently saw him in our home and, later, after I returned to the United States.

The Washington Post, which has for many years been the principal newspaper published in the federal capital, has a very great influence. It has an influence far beyond its circulation, which is very largely limited to Washington. I should say, from my experience, from the years that I've spent in Washington, that it is the first newspaper that high officials of our government in the executive, legislative, and
judicial branches and the administrative services read in the morning. High officials of our government are not satisfied with the resumes of press comment which are invariably prepared for them in order to save them time. I would say from my experience that the first newspaper that practically everybody in a responsible position in Washington reads in the morning, and the one that he does read before going to his desk, is the Washington Post. A good many will read the New York Times before they go to their desk. It is safe to say that most will read the New York Times during the day. In the evening, if they have not read the Times they will read it and the local newspaper which has reached them by mail by that time. The people on the Hill are avid readers of their home newspapers. While the Washington Star has maintained a high newspaper tradition for years and an especially sound editorial policy, it is followed by people in Washington more for the local news and for its editorials than for foreign news. The Washington Post occupies this unusual position in the newspaper field in Washington and in our country.

When my friend Eugene Meyer bought the Post, it was I know his intention to make it one of the best and most influential newspapers in the country. I had long enjoyed a pleasant friendship with Gene and Agnes Meyer. Gene had accumulated a large fortune and for some time had been devoting himself to public life. He made very important contributions to the work of the Federal Reserve Bank in its earlier days and of our fiscal policy and, in the earlier days, to the work of the World Bank. He was able to devote himself very largely to the Post. His wife, Agnes, took a very great interest in the paper. Morley, who was the editor of the Post under the earlier part of Eugene Meyer's ownership of the paper, was one of the great editors of our country. He was a student and an extraordinarily well informed man, sound and unprejudiced
in his thinking, understanding, and courageous. It was during the days that Morley was editor of the Post that its editorial policy began to have an extraordinary influence in the country. Aside from its influence in Washington, among people in the government, Meyer began the practice of having the editorials of the Post sent to the editors of some of the leading papers throughout our country. I remember once his telling me, around 1937, that he was sending tear-sheets of the editorials of the Post for the following day the night before to some eighty of the editors of the leading papers throughout the country.

Completely aside from this position which was occupied by the Washington Post in the Capital, and of its editorial policy and the influence which it had in the capital and in so many editorial offices throughout our country, Eugene Meyer during the period of 1937 to 1940 that I was stationed in the Department, played a very helpful role. He had a broad and understanding attitude of what was happening in the world and its implications for us. He and Agnes had one of the large beautiful homes in Washington, in which they entertained many people from Washington and from the rest of the country and from abroad. His home became much frequented by newspaper publishers from other parts of the country and by some of the leading writers and commentators of that time. His personal influence in the shaping of events and thinking was considerable. The friendship which we enjoyed in those days was a very pleasant one and I shall always recall the many conversations which we had with regard to developing events and their significance as we saw them.

(I'm inserting the following comment in this parenthesis, not because I think it will be useful for publication, but for the purpose of my personal record. Agnes Meyer began to have more and more influence
in the paper. The Englishman, whose name I forget and who was brought in to replace Morley, was a man of deep prejudices and who never understood our country. Not only the news content but the value of the editorial comment went down considerably under this Englishman. One of the Meyer daughters married a man by the name of Graham, whom I always felt was much to the left, at least too far to the left in the opinion of a good many of us. It began to find its reflection in the paper. Increasingly Mrs. Meyer and Graham began to run the Post. It is still an important newspaper in our country for the reasons which have been set forth in these notes, but it does not carry the weight either in Washington or throughout editorial offices in the country that it did during the first years that Eugene Meyer was the owner of the paper. Eugene Meyer was always pondered and considered; Agnes became increasingly passionate and prejudiced. She became more and more of an apostle and the more apostle she became the less weight her speeches and her influence in the Post carried. When I was in the Argentine as Ambassador, the Post carried not only violent articles about Peron and the Argentine but very, what I think, ill-considered statements with regard to myself. They were born out of passions. In those days Braydon was the one who influenced the policy of the Post with regard to its news and comment on Latin America. The Post completely disregarded the violent intervention which he had taken in affairs in the Argentine and his unconstructive attitudes).

It may be worthwhile and of sufficient interest to set down a few notes with regard to some of the leading newspapers published outside of the United States.

The London Times, of course, is and has been for many years the most important newspaper published outside of our country. It is in every respect a great newspaper. I knew it best during the period
from 1930 to 1940. Jefffrey Dawson was a great editor. Lord Astor was already the principal owner of the Times when Hitler came into power in Germany. He and Lady Astor were at least the center, if not the most important, in the so called Cliveden set of unhappy memory. When the Nazi regime came in in Germany, its correspondent in Berlin was Ebbutt, one of the finest correspondents I have known and, like Edgar Mowrer, one of the most fearless. His dispatches out of Berlin, and I say this with all due respect to the great American correspondents we had in Berlin and Central Europe at that time, were the best; but when they appeared in the Times they were horribly mutilated. Lord and Lady Astor and the Cliveden set were controlling the policy of the Times, both as to news and editorials. I have elsewhere recorded in these notes how Jeffrey Dawson, whose personal views were so completely out of accord with those of the Cliveden set, was obliged to follow the policy set by the owners of the paper. It was perhaps the most unhappy epoch in the long and constructive life of the Times. All this is a matter of history.

When one considers the compact form of the Times and compares it with, for instance, the New York Times and other important newspapers in our own country, it is extraordinary how in this compressed space the Times has been able to give a picture of developments throughout the Empire and the world. For what it is worth I would like to express the opinion that the American public is much better informed through its press than the British public. Perhaps our papers are too bulky, perhaps our coverage in some of our best papers of developments outside of our own country is a little bit too detailed for even the most interested and knowledgeable reader to absorb. On the other hand, because the coverage in our leading newspapers is so complete and in so many cases accurate, I believe that the average intelligent person in the
United States has a more complete understanding of developments throughout the world than does the English newspaper reader. Because of the limited compass of the Times and all of the English newspapers, the most important development in our own country or in another part of the world may be compressed into a few paragraphs in the Times. The achievement of the Times in compressing the news and at the same time giving a quite clear picture is really an extraordinary one.

During the period 1930 to 1940 the Manchester Guardian was in my opinion doing a greater service than its older colleague, the London Times. Under the extraordinarily able editing of Garvin, who wrote so many of the editorials for the paper, the Guardian was better informing the English public with regard to developments in the rest of the world than was the London Times. It remains a great newspaper. While I was in Vienna during the years of 1934 to 1937, Fodor, whom I've already mentioned, was also the correspondent for southeastern Europe of the Guardian.

Before the Nazi regime came into power in 1933, when of course all the newspapers were completely government controlled, I had had a good deal of contact with the leading newspapermen in Germany. The Frankfurter Zeitung was a great newspaper - not only for the news it carried and its coverage, but also for the leading articles which, like so many European newspapers, it published. In the years immediately before the access of the Nazis to power, the Berliner Borsen Zeitung, while principally a financial paper, was really a good newspaper. Funk, who later became Under Secretary of Propaganda for Goebbels, had been a leading correspondent of the Borsen Zeitung and later its editor and he was one of the great newspapermen of Europe in those days. When I recall the conversations which I had with him before January 1933, and his understanding perception and courage and his several actuations later,
and almost overnight, under Goebbels as Under Secretary of Propaganda, it makes one wonder about human nature. The German newspapers became a farce; they carried no news except what the government wished the papers to carry. They built up a complete wrong idea in the minds of the German people as to what was happening outside of the wall which the government had built around the country. The only thing that one can admire about this is the extraordinary effectiveness of this wall which the government built around the country and the extraordinarily clever, if cynical, and fiendish way in which the news from abroad and developments from abroad were distorted. Goebbels rightly said that no matter how untrue a thing was that if it was said often enough ninety-nine percent of the people would end in believing it, and the Nazi press was one of the powerful instruments which the government had in bringing about conformity and in preparing the way for the path of world domination on which the regime was bent.

When I arrived in Vienna towards the middle of 1934, it was really startling to see the contrast between the German and the Austrian press. While the Socialist government exercised certain indirect controls over the press, it was a remarkably free press. So far as internal news are concerned and editorial policy, the Vienna press faithfully reflected the opinion of from eighty-five to ninety percent of the Austrian population who did not want Anschluss or Nazification of the country. I had very pleasant relations with the editors of the principal newspapers in Vienna. Dr. Benedict, who was the editor of the (I will have to insert the name of the newspaper) was even according to our standards in the United States a great newspaperman. He was a scholar and I recall with great pleasure conversations which we had after lunch or dinner, usually in his home on the outskirts of Vienna where we could talk tranquilly. In the Austrian government Dr. Hornbostel
maintained relations with the press. He was a well educated Austrian and a good Austrian and a good European. Whatever controls the Dollfuss and Schuschnigg government exercised over the press were very limited and so far as international news was concerned there was really no control.

One of the great newspapers of Europe for years has been the Zuricher Zeitung. Like the London Times, in a very small compass, it gives an unusual coverage of developments throughout the world. One of the features of the Zuricher Zeitung for years has been the leading articles which it carries on political, social, industrial, financial, and other major developments in Europe and in the rest of the world. It is perhaps one of the most widely read newspapers in Europe outside of the limits of its country. I have from time to time over the years had conversations with editors and correspondents of the Zuricher Zeitung and have found them nearer to our own type of foreign correspondents in the United States than those of any other country, with the possible exception of England.

Before I saw a few words concerning the press in Latin America, what I've said concerning the European press would be incomplete - and it is already from the notes I have dictated only a most inadequate resumé of my relations with some of those European newspapers and those who printed them and gathered the news for them - I should say a word concerning the English language newspapers published abroad. I never had any direct relationship with either the Japan Advertiser or the Japanese Times, which had a considerable influence among the English-speaking peoples in the Far East. The London Daily Mail had an English edition published in Paris; it was widely read by English-speaking peoples all over Europe. It was read also a good deal by important people in the foreign offices in the various countries of Europe and by impor-
tant people in business, financial, and industrial circles in Europe. The Paris editions of the Chicago Tribune and of the New York Herald Tribune had much broader circulation, particularly the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune. It was for many years a European institution. It was fed by the correspondents of the Herald Tribune abroad and by the news services, that is, by the United States news purpose services such as the United Press, Associated Press, and International News Service. Considering the difficulties of an English language newspaper of this kind in Europe, it was well managed and gave a good coverage of world news, of developments in the American and British colonies in various parts of Europe, and its editorial policy was, if anything, interesting. It was the most widely read, for many years, of the English language newspapers available in Europe. It was a European institution.

The English language newspapers published in Latin America have had a spotty and difficult existence. For many years the two principal English language newspapers which appeared in Latin America were the Buenos Aires Standard and the Buenos Aires Herald. They were both English owned. Their circulation was to a large extent confined to the Argentine but both of these daily English language papers had a fairly wide circulation in Uruguay, Brazil, Chile, and a few other countries to the north. The English-speaking group in the Argentine went far beyond the large English colony and the relatively large, but much smaller American colony than the British. A great many Argentines were of English, Irish, or Scotch origin, and although long Argentine citizens, that is, for generations, the Standard and the Herald had a large circulation among them. They were in many ways good newspapers. I had very pleasant relations with them while I was in the Argentine, first as Consul General in 1928 and 1929 and later when I was Ambassador there in 1946 and 1947. Although largely read by the American colony in Buenos Aires
and in the Argentine, the general attitude of both the Standard and the Herald was not friendly towards things American. The best English language newspapers which have appeared in Latin America, outside of the two mentioned in the Argentine, have been several papers published in Havana and in Mexico City. They did not carry very much weight at any time and were of interest principally for the news which they carried about the American and British groups in Cuba and in Mexico. In recent years, however, it has been interesting to note the success of the Mexico City News. It is a successor of various efforts to publish an English language newspaper in Mexico City. A few years ago, Novedades, one of the leading newspapers in Mexico, decided to publish an English edition; it is known as "The News". It has been developed into a really good newspaper. It has a good coverage of outside news; it covers the activities of the British and American colonies in Mexico. It devotes a great deal of space to artistic, musical, theatrical, and generally cultural developments in Mexico. As there are almost always some eight or ten thousand American tourists in Mexico City and who have no knowledge of Spanish, and as these tourists frequently spend from a week to a month in Mexico City or vicinity or in the rest of the country, The News serves a very useful purpose for these tourists, not only in keeping them informed as to what is happening in the world outside by also in informing them of what are the best things and the most interesting things to see in Mexico City and the rest of the country. The News carries some of the leading columns published in the United States. Aside from its American and English readers, it is read by many English-speaking Mexicans in the government and in business and industrial and financial circles. It has proved to be the most successful of the English language newspapers so far published in Latin America.
When one considers the relative industrial and general economic and political development in Latin America with that in Europe and in the United States, it is really interesting to observe how well, on the whole, in most of the countries of Latin America the public is served through the daily press. The observations which I shall make with regard to the press in Latin America will have to be in very general and, I'm afraid, in too sketchy form. I have followed the press in most of the countries of Latin America over a number of years closely. I've seen the press in a good many of these countries at close quarters. I've known its problems, political and economic. To anyone who really knows the other American republics it is indeed a gratifying and an encouraging thing to note how many really worthwhile papers have been developed.

In any Latin American country.

It was in the Argentine in 1928 and 1929 and part of 1930 that I had my first direct contact with the Latin American press. At that time and for a number of years, La Prensa and La Nación were the leading newspapers, by far, published in all of Latin America. The Argentine at that time was a great and a rich country. The metropolitan population of Buenos Aires was as large as that, if not larger, than that of any other metropolitan area in other American republics. Literacy was as high if not higher in Buenos Aires than any other similar area in Latin America. Both of these newspapers not only had extraordinary prestige in the Argentine but they were recognized throughout all of Latin America and in Europe and in the United States as the leading Latin newspapers of the American republics. It would be difficult for me to pass in any judgment as to whether the La Nación or La Prensa was in those years the better of the two newspapers. In many ways they were as good, so far as news coverage is concerned, and responsibility, as
most of the important newspapers published in our own country. They were in many respects a close approximation to the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune in those days. They were well fed; the news was attractively presented. The coverage of the foreign news was very ample and much greater than that given in some important newspapers outside of New York in our own country. Both La Nación and La Prensa spent a great deal of money on the services of the United States and from Europe, and particularly from the United Press and the Associated Press. The Buenos Aires newspapers in those days, and probably today still, are the best customers in all of the other American republics of the American press services. The editorial policy of both La Nación and La Prensa was sound and considered, and in view of the fact that Buenos Aires is really very far away from Europe and North America, and one must take that into account, the editorials were of high and understanding quality. There was what I think one could call absolute freedom of the press. There might from time to time be a little indirection with regard to the line to follow, but for the most part La Nación and La Prensa were free in their news and editorial policy as the newspapers in the Anglo-Saxon countries.

La Prensa was the property of the Paz family. It was one of the most valuable newspaper properties of the Western Hemisphere. Aside from its large circulation, it had a tremendous income from advertising. It carried page after page of closely printed classified advertising. The circulation of La Nación was not quite as large as that of La Prensa, but in public opinion they had much the same position so far as prestige and authority is concerned. One of the interesting features of La Prensa and La Nación was that they were read by so many people who were not so much interested in the news as they were in the classified advertising.
in 1928 was to find working men reading La Prensa and La Nación, but I found that they were more interested in the classified advertising than they were in the news; so far as the news is concerned they preferred to read one of the two or three then popular newspapers which covered the news in a more sensational way. La Nación was the property of the X family (I will have to insert the name, it escapes me for the moment). Both families took a tremendous interest and pride in their newspapers and had for generations. By the end of my first stay in Buenos Aires in the 1930's, I had come to the conclusion that La Nación was really the better of the two newspapers. It was clearer in its presentation of the news and, what I should say, less "stuffy". The Prensa took a very authoritative position. Its word on any subject was the last word. La Nación was much less pretentious but I repeat I believe the better newspaper. In this conclusion I do not believe I was influenced by the fact that La Nación on the whole was more friendly towards the United States than La Prensa. La Prensa could not be said to be unfriendly towards the United States at that time but it was much more reserved and less generous in its attitudes towards the United States and with regard to certain internal matters in the Argentine than was La Nación.

My next close contact with the press in Latin America was in Cuba beginning in early 1940. There were three or four daily papers published in Havana at that time which one could call really good newspapers. There were no newspapers of any importance published in Cuba outside of these in Havana. I had a great deal of admiration in those days for Mr. Cue, who was the largest owner and the editor of "El Mundo". He was an enterprising and in many ways an excellent newspaperman.

The most important newspaper in Havana for over a hundred years has been the Diario de la Marina. In many ways so far as appearance, make-up, content, and responsibility are concerned, it was more close to
La Prensa and La Nación in Buenos Aires than any other newspaper in Latin America. At the time that I knew the Diario de la Marina first closely in the early 1940's, Pepín Rivero was the principal owner and editor. His family was of Spanish origin. He was an extremely intelligent man and a good newspaperman. He wrote very well. He perhaps wrote as well as any editor in Latin America at that time. If he so wished he could be extraordinarily sarcastic and cynical. I was told when I arrived in Havana to take up my duties in the Embassy there, that the Diario de la Marina was friendly to the United States and that Rivero himself was very unfriendly. The associate editor was Raúl Mestre, a very intelligent, much younger man than Rivero. We got to know Mestre very well during the early days of our stay in Havana. I was informed by our own people and by good Cuban friends that Rivera was very pro-German and even pro-Nazi. After having followed the news and the editorial comment in the Diario de la Marina for three or four months after my arrival, I could not see anything particularly unfriendly nor anti-American in the policy of the paper nor in its news content. It was at times critical in its editorial comment but not with regard to the war or our attitude towards Germany and Europe. Rivera was of Spanish origin — that is, his family was of Spanish origin — and he was a strong supporter of the Franco government in Spain. He had some years before received a decoration from the German government and before the Nazi government came in. I could not see that all of this pointed to necessarily an anti-American attitude, and I therefore decided that the best thing to do was to get to know Rivera. He asked my wife and me to his home for dinner. We had a very pleasant evening. His wife was a charming woman. This opened the way and I began to see Rivera frequently. During our first conversations there was no mention whatever of newspapers or newspaper policy; we talked about Europe, about Germany, about Fascism, about
internal problems in Cuba, about the responsibilities of the United States in the war, and I pointed out how I saw these responsibilities growing; in fact, we talked about the natural things that it was likely that two people who followed world affairs would talk about. While I could note that he felt very strongly with regard to the Franco government, I could see that his principal reason for criticism of the United States was its attitude towards that government, which he thought was lacking of understanding of the real facts in Spain and the realities of the Spanish situation. I could not detect any unfriendly feeling towards my country. He began to ask me for lunch at the offices of the Diario in Havana, where a few of us including Mestre would meet around the table. Within less than a year after I had arrived in Havana, the Diario de la Marina became as strongly pro-American in its attitude as any newspaper in Cuba. There were those who attributed this stronger slant towards the United States of the paper to opportunism. I am convinced that the basis was not opportunism, it was conviction. That the newspaper should at times editorially attack some of our policies with respect to Cuba should have been understood by any reasonable person as not representing an unfriendly attitude. Our treatment of Cuba with respect to sugar had not been understanding and correct. Rivera and I became good friends and the friendship lasted until he passed away much too early in life.

I got to know the newspapers in Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, Santiago de Chile, and in Montevideo. Considering the economic factors under which these newspapers worked, and considering the limited circulation which so many of them had, they did not do a bad job. None of them had the coverage of United States and European news, which the newspapers in Buenos Aires and Cuba had. The newspapers in Colombia, which I did not see at work in their own country but which I followed from the
issues which came to me at regular periods, were perhaps at that time superior in content to those of the other countries just mentioned.

When I came to Mexico in 1912, I found there four excellent daily papers, or perhaps I should say three very good ones and one moderately good. Excelsior, Novedades, and El Universal, old, well-established newspapers with a long tradition behind them, and the editors of these newspapers were first-class men. La Prensa had a larger circulation than any of the other three, but it was more popular in character and not quite as responsible in many respects as Excelsior, Novedades, and El Universal. The relationships which I was able to establish with the editors of these papers and particularly with Rodrigo de Llano of Excelsior, and Lanz Duret of El Universal, and later with Rómulo O'Farrill of Novedades, were indeed a very pleasant association. The attitude of the Mexican press as a whole, with of course few exceptions, was not only friendly towards the United States but completely understanding of the situation in Europe and of the importance of allied victory. I was able to form very pleasant relationships among some of the principal Mexican correspondents and writers, and one of those whom I shall always remember as a man of great intelligence, understanding, and correctness as a journalist is Bernard Ponce.

In make-up, substance, coverage, and quality of the editorial page, the Excelsior, El Universal, and Novedades rank with the Diario de la Marina and El Mundo at the time in Havana as just below the La Prensa and La Nación in Buenos Aires. During the war there were really no better newspapers in Latin America than the three I have just mentioned in Mexico City. All of these newspapers in Mexico City had in common with La Prensa and La Nación in Buenos Aires and the Diario de la Marina and several other of the leading papers in Havana, the custom of
publishing in every issue leading articles on various political, social, economic, and industrial subjects contributed by well-known writers in the country. It would have been too much to expect that all of these contributors to the leading newspapers in Mexico and to the weekly and monthly periodicals should be friendly and understanding in their attitude towards the United States. After all there is historical background in the relations between the United States and Mexico which cannot be neglected by any thoughtful or intelligent person. That there should be rancors and prejudices which remain and which led at times to unreasonable and unreasoned criticism of the United States, was only too natural and to be expected. On the whole the behavior of the Mexican press during the war was excellent, in the interest of its own country and in the interest of the allies.

I have elsewhere in these notes referred to the freedom of the press in general and have made some references to the direct and indirect controls exercised over the press in some of the Latin American countries. Perhaps one of the most distressing things which happened in the press picture in Latin America was the attitude of the government of Peron in the Argentine towards La Prensa and La Nación in particular, and to several other papers in Buenos Aires and a few in the provinces. The economic and labor policies and, in some ways, the general financial policies followed by the administration of President Peron from the outset did perhaps as much harm towards the economy of that country internally and to its external position as anything which the government could have done. I will not at this point enter into certain social and political situations which existed in the Argentine which made the country ripe for certain changes and which changes were really necessary. Perhaps, however, Argentine prestige suffered no greater blow than the treatment accorded by the government to La Prensa. This newspaper, together with
La Nación, had become a tradition in the Argentine. They stood for things which the Argentine had stood for years. What had come with the advent of the Peron government was really a revolution and this meant radical changes. Certain of these changes, had they been carried through with wisdom and discretion, would have been welcomed not only by the masses but by forward thinking people in the Argentine. The main difficulty from the beginning was that the land-owning classes, the bankers, the important industrialists, and commercial people, and the intellectuals were so deeply rooted in the traditions of the past that they could not admit of any change. They would under no circumstances collaborate with the government. This led to the awakening of passions and resentments, and excesses on both sides were bound to happen; but the representatives of the old order in the Argentine were powerless. The government was completely in the hands of the new administration. Any opposition was reduced to futility. There was, however, the opportunity for the press and particularly for the leaders of the press, La Prensa and La Nación, to exercise a restraining influence on events.

It was always my impression that La Nación, without in any way swerving from any of its principles and its high tradition, was prepared to give the new administration credit for the good things it might do and to criticize it strongly for anything which it considered bad. On the other hand, the attitude of La Prensa from the outset of the regime was to find nothing good and to attack bitterly and often completely unreasonably some really considered efforts towards improvement exercised in the social structure. La Prensa could have a constructive influence had it not made up its mind from the beginning that it was going to destroy the government. It was so proud of its established position, so entrenched in its wealth, and so sure of itself that it felt that by practically ignoring the new administration and by opposing
it in every way possible, that it could destroy it. In this one must remember that La Prensa really represented not so much public opinion in the Argentine as it represented the opinion of the so-called 'distinguidos', a relatively small group of the Argentine population, perhaps very three or four hundred families at the most, who had for decades controlled the political and economic life of the country almost without interruption. This group, although it had had a tremendous setback in the elections, which brought Peron to the presidency, although it realized that the elections had really been an election in which there had been an overwhelming majority in favor of Peron, could not accept defeat. It was just one of those things that could not happen; it was an interlude, it was a strange phenomena which would pass. The Paz family was strongly entrenched in this tradition and attitude.

When I reached Buenos Aires in May, 1946, shortly before the inauguration of President Peron, La Prensa and La Nación had suffered only up to that time minor inconveniences. That the attitude of the new administration would be decidedly unfriendly towards them was quite obvious; that the positions of these two newspapers was in danger was clear. I do not know what would have happened and no one can tell what would have happened if the attitude of La Prensa had been more considered instead of so arbitrary. I myself am of the opinion, in which I think I will find few to support me except those who know the Argentine well, that if the situation had been handled with more understanding by La Prensa, the disastrous events which followed for it as well as for La Nación and for the prestige of the Argentine might have been avoided.

From the outset I had close contact with this problem of the press. I was of the opinion that La Prensa and La Nación and the rest of the Argentine press could retain its integrity and all of its principles and survive. I realized, however, that the attitude taken by
La Prensa in completely ignoring every good thing done by the government and by its bitter personal and general attacks, was in the situation of tension going to precipitate a crisis. I realized that La Nación would have to go along, for better or worse it was in the same bed with La Prensa. Realizing the unhappy consequences which would come to the Argentine and to the Peron government, and the difficulties which it could create in the whole inter-American picture in relations with the United States, I did not hesitate from time to time to speak with Peron with regard to his attitude and that of his associates towards the press and particularly La Prensa and La Nación. I tried to convince him how important it was the freedom of the press not only for him but for his country and for its relations with other countries. I did not hesitate to tell him that harsh measures towards the press, because it did not conform in the way he desired it to conform, lead to very unhappy consequences not only in the country but that it would raise tremendous opposition and feeling in the other countries of Latin America as well as in my own country and in free countries in Europe. I found Peron in the beginning very reasonable about this matter. I think he saw the dangers. He had, however, around him those who were violent and completely unreasonable. I came to the conclusion that a crisis was inevitable. I did not see La Prensa ceding one centimeter. In several secondary problems which arose which had no connection with the freedom of the press, the management of La Prensa showed a completely unsocial attitude. Friends of Mr. Paz and of the family and deeply interested in the freedom of the press endeavored to bear in conviction that the attitude of the paper in certain matters was unreasonable also, and that this would give opportunity for attack on the paper to which it was unnecessary to expose it. Mr. Paz knew that I was endeavoring to be helpful in this matter as well
as others. He did not once by word or gesture, but rather the contrary, show any appreciation of this attitude. Under the circumstances it was inevitable that things should come to a crisis. Peron decided to take over La Prensa and all the facts of this problem are so well known that it is not necessary to go into them in these notes. It is sufficient to say that Peron raised a barrier against himself in the other countries of Latin America and in the United States and in Europe, at least in the free countries of Europe, a feeling with respect to him which one wonders how it can change. Even in those countries where there was a certain direct or indirect control of the press, there was violent criticism and very properly so of the attitude of the Peron government towards La Prensa and others of the Argentine press. Of all the ill-considered steps which may have been taken by the administration of President Peron in the internal and external situation of the Argentine, there is none which has done it more lasting harm than this absolute control over the press and what has amounted to, so far, practical confiscation of La Prensa.

It would not be correct for me even in these intimate notes to cover conversations which took place between President Peron and myself in an entirely friendly way with regard to this treatment of the newspapers and the control of the press by the government. I will, however, make a statement which perhaps few of my friends will understand and which practically no one will agree with, and that is that Peron never intended that matters should go so far in the control of the press and particularly with reference to the drastic action in the case of La Prensa. While perhaps he never realized in the earlier stages and while it was still time to stop all this, all of the implications of these controls, and while he did not realize that what he considered more an internal struggle between himself and his administration and the Paz family and the "distinguidos", would have these world-wide repercussions,
he did at least have sufficient comprehension of the power of repercussions and should have endeavored to avoid really drastic action. It was precipitated by both sides. The feelings were so deep, there was no reconciliation. It came to the point where there was no formula and the government took the final and drastic action. The result of it is that the government is saddled not only with the control of the press, which it perhaps considers still necessary for its security and permanence, but it has heaped upon itself mountains of feeling in others of the Latin American countries and in the United States and elsewhere. There were times when I felt very hopeful that the matter could be settled. There are times when I know it could have been settled without any sacrifice of principle by La Prensa and La Nación, but one has to understand the violent passions which can be aroused in Latin countries and even in other countries, including our own, and one must be able to understand the peculiar situation which had developed for generations in the Argentine and the particular situation which had developed in connection with the advent of the Peron government in order to appreciate that what happened was inevitable.

The foregoing is a very inadequate statement of the situation which led to the taking over of the Prensa and the complete tightening of the controls by the government over the press in the country. Even in these intimate notes, a certain restraint is necessary and there are certain things which would be illuminating which cannot be said. I often wish that the whole story in all of its aspects on both sides could be told so as to avoid the possibility of anything like this happening in any of the other countries of America. Perhaps if the whole story were told in all of its bare facts and with complete objectivity, it would serve as such an object lesson of distressing consequences for both parties concerned as well as for a great human principle, that of
Pleasant Relations with Editors and Correspondents at home and in many other countries.

As I've already indicated in these notes, I learned very early in my service for our government how important it is for a foreign service officer to maintain close contact with the press at home and abroad. During my whole service with my government I endeavored never to forget how essential this was. Whatever other fruits this contact may have had it did have one definite one as I have already stated, and that is the formation of pleasant associations and friendships which have meant a great deal to me.

It was in my third post in Antwerp, where we arrived in early 1919, that I first began to have really close contact with the press. The war had hardly been over when the recognition which had been given in other countries to the part that we had played in the winning of the war began to be dimmed by criticism, which became gradually more and more severe and at times violent. One of the forms in which this criticism found its most active and early expression was in calling us "Shylock". We were, as a matter of fact, not really pressing anybody, but in late 1919 the Belgian press, more particularly in Brussels and in Antwerp, began to carry articles criticizing the United States for harsh pressures on its allies. The term "Shylock" became more and more used. I was confident that a great deal of this criticism was due to lack of understanding of the facts. Certain governments, if they did not actually stimulate such criticism in the press, at least tolerated it. It served a certain purpose. In Antwerp in those day the principal newspaper was Le Neptune. The editor and guiding spirit of the paper was a Mr. van der Sloyn, a relatively young energetic journalist. We
became good friends. He soon realized the injustice of the criticism leveled against the United States. Through him I learned to know the editors of the other newspapers in Antwerp. The Brussels newspapers continued to be as active in their unfounded criticism. One day while with Ambassador Phillips at the Embassy in Brussels, he spoke to me about the difference between the Antwerp and Brussels press in this respect. I told him what we had tried to do there and the way we tried the approach. I told him that I thought this approach in Brussels would be more difficult as, although Brussels was a larger city and the capital, it was in many ways more provincial than Antwerp. He was extremely interested and the Embassy endeavored to establish closer contact with the owners and editors of the principal newspapers in Brussels and with some of the writers on economic and financial subjects. These efforts helped but did not work out as they should have.

It was not until I was assigned to Berlin as Consul General in early 1930 that I began the practice of having every week or every two weeks a meeting in my office of such of the American correspondents who were interested. As almost without exception the representatives of the American newspapers and news agencies in Germany were men of high quality, these meetings turned out to be very useful. I tried from the very beginning to put them on the same give and take basis that I had conducted by personal associations with correspondents. If a correspondent is able to use intelligently and usefully any information which a representative of our government can give him in the way of confidential background, then he is also the type of person who through his own efforts is able to get a great deal of information of his own. If he expects background information, therefore, from a representative of our government, he must be disposed to give to that representative the benefit of any information which he has. I've always found this to work out
very well. As the situation in Germany became more and more serious with the development of the objectives of the Nazi government, this close relationship between the correspondents and the representatives of our government in Berlin became invaluable to both sides. I continued this practice when I went to Vienna and later in Mexico City.

I am making mention of this personal practice because I was, in a way, one of our chiefs of mission and foreign service officers who broke the ice in this field. It was not until the early 1930's that our chiefs of mission and foreign service officers began to realize the importance of collaboration between the press at home and abroad and our missions and consulates. There was always a grave fear on the part of the representatives of our government that the information given in confidence and for background might be misused. That such a danger exists there is no doubt, but my own observation has been that it depends entirely on the way in which the matter is handled. During all these many years that I have had the privilege of enjoying this association with the owners and editors of our papers at home and those who write for them at home and abroad, and with the owners and editors of newspapers in other countries and those who write for them, I have had so far as our own press is concerned only two disappointments and disillusionments - and the sinner in each of these two cases was a completely irresponsible person. It is indeed an extraordinary thing that in our country we have this deep sense of responsibility on the part of the press, not only of those who own and direct it but of those who write for it.

I have spoken of some of our correspondents abroad and of men like Edgar Mowrer, Knickerbocker, Markham. I do not mention so many others with whom I had the opportunity to work with in various places.
I do want to mention particularly John Gunther. We first knew each other in Vienna where he was stationed when I arrived in 1934. He had an extraordinary appreciation of developing events in Europe. He was hungry for facts. He wrote with great facility, he strove for accuracy. We saw each other almost daily during the period of my assignment in Vienna. His first important book on the European situation "Inside Europe" was very accurate and its influence was tremendous. I cannot fail to speak of Dorothy Thompson, who came so many times to various places where I was stationed in Europe. Aside from her personal charm, she is an extraordinarily intelligent woman. During the days in which the European situation was developing so rapidly toward a crisis, there were times when Dorothy became a bit emotional, but she was never wrong in her appreciation of the facts. She had an extraordinary awareness of what was really happening behind the news.

The United Press and the Associated Press, the two leading news agencies in our country, have a record of which they can be proud. The International News Service has also done an excellent job. All three of these news agencies have been able, from time to time, to get into their service in various parts of the world, some of the most able of our foreign correspondents. When I think of the extraordinary ability with which Tom Curran has carried on the activities of the United Press in its main office in Latin America in Buenos Aires, I think of so many other heads of these agencies in Europe and in Latin America whom I've known and worked with, and their associates, any of whom have done a wonderful job in keeping our newspapers at home supplied with accurate pictures of developments in the countries in which they are stationed. Few people in our own country, who have little reason to have direct contact with this problem, have any reason to know how much superior the service is which has been rendered by these agencies to that rendered
by the news agencies in some other countries. I do not speak of Tass, the news agency of the Soviet government, concerning which I could write a little volume. The main purpose of the Tass correspondent is to make the news look like what he knows Moscow wants it to look like. I make reference more particularly to agencies such as France Presse, and Reuters, which are practically the official news agencies of the French and British governments. It is a fortunate thing for us in our country that our newspapers are supplied by these completely independent news agencies, that is, the United Press and the Associated Press and the International News Service, and that the press is not served by a government owned or at least largely government controlled official press agency. We do have now the United States Information Service, which is a government agency, but the main purpose of which is not to gather the news and to supply it to our press at home but to provide certain information concerning our country to be distributed abroad in order that there may be a better understanding of our institutions, our people, our policies, and our objectives.

I do not know of any American writer on our foreign relationships who has over some years had a better understanding of the implication of events abroad on us and on our future than Dave Lawrence. He has shown extraordinary perception and understanding, and the column which he is still writing and the article which he prepares every week for one of his daily publications, are two of the major contributions which are being made in our country to the understanding of what is happening and what it means to us. In these very few words I want to pay my personal tribute to one whom I believe is one of the best interpreters of the news whom we have produced in the United States.
(This long series of notes on the press, etc. will require considerable revision and some additions. I've said little about so many of the columnists, commentators, writers, correspondents, whom I've known so well and for whom I have such affection and admiration, and who have done such a wonderful job. In any revision of this memorandum I must speak individually of some of these men and women, for our country owes a great deal to them. I must also speak of Mike McDermott in the Department of State).