

U.S. AND COMMUNIST PRESS PERSPECTIVES IN WORLD
COMMUNICATION; A CASE STUDY

By

George Gerbner

Institute of Communications Research
University of Illinois

Use

This is the report of a comparative examination of major headline content and news emphasis between The New York Times and the Hungarian Socialist Workers (Communist) party central daily, Népszabadság, dealing with the United Nations 15th General Assembly session in the fall of 1960.

The purpose was not to compare a giant of world journalism, as such, with a tabloid-size 12-14 page organ of a small Eastern European country. It was not even to measure the extent, variety, fullness, or factual nature of the coverage of the sessions in the two papers; no research is necessary to make such comparisons. But neither did we intend this to be merely an off-beat exercise in journalistic analysis.

The study was, in fact, a by-product of other research activities.¹ But its conception stemmed from a concern which we have come to share with other communications researchers² as we became more deeply involved in cross-cultural investigations in a divided world. The concern is over the limitations imposed by our own theories of press and standards

¹The opportunity to obtain materials and some insights for this study stemmed from a larger research project directed by the author under a Cooperative Research Contract with the U.S. Office of Education. The current 2-year phase of the study is designed to investigate various aspects of mass media systems of ten countries, as related to the portrayal of teachers and schools in popular culture.

²Cf. Charles E. Osgood, Graduated Reciprocation in Tension-Reduction; A Key to Initiative in Foreign Policy. Urbana, Ill.: Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1960; Dallas W. Smythe, "The Spiral of Terror in the Mass Media," Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1960; and recent publications of the Center for Research in Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan.

of journalism upon a realistic appraisal of the actual roles news media might play in today's clash of world perspectives.³

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS

Two sets of general considerations provide the theoretical background and hypothesis for this analysis. One is the notion that mass media are cultural arms of industrial systems performing functions inherent in the needs of the systems they serve. Through selection, treatment, and emphasis of aspects of life to be presented, the media help define significant realities and make available major perspectives from which these realities might be viewed. By so doing, they also establish bases for communication among peoples. When definitions of significant world realities are themselves disjointed, and when world perspectives are in conflict, national media play the double roles of representing authoritative national definitions and perspectives, and of attempting to use these as common grounds for global communication. The patterns of selection, treatment, and emphasis which can define significant realities and provide perspectives encompassing the most universal necessities and aspirations will naturally provide the broadest bases of communication with others.

The second set of considerations arose from observations and conversations on all sides of geographical and ideological dividing lines. We concluded that there are two major ways of defining the significant realities and perspectives of today's world scene. One way is along the dimension of the power conflict. Viewed from this point of view, strategy and counter-strategy, threats and counter-threats, yardage gained or lost, and

³These limitations are apparent, to varying degrees, in most major attempts to survey the role of the press in world communication. Also, such attempts have been either too broad and scattered in their attention or the events focused upon were themselves events of (mainly military) conflict providing little common basis for communication across the East-West divide. ~~For~~ *Some* the most illuminating are Jacques Kayser's One Week's News (Paris: UNESCO, 1953) comparing 17 major dailies; Wilbur Schramm's One Day in the World's Press (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1959) reproducing 14 national dailies when Suez and Hungary dominated the world scene, and the Hoover Institute series ranging over a wide field for long periods of time.

keeping the scoreboard up to date become the most significant aspects of newsworthy events. What the game is about is assumed to be known. The important thing is how gains already achieved can be defended, how rules which make gains possible can be preserved, and how new points can be scored. We call this perspective "procedural" and "conflict-oriented."

The other dimension cuts the pie differently. Seen from this perspective, the substance and promise of specific issues occupy the center of the stage. Conflict is seen as delaying, agreement as hastening the realization of all that really matters. The "power-game" with its rules, scores, gains and losses is secondary except as it affects the possibility of agreement on the substantive ends to be achieved. These ends are not abstract, distant, remote, or ultimate; they are immediate and pressing. Coexistence, disarmament, colonial liquidation are seen not mainly as aspects of big-power conflict, or even of ultimate survival; they are seen as bread and butter for tomorrow's table, a separate apartment for the family next year, a school for the children, better wages for the father, appliances in the stores, and freer, more secure life for everyone now. This perspective is essentially "substantive" and "agreement-oriented."

Using such dimensions as categories of analysis might strike Americans as strange and even questionable. We are accustomed to using our own scales of "news values" and standards of reporting as yardsticks. But our own yardsticks are obviously inadequate to measure the role they themselves might play in world communication. It would be dangerous to assume that the rules of the game as we play it are also the ultimate judgments of history. A safer and more reasonable assumption might be that our standards emerge from and guide our own press system and thus play the role of a participant but not that of an umpire on the world scene. We could inquire into that role by contrasting it with others

on terms relevant to divergent standards and definitions of reality. While admittedly oversimplified and interrelated, the dimensions proposed above as categories of analysis seem to us highly relevant to definitions of realities held by most people -- except perhaps the most affluent and/or doctrinaire minority in each country -- around the world.

The study was, therefore, based on the contention that such differential dimensions operate at the broadest levels of world readership. We attempted to explore the following specific questions:

Aside from foregone conclusions about newspaper size, richness of content, extent of coverage, etc., can such analytical categories actually define and differentiate East-West press perspectives of selection and emphasis? What are such perspectives in the two papers as measured by their respective highlighting of ostensibly the same series of events, considered by both to be of top news significance? How does one paper treat those aspects which the other selects for major play? What can we learn from a comparison of shifting emphases in the two papers in relation to similarities and differences in dealing with various facets of a complex scene of great world importance?

These questions were explored in two ways. The first part of the study analyzed and compared major relevant headlines in the two papers. The second part examined other aspects of the general context of respective selection and emphasis.

The theoretical background which suggested the method of analysis also provided our hypotheses and reveals the grounds for our concern. Ongoing studies and personal observation lead us to believe that the "procedural-conflict" definition and perspective is most characteristic of the United States; the "substantive-agreement" perspective is more prevalent in Western Europe, widely held in the countries of Eastern Europe,

and is predominant in the so-called neutral or uncommitted countries. Consequently, we hypothesized that the perspective of emphasis of a major American newspaper (even, as someone put it, The New York Times) would largely fall into the first category, while that of an Eastern European daily (even of the Communist Party of Hungary, among the "least favored" of the Communist parties in the West) would tend to follow a pattern of emphases placing it more into the "substantive - agreement" category. To the extent that the study bore upon and confirmed this hypothesis, and to the extent that the basic assumptions underlying it are valid, the implications for broadly-based international communication are evident.

THE ANALYSIS

The New York Times and Népszabadság were chosen for comparison partly for reasons of expediency. They both happened to be available for the period of time coinciding with the highlights of the 15th General Assembly, and the writer's knowledge of Hungarian enabled him to do the translations himself. The choice of these papers imposes some limitations on the extent to which the results can be generalized. For example, The Times has its own correspondents covering the U.N., while most other American papers use wire service stories. The Times page one makeup and headlines are generally thought to be more subdued and impartial in highlighting East-West events than those of most major American papers. The unique characteristics of The Times, however, have some compensating advantages. The Times is one of the few "national" U.S. dailies with a large international circulation. Its selection also makes the comparison a conservative one with respect to most American papers' handling of potential cold-war issues.

The choice of Népszabadság also has some disadvantages, as well as some virtues. Certainly Pravda or Izvestia would have been a better match. We invite someone with the necessary facility to replicate the

analysis using those papers. However, Népszabadság is clearly the authoritative national newspaper of a governing Communist party. Its circulation (650,000) is comparable to The Times!; and it is the only Hungarian daily with a significant foreign circulation. Many of its U.N. stories were distributed by Tass, the Soviet news agency. It is believed to have handled the events of the Assembly in a way not atypical of most Eastern European communist daily papers.

Comparison of major headlines

The "major" Times headline was defined as over the right-hand column or columns on top of the front page (excluding decks), and of course, all headlines across the entire front page. In Népszabadság, the five-column front page was usually divided into a three-column and a two-column section, with the major headline clearly over the leading story getting the three-column play. On three of the days studied this happened to fall on the left-hand side of the page. Otherwise the criteria were the same as those applied to The Times. There was never any doubt about which was the top headline or lead story in either paper.

Table 1 lists, in chronological order, all major front-page headlines dealing with the U.N. Assembly in both papers for the period under study. During the 26-day period, 23 days were selected for comparison because Népszabadság does not publish Mondays. The New York Times gave the top position to a U.N. story and headline on 20 of the 23 days; Népszabadság on 21 of the 23 days.

The line was the unit of analysis. Each line of every headline was classified in two ways. First, we asked whether the emphasis of the line was upon "procedural" or "substantive" aspects of events. Secondly, we had to decide whether the direction of the emphasis was "agreement," "neutral," or "conflict." (Each of these categories is defined below). The classification is shown immediately following each line on Table 1. The first letter (S or P) stands for "procedural" or "substantive" emphasis; the second letter (A or N or C) stands for "agreement," "neutral," or "conflict" direction.

TABLE 1 -- ABOUT HERE

"Substantive" was the term assigned to lines which focused upon the substance of issues pending before the Assembly. Such lines as "EISENHOWER CALLS FOR PEACE" or "SOLVE GENERAL DISARMAMENT" were considered "substantive" in emphasis.

"Procedural" was the term given to emphases pointing to U.N. organization, Assembly procedure, agenda, strategy, parliamentary moves, contacts among the powers, and circumstances surrounding the meetings.

"Agreement" direction was defined as emphasis on matters (either "substantive" or "procedural") generally accepted or desired (at least in principle) by most of those who would agree with the basic purposes of the United Nations. Peace, freedom, disarmament, summit meeting, independence of colonial countries fall into the "agreement" category.

"Neutral" denotes the direction of statements which are non-controversial or do not raise any cold-war issues. Simple statements of who met whom, "U.N. ASSEMBLY BEGINS," and the like, were classified "neutral."

"Conflict" was defined as either "substantive" or "procedural" emphasis upon matters which indicate, imply, or record the existence of a power struggle, report disapproval or support for either side, focus upon outstanding divisive issues in the cold war, or point up threats or warnings of conflict.

In the few cases of doubt, that category was chosen which would tend to contradict rather than confirm the hypothesis.

Findings of headline analysis

The findings of the headline analysis are summarized in Table 2. The tabulation shows the percentages of the 60 lines of major New York Times, and of the 56 lines of major Népszabadság headlines in each of the categories.

The near mirror-image of the two papers' perspectives of emphasis is reflected in the comparison between categories of opposite value in terms of the analytical dimensions discussed above. The largest single concen-

tration of lines in The New York Times -- 45 percent of the total -- was in both "procedural" and "conflict" categories. Only 5 percent of all the lines in Népszabadság fell into both of these categories. Conversely, almost one-third (30 percent) of all lines in Népszabadság were classified both "substantive" and "agreement," while The New York Times devoted as many lines to "substantive - agreement" as Népszabadság did to "procedural - conflict" -- 5 percent.

TABLE 2 -- ABOUT HERE

Népszabadság featured nearly three times as many "substantive lines, regardless of direction, as did The Times. "Procedural" lines predominated over "substantive" lines in both papers; but The Times' ratio was four to one while Népszabadság's was a little over two to one.

Comparing direction alone, we found the percentage of "agreement" five and a half times the percentage of "conflict" in Népszabadság. "Conflict" was over four times the percentage of "agreement" in The Times. Népszabadság had three times as many "agreement" lines as did The Times. The Times had over seven times as many "conflict" lines as did Népszabadság. Over half of the lines in Népszabadság and over one-third of the lines in The Times were "neutral."

* * *

The headwriting styles reflected in these findings play a part in directing as well as in expressing emphases. These styles -- as other tools and conventions of the journalist's craft -- serve not only to communicate his perspectives but also to guide his selection and attention to those aspects of events which fit them best. Our penchant for stark, terse, active, and pungent headlines tends to impose its own priorities upon our emphases; it tends to direct attention to procedure -- who does

what to whom -- rather than to the substance of ideas.⁴ With a verb in nearly every line, The New York Times -- noted for its subdued headlines -- pinpointed strategy with "admits," "meets," "joins," "confer," etc. It emphasized tension between antagonists with such verbs as "quit," "wins," "snub," "insists," "rebuffs," "defies," "charges," "bars" (used twice), and "warns" (used three times). Dynamic terms such as "buffer bloc," "arms impasse," "war peril," and "rocket power," were used to add punch to the lines. Modifiers "coldly," "noisy," and "angry" (always applied to a protagonist) supplied color to the drama of highly personalized encounter and clash (36 names in 60 lines).

With only one verb in every three lines, Népszabadság heads were short on what we would consider "hard news" content and long on declarations of intent. Their procedural verbs such as "arrives," "begins," "belongs," "debates," "continues," focused on progress toward aims. Two out of the four tension verbs used -- "expose," and "hate," -- pointed at imperialism and war; only two -- "reject," and "demand" -- dealt with people. "Greet," "solve," and "live" (used three times) denoted mutuality; "peace," "freedom," "independence," and "disarmament" (used seven times) denoted the aims. Only three major headlines (one line in eight) named individuals.

Comparison of treatment and emphasis

Differences in perspective go deeper than style or even selection of top headlines. In the second part of the analysis we followed the course of the Assembly as highlighted in the two papers. The following is an account of major or characteristic differences in the selection and treatment of those aspects of the events which one or both papers chose to emphasize.

⁴I am indebted to my colleague, Prof. Howard Maclay, for pointing out some possibilities of linguistic analysis -- more than space would allow -- in such a comparative study.

The Baltika was still on the high seas when the Security Council received a strong Soviet protest over the role of the Secretary General as Commander-in-Chief of the U.N. army in the Congo. The Times kept the spotlight on embattled Hammarskjold. Its first headline for the period (see Table 1) was followed by the reassuring top line the next day (when Népszabadság did not publish) that "ASIAN-AFRICAN BLOC AIDS U.N. CHIEF." Companion front-page headlines asked for "restraint" in Khrushchev's TV coverage; related the hope of the State Department that the Assembly "will not become propaganda platform;" expressed Mr. Eisenhower's wish that "DIGNITY BE SHOWN TO FOREIGN CHIEFS," and reported that "2,000 DENOUNCE PREMIER" before his arrival.

The aspects and events spotlighted in The Times cast only a partial shadow on the back pages of Népszabadság. On page five of the September 18 issue, Népszabadság headlined its U.N. story "ILLEGAL ATTEMPT BY U.S./ TO HAVE EXTRAORDINARY U.N. SESSION / SANCTION AGGRESSION AGAINST CONGO." A companion piece claimed that "COLONIALIST'S AGENTS / GRAB POWER IN LEOPOLDVILLE / WITH U.N. ASSISTANCE."

Front-page emphasis, however, was on peace, hope, and good wishes. "MAY SUCCESS FOLLOW YOUR WORK!" the two-column headline cited one of reportedly "hundreds of telegrams" pouring in from "workers, peasants, intelligentsia" to the passengers of the Baltika on their way to New York. The major three-column spread was headlined "REPRESENTING PEACE." It was a long editorial sounding the keynote of the coverage for days to come. "Representing peace" were the socialist delegations soon to arrive at the world forum to battle for the overriding concern of all humanity, declared the editorial, and to engage in (what The Times warned about on its front page) propaganda for disarmament. The key portions of the lengthy piece are paraphrased below because they are necessary to an understanding of the communist press perspective:

The West has defeated 40 disarmament proposals advanced by the socialist camp in the last 15 years. It has opposed, then scuttled the Summit. But the diplomacy of imperialism has suffered a setback: disarmament is on the Assembly agenda again and even a Summit is being realized. The world must listen now not only to our proposals but also to concrete unilateral steps that have been taken. In five years the Soviet Union reduced its armed forces from 5,763,000 to 2,423,000, and the Warsaw pact countries followed suit...

And what does all this mean to mankind? Consider a few facts... Every single day a hundred million people spend almost a billion hours not to build houses, not to produce clothes and food and drugs and school implements but means of destruction! . . . Every year the world spends twice as much on armaments as on food for all mankind. . .

Obviously, the success of disarmament cannot depend on those who profit from armaments. They are afraid; they say all our talk is propaganda. So be it; it is propaganda in the interest of humanity and of life itself!

On september 20, the Baltika arrived in New York. An elated Népszabadság devoted most of the front page to Khrushchev's arrival message. "WE MUST AGREE ON STRICTLY CONTROLLED DISARMAMENT" said the headline, alongside a smiling picture of the Soviet Premier surrounded by friendly faces, captioned "Warm Reception." The message itself sounded some of the key motifs: "All thoughts turn to peace . . . We must agree on the strictest international controls for disarmament . . . Unfortunately, those who pay lip-service to strengthening the U.N. actually oppose its work for disarmament . . . They call our proposals propaganda . . . I am proud to conduct such propaganda until the last ounce of my strength."

The Times headlined Hammarskjold's victory on Congo, Khrushchev's "cold" reception, and Castro's "angry" hotel-switch (see Table 1). The lead of the arrival story set a somber mood, noting that "The red carpet . . . was soggy, and rain streamed through the leaky roof of dilapidated Pier 73 . . ." The picture showed, "A well isolated Soviet Premier" (according to the caption) stepping off the gangplank with head bowed.

The General Assembly opened the next day, September 21. The usual three-line deck over The Times lead story noted that "Ireland's Boland Wins Presidency Contest -- Defeats Czech." Népszabadság gave the vote midway in its nearly full-page running account of the session.

The pictorial spotlight in both papers went to Khrushchev and Castro. The Times depicted the "Bear Hug" on the Assembly floor, while Népszabadság showed the two men in "Warm, Friendly Meeting" in Harlem. Accounts of the Assembly "bear-hug" itself differed slightly but significantly. ". . . Mr. Khrushchev appeared for the first time on the floor . . ." said The Times story. "He joined Dr. Castro in a massive bear-hug."

Népszabadság was more dignified and circumspect:

A member of the Cuban delegation stepped to the Soviet delegation and requested Khrushchev to visit Castro at his table on the other side of the floor. In the company of members of his delegation, Khrushchev passed by the presidential rostrum to go to Castro. The Soviet and Cuban Premiers were surrounded by a great crowd. Hundreds of delegates and reporters crowded around them as they shook hands smilingly.

Preliminary contacts between delegations occupied next day's (September 22) major headlines in both papers. Népszabadság stressed socialist countries' greeting new member states, and The Times highlighted Eisenhower's plan to visit Tito and Latin-American delegates "but snub Castro." The Assembly session itself received little attention. The Times' lead noted African leaders' "high praise for France." Népszabadság reported a Lebanese delegate denounce "imperialist exploitation of Africa and Asia."

On Friday, September 23, The Times carried its first banner headline. In Népszabadság it was the first day the U.N. Assembly shared front-page space with another event -- the Hungarian harvest. Eisenhower spoke to the Assembly. He arrived, according to Népszabadság, "through a back door, avoiding all contact with delegates." This remark came after the lead noted that Khrushchev had greeted delegates in the lounge, chatted with Tito, and introduced members of his delegation to Castro.

The Times' top headline featured Eisenhower's call "for peace through U.N.," and "plans for Africa and for disarmament." The lead stressed the President's support of Hammarskjold. But as paraphrased by Tass on the front page of Népszabadság, the Eisenhower speech story began: "The President greeted new member states and declared that the striving for independence creates a new world in Africa. In a reference to the Congo, he asserted that provocations against world opinion, peace, and orderly development can now be observed in Africa. At the same time he was deeply silent about the efforts of Belgian colonialists to rob this new nation of its independence." The key paragraph of the speech story stated:

The American President spoke in vague generalities about the desirability of disarmament in some distant, unspecified future. But again he placed the emphasis not upon disarmament but upon armaments inspection . . . With this he returned to the same old proposals which are designed -- as has often been proven -- not to secure the peace but to legalize espionage.

The next day it was Népszabadság's turn to run its largest type across the front page. Colonial Freedom, Independence, and Disarmament were the terms selected for emphasis from (as the deck declared) "Significant Speech of Comrade Khrushchev on Burning Problems of Our Age." The six and a half page account of the speech was dotted with such ecstatic page-one subheads as "All the Beauty of the World Could Flower," and "The Exalted Tasks of the U.N."

In contrast to this jubilant mood, The Times' heads featured Krushchev's attack on Hammarskjold and Herter's charge of "Declaration of War on U.N." The Times' decks drew a neat balance of intransigence: "PREMIER IS HARSH," said the line on one side of the speech photo; "AMERICAN IS ANGRY," was the line on the other side.

Népszabadság gave no emphasis to Krushchev's attack on the U.N. Secretary. His U.N. reform proposal came at the end of the long speech, and was missing entirely from the reaction story. The proposal itself,

as reported in both papers, attempted to relate U.N. reform to the needs of disarmament by arguing that in a disarmed world the U.N. force should not be under the command of any one man attached to any one power bloc.

The next day, September 25, the Soviet Premier said that in the light of Herter's remarks he wished to clarify his U.N. reform proposal. In an impromptu press conference in the driveway of the Soviet's Glen Cove mansion, Krushchev repeated the reasons given for his plan, and said -- obviously tongue-in-cheek -- that while Marshal Malinovsky is undoubtedly a great leader, the Soviets would not insist on his heading a world police force if they really wanted general disarmament. The Times headlined its top news account of the informal press conference "KRUSHCHEV INSISTS U.N. REVISION / MUST PRECEDE DISARMAMENT PLAN. Népszabadság noted it briefly in a roundup story on page four, and interpreted it as a move to strengthen the U.N. for the tasks of the future. Instead, Népszabadság gave banner headlines and the first three and a half pages to a detailed account of the Soviet proposal on disarmament submitted to the U.N. along with the Krushchev speech the day before. The account included such large front-page subheads as "One Year's Military Costs Could Pay for Africa's Complete Technical and Economic Reconstruction;" "Life Itself Demands Discussion of Disarmament," and "Another Year Lost Because of Behavior of the West." The Times did not carry the disarmament proposal. In its next issue (September 27), Népszabadság gave front page banner headline and two inside pages to the Soviet "colonial declaration," also submitted along with the disarmament proposal. The Times gave news of the declaration in five inside paragraphs noting that it was "tough" and dealing mostly with reactions to it.

On Monday, September 26, (when Népszabadság did not publish), The Times, was still dwelling upon the dangers of Krushchev's U.N. reform plan, mostly on the basis of further "clarifications" from Glen Cove over the weekend. Népszabadság, gave the first two pages Tuesday, September 27,

to a Tass roundup of the weekend press conferences, under the banner headline MUST LIVE TOGETHER / CAN LIVE TOGETHER. This account gave, in question-and-answer form, the substance of most of the conversations reported in the two

ing itself came in the jump on page five under the head: "CRUDE VOTING MANEUVER." The story asserted that the neutralist resolution ("well intentioned although not very practical") was accepted and supported by the Soviet delegation as "a sincere effort . . . to end the cold war and to relax tensions." However, the story went on, the Western powers "determined to torpedo the resolution" resorted to "desperate and unprecedented procedural tactics" to avoid having to discuss peace and disarmament.

After this, the Népszabadság's interest in the U.N. Assembly reached a low ebb. On October 7, The New York Times gave top play to the Ceylonese plea for admission of Red China. A companion headline declared that "NEUTRALS SCORE / U.S. BAR TO TALKS." Népszabadság shifted the spotlight from agricultural to industrial news, ignoring both stories ostensibly reporting cold war points scored on the Soviet side.

On October 9 Népszabadság returned to the peace offensive. It headlined Khrushchev's statement at a U.N. correspondents' luncheon: "CALL U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY / SPECIAL SESSION FOR SPRING 1961 / TO DISCUSS DISARMAMENT." In two and a half pages, the story gave the complete text of the talk and of the subsequent question-and-answer session. One of the last questions was asked by a UPI correspondent who wanted to know whether the status of Berlin would remain unchanged until the next summit meeting. In his reply, Khrushchev stated: "As it is framed, the question is much too abstract. First of all, it is contingent on whether or not there will be a summit conference. If you want me to give assurances that the status quo will be preserved . . . without the reaching of an agreement on the date of the conference -- the month or even the year -- then I can give no such assurances."

Khrushchev's talk made The Times on October 8. The headline was given the second spot (left top) on the front page, and was based largely

on the exchange cited above (also carried in The Times' excerpts from the speech): "KHRUSHCHEV SAYS SUMMIT / AFTER U.S. VOTE IS PRICE / FOR STATUS QUO IN BERLIN." The lead began: "Premier Khrushchev threatened today to sign a peace treaty with East Germany unless he was assured that the Western Big Three agreed to meet with him shortly after the United States Presidential election or voiced wish to do so."

On October 9, The Times' top headline recorded the score in the perennial battle over seating the Peiping regime as the government of China. Népszabadság carried that story on page five the same day (the front page went to Khrushchev's call for special disarmament session), and headlined it "AMERICAN PRESSURE / AGAIN POSTPONES / DISCUSSION OF CHINA'S U.N. MEMBERSHIP."

Khrushchev's appearance on the "Open End" television program was headlined in The Times on Monday, October 10, and in Népszabadság on Tuesday, October 11. The Times' top headline of Tuesday (Nehru's proposal for advisers for Hammarskjold) rated no play in Népszabadság.

On October 12 the Soviets suffered their major defeat. The top Times headline recorded the score, and a threat: "U.N. REBUFFS KHRUSHCHEV, 54 TO 12; / BARS ASSEMBLY ARMS DEBATE NOW; / PREMIER WARNS OF ROCKET POWER." On the same day, the Népszabadság headline insisted that "THE QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT / BELONGS TO PLENARY SESSION / OF U.N. ASSEMBLY." The deck cited Khrushchev's assembly speech as reiterating that "If Present Session is Unable to Discuss Disarmament / Call Special Session in Spring with Heads of State." The vote itself was noted at the end of the long story. The rocket "threat" was part of the verbatim account on page two, under the three-column head "WE INSIST ON PRIORITY FOR DISARMAMENT," and the subhead "You Cannot Scare the Soviet People."

The major theme of unceasing effort on behalf of disarmament and in the face of obstruction and provocation returned to Népszabadság's

front page the next day, October 13. "WE SHALL NOT SLACKEN OUR EFFORTS / IN THE STRUGGLE FOR DISARMAMENT" declared the top headline based on a ~~Krus~~ Khrushchev press conference after the previous day's session. A long front-page editorial shared the spotlight with the lead story. It began in a sarcastic vein:

We can safely say that in the recent history of imperialism there has rarely been a more dubious 'victory' than that won by the Western bloc on disarmament . . . Consider what has been achieved! American history books will now be able to say: 'Thanks to the firm stand of our government, we were able to keep the major question of disarmament off the Assembly floor and thus gain time for the arms race, hated by all peoples!'

While Népszabadság kept the spotlight on disarmament, The New York Times featured the scene to be long remembered in the annals of the U.N. Assembly. The Soviet resolution on colonial liberation was on the agenda. That was the day when the shaky decorum of Assembly procedure was finally shattered by table-pounding, shoe-banging communist delegates. Népszabadság carried the story of the meeting on page five, under a three-column headline: "SERIES OF WESTERN PROVOCATIONS / MARK WEDNESDAY AFTER-NOON SESSION." The "provocations" reported consisted mostly of the Assembly President's interruptions of various speakers urging passage of the colonial declaration. Finally, the story related, as the vote was about to be taken the American delegate rose to inject irrelevant and slanderous remarks directed against the people of Eastern Europe. The Rumanian delegate objected to this delaying tactic but could not complete his remarks; in a "provocative maneuver" the Assembly President unexpectedly adjourned the meeting. (According to The Times, he also broke his gavel in the process). The story concluded: "However, the discussion will be continued tomorrow and then it shall be seen what the American delegation can achieve with such maneuvers."

The next day the Soviet colonial resolution was passed by acclamation after the United States, according to The Times' account on page two, "withdrew its opposition . . . with a brief statement by Francis W. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State, that the debate yesterday had shown 'the intensity of feeling among nations around the world on the question of national independence and human freedom everywhere.'"

Népszabadság headlined the action, gave it most of page one, and termed it in a subhead, "Defeat of Colonialists." The Times, which had given precedence to the U.N. over the U.S. election campaign throughout the Assembly session, now switched positions. It relegated the U.N. story to second place. The colonial declaration was noted in four lines of the seventh paragraph. The headline was "KHRUSHCHEV GOES HOME / AFTER A THREAT IN U.N. / TO BOYCOTT ARMS TALKS." "Premier Khrushchev," stated the lead, "bade an angry farewell to the General Assembly today after threatening to walk out on any future disarmament negotiations unless they were conducted on Soviet terms." In a front-page story the next day, Népszabadság gave its account of Khrushchev's last day in New York, citing him as follows: "We leave in a good mood as we believe there are signs of hope for a solution of major international problems . . . We are especially satisfied over the decision on liquidating the colonial system . . . The Soviet Union will do everything in its power to achieve general and complete disarmament. . ."

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Every newspaper presents a fragmented and synthetic image of the world. It highlights its own set of significant realities from its own social and cultural vantage points. When viewed on the world scene, even "All the News That's Fit to Print" provides a perspective of emphases which cannot be understood with sole reference to our own points of view. The

majority of newsreaders do not share our standards; furthermore, they are confronted by perspectives and standards of news value sharply contrasting with those of our own.

This study attempted to inquire into such contrasting perspectives as they might appear to many newsreaders following the same events in authoritative organs of East and West. Our hypothetical (but very real) global newsreaders know little and probably care less about theories of what the press should be. But they feel the impact of world events in their daily lives. They know and care much about what the press actually says and does.

How can we differentiate and appraise the roles contrasting perspectives of press emphasis play in communicating with such readers? This study suggests that we can differentiate and appraise such roles (1) with reference to categories of analysis based on both perspectives rather than defining one only by the standards of the other; (2) on the basis of well-established principles of the communication process; and (3) in the light of what we know about communication perspectives different cultures engender in people leading lives different from ours.

Enriched as our avid world newsreader would undoubtedly be reading The New York Times alongside a communist newspaper, he is also likely to be puzzled by its emphases. Following our concepts of headline style, newsworthiness, and primary stress on matters of particular concern to the American power position, The Times highlighted procedural moves, threats, victories and conflicts. In comparison with the communist paper, it placed prime emphasis on method rather than substance, and on the tension-arousing rather than mutually acceptable or even neutral aspects of events.

The analysis appears to confirm the hypothesis that Nepszabadsag, in comparison with even such a respected organ of Western journalism as

The Times, tended to spotlight the substance of issues generally accepted to be of major daily concern and hope to most people around the world. It emphasized communist initiative on behalf of common aspirations, and of course presented the Soviet side always in a favorable light. It is evident that the communist paper was in no position to report many procedural victories, or to give top play to threats to the Soviet position without appearing to be exposing weakness on its side.

Confronted with divergent perspectives of emphasis, readers can be expected to respond in terms of their own outlook and understanding. Every communication exchange not only transmits messages but also defines the bases for communication. The nature and effect of communication depends largely on the extent to which those involved in it can share these premises. When readers are presented divergent images of events, they will communicate with each in the light of their own perceived needs, realities, and perspectives.

* * *

There is no doubt that when judged by our own conventional standards of journalism, the Western press always comes out on top. Our analysis suggests, however, that these conventional standards themselves emerge from, and impose, a limited perspective.

This perspective serves the needs of Western societies for producing and selling news and other commodities on behalf of clients with conflicting views but a common stake in the rules of the game. The standards we hold are most applicable to reporting the progress of a game -- political, athletic, personal -- from a more or less detached vantage point, but with primary emphasis on the clash, the color, and the score. The detachment is especially noticeable in skirting the ideological content and substance of what is at stake in the game; but our predilection

for emphasis on procedure and conflict is clearly evident (and, in a nuclear age, somewhat disconcerting).

We take much of that for granted, and make certain allowances. For example, we usually assume that while our news perspectives might reflect and shape prevailing modes of communication, they do not necessarily express official policy. But the world newsreader is likely to make fewer allowances for our emphases, assuming them to be a more straightforward expression of policy priorities, objectives, and intentions. He may not share our interpretation of private corporate controls as "freedom" versus public corporate controls as its opposite; but he does see each paper use such freedom as it has to highlight those aspects which fit its perspective. He may not be aware of the fact that it is our very conception of "objectivity" which makes The New York Times relatively even-handed in spotlighting strategic moves in the East-West conflict. Rather, he is more likely to feel that the aspects of reality we choose to be most emphatically "objective" about seem, from his point of view, somewhat parochial. Over most of the world today, the din of procedural conflict grates on the ears of hungry people impatient to get on with the long-promised transformation of their daily lives. They have little choice over the means; they do not want to be further delayed or even destroyed by conflicts over how to reach their ends.

* * *

The communist national press (party and non-party) serves clients with a common stake in the ends to be achieved but changing and even varied views about the rules of the game. The definition of significant realities in the communist press is keyed to communication on the broadest basis of common needs and aspirations. Discursive, at times almost lyrical top headlines betray not a lack of militancy but a harnessing

of themes to the tasks of the communication objectives. Strategy, procedure, conflict are far from neglected; they are treated as variable means to universal ends. Primary emphasis is upon the ends themselves.

The ends are defined clearly, emphasized daily, and espoused enthusiastically. They implicitly sweep aside the "game theory" of "objectivity" in preference to the claim that aspects of reality to be most emphatically "objective" about are the bread-and-butter promise and substance of the great issues of our time, and the "objective requirements" of a radical transformation of life.

* * *

It is more than likely that only historical evidence can confirm the adequacy of standards for appraising the global communication roles of mass media. Such evidence as we have amply demonstrates the inadequacy of self-satisfaction as a measure of relative accomplishment.

There is also sufficient historical evidence to support serious consideration of the assumptions, findings and conclusions reported in this study. Our approach certainly needs confirmation on a broader basis. Cross-cultural readership studies might yield evidence of a different sort, although no more valid or conclusive unless policies and emphases could be varied in such a way as to isolate the roles news media might play in any total reader response. In the meantime, we invite extension and discussion of this and other approaches relevant to media perspectives and roles in world communication not as we wish them to be but as they actually are.

TABLE 1

Major Front Page Headlines when Dealing with U.N. Assembly in The New York Times
and Népszabadság

Date	<u>The New York Times</u>	<u>Népszabadság</u>
	Major headline and classification*	Major headline and classification*
Sept. 18	U.N. CHIEF WARNS SC HE MAY QUIT POST PC OVER CONGO ROLE PN	REPRESENTING PEACE PA
20	U.N. CHIEF WINS 70-0 CONGO VOTE; PC KHRUSHCHEV RECEIVED COLDLY; PC ANGRY CASTRO SWITCHES HOTELS PC	BALTIKA ARRIVES IN NEW YORK: PN MUST COME TO AGREEMENT ON SA STRICTLY CONTROLLED DISARMAMENT SA
21	U.N. ADMITS 13 AFRICAN COUNTRIES; PN TITO HERE TO SEEK A BUFFER BLOC; PN KHRUSHCHEV PAYS CALL ON CASTRO; PN	BEGINS PN U.N. ASSEMBLY'S PN 15TH SESSION PN
22	EISENHOWER TO CONFER WITH TITO PN AFTER ADDRESSING THE U.N. TODAY; PN WILL SEE LATINS BUT SNUB CASTRO PC	SOCIALIST REPRESENTATIVES PN GREET NEW U.N. MEMBERS PN
23	EISENHOWER CALLS FOR PEACE THROUGH U.N., SA GIVES PLANS FOR AFRICA AND FOR DISARMAMENT; SA TITO URGES IMMEDIATE STEPS TO CUT ARMS SA	U.N. ASSEMBLY BEGINS PN GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE PN
24	KHRUSHCHEV ASKS HAMMARSKJOLD OUSTER; PC WOULD SUBSTITUTE A 3-BLOC DIRECTORATE; PC HERTER SEES 'DECLARATION OF WAR' ON U.N. PC	FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE SA TO ALL COLONIAL PEOPLES! SA SOLVE GENERAL DISARMAMENT! SA
25	KHRUSHCHEV INSISTS U.N. REVISION PC MUST PRECEDE DISARMAMENT PACT; PC AFRICANS SUPPORT HAMMARSKJOLD PC	DISARMAMENT IS THE SA CENTRAL ISSUE OF OUR AGE, SA FOUNDATION OF SECURE PEACE SA
27	NEHRU AND NASSER TELL PRESIDENT PN THEY OPPOSE KHRUSHCHEV PLAN; PC CASTRO CHARGES U.S. AGGRESSION SC	SOVIET PLAN ON COLONIAL FREEDOM PA MUST LIVE TOGETHER SA CAN LIVE TOGETHER SA
28	EISENHOWER AND MACMILLAN ASK PN U.N. TO PRESS FOR DISARMAMENT; PA NASSER URGES U.S. SOVIET TALKS PA	SOCIALIST AND EX-COLONIAL PN LEADERS EXPOSE IMPERIALISM SC BEFORE U.N. ASSEMBLY FORUM PN
29	MACMILLAN TO SEE PN KHRUSHCHEV TODAY PN ON ARMS IMPASSE PC	CONTINUE PN GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE PN AT U.N. ASSEMBLY PN
30	MACMILLAN MEETS KHRUSHCHEV PN AND DISCUSSES 'SUMMIT' ISSUES; PA NEUTRALS ASK U.S.-SOVIET TALK PA	STILL IN FOREFRONT: PN QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT SA AND OF COLONIES SA

*Classification: P - procedural; S - substantive; A - agreement; N - neutral;
C - conflict. Each line is classified either P or S and
A or N or C. See text for explanation of categories.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Major Front Page Headlines when Dealing with U.N. Assembly in The New York Times and Népszabadság

Date	<u>The New York Times</u>		<u>Népszabadság</u>	
	Major headline and classification*		Major headline and classification*	
Oct.				
1	EISENHOWER SETS TALK TOMORROW WITH MACMILLAN	PN PN PN	REPLIES REJECT MACMILLAN SPEECH 5 COUNTRIES ASK KHRUSHCHEV-EISENH. MEET SUKARNO ALSO DEMANDS U.N. MOVE	PC PA PC
2	KHRUSHCHEV WARNS U.N. OF WAR PERIL OVER CHINA ISSUE	PC SC PC	ASSEMBLY DEBATES KHRUSHCHEV-EISENHOWER CONFERENCE PROPOSAL	PN PN PA
4	HAMMARSKJOLD DEFIES DEMAND BY KHRUSHCHEV THAT HE RESIGN NEHRU SUPPORTS RECORD OF U.N.	PC PC PC	OUR PEOPLE HATE WAR, IMPERIALISM WANT TO LIVE IN PEACE WITH ALL	SA SA
5	(U.N. not lead story)		MAJORITY OF SPEAKERS SUPPORT PLACING PEOPLE'S CHINA REPRESENTATION ON AGENDA	PN PC PN
6	NEUTRALS IN U.N. ABANDON MOVE FOR BIG TWO TALKS AS KEY POINT IS REJECTED	PN PN PC	U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONTINUES GENERAL DEBATE	PN PN
7	CEYLONESE JOINS REDS IN U.N. PLEA FOR PEIPING SEAT	PN PC PC	(U.N. not lead story)	
8	(U.N. not lead story)		(U.N. not front page story)	
9	U.N. ASSEMBLY AGAIN BARS SEAT FOR RED CHINA, 42-34; MARGIN FOR U.S. NARROWS	PC PC PC	CALL U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY SPECIAL SESSION FOR SPRING 1961 TO DISCUSS DISARMAMENT	PN PN PA
10	NEHRU PROPOSING GROUP OF ADVISERS FOR HAMMARSKJOLD	PN PN PN	KHRUSHCHEV'S CONVERSATION ON INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS ON NEW YORK TELEVISION	PN PN PN
11	U.N. REBUFFS KHRUSHCHEV, 54 to 13; BARS ASSEMBLY ARMS DEBATE NOW; PREMIER WARNS OF ROCKET POWER	PC PC SC	THE QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT BELONGS TO PLENARY SESSION OF U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY	SA PN PN
13	NOISY U.N. SESSION CUT SHORT TO END HECKLING BY REDS	PN PN PC	WE SHALL NOT SLACKEN OUR EFFORTS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR DISARMAMENT	PN SA
14	(U.N. not lead story)		QUESTION OF COLONIALISM TO BE DEBATED AT PLENARY SESSION	SA PN PN

*Classification: P - procedural; S - substantive; A - agreement; N - neutral;
C - conflict. Each line is classified either P or S and
A or N or C. See text for explanation of categories.

TABLE 1

Major Front Page Headlines when Dealing with U.N. Assembly in The New York Times
and Népszabadság

Date	<u>The New York Times</u>	<u>Népszabadság</u>
	Major headline and classification*	Major headline and classification*
Sept. 18	U.N. CHIEF WARNS SC HE MAY QUIT POST PC OVER CONGO ROLE PN	REPRESENTING PEACE PA
20	U.N. CHIEF WINS 70-0 CONGO VOTE; PC KHRUSHCHEV RECEIVED COLDLY; PC ANGRY CASTRO SWITCHES HOTELS PC	BALTIKA ARRIVES IN NEW YORK: PN MUST COME TO AGREEMENT ON SA STRICTLY CONTROLLED DISARMAMENT SA
21	U.N. ADMITS 13 AFRICAN COUNTRIES; PN TITO HERE TO SEEK A BUFFER BLOC; PN KHRUSHCHEV PAYS CALL ON CASTRO; PN	BEGINS PN U.N. ASSEMBLY'S PN 15TH SESSION PN
22	EISENHOWER TO CONFER WITH TITO PN AFTER ADDRESSING THE U.N. TODAY; PN WILL SEE LATINS BUT SNUB CASTRO PC	SOCIALIST REPRESENTATIVES PN GREET NEW U.N. MEMBERS PN
23	EISENHOWER CALLS FOR PEACE THROUGH U.N., SA GIVES PLANS FOR AFRICA AND FOR DISARMAMENT; SA TITO URGES IMMEDIATE STEPS TO CUT ARMS SA	U.N. ASSEMBLY BEGINS PN GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE PN
24	KHRUSHCHEV ASKS HAMMARSKJOLD OUSTER; PC WOULD SUBSTITUTE A 3-BLOC DIRECTORATE; PC HERTER SEES 'DECLARATION OF WAR' ON U.N. PC	FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE SA TO ALL COLONIAL PEOPLES! SA SOLVE GENERAL DISARMAMENT! SA
25	KHRUSHCHEV INSISTS U.N. REVISION PC MUST PRECEDE DISARMAMENT PACT; PC AFRICANS SUPPORT HAMMARSKJOLD PC	DISARMAMENT IS THE SA CENTRAL ISSUE OF OUR AGE, SA FOUNDATION OF SECURE PEACE SA
27	NEHRU AND MASSER TELL PRESIDENT PN THEY OPPOSE KHRUSHCHEV PLAN; PC CASTRO CHARGES U.S. AGGRESSION SC	SOVIET PLAN ON COLONIAL FREEDOM PA MUST LIVE TOGETHER SA CAN LIVE TOGETHER SA
28	EISENHOWER AND MACMILLAN ASK PN U.N. TO PRESS FOR DISARMAMENT; PA NASSER URGES U.S. SOVIET TALKS PA	SOCIALIST AND EX-COLONIAL PN LEADERS EXPOSE IMPERIALISM SC BEFORE U.N. ASSEMBLY FORUM PN
29	MACMILLAN TO SEE PN KHRUSHCHEV TODAY PN ON ARMS IMPASSE PC	CONTINUE PN GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE PN AT U.N. ASSEMBLY PN
30	MACMILLAN MEETS KHRUSHCHEV PN AND DISCUSSES 'SUMMIT' ISSUES; PA NEUTRAIS ASK U.S.-SOVIET TALK PA	STILL IN FOREFRONT: PN QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT SA AND OF COLONIES SA

*Classification: P - procedural; S - substantive; A - agreement; N - neutral;
C - conflict. Each line is classified either P or S and
A or N or C. See text for explanation of categories.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Major Front Page Headlines when Dealing with U.N. Assembly in The New York Times and Népszabadság

Date	<u>The New York Times</u>		<u>Népszabadság</u>
	Major headline and classification*		Major headline and classification*
Oct.			
1	EISENHOWER SETS P TALK TOMORROW P WITH MACMILLAN P		REPLIES REJECT MACMILLAN SPEECH P 5 COUNTRIES ASK KHRUSHCHEV-EISENH. MEET PA SUKARNO ALSO DEMANDS U.N. MOVE PC
2	KHRUSHCHEV WARNS PC U.N. OF WAR PERIL SC OVER CHINA ISSUE PC		ASSEMBLY DEBATES P KHRUSHCHEV-EISENHOWER P CONFERENCE PROPOSAL PA
4	HAMMARSKJOLD DEFIES DEMAND PC BY KHRUSHCHEV THAT HE RESIGN PC NEHRU SUPPORTS RECORD OF U.N. PC		OUR PEOPLE HATE WAR, IMPERIALISM SA WANT TO LIVE IN PEACE WITH ALL SA
5	(U.N. not lead story)		MAJORITY OF SPEAKERS P SUPPORT PLACING PEOPLE'S CHINA PC REPRESENTATION ON AGENDA P
6	NEUTRALS IN U.N. ABANDON P MOVE FOR BIG TWO TALKS P AS KEY POINT IS REJECTED PC		U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY P CONTINUES GENERAL DEBATE P
7	CEYLONENE JOINS P REDS IN U.N. PLEA PC FOR PEIPING SEAT PC		(U.N. not lead story)
8	(U.N. not lead story)		(U.N. not front page story)
9	U.N. ASSEMBLY AGAIN BARS P SEAT FOR RED CHINA, 42-34; PC MARGIN FOR U.S. NARROWS PC		CALL U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY P SPECIAL SESSION FOR SPRING 1961 P TO DISCUSS DISARMAMENT PA
10	NEHRU PROPOSING P GROUP OF ADVISERS P FOR HAMMARSKJOLD P		KHRUSHCHEV'S CONVERSATION P ON INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS P ON NEW YORK TELEVISION P
11	U.N. REBUFFS KHRUSHCHEV, 54 to 13; PC BARS ASSEMBLY ARMS DEBATE NOW; PC PREMIER WARNS OF ROCKET POWER SC		THE QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT SA BELONGS TO PLENARY SESSION P OF U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY P
13	NOISY U.N. SESSION P CUT SHORT TO END P HECKLING BY REDS PC		WE SHALL NOT SLACKEN OUR EFFORTS P IN THE STRUGGLE FOR DISARMAMENT SA
14	(U.N. not lead story)		QUESTION OF COLONIALISM SA TO BE DEBATED AT P PLENARY SESSION P

*Classification: P - procedural; S - substantive; A - agreement; N - neutral; C - conflict. Each line is classified either P or S and A or N or C. See text for explanation of categories.

TABLE 2

Percentage of New York Times and Népszabadság Headlines in Each Category

Classification	<u>Times</u> N= 60 %	<u>Népszabadság</u> N= 56 %
Substantive - agreement	5	30
Substantive - neutral	-	-
Substantive - conflict	7	2
Procedural - agreement	7	9
Procedural - neutral	36	54
Procedural - conflict	45	5
Total	100%	100%
All substantive	12	32
All procedural	88	68
Total	100%	100%
All agreement	12	39
All neutral	36	54
All conflict	52	7
Total	100%	100%