

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Modern mass communication has made major national perspectives available on a global basis. Two American, one British, one French, and two Russian news agencies provide most of the international news for the entire world. An increasing number of world news readers and listeners are exposed to the competing and conflicting <sup>news-making</sup> perspectives of different <sup>social</sup> ~~news~~ systems.

~~In recent years I have become increasingly concerned with the~~ limitations imposed by our own standards of reporting upon a realistic appraisal of the actual role news media play on the world scene. My concern is not so much with the propaganda we broadcast abroad as with the press perspectives we produce for ourselves but circulate abroad among an increasing number of world news readers, the politically significant elite of many countries.

What do press perspectives do? How can we compare them? What do they mean to others and to us? These are the questions I would like to explore.

\* Through ~~the~~ selection, emphasis, treatment, and structuring,

This is what press perspectives do:

- (1) They select their own set of significant events. They define what is "real" in the common culture, what is to be attended to, what is relevant to our purposes.
- (2) They structure the agenda of common discourse. Thus they affect not only what gets talked about but how <sup>fast</sup>, ~~soon~~, how much, and how <sup>loud</sup> ~~fast~~.
- (3) They make available the dominant points of view from which to view our selection and priority of events.

~~and the~~ priority of events,

*Handwritten signatures and scribbles at the top left of the page.*

Press perspectives <sup>may</sup> ~~may~~ or may not decide the outcome of specific issues. They do something more important. They shape the collective outlook and climate in which the process of decision-making goes on. <sup>2NY</sup>

As instruments of world communication, national media represent dominant perspectives of their societies. But they can share the common basis necessary for world communication only to the extent that their definition of significant realities appears tenable, their priorities reasonable, and their points of view acceptable in the light of competing and conflicting perspectives. ~~also available~~

How can we assess perspectives in conflict?

Obviously, we cannot use self-justifying standards to measure performance among those who do not share these standards. For example, our own rules of freedom and objectivity are more a hindrance than help in situations where freedom means the ability to marshall all resources on behalf of goals we have already achieved, and where objectivity means an intensely partisan preoccupation with the objective requirements of a needed reconstruction of life. Far from being universal yardsticks, such differential conceptions should themselves become weights on a scale of measurement.

The standard I propose as relevant to bases of communication with people around the world has two dimensions. The first is the dimension of procedure. From this point of view, strategy, conflict, and keeping the scoreboard up to date are the most significant aspects of newsworthy events. What the game is about

is assumed to be known. Important items on the agenda concern matters of technique: how gains can be defended, rules utilized to best advantage, new points scored. The perspective is that of a contest. I call this dimension procedural and conflict-oriented.

The other dimension cuts the pie differently. The substance and promise of common issues occupy the center of the stage. Summit meeting, disarmament, colonial liberation are seen not so much as aspects of big-power strategy as aspects of everyday reality: bread and butter for tomorrow's table, a school for the children, a freer and more secure life for everyone now. From this perspective, conflict is seen as delaying and agreement as hastening the realization of all that really matters. I call this perspective substantive and agreement-oriented.

Now let us apply the yardstick.

I have recently concluded a comparative study of how two newspapers covered the fall 1960 "summit" session of the U.N. General Assembly. You recall that this was the session with President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev and other heads of state in attendance. The eyes of the world were focused on the conference coming on the heels of the U-2 fiasco, the Paris summit collapse, and the U.N.'s entry into the Congo. I wanted to compare the ways an American and a communist national newspaper highlighted that conference, as these perspectives might be seen by world news readers not necessarily committed to either side in the cold war.

In selecting the newspapers to be compared, I might appear to have stacked the deck in our favor. The American paper selected

What do (1/1)  
Americans say  
summit?  
100-  
procedural  
substantive  
agreement-oriented

was The New York Times, and the communist daily was Népszabadság, the official organ of the Hungarian communist party.

Now, of course, the purpose was not to compare a giant of world journalism, as such, with a 12-14 page paper of a small European country, even though the latter is a fairly typical party organ with circulation about the same as The Times. The purpose was to compare perspectives of emphasis during Assembly. We tried to see what each paper selected as the most significant aspect of the sessions, how each paper structured the agenda, and from what point of view each paper viewed the events or aspects selected for emphasis.

Let me first give you a shortcut to our findings. Among other things, we classified every line of every major front page headline dealing with the Assembly in both papers -- a total of about 60 lines in each paper. In the categories of both procedural emphasis and stress on conflict fell 45 percent of the lines in The Times and 5 percent of the lines in the communist paper. In the categories of both substantive emphasis and stress on common goals fell 5 percent of all lines in The Times and 30 percent of the lines in Népszabadság. In other words, the substance of common aims which tend to unite mankind were highlighted in the communist paper five times as much as were the tactics of the cold war, and also five times as much as these common aims were given major emphasis in The Times. Conversely, procedural strategy and conflict were stressed in The Times nine times as much as were the goals the majority of mankind hold in common, and also nine times as much

as these cold war tactics were emphasized in the communist paper.

The relatively subdued headlines and even-handed treatment of cold war issues in The Times no doubt influenced the findings (in our favor). Let me hasten to repeat that this study ignored the major strength of The Times -- its unequalled record of current events and its coverage in depth. In concentrating mostly on the selection of highlights and the priorities of emphasis, rather than on total coverage, we attempted to use The Times as an indicator of U.S. press perspective rather than to do justice to its unique qualities as a newspaper of record.

So the differences we found are indicative of perspectives of emphasis and of necessarily selective spotlighting of events, not of completeness or quality. Let me illustrate by describing the comparative highlights of the first two days of our study period, and then by sketching the treatment of three major issues before the Assembly.

The Soviet ship Baltika was still on the high seas with its retinue of Red dignitaries when the Security Council received a strong protest over the alleged role of the Secretary General as Commander-in-Chief of the U.N. army in the Congo. (You recall that this was shortly after Mobutu's military coup replaced the government of the late Premier Lumumba.) When our study period opened, The Times kept the spotlight on embattled Hammarskjold. Its September 18 top headline was "U.N. CHIEF WARNS / HE MAY QUIT POST / OVER CONGO ROLE." This 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 and related the hope of the State Department that the Assembly "will not become propaganda platform."

These procedural aspects of the conflict cast only a partial shadow on the back pages of Népszabadság. A page five headline in the September 18 issue of the communist paper declared "ILLEGAL ATTEMPT BY U.S. / TO HAVE SPECIAL 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 the 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!

When the Baltika reached 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 arrival 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 major Times headline of the same day was "U.N. CHIEF WINS 70-0 CONGO VOTE; / KHRUSHCHEV RECEIVED COLDLY; / ANGRY CASTRO SWITCHES HOTELS." 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, according to the caption, "A well isolated Soviet Premier" stepping off the gangplank with head bowed.

And so on went our findings of the day-by-day highlights of news coverage in the two papers. Toward the end of the Assembly, three key issues remained to be settled. They were (1) the five-power neutral move for a summit, (2) the disarmament proposal, and (3) the colonial resolution.

Neutral move for summit. It was on October 6 that five neutral powers gave up their attempt to bring the Big Two face-to-face. "NEUTRALS IN U.N. ABANDON / MOVE FOR BIG TWO TALKS / AS KEY POINT IS REJECTED," said the top Times headline. The debacle came after a simple majority voted to include Eisenhower and Khrushchev by name in the "peace talk" resolution, but Irish Assembly President Boland invoked the two-thirds rule. The rule was upheld, according to The Times' lead story, "after a procedural wrangle of an hour and a half;" whereupon the sponsors withdrew the resolution as pointless.

Népszabadság also carried news of the defeat. This was one of the few days when the U.N. story did not get the top spot on page one. The story focused upon what The Times termed a "procedural wrangle." The headline said "WESTERN VOTING MANEUVERS / BLOCK EFFECTIVE WORK BY U.N." A deck explained that "BOLAND'S PROCEDURAL MANIPULATION CAUSES FIVE POWERS TO WITHDRAW PROPOSAL." A two-column subhead quoted the Ukrainian delegate as saying "It is Time to Prevent Use of U.N. as Tool of Western Bloc." The story asserted that the neutralist resolution 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 resorted to "desperate and unprecedented procedural tactics" to

avoid having to discuss peace and disarmament.

Disarmament. President Eisenhower addressed the Assembly on the subject of disarmament and Africa. "EISENHOWER CALLS FOR PEACE THROUGH U.N." was the top line in The Times. The lead stressed the President's support of Hammarskjold.

As paraphrased by Tass on the front page of the communist paper under the non-committal headline "U.N. ASSEMBLY BEGINS / GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE," 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 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 following day Khrushchev spoke to the Assembly. It was the first of his repeated appearances on behalf of detailed and lengthy disarmament and colonial resolutions submitted to the Assembly. And it was the communist paper's turn to run its largest type across the front page. The headline declared: "FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE / TO ALL COLONIAL PEOPLES! / SOLVE GENERAL DISARMAMENT!" The first six pages were devoted to what the deck called "Significant Speech of Comrade Khrushchev on Burning Problems of Our Age." The account was dotted with such ecstatic subheads as "All the Beauty of the World Could Flower," and "The Exalted Tasks of the U.N." Khrushchev's proposal for reforming the Secretariat came at the end of the long speech. There he argued that if the world was to disarm, the international police force should not be

under the command of any one man attached to any one power bloc.

In contrast to this jubilant mood and emphasis on disarmament hopes, The Times banner headline was "KHRUSHCHEV ASKS HAMMARSKJOLD OUSTER; / WOULD SUBSTITUTE A 3-BLOC DIRECTORATE; / HERTER SEES 'DECLARATION OF WAR' ON U.N."

The next day, 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, Khrushchev 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 disarmament.

The Times headlined its top news story of the informal press conference "KHRUSHCHEV INSISTS U.N. REVISION / MUST PRECEDE DISARMAMENT PLAN." Népszabadság noted the remarks in a roundup story on page four, and again interpreted them as moves to strengthen a more democratic U.N. for the tasks of the future.

While in The Times' major headline Khrushchev put U.N. procedure before disarmament, Népszabadság's banner headline of the same day insisted that "DISARMAMENT IS THE / CENTRAL ISSUE OF OUR AGE / FOUNDATION OF SECURE PEACE." The first three and a half pages were devoted to the Soviet disarmament proposal submitted along with the Khrushchev 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" and "Another Year Lost Because of Behavior of the West." The Times did not carry the disarmament proposal.

Defeat of the disarmament proposal was recorded, along with the score and a threat, in The Times' top headline of October 11: "U.N. REBUFFS KHRUSHCHEV 54 TO 13; / BARS ASSEMBLY ARMS DEBATE NOW; / PREMIER WARNS OF ROCKET POWER." On the same day, Népszabadság's major headline still insisted that "THE QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT / BELONGS TO PLENARY SESSION / OF U.N. ASSEMBLY." The deck cited Khrushchev declaring 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 in the face of obstruction and provocation returned to Népszabadság's front page on October 13. "WE SHALL NOT SLACKEN OUR EFFORTS / IN THE STRUGGLE FOR DISARMAMENT" declared the top headline based on a Khrushchev press conference. 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!'

On the same day, The Times front page featured a scene long remembered in the annals of the U.N. Assembly. The headline was

"NOISY SESSION / CUT SHORT / TO END HECKLING BY REDS." The resolution on "speedy and unconditional" colonial liberation had reached the Assembly floor. (Actually the "heckling" incidents had begun two weeks earlier. When Macmillan expressed hope that a new summit meeting might be held, Khrushchev shouted "Just don't send us any U-2's!" And when the Prime Minister discussed the difficulties of finding an acceptable form of arms inspection, the Russian premier cried "Give us disarmament and we'll accept any kind of controls!" But the final uproar came on the colonial resolution.)

Colonial resolution. Earlier in the Assembly, the communist paper gave a front page banner headline to the "SOVIET PLAN ON COLONIAL FREEDOM." Two full pages were devoted to the Soviet colonial declaration, submitted along with the disarmament proposal. The Times gave news of the colonial declaration in five inside paragraphs, noting that it was "tough," and dealing mostly with reactions to it.

All in all, each paper made eight front page top headline references to colonial and underdeveloped countries or their leaders during the study period. In The Times, six out of the eight referred to events in the cold war, mostly citing support for the U.S. position. None indicated U.S. support for colonial liberation. In the communist paper one of the eight referred to a cold-war move; this was Sukarno's demand that the U.N. move its headquarters from New York. Two expressed opposition to imperialism; the others stressed support for colonial freedom.

The day when the shaky decorum of Assembly procedure was

finally shattered by shoe-banging, table-pounding communist delegates, Népszabadság still gave top play to "THE STRUGGLE FOR DISARMAMENT." But on page five it carried a story headlined "SERIES OF WESTERN PROVOCATIONS / MARK WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION." The "provocations" reported consisted mostly of the Assembly President's interruptions of various speakers urging passage of the colonial resolution. As the vote was about to be taken, related the story, 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 "provocation 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."

True enough, the next day the colonial resolution passed by acclamation. The United States, according to The Times, "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 "Defeat of Colonialists." The Times U.N. story 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..."

So much for the issues as seen from the two perspectives of emphasis. Each highlighted its own set of significant realities from its own social and cultural vantage point. The standards we hold seem most applicable to reporting the progress of a game -- business, political, athletic, personal or atomic -- with primary emphasis on the clash, the color, and the score.

The definition of significant realities in the communist paper appeared to be keyed to communication on a broader basis. Strategy, conflict, procedure were not neglected but treated as subordinate means to universal ends. The ends themselves were those generally accepted to be of major daily concern and hope to most people around the world. These ends were defined clearly, emphasized daily, and espoused enthusiastically. They implicitly swept aside the "game theory" of freedom and objectivity in preference to the claim that aspects of reality to be most freely objective about are the bread-and-butter promise and substance of the great issues of our time.

\*

What do these perspectives mean to others? What do they mean to us?

Seldom do we have the disturbing privilege of taking a tough look at competing and conflicting perspectives available to politically significant elites in other countries. The rattle of atomic arms has a very special meaning for people obsessed with the actual use of these arms by a Western country upon a non-Western country a few days before the agreed-upon Soviet entrance into the war against a collapsing enemy. The inescapable suspicion is that Hiroshima and Nagasaki were the monstrous opening shots of the cold war; that the cold war serves humanity upon the altar of big power frustration and ambition.

One of the most striking implications of our press perspective outside the West is the extent to which its cold war premises are seen as rationalizing hot wars against revolutionary movements in developing areas. A country which -- the argument goes -- with one-fourteenth of the world's population eats one-fifth of the world's foods and mines half of the world's resources to collect two-thirds of the world's income naturally derives its privileges from maintaining the present power structure. As this can best be done under the guise of anti-communism, the limited world supply of communists is carefully nurtured, rationed, even manufactured if necessary, and judiciously allocated to trouble spots in need of military attention. With an evacuation of bases and reduction of arms among the major powers, the armed shield of Western privilege would vanish, and the neo-colonial structure would collapse.

These are some of the assumptions and perspectives freely available to the non-Western news reader. He lives in a country of poor people, and in a climate of national fervor reacting to a

colonial past. The din of big power conflict grates on the ears of hungry people impatient and determined to get on with the long-promised transformation of their daily lives.

Our perspective of emphases appears at best irrelevant, at worst running counter to a tidal wave of pent-up aspirations bursting the dams of the old power structure.. Our vantage point appears to be that of a grim holding operation based on remnants of the established order and preoccupied with the mechanics of a fascinating -- if deadly -- game of power.

Our own structuring of issues in terms of cold war strategy does not help communicating with people to whom colonial freedom, racial equality, free medical care, free higher education and care for the aged are much more brightly shining symbols of a good society than is the armed defense (often on their own territory) of a "free world" they have never known, of "free enterprise" they have never had, or of "dignity of the individual" they have never enjoyed.

In one of the few really tough appraisals of our encounter with other perspectives, Robert L. Heilbroner wrote in The Future as History: "Until the avoidable evils of society have been redressed, or at least made the target of the wholehearted effort of the organized human community, it is not only premature but presumptuous to talk of 'the dignity of the individual.' The ugly, obvious, and terrible wounds of mankind must be dressed and allowed to heal before we can begin to know the capacities, much less enlarge the vision, of the human race as a whole. In the present state of world history the transformations which are everywhere at

work are performing the massive and crude surgery." What we need, wrote Heilbroner, is "a broad and compassionate comprehension of the history-shaking transformations now in mid-career, of their combined work of demolition and construction, of the hope they embody and the price they will extract."

\*

What is the significance of our press perspective for the Russians themselves, and for others living in communist countries? This is more difficult to assess because most of them are prevented (one might say protected) by jamming and censorship from being exposed to it. The paradoxical consequence is that, as Ralph K. White of the United States Information Agency concluded on the basis of a number of studies, "they are basically very friendly to us, in spite of anti-American Communist propoganda." At the same time, these studies indicate that

...they think we are probably dangerous to them. They accept, though with some doubts, the Communist propoganda claiming that America is ruled by capitalists who profit from war... They find it hard to believe that we could be sincerely afraid of them... Even disaffected Soviet individuals are likely to think that their government would not risk war, and that their government's peacefulness must be evident to the rest of the world.

Studies of Soviet refugees by Harvard's Russian Research Center showed that their contact with the Western press and cheap literature produced the greatest negative effects, next to their surprise at the lack of free medical care and free higher education -- features they had taken for granted as part of all civilized life.