

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Theses from the College of Journalism and Mass
Communications

Journalism and Mass Communications, College of

5-2010

Edward R. Murrow: His Life, Legacy and Ethical Influence

Howard Lester Rose

University of Nebraska at Lincoln, H.Les.Rose@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/journalismdiss>



Part of the [Journalism Studies Commons](#)

Rose, Howard Lester, "Edward R. Murrow: His Life, Legacy and Ethical Influence" (2010). *Theses from the College of Journalism and Mass Communications*. 2.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/journalismdiss/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journalism and Mass Communications, College of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses from the College of Journalism and Mass Communications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

EDWARD R. MURROW: HIS LIFE,
LEGACY AND ETHICAL INFLUENCE

by

Howard Lester Rose

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirement
For the Degree of Master of Arts

Major: Journalism and Mass Communications

Under the Supervision of Professor Nancy Mitchell

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 2010

EDWARD R. MURROW: LIFE,
LEGACY AND BROADCAST ETHICS TODAY

Howard Lester Rose, M.A.

University of Nebraska, 2010

Adviser: Nancy Mitchell

This study researched the life and legacy of Edward R. Murrow and examined broadcast ethics today. Murrow invented radio news, as we know it and was the standard-bearer of journalism, ethics, and reporting. Many consider him the father of broadcast journalism.

This study covers ethics in broadcast journalism *today*, with remarks by veteran journalists (and one student) and journalism educators. These experts comment on where TV news stands today based on the ethical standards that Murrow set five decades ago. They speak about the importance of getting the story right, what is wrong ethically with journalism, and how to stay on the journalistic high road at a time when many journalists have take a low road detour.

With the paper's objectives in mind, surveys and questions were sent to student, active, and retired journalists, as well as academics involved in journalism. The findings of these surveys are presented as edited conversational responses, email responses and telephone interviews. Complete verbatim responses of each person interviewed are included for closer analysis in this paper's appendixes.

The interviews with the journalists indicate that Murrow's ethical influence is still present, even though many journalists do not know where or when the standard was set. Journalists may not think of Murrow daily, but virtually all consider him the standard-bearer of good reporting and ethical decision-making. It should be noted, that even Murrow was not perfect ethically and made some egregious errors in his decision-making.

Overall, the findings in this paper show that there is a pronounced difference between local news and network news ethics in the United States. Internationally, many foreign news entities have decidedly different approaches to ethics. Some, in fact, are, unethical. Among the journalist surveyed, there was a noted difference between cable news and network news ethics. They said that cable and network news have standards and practices as gatekeepers, while most local and foreign news providers do not.

DEDICATION

This Thesis is dedicated first to my wife Michele, and to my family and friends who have supported and encouraged me in all my studies and research.

Live, Love, Laugh, Luck, Learn.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Nancy Mitchell, for all her encouragement, support and assistance while I was working on this Thesis. I would also like to thank the other members of my graduate committee, Mr. Barney McCoy and Dr. John Bender, for all their aid and guidance.

I would also like to thank the following for their help and tremendous support of my research: my wife Mrs. Michele Rose, Dr. Julia-Marie Halderman, Mr. Tim O'Brien, Mrs. Stacy Bagley, Mrs. Jessica Milligan-Keif and all the individuals I interviewed.

Additionally I would like to acknowledge Eleanore Vega, Bruce Rheins, Frank Governale, and the staff of CBS News for all of their support and help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROLOGUE.....	1
PART I: HIS LIFE.....	6
A Turn of the Century Tarheel.....	6
Director of Talks.....	10
The Rise of German Propaganda.....	13
Goodnight Vienna.....	15
This is ... London.....	19
The Korean War, Murrow, and the Birth of <i>See It Now</i>	23
Senator Joseph McCarthy, Demagogue.....	26
Paranoia and the Fifties.....	28
U.S. Interracial Progress...and Tensions.....	39
The Economy.....	32
Home at Last.....	32
Not so Healthy Times.....	33
Education and the Educated.....	34
Einstein, the Bomb, and Senator McCarthy.....	36
Scary Times Make for Scary Movies.....	38
The Fifties (Not so Fabulous).....	39
Beginnings of a Battle: McCarthyism, Radulovich, and the Times.....	41
March 9, 1954: Murrow, McCarthy and a Moment in Time.....	45
Technology, <i>Small World</i> , and “Lights in a Box”.....	53
Pride in “Harvest of Shame”.....	57
Farewell.....	61
PART II: HIS LEGACY: JOURNALISTS (AND THE PRESIDENT) ON MURROW, ETHICS, AND THE FUTURE JOURNALISM.....	63
Kenny Irby.....	66
Miles Doran.....	69
Ron Olsen.....	70
Linda Mason.....	71
Keith Woods.....	76
Crocker Snow Jr.....	80
Terry McCarthy.....	82
Steve Hartman.....	87
Robert M. Steele, PhD.....	92
Bob Dotson.....	94
President Barack Obama.....	96
REFLECTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	99

APPENDIX A (Kenny Irby).....	102
APPENDIX B (Miles Doran).....	107
APPENDIX C (Ron Olsen).....	109
APPENDIX D (Linda Mason).....	111
APPENDIX E (Keith Woods).....	120
APPENDIX F (Crocker Snow).....	142
APPENDIX G (Terry McCarthy).....	144
APPENDIX H (Steve Hartman).....	151
APPENDIX I (Robert Steele).....	162
APPENDIX J (Bob Dotson).....	165
APPENDIX K (President Barrack Obama).....	168
REFERENCES.....	172

PROLOGUE

The 1950s are remembered as a simple time in American culture: malt shops, penny loafers, and the birth of rock and roll. It was also during this decade that TV news, even in its infancy, had perhaps its greatest moments and milestones. Many ethical standards for TV news were established courtesy of Edward R. Murrow and his staff. Dan Rather, in an interview with Brian Lamb (Lamb, 1999), described it this way: "... the making of the Murrow legend; basically the Battle of Britain, the McCarthy broadcast and 'Harvest of Shame.' Now, he had a lot of other accomplishments, but those are the three pillars on which the justified Murrow legend is built. There's—no one else in electronic journalism that has had anything close to it."

Murrow won nine national Emmys for his broadcasting achievements. He also received the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1964, America's highest civilian honor. Great Britain made him an honorary knight and Sweden, Belgium, and France granted him similar honors (Berta, 2006). Murrow had terrific timing: he was the right person at exactly the right time. Gary Edgerton, chair of the communications and theatre arts department at Old Dominion University (Norfolk, Virginia) noted that; "The creation of the Murrow legacy and tradition speaks both to the sterling talent of the man himself and the enormous growth and power of radio during the war years" (Edgerton, 2008). Many felt that Murrow, "...almost singlehandedly created broadcast journalism" (Betka, 2008).

Murrow virtually invented radio and television news and set a standard for decades to come. In fact, one of the highest honors a journalist can receive is the Edward R. Murrow award. "RTNDA has honored outstanding achievements in electronic journalism

with the Edward R. Murrow Awards since 1971. Murrow's pursuit of excellence in journalism embodies the spirit of the awards that carry his name” (RTNDA, 2008). This was proper recognition for a man known for his journalistic courage and integrity, but still had his share of human flaws. At times, his opinions would get in the way of his news coverage and analysis and he was accused of being liberal, according to Murrow biographer Ann M. Sperber, “Of course, if you insisted on the question, did Murrow’s opinions underlie his treatment of news analysis, the answer must be yes” (Sperber, 1986).

Recorded sound was not allowed on CBS Radio until Murrow changed that. Radio at the time was something for live events: concerts, major speeches, and hearings. Murrow also changed American radio by reporting in London about the “Blitz.” The sustained WWII German bombing attack killed more than 43,000 civilians, half of them in London, and destroyed or damaged more than a million homes in London alone. He risked his life several times to report, telling the world on London rooftops that Britain was being bombed.

Murrow was immensely popular, but lonely. Edward R. Murrow was known to have immense respect and worldwide influence, yet very few friends. A great insight into his personality (and some of his flaws) came from a *Time* cover story of that era: “A few who have known him for years think that Murrow has grown vain and pompous—an impression that his style also induces in some of his audience...Living in a swirl of hero worship, Murrow is obliged to recall the Murrow-Ain't-God Club. He smokes too much (three packs of Camels a day), is still gnawed by nerves before every broadcast; even in the air-conditioned studio, doing his radio show, he drips sweat and jiggles his legs

tensely... he has little small talk in social conversation.” The *Time* story continues, giving more insight to his personality; “He has an intemperate streak that pushes him beyond sensible limits in poker playing, makes him work 40 hours at a stretch in a projection room or overdo the plowing on his farm. Sometimes in company he drifts off into a trancelike gloom” (This is Murrow, 1957). His life seemed to be a case of loneliness at the top. “I’ve never had any intimate friends,” he once confided. “If I were in serious trouble, I would have trouble knowing where to turn” (This is Murrow, 1957).

So why is Murrow still so revered 50 years after his death, including the 2005 major motion picture (*Good Night and Good Luck*) of his battle with Sen. Joseph McCarthy battle? This paper will examine whom Murrow was, how he got to the top, and four watershed career moments. These include *See It Now* (his McCarthy shows), *Hear It Now* (the London bombings and their aftermath), and his documentary *Harvest of Shame*. Finally, his 1958 speech in Chicago to the Radio and Television News Directors Association (RTNDA) that took on the very industry he thrived in will be examined. At that speech, “He (Murrow) castigated the broadcast industry, from local station owners to the FCC, for allowing television to become escapist and profit-oriented (Murray, 1999).” He took on his employer (CBS News); he also took on an entire industry to task for getting it *wrong*.

Fifty years later, the television news industry is in much worse shape by many accounts (yet there are numerous glimmers of hope). All three major networks have had their own scandals: the 1992 ABC News’ Food Lion story, the 1993 Dateline NBC’s rigging of a truck to explode on camera, and CBS’ *60 Minutes Wednesday* from 2004 that had the Dan Rather (and producer Mary Mapes) National Guard scandal that

involved then President George W. Bush (Doty, 2005). To that end, this paper will also show how Murrow's tenacity, honesty, and moral compass may be the key to making the television news industry better, in spite of itself.

This work is about Murrow's back story that influenced his broadcast career, Murrow's radio and television milestones, and what exactly made Murrow *Murrow*. I phoned, e-mailed, and personally interviewed more than a dozen select broadcast journalists, students, and broadcast instructors from May 2008 through December 2009 for answers about Murrow, his standard of ethics and his influence.

The respondents' answers also take a pulse on broadcast news ethics today, and broadcast ethics was Murrow's hallmark: Their remarks are a perfect link to Murrow's legacy.

The journalism that Murrow represented has never been needed more. There is a palpable sense of frustration today among journalists concerning corporate owned journalism. Professor Robert McChesney, PhD (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) notes "Our news media is increasingly bowing to sophisticated public relations campaigns serving corporate America and commercial pressures to provide inexpensive, unthreatening schlock journalism centered on entertainers, athletes, and royal families (McChesney, 1995)." That said, today's *60 Minutes*, ABC's *20/20* and a few notable exceptions are still turning out a quality product (Woods, 2001).

I am a 24 year CBS News employee (13 of them at the network) and have atypical access to network news professionals. I am a photojournalist and field producer, which means I have worked with a wide variety of colleagues. I note this because through

interviews of those CBS colleagues (and other employees and academics) I sought insightful perspectives about Murrow's work and ethics.

PART I

HIS LIFE

A TURN OF THE CENTURY TARHEEL

Egbert Roscoe Murrow, the youngest son of Quaker parents, was born April 25, 1908, near Wilmington, North Carolina in a tiny town called Polecat Creek. He was raised in a poor farm home lacking, electricity and plumbing. His parents, Roscoe and Ethel, had their hands full with their three boys, the youngest being Egbert. Egbert had to outdo his older brothers in every task: it was what was expected of younger brothers (Edwards, 2004).

Along that journey, Murrow virtually invented radio news, television news, and became the conscience of an industry. During World War II, he was the eyes and ears of the world. Historian Judy P. Sopronyi writes, “His reports took advantage of one of the best features of radio—the listener’s imagination. With Murrow’s help, imagination could put listeners beside him on a London rooftop as air-raid sirens wailed, German planes buzzed in, and bombs exploded (Sopronyi, 2006).” His timing could not have been better: Broadcast news and Murrow’s career were born at about the same time. America, Europe, and McCarthy would never be the same.

Like many true leaders, Murrow was the product of solid parents and great teachers along the way. According to *NPR’s* Bob Edwards, in *Edward R. Murrow and the Birth of Broadcast Journalism*, “Egbert’s family moved from North Carolina to Washington State, well north of Seattle, when he was five. English teacher Ruth Lawson taught Egbert at Edison High, and recommended that he join three girl classmates on the debating team. They were the best in their region, and Egbert was the star. Edwards notes

that perhaps it is Ruth Lawson whom we “...modern broadcast journalists should thank for engaging our founder in world affairs” (Edwards, 2004, p.13). He had plenty of distractions: “Egbert was in the school orchestra, he sang glee club solos in the school operettas, played baseball and basketball, drove the school bus, and was the President of the student body in his senior year” (Edwards, 2004, p. 13).

But this moody future journalist was never without his faults, including his formative years. Edwards said, “When not in one of his silent black moods, Egbert was loud and outspoken. For that reason, the kids called him Eber Blowhard, or just ‘Blow’ for short. His parents called him Egg. In his late teens he started going by the name of Ed, and would legally change his name while in college” (Edwards, 2004, p.8).

While at Washington State College, he was elected president of the National Student Federation of America (N.S.F.A.) after his convention speech urging students to become more interested in national and world affairs and less concerned with “...fraternities, football, and fun” (Edwards, 2004, p.16). This collegiate concern for national and world affairs was a foundation that would serve him for a lifetime.

Edwards notes, “Ed’s class of 1930 was trying to join the workforce in the first spring of the Great Depression. Banks were failing, plants were closing, and people stood in bread lines, but Ed Murrow was off to New York City to run the national office of the N.S.F.A., his first job out of college” (Edwards, 2004, pp. 16-17). He was barely settled in New York when he made his first journey to Europe, attending the Confederation International of Students in Brussels. This was Europe between World Wars, and Murrow advocated that the Europeans should not punish the young Germans because of their

elder's actions. The delegates were so impressed with Murrow that they wanted to make him their president. This time he refused (Edwards, 2004, p. 17).

Returning to New York, Murrow convinced the *New York Times* to quote the federation's student polls, and Murrow co-created and supplied guests for the *University of the Air* series on the two-year old Columbia Broadcasting System (which turned out to be his first job at CBS). What was in it for CBS? CBS enjoyed the prestige of having the great minds of the world delivering "talks" and filling out its program schedule while the N.S.F.A. would gain terrific publicity and help in its fundraising (no small task in the Great Depression). When CBS wanted big names for the *University of the Air* broadcasts, Murrow brashly promised Albert Einstein without a clue he could deliver him. Not only did he deliver Einstein (who years later would be anti-McCarthy), he followed with Mohandas Gandhi (later known as Mahatma Gandhi), German President Paul von Hindenburg, and British Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. Murrow did all of this in his senior year of college!

Murrow left for a job at the Institute of International Education (IIE), as an assistant to Dr. Stephen Duggan. Edwards notes, "This was Ed's introduction to the Eastern establishment. Duggan had contacts with the elite of business, law, finance, government, philanthropy, and of course, education. He was close to Franklin Roosevelt, who would be elected president that year. As Duggan's assistant, Murrow was meeting everyone a future journalist needed to know" (Edwards, 2004, p. 19). Part of the job was going to Europe in the summer of 1932 to evaluate scholars to be invited to lecture in the United States (Edwards, 2004, p. 20). Some of that work would come back to haunt him in the worst way and at the worst time. Senator McCarthy would later use Murrow's

involvement of making available summer courses in Moscow to American visitors as a way to smear Murrow and link him to Communists.

Remember the times: President Franklin D. Roosevelt was not the only election winner of 1932. Notes Edwards; “Adolf Hitler was the new leader of Germany, and purges of German universities began shortly after the Nazis took control of government offices in Berlin in the spring of 1933” (Edwards, 2004, p. 20). The on-campus horrors in Germany continued: 20,000 books were burned in May, the same month in which the IIE pleaded for help. Ed Murrow unofficially ran the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Students (“German” would later become “foreign”). Murrow’s work on behalf of the Emergency Committee over the next several years, according to Edwards and numerous others, was nothing short of heroic. It would also lay the groundwork for Murrow’s wartime radio reporting from London rooftops.

The Emergency Committee, run by Murrow, successfully relocated hundreds of Europe’s greatest minds to America. The list included Thomas Mann, Herbert Marcuse, Felix Bloch, and Otto Nathan (Edwards, 2004, p. 22). The impact of this effort is felt to this day. Although Murrow preferred to focus on the thousands of applicants the committee could *not* help, years later Murrow told an interviewer that his work with the Emergency Committee was “the most satisfying thing I ever did in my life” (Edwards, 2004, p. 23).

Just a few years later Murrow decided he wanted to stay in the education field. He applied to be president of several colleges, including Rockford College, which was then a women’s institution in Illinois. Murrow was rejected when Rockford College learned he had falsified his credentials and found out that he was only 26 (Edwards, 2004, p. 24). At

the age of 27, when Murrow applied to CBS for his second job called, “Director of Talks,” this future bastion of integrity lied on his employment application. He actually lied not once but three times; he added five years to his age, changed his major to political science and international relations, and claimed to have had an M.A. from Stanford (Edwards, 2004, p. 24). The year before, CBS hired him as a part-time employee based on his experience with the *University of the Air* series. Ironic that a person of his credentials, even then, lacked the confidence of truth and personal courage. That was about to change.

DIRECTOR OF TALKS

Murrow always thought of himself as an educator: According to Edwards, everything he had done since college had been connected to education. After his failure to become president at Rockford College, Edward R. Murrow arrived at CBS with the knowledge that he would not be on the air.

In fact, Murrow biographer A.M. Sperber notes; “He hadn’t arrived with any hopes of being a *journalist*. Journalism was still not in the picture, although his new post as Director of Talks included responsibilities previously handled by the Director of News Paul White, and White resented it” (Sperber, 1986, p. 82). Murrow arrived without fanfare. In fact, no one had bothered to tell the tiny news staff about the new hire. Robert Trout, the young news announcer (and not really regarded as a ‘journalist’) remembers getting off on the 17th floor and “...there was a strange fella in a very small cubicle” (Sperber, 1986, p. 82). That was the new Director of Talks, he was told. The Director of Talks, he thought?

Paul White was at once Murrow's nemesis, boss, competitor, and ally. White was smart enough to know that the "educator" had terrific contacts in Europe and America and knew what he was talking about. Still, White thought Murrow was a little too "slick." When Murrow's real date of birth was revealed, White was heard to mumble a low, barely audible, "I thought there was something...immature" (Sperber, 1986, p. 84).

Murrow arrived at a time when NBC was surging ahead in net profits and sales (Sperber, 1986, p. 84). There would soon be a very green light at CBS for the building of a formal news operation, and Murrow would be at exactly the right place, at the right time. The reason that CBS President Bill Paley wanted to make a big move into public affairs was largely dictated by the fact that NBC "...was so strong in entertainment that the easiest way for a newcomer to make a reputation was in news" (Halberstam, 1979, p. 53).

However, that small newsroom would be a surprise to a generation familiar with the worldwide operations of today's CBS News. In 1935, CBS News was basically White, Murrow, Trout and just a few others. Murrow loathed his role as Director of Talks, lining up speakers and press conferences and doing very little journalism. Not that he was impressed with what he saw. His friends at the time remember Murrow saying, "Nobody has the slightest understanding of what is going on..." (Sperber, 1986, p. 90). Murrow ran CBS' overseas radio operations from New York, stopping to help cover political conventions and some American set-ups. However, overseas radio, despite Murrow's best efforts, had been mostly a novelty act to fill time. That changed in 1936 when King Edward VIII abdicated his throne to marry a twice-divorced American

socialite, and Murrow lined up a resistant BBC to help cover it in America (Sperber, 1986, p. 97).

In late February the following year, Murrow was asked to take the job as European Director for CBS by the no nonsense Edward Klauber, the executive vice president of CBS (who later requested Murrow to speak at his funeral) (Sperber, 1986, p. 488). Murrow's wife Janet, whom he married in 1934, agreed that it was a grand idea to go to the United Kingdom. Murrow was about to become the first bureau chief for CBS News London, and its only employee (Sperber, 1986, p. 99).

Replacing bureau chief Cesar Saerchinger, Murrow was asked by Sir John Reith, the head of the BBC, "Why did they send you here?" "I really don't know," Murrow, answered. "Well," Sir John continued, "in view of your record, I dare say your company's programs in the future will be a little more intellectual." Murrow responded to Sir John with a philosophy that Murrow would pursue for the rest of his career. He said, "On the contrary, I want our programs...to be down to earth, in the vernacular of the man in the street" (Finkelstein, 2007, p. 55). For the rest of his life, Murrow considered that decision to go to Europe the greatest one of his life. Speaking like a newly minted journalist, Murrow said, "It gave me a front-row seat to some of the greatest moments in history" (Finkelstein, 2007, p.51). Murrow would soon get some help on the streets of Europe: badly needed colleagues. One of the biggest stories of the century was about to put them all to the test: Adolph Hitler had plans for Europe, and the world would soon be at war.

THE RISE OF GERMAN PROPAGANDA

According to Sperber, long before Murrow's arrival in Europe, Murrow had been the subject of urgent internal memos at NBC. Murrow's assumption of the job was viewed as proof of "increased CBS competition." The NBC office checkmated his every move, so Murrow immediately hired a single correspondent named William Shirer, a talented newspaperman with a mediocre voice, and built from there. In those first few months, Sperber notes, "For Murrow as for Shirer, there was no reporting. In fact, their contracts specifically excluded broadcasting—a clause, which caused both men, informed as they were, some irritation" (Sperber, 1986, p. 104). Murrow and Shirer were the arrangers at best, anonymous voices, doing the introductions living out of suitcases, setting up broadcasts anywhere from Amsterdam to Athens, seeing to it that they reached New York on schedule. It was the calm before the storm, and the storm troopers.

Propaganda was escalating from the Germans and beyond, over European shortwave. In a speech to the prestigious Royal Institute of International Affairs, the 29-year-old-Murrow, well regarded at all levels of the BBC (CBS' Europe offices were directly across the hall from them), spoke to a rapt audience. Sperber notes that the talk was "intended as a comment on the contemporary scene, the talk was in effect a first-time formulation of Edward Murrow's views on broadcasting" (Sperber, 1986, p. 110).

The speech was a call to arms, more specific to the times and less broad than his still-to-come RTNDA speech, to be examined here later. He questioned, "The failure of broadcasting to accept its responsibilities, to seek for truth wherever it might be found and to disseminate that truth as widely as possible." He was firm in his belief that the content, not the medium, was the message. Murrow said, "I think we are all prepared

to...marvel at the technical excellence of present-day broadcasting. But I am convinced that most of the achievements to date must be credited to the engineers and technicians rather than those responsible for programme [sic] content. Broadcasting...has not been properly related to the social, political, and economic structure that it inevitably reflects. There has been too much blind acceptance of the broadcasters' statements of policy and principle" (Sperber, 1986, p. 110). Murrow expressed concern for the rising propaganda of both political speech from Hitler and the quest to sell "cigarettes, soap, or automobiles" in the U.S. "In this last field of propaganda, I must maintain with all humility that Americans are without equal," (Sperber, 1986, p. 111) Murrow lamented (Sperber, 1986, p. 111).

All the Murrow moments were there, though he was speaking as a producer, not a reporter. Murrow saw the need to speak specifics, be concrete, avoid the abstract; include just a bit of talking down, and an emphasis on the everyday. These very elements, along with getting the facts straight and being a voice for the voiceless, would make up the bulk of Murrow as correspondent for years to come. Murrow lamented about television's squandered potential; "The medium had enormous power...but it has no character, no conscience of its own. It reflects the hatreds, the jealousies and ambitions of those men and governments that control it. It (television) can be a powerful force for mutual understanding between nations, but not until we have made it so" (Sperber, 1986, p. 112).

Chances are Murrow's comments never made it to New York; a good thing for they might have upset his bosses at CBS. He was speaking off the record to a closed meeting to an institute whose rules ritually enjoining members from the attribution of

remarks (Sperber, 1986, p. 112). Years later, his RTNDA speech in Chicago would reach CBS' New York headquarters instantly, and a 2009 speech by President Barack Obama would echo the same sentiment. However, history would be made in the meantime.

GOODNIGHT VIENNA

It is now 1938, and three years since Hitler had disavowed all interest in the *Anschluss*, or the annexation, of Austria. Four years had gone by since the aborted Nazi coup. However, Mussolini, this time, was secretly in Hitler's pocket. Meanwhile, NBC had exclusives on most stories coming out of Europe, and it was well ahead of CBS. Murrow insisted on equal treatment for Columbia (what CBS was sometimes known as at the time) with German officials, using the launch of a new dirigible as the specific story for an access fight. He was gaining ground for CBS in tiny steps (Sperber, 1986, p. 114).

March 5, 1938: Nazis were rioting in Austrian cities, demanding Anschluss. Hitler was beating the drum in the name of self-determination for those Germans beyond the borders of the Reich. NBC was carrying the story in eyewitness accounts, although censored ones, and CBS was not. Sperber notes the frustration: "How to top them (NBC) once, as must inevitably happen, without CBS' access to the microphone" (Sperber, 1986, p. 116) ?

Remember that Murrow was in Europe as the CBS European director when Hitler pressured the Austrians into Anschluss. "When the Germans moved into Austria, Murrow overnight became a journalist" (Halberstam, 1979, p.63). Murrow becoming a journalist was never his intent: He considered himself an educator. CBS just considered Murrow a lower level employee...at the time.

Sperber notes the prototype of radio news, which later would be TV news roundups. “Someone came up with the idea of broadcasting a series of reactions from the different capitals, different points of origin, all on one show—London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, and Vienna. Instead of breaking into several programs from several places, they would make *one* program an entire half hour” (Sperber, 1986, p. 116). It was revolutionary at the time and considered standard practice today.

Murrow’s voice originated from Vienna, and they hired American newspaper correspondents from Paris, Rome, and Berlin. This arrangement was, in fact, the invention of the network newscast. It worked well, with few glitches with all of the phone lines in different time zones. One week later, it seemed like a simple rehearsal for what was to come.

Fred Friendly, Murrow’s producer of 16 years at CBS, remembers the confluence of radio, history, and Murrow. Friendly wrote in *Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control*, “...due to an accident of history, Murrow was at the end of a shortwave circuit when radio and World War II burst upon an isolationist America” (Friendly, 1967, pp. xv-xvi). Murrow knew his way around electronics, newspapers, and had a love for motion picture documentaries: and they all converged in a new medium called ‘television’ (Friendly, 1967, p.xvi). Television and television news were about to be born, but it was radio that brought it home in this war and in this moment in time.

Sperber writes, “Sunday night, March 12, at 8:00 pm EST, CBS heard the familiar voice of Bob Trout announcing cancellation of the program *St. Louis Blues* to make way for a special broadcast with reports directly from Europe. In London and on the European continent, it was already March 13” (Sperber, 1986, p. 118). First there were the wire

agency bulletins: Hitler was on his way to Vienna, there were German troop movements in France, and there was talk of Germany reinforcing ties with the Soviet Union. Hitler was pushing Europe into war, but CBS still had to get to some reporters in the field and off of depending on the wire reports.

It was an engineering nightmare, and a total triumph. The frantic hours of dialing, talking, cabling, writing, and running suddenly made sense. “The correspondents, scattered across the map of Europe, moved into position like figures on a chessboard,” (Sperber, 1986, p. 119). Radio was not only giving the news but examining events as they occurred: something new. It had a speed and immediacy that was unmatched by any other medium. Radio news was coming of age, and a new, authoritative, baritone voice arrived with it: “This is Edward Murrow speaking from Vienna. It is now nearly 2:30 in the morning and Herr Hitler has not yet arrived. No one seems to know just when he will get here, but most people expect him sometime after 10 o’clock tomorrow morning” (Sperber, 1986, p. 119).

The Warsaw, Poland that Murrow had left, was calm. Nevertheless, Vienna had changed. Austria had been annexed into Germany on March 12, 1938. Germany’s Wehrmacht troops had entered Austria to enforce the Anschluss: “Young storm troopers are riding about the streets, riding about in trucks and vehicles of all sorts, singing and tossing oranges out to the crowd. Nearly every principal building has its armed guard, including the one from which I am speaking” (Sperber, 1986, p. 119). It was as much as he could get past the censor at his side, the very first of more than 5,000 broadcasts (several historic) he was to make in the coming years.

But David Halberstam notes in *The Powers That Be*, that Murrow's was a unique arrival, and "No other broadcast journalist would ever again accumulate the prestige both inside and outside the company that Murrow had" (Halberstam, 1979, p. 60). The reasons were both simple and historic: the medium of radio was new (practically experimental), the story of World War II was huge (Halberstam notes it was the "...story of survival of western civilization"), and Murrow was so very good. There were simply no complicated systems in place editorially to restrain him. This war was not Vietnam; this was the survival of the English-speaking world. This was a very different type of journalistic coverage from what was to come. There was no need to give the German point of view. (Ibid) In later years, Murrow became appalled by the growing pressure to balance out viewpoints for the sake of artificial fairness. Murrow compared this with balancing the views of Jesus Christ with those of Judas Iscariot. But this was a historic time, and Murrow was one of the heroes in it (Halberstam, 1979, pp. 60-61).

Note here that the role of the radio correspondent was defined through this, "...uniting in one person the functions of news gatherer, writer, and broadcaster, neither a commentator nor a news reader, but a staff reporter—a figure new to communications" (Sperber, 1986, p. 131). Murrow was on his way to stardom. .

These multitasking reporting skills still ring true 70 years later with today's trend of the VJ (Visual Journalist) or "Back Pack" Journalist in television. To save money, one person in a TV newsroom is the reporter/ editor/ producer/ photographer/ assignment desk. This model does not work in all TV newsrooms, but many newsrooms are making this work as part of their employee workforce. Another Murrow first that has come full circle.

THIS IS...LONDON

August 24, 1940. Poland and Warsaw buckled and burned; the war had been underway almost a year. On this night particular night, reporter Eric Sevareid is at a London dance palace, Larry LeSueur at an air-raid precautions station, and Ed Murrow, microphone in hand, is at the Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in Trafalgar Square. The program was *London After Dark*, "...starring the citizenry of London and the better part of 1,000 uninvited guests" (Sperber, 1986, p. 163).

In *Broadcasts from the Blitz: How Edward R. Murrow Helped Lead America Into War* author Phillip Seib quotes Murrow on the German advance in May, 1940, "...there is a feeling of surprise and bewilderment, a realization that the German bid for victory is directed by unorthodox minds, willing to attempt the impossible, and favored so far by incredible luck" (Seib, 2007, p. 33). September 7, 1940 in the afternoon, the worst of Londoners' fears happened above their skies. Nearly a thousand German planes~348 bombers escorted by 617 Messerschmitt fighters attacked for two hours straight (Stankysy, 2007, p. 30). That made way for another attack;, the principal targets were docks along the Thames. The losses were massive; 430 died and 1,600 were badly injured. Seib notes that this was Hitler's version of "shock and awe" (Seib, 2007, p. 77). An estimated 20,000 tons of high explosives were dropped on London in the next nine months. There are active reminders of the bombings to this day. On June 6, 2008, Royal Engineers defused a huge bomb from this era, discovered near an Underground construction site. The bomb started ticking when it was moved (The Associated Press, 2008).

The breadth of the devastation was stunning. During the first six weeks of the blitz, 16,000 London houses were destroyed, 60,000 were seriously damaged, and 300,000 people needed temporary housing. The world had never seen anything like this use of massive air power against civilians (Seib, 2007, p. 79). As for Americans' attitudes, Seib writes, "'It has nothing to do with us' remained the prevailing sentiment as the Blitz began. Americans were still just spectators, intent on keeping their distance" (Seib, 2007, p.78).

Murrow determined that his compatriots would not (and should not) ignore a battered Britain, brought the war into their living rooms with, according to Seib, "...vivid and sometimes poetic descriptions of what was going on around them." Murrow's first night of reporting the blitz was this, in his calm but firm voice: "The fires up the river had turned the moon blood red. The smoke had drifted down until it formed a canopy over the Thames, the guns were working all around us, the bursts looking like fireflies in a southern summer night" (Seib, 2007, p. 79). It was Murrow at his best and his reporting style was born. He reported the facts, but always included the nuances he saw. Nuances that brought what he saw straight into the living room. He described the "...rainbow bending over the battered and smoking East End just when the 'all clear' sounded." Or, "The tolling of Big Ben can be heard in the intervals of the gunfire." He was trying, he said, to give a sense of "...the life in London these days—the courage of the people; the flash and roar of the guns rolling down streets where much of the history of the English-speaking world has been made" (Seib, 2007, p. 80). Murrow knew his limitations of such an overwhelming story, adding; "These things must be experienced to be understood."

Murrow never forgot the Londoner's toughness and spirit. Murrow said, "I've seen some horrible sights during these days and nights, but not once have I heard man, woman, or child suggest that Britain should throw in her hand. These people are angry" (Seib, 2007, p. 79). His broadcasts usually gave his listeners a good idea what it was like to be in the middle of the blitz, giving numerous reports from the rooftop of the BBC/CBS complex. This gave some immediacy to his voice: the sounds of gunfire and bombs surrounding him from that lookout. For a while, it was all the sounds that CBS would allow. Pre-recorded sounds on radio were nearly unheard of. Radio was a live medium and prerecording was a technique and technology that was rarely used.. But to tell the story of this war, Murrow started using sound recordings of the bombing so he wouldn't always have to risk his life on the rooftops. The New Yorkers just had to accept it, and they did (Kendrick, 1969, p. 221). Murrow at those moments created the prototype of the modern radio news report.

The kinship with the BBC was included in his newscasts, reminding Americans this just wasn't another country in dire straits, this was America's parent. Seib notes that Murrow "...wanted to inspire some family loyalty" (Seib, 2007, p. 80). Murrow was frustrated; he tried nearly daily to convey the importance of what was happening. But his reports were going to an America trying to ignore the fact that what affects Britain affects the U.S.A.

To make this kind of reporting possible, there was an informal partnership between Murrow and Churchill. When the Air Ministry at first blocked Murrow's efforts to do live broadcasts from the rooftops with a view of the city, he appealed to Churchill who "heartily approved" and overruled the military bureaucrats. Above all, according to

Seib, Churchill recognized that the more leeway Murrow was granted to do his reporting, the more likely he could rouse American sympathy. And then hopefully, Churchill could get America's involvement and aid (Seib, 2007, p. 83).

Not that Murrow's reporting style was without peril. Murrow's colleague Elmer Davis said, "The only objection that can be offered to Murrow's technique of reporting is that when an air raid is on he has the habit of going out on the roof to see what is happening, or driving around town in an open car to see what has been hit. This is a good way to get the news, but perhaps *not* the best way to make sure that you will go on getting it" (Seib, 2007, p. 83). Murrow would get profoundly fatigued and even landed in a hospital a time or two from exhaustion, but kept going despite his colleagues' and wife's pleas. He nearly worked himself to death (literally), getting strep and pneumonia from the nonstop coverage and his addiction to 60-80 unfiltered Camel cigarettes a day (Seib, 2007).

Murrow was not a trained journalist, and with the rise of radio, this proved to be an asset because "...there was a vast difference between the words and rhythms of print journalism and of spoken English; he had nothing to unlearn" (Halberstam, 1979, p. 62). His passion was not for the scoop but for intelligence. Remember: he had come from the academic world and his first job at CBS had been running its educational service (Halberstam, 1979, p.63). He tried to teach younger reporters at CBS in later years to "...try to envision themselves standing at the bar after one or two drinks and explaining what they had seen that day—and use the exact same language" (Halberstam, 1979, p. 63).

The immediacy of Murrow's reports, his heroism and bravery in telling them, and never giving up hope for American help, is one reason why Murrow has remained America's greatest radio broadcaster. Murrow revolutionized and practically invented radio news, and was about to change television news forever.

THE KOREAN WAR, MURROW, AND THE BIRTH OF *SEE IT NOW*

The Korean War started June 27, 1950 and lasted three years and a month, roughly a third of the 1950s in America was a time of war. Murrow covered the war in the *Hear It Now* radio show, but the marriage of Murrow and television was just around the corner.

The television version of radio's *Hear It Now* was called effectively enough *See It Now*. This series, which proved over time to be journalistically tough as steel, was the idea of an aluminum manufacturer. In 1951, Alcoa had approached Edward R. Murrow; because he was revered for his World War II reports, about a television version of *Hear It Now*. This was not a case of a corporation taking the high road for purely societal reasons: Alcoa had just lost a Federal antitrust suit, having been found to control 90 percent of the aluminum market. The president of Alcoa told Murrow and Friendly, "You do the programs, we'll make the aluminum. Don't tell us how to how to make the aluminum, and we won't tell you how to make the program" (Barnouw, 1978, p. 51). The right sponsor had found the right show, at least for now.

The first *See It Now* program had Edward R. Murrow as editor and anchor and produced by Fred Friendly. It was broadcast live on November 18, 1951 and noted their shift from *Hear It Now* from the opening; "This is an old team trying to learn a new

trade” (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 118). Before they got to their Korean War report that night, they wanted something to highlight and take advantage of this medium of television. As Murrow and Friendly wrote in the foreword to the book version of *See It Now*; “On that first program the two monitors in the control room of Studio 41 were used to show the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean simultaneously (live, not on film). It occurred to us that, until the electronics of television, no man had been capable of gazing at both oceans in the same instant” (Murrow and Friendly, 1955, p. xi). They thought that a medium capable of doing this would enable reporters with “...an entirely new weapon in journalism.”

Murrow and Friendly approached television almost as a beautiful but potentially harmful device from the start. Continuing with those first thoughts in the first episode of *See It Now* was pure Murrow; “We stated that we were going to try to learn to use it, that we hoped we would never abuse it, and that we would not get too big for our britches. There are those that would testify that we have done all three things” (Murrow and Friendly, 1955, p. xi). From the start, he would try to get things right with this new medium. Many in television did not share his high ethical standards or approach: his blistering speech on the state of the television industry to the Radio and Television News Directors Association (R.T.N.D.A.) in Chicago would address the industry in just a few years.

Just as Murrow had used radio to bring home the grimness of World War II into American homes, he was now using television to bring home the grim realities of another war (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 119). After showing both of America’s oceans, it was time for a more serious subject. Murrow narrated a portrait of American soldiers in

Korea, who were involved in a war that was largely misunderstood at home. He introduced several soldiers and then at the end of the segment, "...Murrow looked into the camera to give viewers an update on the soldiers they had just seen and the frontline action they were experiencing. He spoke solemnly of the casualties they suffered and ended by telling Americans, 'They may need some blood. Can you spare a pint?' Murrow then turned his face away from the camera as if to make the question undebatable" (Finkelstein, 1997, pp. 118-119). Over the next few days, hundreds of thousands of viewers turned up at Red Cross centers to donate blood.

The Murrow team and a crew of twenty went to Korea for the next two Christmases. On the December 29, 1953 *See It Now: Christmas in Korea* the show had a distinctly "Ernie Pyle, or "everyman," approach. Murrow was not concerned with the generals and colonels, but the regular GIs. One conversation with some levity early in the show:

Murrow: What would you fellows like to be doing if you were home right now?

(laughter)

Marine: Are you kidding? (MUCH LAUGHTER)

Murrow: What about it?

Marine: Well, I'll be frank. I'd like to be sitting in a car with my girlfriend right now. (General Laughter). (Murrow and Friendly, 1955, p. 5)

And so it went. Different conversations with different CBS reporters in different locations, all with the young men (and women nurses) missing home at Christmastime. Many scenes of GIs telling their stories with plenty of "Miss You Mom"

televised moments. Murrow ended that show with: “There is no conclusion to this report from Korea because there is no end to this war. (PAUSE.) That ends our report from Korea. And it remains on behalf of the men with whom we have worked out here, the fighting men with whom we shared a little experience, to say, perhaps, make a prayer, and don’t forget to write. Good night and good luck” (Murrow and Friendly, 1955, p. 29).

SENATOR JOSEPH MCCARTHY, DEMAGOGUE

On March 9, 1954, CBS ran an edition of its documentary show *See It Now* with Edward R. Murrow. It was a show entitled, “A Report on Senator Joseph S. McCarthy.” It was not just another television show: It was a show that would eventually bring down a United States senator. McCarthy was a senator who had an entire country living in fear for their personal and professional reputations, their livelihoods, and their citizenship at stake (Doherty, 2003, p. 257).

“The late Joseph R. McCarthy, a United States senator from Wisconsin, was in many ways the most gifted demagogue ever bred on these shores. No bolder seditionist ever moved among us—nor any politician with a surer, swifter access to the dark places of the American mind” (Rovere, 1982). Richard Rovere, in *Senator Joe McCarthy*, opens his biography of McCarthy with those words; perhaps making the Wisconsin senator sound more like a science fiction movie star than a trusted elected official. However, McCarthy and McCarthyism were all too real; and a largely complacent press helped to make it happen.

“McCarthy was able to generate the massive publicity that made him the center of anti-Communism because he understood the press, its practices, and its values; he

knew what made news” (Bayley, 1981). Edwin Bayley’s book notes that the press was inept and titled his second chapter, “The Floundering Press” (Bayley, 1981, p. 39).

McCarthy was battling President Truman to get documents released, among other things, “...Truman said that he would not turn over State Department loyalty files to the Senate investigating committee...” (Bayley, 1981, p. 40).

Thirty years after the 1919 Red Scare, a generation later, there came to be a similar showdown between Senator McCarthy and CBS newsman Edward R. Murrow (with producer Fred Friendly and staff). Murrow’s dismantling of McCarthy on March 9, 1954, on his CBS show *See It Now* (and the follow up April 6, 1954, that aired McCarthy’s rebuttal) “...remains to this day the most celebrated...and famous...television documentary ever broadcast” (Soerber, 1998). The telecast was composed almost entirely of McCarthy’s own words and pictures, “...a damning portrait of a fanatic... the combination of the program’s power and broke the Senator’s hold over the nation” (PBS, 2009).

This certainly was not the first time America feared Communists. *Red Scare* (Schmidt, 2000, p. 28) notes, “In 1919, Communism threatened to spread to Western Europe with Red uprisings in Germany and Hungary...in the U.S., radicals, already identified with disloyalty because of their opposition to the war, were emboldened...” Schmidt also notes, “...the organized labor and the press feared they would become targets of a sedition law” (Ibid).

Murrow’s McCarthy show will soon be further discussed. An insight into 1950s American society as a social and moral battleground that led to that confrontation is still needed for historic and social context. What were the issues of the times that led to

McCarthyism and the paranoia of the times? The central question is an oft-repeated one: How could McCarthy influence so many people to do the wrong thing? America in the 1950s was much darker in tone and fearful than *Happy Days* and *American Graffiti* would lead the baby boomers to believe. The Cold War, it seemed, was heating up to a full boil.

PARANOIA AND THE FIFTIES

David Halberstam, the Pulitzer Prize winning journalist (and author of the previously cited *The Powers That Be*), wrote in his book *The Fifties*, “By the summer of 1949, America had enjoyed a four-year monopoly of the atom bomb. It had been finished too late to use against Germany. Nonetheless, it arrived in time to be a trump card in the growing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union” (Halberstam, 1993, p. 24). That trump card was trumped itself: The American monopoly on nuclear weapons ended on September 3, 1949, when a U.S. reconnaissance plane found a high level of activity in Russia. The Soviets had exploded some kind of atomic device (Halberstam, 1993, p. 25). Roughly five months later, Senator Joseph McCarthy and his search for Communists would begin.

On February 8, 1950, and just a few states away from his native Wisconsin in Wheeling, West Virginia, McCarthy was stumbling into history. He “...stepped forward to lend his name to a phenomenon that, in fact, already existed. He was the accidental demagogue” (Halberstam, 1993, p. 49). McCarthy mentioned in a speech, almost casually, that there were Communists in the State Department and that they controlled American foreign policy. McCarthy, feeding off the mounting attention yet with little

proof, then hit the road with the Washington press corps in gleeful tow. Halberstam writes about them that: “They had little interest in reporting how careless he was or how little it all meant to him. It was news and he was news; that was all that mattered” (Halberstam, 1993, p. 55).

The “McCarthy Circus” was gaining momentum at the same time Murrow (in 1950) launched *Hear It Now*, a radio documentary program. The next year, Murrow and CBS moved the format to television and called it *See It Now* (Young & Young, 2004, p. 235). It was this television series that would showcase the Murrow/McCarthy showdown just three years later. Meanwhile, there was another Red Scare in America, and this time McCarthy, an alcoholic American senator, was there to take America on the wrong path (Halberstam, 1993, p. 54). But in early 1950s America, this Red Scare would soon be linked to black civil rights.

U.S. INTERRACIAL PROGRESS...AND TENSIONS

The Red Scare aside, black people had their own worries. However, several forces came together for at least the *potential* of interracial progress in the 1950s, and ignited the Civil Rights movement to come. This is the context within Murrow worked. President Truman had to consider civil rights at home if America claimed to lead the “Free World.” There were ongoing social and demographic changes as well as pressure from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (N.A.A.C.P.).

That change would come painfully and slowly. Though lynching blacks had dropped considerably since the 1930s (from roughly twelve a year then to about twelve from 1945-1950), blacks in the south had suffered from a “...Jim Crow society that

segregated everything from schools and busses to bathrooms, beaches, and drinking fountains” (Patterson, 1997, p. 381). *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka* Supreme Court desegregation decision in 1954, along with Martin Luther King, Jr.’s leadership in the Montgomery, Alabama bus boycott, would make the 1950s the start of the modern civil rights era (Joseph, 2007, p. 7). King did not start the bus boycott, but organized it. A noteworthy, quiet woman spoke volumes when she sat down and stood up for a cause. “Passive resistance was midwifed by a Negro seamstress and NAACP activist, Rosa Parks, who violated city ordinance and Alabama state law by refusing to give up her seat on a municipal bus to a white man” (Roberts, 2007, p. 109).

“Segregation in Schools” was a CBS *See It Now* show that was made the week following the *Brown* decision, which was handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court on May 17, 1954. It reports on reactions to *Brown*, which declared that separate education for blacks and whites was neither separate nor equal. The show was not a milestone to many, but did reflect a dignified peace. In *A New History of Documentary Film*, Jack C. Ellis writes that it was an overall stiff presentation, reporting from Natchitoches, Louisiana, and Gastonia, North Carolina. “When feeling does break through—actual expressed emotion of an older black woman, a black high school youth, and elderly white woman, and a black male teacher—it is moving and is real in a way that helps us to understand...” (Ellis, 2005, p. (Turner, 2003) 182). Passiveness is evident when viewing this show, as is patience.

The year prior, in 1953, at the Norfolk Prison Colony in Massachusetts, Malcolm X had walked out of jail. His followers in The Nation of Islam (also known as the “Black Muslims”) were advocating a nation within a nation, separating themselves

from whites wherever possible. By then end of the 1950s, the Nation of Islam had roughly 50,000 members and tens of thousands of sympathizers (Painter, 2006, p. 256).

However, in this environment, the Reds saw blacks as an opportunity, though it never came to real fruition. "Communists, through support of black criminal defendants, sharecroppers, trade unionists, artists and writers, also played important, hotly debated roles. Black sympathizers...viewed the CP (Communist Party) as a potential vehicle for liberation..." (Ibid).

Along with *Brown vs. Board of Education*, the '50s had another federal civil rights milestone. In 1957, President Eisenhower sent Congress a proposal called *The Civil Rights Act of 1957*. It established the Civil Rights Section of the Justice Department and empowered federal prosecutors to obtain court injunctions against interference with the right to vote. It also established a federal civil rights commission to investigate discriminatory practices and recommend corrective measures (Eisenhower Presidential Library, 2009). Primarily a voting rights act, it was the first federal anti-discrimination legislation in 82 years (Block, 2007).

Kenneth Marcus headed that commission from 2004 until January 19, 2008. "It (The Civil Rights Act of 1957) was important in that it was the first commitment by Congress and the President since the mid-19th century to new civil rights," he says, "...and it created an apparatus through which more work would be done in the 1960s" (Block, 2007).

THE ECONOMY

During the 1950s and 1960s, the U.S. economy was preeminent globally and was virtually self-sufficient. America was clearly number one: “U.S. G.N.P. (Gross National Product) per capita in 1950 was double that of Europe and was six times greater than Japan’s” (Litan, 1988). The Gross National Product has since been renamed Gross Domestic Product, The American economy, it seemed at the time, could do no wrong. “The U.S. economy had been free of inflationary pressures, despite high rates of economic growth, during the first half of the 1950s; in fact, consumer prices had fallen during 1954” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 336).

HOME AT LAST

The boys coming home from the Korean War were ready to dive into something far more comfortable than a foxhole: suburbia. Jennifer Price writes in *Flight Maps*, “In the 1950s, developers plowed an average of three thousand acres each day. Many lower-middle-class Americans, and even some working-class families, now earned enough to buy single family houses” (Price, 2000, p. 125). Tiny that the houses were, it was still a start.

No industry had suffered more than housing during the Depression and World War II; housing starts fell from one million a year to fewer than 100,000 during that era (Halberstam, 1993, p. 134). The 1950s brought pent up demand and a federal housing bill that resulted in a boom for many builders, especially Bill Levitt. The basic (and tiny) Levitt Cape Cod sold for \$7,900 on a lot that was 60 by 100 feet. The living room was 12 by 16 feet, and the homes were two bedrooms and one bathroom (Ibid, p. 135). By 1955,

Levitt-type subdivisions, such as the prototype Levittown, N.Y., represented 75 percent of new housing starts (Ibid, p. 142).

Lest we forget, this was still roughly two decades before equal housing was legislated. Blacks could not buy into any Levittown—a Levitt policy that lasted for over two decades, long after the nation began legally trying to rid itself of lawful segregation (Ibid, p. 141). Founder Bill Levitt put it this way, in Halberstam’s *The Fifties*, “As a Jew I have no room in my mind or heart for racial prejudice. But...I have come to know that if we sell one house to a Negro family, then 90 or 95 per cent of our white customers will not buy into the community. That is their attitude, not ours” (Halberstam, 1993, p. 143).

NOT SO HEALTHY TIMES

Yes, the 1950s had its share of paranoia: some people felt it more than others. The mid-1950s were the height of institutionalization of the mentally ill, but only a tiny fraction of them were in mental hospitals (Frank, 2006, p. 16). Blacks, as with housing, may have had it the worst.

“Many studies in the 1950s and 1960s found high rates of mental illness among non-whites (mostly blacks). Researchers interpreted this as demonstrating that pervasive discrimination and other social ills facing minorities caused them,” Richard Frank wrote in his book *Better But Not Well: Mental Health Policy in the United States Since 1950*. Frank said that studies decades later found; “The prevalence of mental illness is greatest among those with the lowest socioeconomic status groups and varies little by ethnicity or gender” (Frank, 2006, pp. 15, 16). Whichever is true about the mental health studies, blacks were dealt the worst hand.

The cigarette companies in the 1950s cared about consumer spending, and seemingly cared about their health. Cigarettes were marketed in the 1950s as giving extra protection against colds. *The Journal of the American Medical Association* regularly published cigarette ads within its pages (Salinger, 2004, p. 166). Lawrence Salinger in the *Encyclopedia of White Collar and Corporate Crime* wrote, “In 1953, the tobacco company Lorillard launched the Micronite filter, marketing it as a guarantee of ‘the greatest health protection in cigarette history’. Yet, this also turned out to be deceptive as it was discovered the filter was made of asbestos, and its use was discontinued four years after its promotion.” The advertising shifted from “healthful” benefits to “flavor” in the 1950s, with slogans like “Come to where the flavor is. Come to Marlboro Country” (Ibid).

For Edward R. Murrow, cigarettes were a part of his life until the end: he died young. He was 57 when he succumbed to the lung cancer brought on by a three-to-four pack-a-day cigarette habit. This was not only a vice; it was one of his trademarks. He could not kick smoking even long enough while he was on the air reporting about the dire effects of...smoking (Henry, 1986).

EDUCATION AND THE EDUCATED

The biggest jolt to education in the 1950s was not the dropout rate, and it was not segregation: it was a space capsule named *Sputnik*. To be sure, the 1947 Marshall plan symbolized the new role of the U.S. in the world, and Americans were optimistic. Maureen Stout, author of *The Feel Good Curriculum*, states, “But when the Soviet Union beat the United States into space in 1957 with *Sputnik*, the first space satellite, the nation

received a shock, and nowhere was it felt more profoundly than in the schools” (Stout, 2001, p. 83). Sputnik shook the country and its education system “...to its foundation. America’s technological, scientific, and intellectual authority had been challenged, and it was now up to schools to take up the cause,” Stout declared, but it was true (Stout, 2001, p. 84). Fearful that the Russians would surpass the U.S. in science and technology, President Eisenhower backed the National Defense Education Act, which authorized \$900 million in aid to schools and colleges, especially for scientific study (*Time*, 1978, p. 3).

Colleges and universities in Cold War America should have been bastions of optimism to take on McCarthyism. Often, it did not work out that way. In Rebecca Lowen’s *Creating the Cold War University: the Transformation of Stanford*, the author argues adamantly that during this time, college was not about the college students. Lowen notes, “...the leaders of the nation’s universities, along with patrons and some scientists, strongly influenced the creation of the cold war university” (Lowen, 1997, p. 9). The next line summarizes what Lowen shows happened at Stanford in the 1950s and a few other schools as well, “For both institutional and ideological reasons, they favored and promoted the development of heavily subsidized scientific work and stressed the production of knowledge over the education of students.” The Cold War had not only come to a top ten university; it had taken over. The University campus was not immune to the ’50s paranoia.

EINSTEIN, THE BOMB, AND SENATOR McCARTHY

Siegfried Grundmann, the author of *The Einstein Dossiers* scrutinizes Albert Einstein's FBI File from 1950-1955, outlining Einstein's image in politics and German policies. Here is what drew the attention of Senator McCarthy to Albert Einstein: Grundmann writes, "On 2 August 1939 [Einstein] had written a letter to President Roosevelt 'emphasizing the necessity for large scale experiments to examine the possibility of producing an atomic bomb.' Einstein justified himself on 20 September 1952 with the words, 'the probability that the Germans would be working on the same problem with some prospect of success compelled me to take this step. I had no other choice'" (Grundmann, 2005, p. 366). One of the atomic bombs' greatest advocates became one of its biggest foes.

Grundmann adds that Einstein believed, "the exercise of power over atomic weapons ought to be entrusted to an international organization." Grundmann knew that, "Einstein became a passionate defender of peace" (Grundmann, 2005, pp. 366, 367). Grundmann writes; "On 31 January 1950 President Truman announced a program to accelerate the development of the hydrogen bomb. A few days later on 12 February 1950, Einstein answered on American television. He warned that the development of the H-bomb and its inevitable triggering of an arms race could lead to the destruction of mankind. Thus Einstein dropped out of favor as an unwelcome alien" (Ibid, p. 367).

Albert Einstein knew this feeling: the Nazis considered him an unwelcome alien long before. Einstein, writes Grundmann, fell within the range of Communist hunters. There was an FBI file on Einstein. Senator John Rankin accused him of Communist activities, and the month before, Klaus Fuchs had confessed to passing top-

secret atomic bomb information to the Russians. Fears about the Communist threat reached a new high point (Grundmann, 2005, pp. 367, 368).

Einstein biographer Walter Isaacson: “The rush to build the H-Bomb, rising anticommunist fervor, and Senator Joseph McCarthy’s increasingly untethered security investigations unnerved Einstein. The atmosphere reminded him of the rising Nazism and anti-Semitism of the 1930s” (Isaacson, 2007, p. 524). Einstein lamented to the queen mother of Belgium in early 1951, “The German calamity of years ago repeats itself. People acquiesce without resistance and align themselves with the forces of evil” (Ibid). This was not a civil servant with a bone against McCarthy; this was the greatest mind of his time, comparing an American senator to Adolph Hitler.

To mark the centennial of Einstein’s birth on March 14, 1879 writers and editors at *Time* jointly wrote a commemorative article and a retrospective of Einstein’s accomplishments. While celebrating the father of relativity and his $E=Mc^2$ formula, *Time* did not forget the importance of his battle with McCarthy. *Time* wrote; “In his final years Einstein was an outspoken foe of McCarthyism, which he felt was an echo of the turbulent events that had preceded the downfall of Germany's Weimar Republic. He urged intellectuals to defy what he considered congressional inquisitions, even at the risk of ‘jail and economic ruin.’ He was widely denounced, and Senator Joseph McCarthy called him ‘an enemy of America.’ In his last public act, Einstein joined Bertrand Russell and other scholars in a desperate plea for a ban on all warfare” (*Time*, 1979, p. 11).

Joseph McCarthy indirectly called Albert Einstein, the father of relativity and one of the greatest minds of all time, an enemy. McCarthy said, “Anyone who advises

Americans to keep secret information which they have about spies and saboteurs is himself an enemy to America” (Isaacson, Einstein, 2007, p. 529).

SCARY TIMES MAKE FOR SCARY MOVIES

Motion pictures, like any art form, are a reflection of their time (John, 2009). Cynthia Hendershot’s book *Paranoia, the Bomb, and 1950s Science Fiction Films* opens with; “Post-World-War-II American society is popularly and frequently defined by the symptom of paranoia. The paranoia that pervades the McCarthyist witch-hunts, the ‘duck and cover’ policy of civil defense, and postwar representations of the alien invader characterizes late twentieth-century perceptions of 1950s America” (Hendershot, 1999, p. 7). There is plenty to back her up. Some of the science-fiction films of the ’50s include *The War of the Worlds* (1953), the original *Godzilla, King of the Monsters!* (1955), *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1956) and *The Incredible Shrinking Man* (1957) (Corliss, 2009, pp. 1-10).

To be fair, the decade included some significant filmed works like the Academy Award winning *All About Eve* (1950), *On the Waterfront* (1954), *The Bridge on the River Kwai* (1957), and *Ben-Hur* (1959). The Oscar *nominated* films, as is always the case with a subjective contest, prove to be at least as worthy as the winners in the eyes of most. The nominees included *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1961), *High Noon* (1952), *The Ten Commandments* (1956), and *The Diary of Anne Frank* (1959) (AMPAS, 2009).

In Tony Shaw’s *Hollywood’s Cold War*, he notes that Hollywood tried to displace the anxieties about The Bomb into horror films. He notes that his particular

interest is in movies in which alien forces are warning earth of "...the lunacy of the nuclear arms race, preaching East-West peaceful coexistence, or exposing McCarthyite paranoia and xenophobia" (Shaw, 2007, p.139). No film resonated more deeply with Shaw than *The Day The Earth Stood Still*. "Despite its fantastic plot, the end product patently makes serious and well crafted points about the build-up of nuclear weapons and the Red Scare" (Shaw, 2007, p. 142). One of the lead characters was "Dr. Barnhardt," played by Sam Jaffe, who had a physical resemblance to Albert Einstein.

Victoria O'Donnell writes in her book section *Science Fiction Films and Cold War Anxiety*, "...science fiction films presented indirect expressions of anxiety about the possibility of a nuclear holocaust or a Communist invasion. These fears were expressed in various guises, such as aliens using mind control...and scientists obsessed with dangerous experiments" (O'Donnell, 2003, p. 169). Those 1950s science fiction films of paranoia are still in vogue today; *Planet 51* is an animated film set in the 1950s...on Mars. The film, released November 20, 2009, involves a different "alien," a wayward American astronaut. Film critic Roger Ebert recognized the 1950s connection in his review; "In the 1950s Hollywood tradition, an alien spaceship landed on Earth, and then was surrounded fearfully by military troops. *Planet 51* is true to the tradition, but this time, the ship comes from Earth, and it lands on a planet inhabited by little green men. It's still the 1950s, however" (Ebert, 2009).

THE FIFTIES (NOT SO FABULOUS)

So it was a time that anyone could get a drink of water, go to the University of Alabama or live in a Levittown home -- unless you were black. Two men with two very

different approaches sought to change that; one advocated a separate nation (Malcolm X) and one chose making all men closer (Martin Luther King Jr.) Finally, the Civil Rights Act was born. Still, the government housing policies created white flight, which changed America's cities and suburbs.

The economy was booming and the scientists were researching. Americans just did not get mad when *Sputnik* beat them to space; they got motivated. They invested in their schools, military, and scientists. Cigarettes are marketed heavily as healthy, polio was virtually eliminated, and measles hit its heights and decline.

The interstate highway system was invented, and maligned, by both Steinbeck and Kuralt (USDOT, 2008). Jack Kerouac stayed mostly off those roads, inspiring a nation along the way. Albert Einstein was smart about many things, and McCarthyism was one of them. He knew what he was up against and had been through worse than the junior senator from Wisconsin: Hitler had denounced Einstein before.

With reality that scary, Hollywood did its best to keep up with scarier entertainment. Flying saucers, Godzilla, and body snatchers kept the drive-ins packed. The films proved to be a safe way to work out anxiety. *Filmsite.org* notes that, "Horror films are designed to invoke our hidden worst fears, often in a terrifying, shocking finale, while captivating us and entertaining us at the same time in a cathartic experience" (Dirks, 2009). America kept its TV shows crime free and mostly free of blacks as well. They were not scandal free: the quiz shows proved they could not be trusted and that average folks could get in as much trouble as celebrities. For added measure, so could the networks involved.

So with a Red Scare on once again in America, a press corps that was asleep at the wheel, and an unchecked senator on the rise, who was to stop McCarthy, the blacklisting, and the paranoia of a nation? Among those seeking change: Edward R. Murrow, CBS News, and a producer named Fred Friendly. In the words of Bette Davis from that 1950 Oscar winner *All About Eve*, “Fasten your seatbelts, it’s going to be a bumpy night” (Sikov, 2007, p. 378). On March 9, 1954 it was just that for “*See It Now: A Report on Senator Joseph S. McCarthy.*” But first, there was a man named Radulovich who would simply say no to some rough allegations against his family.

BEGINNINGS OF A BATTLE: MCCARTHYISM, RADULOVICH, AND THE TIMES

The word “McCarthyism” was born not on a senate floor, the halls of CBS, or from Murrow himself. It came from a cartoonist, Herbert Block (he signed his work “Herblock”) who was a staffer at the time for the *Washington Post*. “The word was an oath at first—a synonym for the hatefulness of baseless defamation, or mudslinging. Later it became, for some, an affirmation” (Rovere, 1982, p. 7).

How did Senator McCarthy (R-WI) have so much influence that, at one point, he was considered by many to be more influential than President himself? In Griffith’s *The Politics of Fear*, the author describes a one-two punch that led the senator to so much power: “McCarthy’s own power and influence rested upon the twin issues of ‘communism-in-government’ and American policy in the Far East. Together they provided the powerful symbols and slogans for a partisan drive for power, and McCarthy proved himself a daring and consummate manipulator of this entire body of political

mythology” (Griffith, 1987, p. 116). Griffith called the two issues the symptoms of a malfunctioning political system.

“It was not the constitutional immunity of the Senate floor which protected Joe McCarthy, but the political immunity conferred upon him by the issues he had come to symbolize” (Griffith, 1987, p. 117). It was this fearful environment in the U.S. Senate (and a paranoid America) that Edward R. Murrow took on the influential junior Senator from Wisconsin.

The true roots of the Murrow-McCarthy passage of arms went back to Murrow’s childhood. According to Kendrick, “His experience in Nazified Europe and war time England; his belief in the inviolability of free government, free speech, and free thought and two incidents which made what is generically known as McCarthyism a personal matter for him,” (Kendrick, 1969, p. 36). One was Murrow’s involvement in his youth for the student exchange programs in foreign countries and the other was a friend of Murrow’s, a former State Department official, whose name was brought into the Alger Hiss case (Kendrick, 1969, p. 36).

However, during the first two years of *See It Now*, the show examined a number of issues, but not that of now-rampant McCarthyism. “That Murrow, a symbol of courage during World War II, should ignore such a subject troubled many people” (Barnouw, 1975, p.172). Murrow was accused of settling into comfortable affluence, to which he answered, “You may be right” (Ibid). But Murrow used those same words to those who said he should get behind Senator McCarthy, as some newsmen and executives were doing. “It seemed to Friendly that Murrow was husbanding his energies for some decisive action, on a battlefield chosen with care. Late in 1953, the action began” (Ibid).

If Murrow's taking on McCarthy was a firestorm, the kindling for it was the Milo Radulovich case. Kendrick writes; "The Radulovich case symbolized the McCarthy era, for it was a classical case of guilt by association" (Kendrick, 1969, p. 37). Kendrick notes that on the evening of October 20, 1953 (which predates taking on McCarthy directly by about five months), Murrow's *See It Now* show told the story. "Murrow reported that a young lieutenant in the Air Force Reserve, a senior at the University of Michigan, who after eight years active duty in the Air Force, had been classified as a security risk under Air Force Regulation 36-52 because of his close association with 'Communists or Communist sympathizers'" (Kendrick, 1969, p. 37).

The "close association" was, in fact, Milo's father and sister. They apparently read "subversive" newspapers and engaged in "questionable" activities by Air Force standards. Through it all, Radulovich's loyalty was never questioned by the Air Force, though the Air Force wanted Milo to end his "association" with them and denounce them. He refused (Kendrick, 1969, p. 37).

In testimony in Detroit at an Air Force hearing, filmed at *See It Now* staffer Joseph Wershba's urging to Murrow, Radulovich testified that these activities against him had not been specified. Radulovich, who had refused to resign despite the Air Force's urging, was now "separated" from the Air Force on security grounds. At the hearings, the 26-year-old plainly stated; "The actual charge against me is that I had maintained a close and continuing relationship with my dad and my sister over the years" (Barnouw, 1975, pp 172-173).

The decision to explore the Radulovich case was Murrow's own, and through a series of interviews and advocacy reporting, he made a case for a reappraisal of

Radulovich's case with the Air Force (Kendrick, 1969, p. 38). Murrow won: five weeks after the story aired, the Secretary of the Air Force appeared on *See It Now* to say that, on second thought, the lieutenant was not a security risk. CBS and its sponsor (ALCOA) refused to promote the show, so Murrow and producer Fred Friendly paid \$1,500 of their own money to buy an ad in the *New York Times* (Kendrick, 1969, p. 38). This process would be repeated for the Murrow vs. McCarthy showdown.

In *Edward R. Murrow An American Original*, Joseph E. Perisco argues that "The case was a modern morality tale. An appealing young man appeared on the screen asks, 'If I am being judged by my relatives, are my children going to be asked to denounce me? Are they going to be asked what their father was labeled?' I see a chain reaction that has no end" (Perisco, 1988, p. 371). The show deliberately flew in the face of CBS News policy that forbade taking sides in political controversy. That policy at CBS News is still in place today, and includes social controversies as well (gay marriages, religious donations for controversial causes, and anything issue with two or more distinct sides) that must be presented fairly (Mason, 2009).

Jack Gould, writing in the *New York Times*, understood instantly what had happened on television on the Radulovich show (officially called "The Case Against Milo Radulovich A0589839). He wrote the next day, "The program marked perhaps the first time that a major network, the Columbia Broadcasting System, and one of the country's most important industrial sponsors, the Aluminum Company of America, consented to a program taking a vigorous stand in a matter of national importance and controversy" (Gould, 1953, p. 82).

More than a dozen brave journalists, including Walter Lippmann and three of the journalists known as “Murrow’s boys” (Eric Sevareid, Harry Smith, and Ed Morgan) went after McCarthy before Murrow did the night of the Milo Radulovich show. But this time it was different: the Radulovich broadcast put Ed Murrow and Joe McCarthy on a collision course (Perisco, 1988, p. 373). Several months later, Murrow produced the *See It Now* show of March 2, 1954 to give the public a break from “the Cold War, with current crises or with retreat into unreasoning fear that seems to be part of the climate in which we live,” (Ibid) by doing a show on the New York Philharmonic and its director. He ended the broadcast that night by saying, “We shall try to deal with one aspect of that fear next week.” Not a single columnist, critic, or CBS executive caught the hint and called to ask what he was talking about. (Perisco, 1988, p. 374). The showdown was about to begin.

MARCH 9, 1954: MURROW, MCCARTHY AND A MOMENT IN TIME

“All I can do hope to teach my son is to tell the truth and fear no man.” Edward R. Murrow, 1954, just before the McCarthy broadcast (Wershba, n/a).

“If none of us ever read a book that was ‘dangerous,’ nor had a friend who was ‘different,’ or never joined an organization that advocated ‘change,’ we would all be just the kind of people Joe McCarthy wants.” Murrow, in a talk to his staff, as quoted by staffer Joseph Wershba (Wershba, n/a, p. 5).

Fred Friendly was Murrow's *See It Now* producer on the McCarthy show, the Milo Radulovich episode, and the documentary *Harvest of Shame* among others. Friendly was concerned about the timing of the McCarthy showdown; "Ed and I knew that timing on this broadcast was crucial. If we waited much longer, history or McCarthy-or both-might run us down" (Friendly, 1967, p. 30).

The very morning of the McCarthy/Murrow showdown, the feelings against McCarthy in the United States Senate were explosive. The Republican Senator from Vermont, Ralph Flanders, had had enough of his Republican colleague. Flanders took the Senate floor with anger and scorn. He spoke about McCarthy in a way that not even the Senate had heard in a very long time: "He dons his warpaint. He goes into a war dance. He emits his warwhoops. He goes forth to battle and proudly returns with the scalp of a pink Army dentist. We may assume that this represents the depth and seriousness of Communist penetration at this time" (Goldman, 1956, p. 270).

The *See It Now* episode was entitled, "A Report on Joseph R. McCarthy." The show consists mostly of McCarthy clips gathered over a four-month span; Murrow, after a brief introduction and a commercial break, fired the first salvo with, "Our working thesis tonight is this question: 'If this fight against Communism, is made a fight against America's two great political parties, the American people know that one of those parties will be destroyed and the Republic cannot endure very long as a one party system.'" Murrow immediately added, "We applaud this statement and we think Senator McCarthy ought to. He said it, seventeen months ago in Milwaukee" (Murrow, 1954). Murrow using McCarthy's own words against him defined this documentary right from this beginning.

This show was far from a simple production and all involved knew they had to get it right. Fred Friendly called a meeting of the *See It Now* staff the week before the show aired to get a sense of where they stood about the content and what might make them suspect. “One man told us that his first wife had been a Communist Party member but their marriage had been dissolved years before” (Friendly, 1967, p.33). Friendly remembers Murrow’s response to the staff’s concerns from that meeting: “In a characteristic pose, his elbows on his knees, his eyes on the floor, he was silent for about 10 seconds. At last he said, ‘We, like everyone in this business, are going to be judged by what we put on the air; but we also shall be judged by what we don’t broadcast. If we pull back on this we’ll have it with us always.’ He snuffed out what was probably his sixtieth cigarette of the day....” (Friendly, 1967, p. 34).

Alexander Kendrick’s *Prime Time: The Life of Edward R. Murrow* describes the night like this, “It was the evening Edward R. Murrow, on his weekly program *See It Now*, presented the nation’s most successful and most feared demagogue, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, as his own executioner, in full view of tens of millions of enthralled Americans.” Kendrick noted that by the “simple but devastating method” of merely showing the Senator in action on various typical occasions, the filmed program had a “direct and powerful cumulative effect that outdid any kind of printed or spoken appraisal” (Kendrick, 1969, p. 35).

In one clip, the Senator is going after civil servant Reed Harris, a long-term employee in the State Department directing the information service. “Harris was accused of helping the Communist cause by curtailing some broadcasts to Israel. Senator McCarthy summoned him and questioned him about a book he had written in 1932,” said

Murrow in the show, setting up the clip of Harris' testimony in front of the congressional committee. McCarthy after only a few questions quickly went off track, asking him about his attendance in Columbia University as a student in 1932 (Murrow, 1954).

McCarthy: And were you expelled from Columbia?

Harris: I was suspended from classes on April 1st, 1932. I was later reinstated and I resigned from the University.

McCarthy: And you resigned from the University? Did the Civil—Civil Liberties Union provide you with an attorney at that time?

Harris: I had many offers of attorneys, and one of those was from the American Civil Liberties Union, yes.

McCarthy: The question is did the Civil Liberties Union supply you with an attorney?

Harris: They did supply me with an attorney.

McCarthy: The answer is yes?

Harris: The answer is yes.

McCarthy: You know the Civil Liberties Union has been listed as a 'front for, and doing the work of,' the Communist Party?

Harris: Mr. Chairman, this was 1932.

McCarthy: Yeah, I know it was 1932. Do you know that they have since been listed as "a front for, and doing the work of" the Communist Party?

Harris: I do not know that they have been listed so, sir (Berkeley, 2006).

And so it went clip after clip of McCarthy just being himself. Between those moments, there was Murrow on a simple set, simply reading statements aloud from a

script or staring straight into the camera. No graphics, no sound effects, and no other film were to be shown. It was a show the *New York Times*, in a review the next day, said was an occasion where “broadcasting recaptured its soul” (Kendrick, 1969, p. 35). Murrow was not done yet, and summarized the night with: “We will not walk in fear, of one another. We will not be driven by fear into an age of unreason. We cannot defend freedom abroad by deserting it at home.” He then looked into the camera and ended with:

The actions of the junior Senator from Wisconsin have caused alarm and dismay amongst our allies abroad, and have given considerable comfort to our enemies. And whose fault is that? Not really his. He didn't create this situation of fear; he merely exploited it—and rather successfully. Cassius was right. ‘The fault dear Brutus is not in our stars, but in ourselves.’ Good night and good luck (Murrow, 1954).

The credits began to roll; the program was over. Some people in the control room had tears in their eyes and broke into applause (Finkelstein, 1997, p.11). Friendly remembers it differently. “Then it was over. Ed slumped in his chair, head down. I thanked everyone for a perfect show; it had gone off without a hitch and we had not run out of time” (Friendly, 1967, p.41).

Friendly then remembers silence. “The phones were strangely quiet in the studio, until a messenger came in with a note from the switchboard operators: ‘We are swamped. Could we put through some calls to Studio 41?’” (Friendly, 1967, p. 42). Fred continues with, “We all roared with laughter, and in a moment the greatest flood of calls in television history—at least up until that time—swamped the control room, the switch board and the affiliates” (Ibid). The majority were favorable by a ratio of 10 to 1, noted

Friendly, and there were plenty of vicious and obscene messages among the negative responders. The reaction varied from city to city: in San Francisco it was 15-1 against Senator McCarthy and in New York “just” 2-1 against him (Goldman, 1956, p. 271).

Three days later, television and radio critic John Crosby in the March 12 edition of the New York Herald Tribune reacted this way; “The greatest witness against McCarthy was McCarthy himself. Sneering, truculent and wholly evil, he rumbled his evasions and hesitations and lies in a way that must have been a little shocking even to staunch McCarthyites” (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 12).

The public mobbed Murrow (favorably) the next day during a walk on Fifth Avenue, and it went that way the rest of the week. He got a standing ovation at the Overseas Press Club as Secretary of State Dulles was about to speak, he assumed the ovation was for Dulles. He was wrong. At another dinner, Murrow bumped into Albert Einstein, and the physicist greeted him with, “Aha, a fighting man “(Kendrick, 1969, p. 61).

According to author Finkelstein, not all reaction to the McCarthy *See It Now* program was favorable. *The New York Counterattack*, a staunch anti-Communist newsletter, devoted its March 19, 1954 issue to the question, “Why does the Communist press praise Edward R. Murrow so highly” (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 12). Jack O’Brian (a McCarthy supporter) in the New York Journal American wrote, “Murrow’s techniques on radio and TV are identical. He stubbornly sticks to the left side of any situation. He states cases as fact when they are merely Murrow’s opinions” (Finkelstein, 1997, pp. 12-13).

Three weeks later, McCarthy gave his rebuttal on Murrow’s show (not videotaped by CBS, but by a hired crew), but the damage was already done. “It was public opinion,

informed by television that judged McCarthy in 1954” (Kendrick, 1969, p. 70). He lashed out wildly, twisting seemingly innocent events into great Communist conspiracies involving Murrow, according to author Finkelstein. “The half hour was vintage McCarthy, filled with innuendo, false accusations, and half-truths aimed at Ed Murrow, the senator’s latest target” (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 15). From the rebuttal show itself, the senator charged, “Murrow is a symbol. The leader and the cleverest of the jackal pack, which is always found at the throat of anyone who dares to expose individual Communists and traitors” (Ibid).

In a last desperate attempt and in true McCarthy style, he was unable to provide proof of his many charges, so McCarthy told viewers, “Much of the documentation which we have here on the table tonight will not be available to the American people by way of television. However, this will all be made available to you within the next two weeks.” It never was (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 16). Michael Murray, in *The Encyclopedia of Television News* wrote of the second McCarthy show, “McCarthy’s subsequent attempts to disgrace them (Murrow and Friendly) went unbelievably by viewers who had seen and heard the senator’s own words” (Murray, 1999, p.83).

To its credit, sponsor ALCOA held firm with its promise to Murrow: you make the programs, we make the aluminum. But at least through the McCarthy shows, Alcoa President Irving W. Wilson told Murrow: “I wouldn’t ask you not to do such programs, but I would hope you wouldn’t do them every week.” The mail Alcoa got ran 5 to 4 against Murrow. The company got a flood of mail, pressure from dealers, and denunciations from columnists (Barnouw, 1978, p. 51). Alcoa withdrew its sponsorship a year later in 1955 and the show continued until 1958. In the end, Alcoa’s years of sitting

on the hot-seat, made most sponsors "...wary of documentaries, particularly when produced by a free-thinking entity like the Murrow unit" (Barnouw, 1978, p. 52).

Few had a better perspective of the original Murrow/McCarthy showdown than Joseph Wershba: he was there and helped produce the show. Joseph Wershba joined CBS News in 1944 as a writer, editor and correspondent. From 1968 to 1988, he was a producer at *60 Minutes*. He was part of Murrow's team on *See It Now*, including the McCarthy show. As a side note, in the film *Good Night and Good Luck* he was played by Robert Downey Jr. (Scott, 2005). Murrow was Wershba's occasional roommate during the Korean War, remembering, "He regarded the news as a sacred trust. Accuracy was everything. And, always, fairness" (Wershba, n/a).

What Wershba wrote about Murrow and the Senator McCarthy showdown, as Murrow's colleague and friend, is from informed perspective:

Murrow did not kill off McCarthy or McCarthyism, but he helped halt America's incredible slide toward a native brand of fascism. Unbelievable. You have to live through the times to know how fearful—indeed terrorized—people were about speaking their minds. The cold war with Russia, the threat of a hot war with China, security programs and loyalty oaths—all had cowed the citizens of the most powerful nation on earth into keeping their minds closed and their minds shut. The Senate of the United States, in order not to appear Red, chose to be yellow. It was an Age of McCarthyism. Edward R. Murrow helped bring it to an end (Wershba, n/a).

Wershba remembers that Murrow always gave him and his colleagues' full credit on the air, but when he was mad, "Ed Murrow in a suppressed rage was a terrible thing to behold." Finally, Wershba's best memory of the McCarthy showdown happened *before* it aired, "When we looked at the near-final cut of the McCarthy broadcast and the staff showed fear of putting it on the air, Murrow spoke a line that landed like a lash across our backs: "The terror is right here in this room." And later: "No one man can terrorize a whole nation unless we are all his accomplices" (Wershba, n/a). The next year after the show, the Senate officially censured McCarthy for "...conduct unbecoming a Senator. On December 2, 1954 Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin was officially censured-condemned by the United States Senate "(Finkelstein, 1997, p.17) His ostracism from his party, coupled with chronic alcoholism, led to his death May 2, 1957, about three years after the show aired (Wisconsin Historical Society, 1996). Author Finkelstein notes that, "His death was attributed by many to his heavy reliance on alcohol. Others said it was television and Edward R. Murrow's incisive and daring reporting that really killed McCarthy" (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 17).

TECHNOLOGY, *SMALL WORLD*, AND "LIGHTS IN A BOX"

Murrow's television series was about to come to an end as well. *Time* in its March 2, 1959 issue; put it this way about the demise of Murrow's series *See It Now*: "But *See It Now* and its sometimes overdone passion for the controversial proved too controversial for many advertisers. Last year, despite violent protests by Murrow, the show went off the air, four years after he took on McCarthy and won" (Time, 1959).

CBS and Edward R. Murrow had a new show to launch. The new show was called *Small World* and the idea for it sounds like any network or cable newscast of today, but with a singular topic. Murrow explained the show one night, after several Scotches, to his friend Lauren Bacall. Perisco wrote; “At the club Ed finally broached the purpose of the meeting. He had an idea for a new program. He wanted to use the technology of television to juxtapose people, anywhere they might be on earth, people who would strike conversational sparks off each other” (Perisco, 1988, pp. 430-431). Bacall would be one of his first guests. But, according to Perisco, a lively half hour of “stimulating conversation once a week was hardly compensation for the loss of *See It Now*. If William S. Paley (CBS chief and Murrow’s friend) and the CBS News management believed they had placated Murrow, they only had to wait three days after the first appearance of *Small World* to learn otherwise” (Perisco, 1988, p. 432).

In September, the month prior to *Small World*’s launch, there were signs of Murrow’s growing distaste. At a cocktail party that Paley gave for young people who had been given CBS fellowships, Murrow was openly bitter. Murrow was telling the fellows that they were becoming “prisoners of an unwholesome machine. Don’t fool yourself that television is a medium of education and elucidation. It’s an advertising medium and don’t forget it” (Perisco, 1988, pp. 432-433). Increasingly, Murrow had been saying the same thing to his colleagues. He was about to tell the whole world just how he felt. “He went about it with the painstaking deliberation of a man laying dynamite, in a matter that seemed almost calculated to bring down the wrath of his superiors: a carefully devised exercise in bridge burning” (Perisco, 1988, p. 538).

October 15, 1958 the bridge burned and the dam burst. A copy of the speech was sent to Paley, the wire services, and trade publications. What a shocked Paley read that afternoon, Edward R. Murrow read that night in Chicago at the Sheraton-Blackstone hotel to a crowd of 1,500 journalists at the Radio and Television News Directors Association (RTNDA) convention (Perisco, 1988, p. 433). The speech started with, “This just might do nobody any good. At the end of this discourse a few people may accuse this reporter of fouling his own nest and your organization may be accused of having given hospitality to heretical and even dangerous thoughts” (RTNDA, 1958). Perisco notes, “Read on another level, the speech is a remarkable piece of self-revelation. The essential Murrow is visible in almost every line; a doomsday prophet who forever sees the world teetering on the edge of an abyss (‘this nation is in mortal danger’); at the same time, we see the skeptical idealist whose analysis is unerring, but whose solution to the ills of television is astonishingly bland and safely inside the bounds of the status quo” (Perisco, 1988, p. 434). Remember, this was a time of *The Donna Reed Show* and *Peter Gunn*. Shows like *Jerry Springer*, *Donahue*, and *Hard Copy* are still decades away.

The purpose here is not to show the speech in its entirety, but to help gain an insight into what made it a milestone. Murrow made his name, living, and reputation in television. The very industry he helped to build was now held with great disdain: “We are currently wealthy, fat, comfortable and complacent. We have currently a built-in allergy to unpleasant or disturbing information. Our mass media reflects this. But unless we get off our fat surpluses and recognize that television in the main is being used to distract, delude, amuse and insulate us, then television and those who finance it, those who look at it and those who work at it, may see a totally different picture too late” (RTNDA, 1958).

This is reminiscent of Murrow's speech to his staff before the McCarthy showdown:

"The terror is right here in this room" (Wershba, n/a). This time, Murrow was prepared to place the blame across the board. "Great. I can see you connecting the pieces I'd encourage even more of this type of analysis. Go beyond reporting what you read and include more synthesis and analysis based on what you read."

Edward R. Murrow's closing salvo that night, just 20 minutes after he had begun, was a call to arms complete with a Civil War analogy: "This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, and it can even inspire. But can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely wires and lights in a box. There is a great and perhaps decisive battle to be fought against ignorance, intolerance and indifference. This weapon of television could be useful. Stonewall Jackson, who knew something about the use of weapons, is reported to have said, 'When war comes, you must draw the sword and throw away the scabbard.' The trouble with television is that it is rusting in the scabbard during a battle for survival" (RTNDA, 1958).

CBS chief Bill Paley was not pleased:

Chicago was the one decision never brought to him by Ed, who never—but never—made a move without him. Twenty-three years after the fact, the voice of the Chairman of the Board, sitting in his corner suite on top of Black Rock, would turn low and distant, answering the question, 'Did it hurt?'. It did. No conversations before it, none after. Never referred to it either. He was talking about things he didn't *like*, which were under my control. So it was very much a personal attack (Sperber, 1986, p. 542).

PRIDE IN “HARVEST OF SHAME”

Television was not in great shape in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Alexander Kendrick, one of the handpicked journalists at CBS known as “Murrow’s Boys” described the time as when; “More money was being spent for news and public affairs programs, but their nature was changing. Blandness was replacing boldness, and entertainment took over from enlightenment as committee rule prevailed” (Kendrick, 1969, p. 445). Boldness was about to come back, at least for a night. November 25, 1960 was the day after Thanksgiving that year. To Edward R. Murrow and his team, that day would not be one of rest, but some of their finest work.

Americans were about to find out where their food came from, and this documentary wasn’t going to go down easy. With Aaron Copeland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man* playing underneath the title sequence, the 55-minute documentary began with a bang. The opening scene in the CBS News documentary, *CBS Reports: Harvest of Shame* is a wide shot of trucks and men and a barker saying, “Over here! 70 cents today! You will have eleven dollars in your pocket!” Murrow’s voice says, “This scene is not taking place in the Congo. It is not Nyasaland or Nigeria. It has nothing to do with Johannesburg or Cape Town. This is Florida. These are citizens of the United States, 1960” (Friendly, 1960). Murrow and his team were just getting warmed up.

The documentary continues with footage of African Americans being crammed into trucks. Later scenes would show that Hispanics and poor whites were migrant workers as well. Murrow continues the documentary open with, “This is a shape-up for the migrant workers...this is the way the humans who harvest the food for the best fed

people in the world get hired. One farmer looked at this and said, ‘We used to own slaves, now we just rent them’” (Perisco, 1988, pp. 460-461).

The story of this documentary began with an ABC radio commentary by Edward P. Morgan. Murrow’s producer Fred Friendly heard it; “pitched” the story idea to Murrow as a documentary, and the rest is genuine broadcasting history (Sperber, 1986, p. 594). David Lowe, a tenacious sort who appeared once a week at CBS looking for work, did the bulk of the reporting (which included months of following the migrants up and down the Eastern seaboard) with Marty Barnett as cameraman. Murrow had come on the scene after months of shooting, but insisted on going to the fields to see for himself, and was critical in the editing process (Sperber, 1986, p. 594).

Lowe’s reporting, Barnett’s images, and Murrow’s appearances and writing combined for powerful results. In one scene, Lowe is having a quiet conversation with a 9-year-old boy in the boy’s shack. Lowe asks, “How’d you get the hole?” “Rats,” the boys answered. Lowe then chats with a woman who had picked beans for 10 hours and said she earned a dollar (Friendly, 1960). This 1960 daily wage (not hourly) in 2008 dollars was worth \$7.28, for 10 hours of picking beans in the Florida sun and humidity (The Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, 2008).

The reporting team gave a voice to the voiceless, at least for this night. Murrow biographer Persico discussed the production; “The scene shifted to a white family standing in front of a jalopy in a scene lifted intact from *The Grapes of Wrath*. The family had spent the previous night sleeping in a field. The father said that he was looking for work. The reporter (Lowe) asked him how much money he had in the world, ‘A dollar forty-five cents’ ” (Perisco, 1988, p. 461). Murrow noted near the end of the

report that the federal government was spending \$3.5 million a year for the education of these migrant children and \$6.5 million to protect migrant...wildlife (Perisco, 1988, pp. 461-462).

The laborers' "bosses" were represented. In an interview with Lowe and a farmer, Lowe asked the farmer what he thought of the migrants; "Well," he answered, "I guess they got a little gypsy in their blood. They just like it. Lot of 'em wouldn't do anything else...they love it. They love to go from place to place. They don't have a worry in the world. They're the happiest people on Earth." Perisco notes that "The man spoke amiably, without a trace of malice, contempt, or irony" (Perisco, 1988, p. 462).

Editor Johnny Schultz remembered Murrow coming into his screening room during the *Harvest of Shame* edit sessions "...looking just rapt at the footage." Schultz believed Murrow, as noted by biographer A.M. Sperber, "...had a sense of understanding growing in his cutting room between the logging engineer's son (Murrow) who had hoed corn and seen his parents go hungry, and the migrant logger's son, with his childhood memories of picking potatoes "(Sperber, 1986, p. 595).

Harvest of Shame closed with the camera panning the faces we had come to know, the father who had \$1.45 to his name...a mother who could afford milk for her children once a week (Perisco, 1988, p. 462). "The people you have seen," Murrow said in the closing, "have the strength to harvest your fruits and vegetables. They do not have the strength to influence legislation. Maybe we do. Good night, and good luck" (Perisco, 1988, p. 462).

Though this was one of Murrow's last and best known works, its impact was short-lived on the public. Other documentaries, including a CBS sequel forty years later,

have taken on the plight of farm workers. Nevertheless, they are overwhelmingly the “forgotten people” (Krebs, 2003). Forty-eight years after *Harvest* aired, things have taken a very ugly turn for some of these workers.

In Immokalee, Florida in 2008 where part of *Harvest* was filmed (including the opening scenes), a 17-count indictment was handed down on two men charged with, in the words of Chief Assistant U.S. attorney Doug Malloy, “slavery, plain and simple” (Williams, 2008). Five farm bosses held more than a dozen people (Mexican and Guatemalan nationals) in boxes, trucks, and shacks on the family property. These were farm laborers, the same kind of workers described in *Harvest of Shame*. These people were chained, beaten, and forced to work in the farm fields in Florida and North and South Carolina, and the workers were kept in ever-increasing debt. Incredibly, there have been more than 1,000 of these workers freed in six slavery cases, according to a member of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (Williams, 2008). The five farm bosses face up to 35 years in prison (Weaver, 2008).

As a former Florida resident of 20 years, I could not recall a single network story on the slavery trial. A Google search of “Immokalee slavery” on September 9, 2008 revealed only two dated references in the first 20 pages (*forbes.com* and *nyt.com*) of a major news organization and no recent articles outside of local Florida papers (Google.com, 2008). The same search in the same hour at CBS News’ website, *cbsnews.com*, where Murrow worked his entire career and helped to build, revealed “no results” (CBS News, 2008). By the way, the Google search for “Immokalee slavery” search gave 24,600 results. Immediately following, I was curious about news story

priorities and a Google search for “Paris Hilton’s Dog” garnered 9,710,000 results (Google, 2008).

FAREWELL...

Murrow’s final days were far more akin to tragedy than triumph. Edward R. Murrow died April 27, 1965 of lung cancer. It was 11 years after his McCarthy battle, five years after *Harvest of Shame*, and less than a year after he got the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Just a few weeks prior to his death he was knighted by the Queen of England. Walter Cronkite, who was hired by Murrow, noted when he died that, “He had made television news a profession a man could be proud of” (Sperber, 1998, p. 703). Cronkite, as a face of CBS, had total strangers walking up to him in the days after Murrow’s death, expressing condolences. Eric Sevareid, one of “Murrow’s Boy’s” he had hired, said, “He was a shooting star. We shall live in his afterglow for a very long time...we shall not see his likes again” (Fellow, 2009, p. 291).

Perhaps the most fitting tribute came from Senator Robert F. Kennedy on the U.S. Senate floor, quoting Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, just as Murrow had done in ending his McCarthy show. Kennedy gave Antony’s valediction over Brutus:

His life was gentle, and the elements

So mixed in him that Nature might stand up

And say to all the world, “This was a Man!” (Sperber, 1998, p.704)

At the CBS Broadcast Center in New York, a small brass plaque is at the entrance for all to see, but few seem to notice. It reads, “Edward R. Murrow was one of America’s most dedicated and eloquent spokesmen. The people of the free world are deeply in his

debt. So is broadcast journalism which, in so many ways, he helped to establish and of which he was one of the finest practitioners” (Finkelstein, 1997). This was a direct reference to his London reporting, and his part in getting America involved in World War II. The plaque continues with, “He set standards of excellence that remain unsurpassed. His thoughtful spirit of inquiry, his profound insight and his single-minded devotion to quality were without parallel in radio, television, or any other medium.”

In 1993, Dan Rather paid a tribute to his mentor at the annual Radio and Television News Directors Association convention. This was the very same group (and event) Murrow addressed with his “lights in a box” speech 40 years earlier. Rather said that, “He was the best reporter of his generation. The best reporter in broadcast or print. He reported, he led, he made the best broadcasts of his time, both radio and television. And those broadcasts remain, to this day, the best of all time” (Finkelstein, 1997, p. 162).

On the day of his death, in perhaps Murrow’s last ironic moment, the White House sent a message from President Lyndon Johnson. Murrow had intense hatred for Johnson (as did Johnson for Murrow, thanks to differences over Vietnam). The message said simply: “We have lost a friend” (Sperber, 1986, p. 8). So had journalism.

PART II

HIS LEGACY: JOURNALISTS (AND THE PRESIDENT) ON MURROW,
ETHICS, AND THE FUTURE OF JOURNALISM

As a 31-year broadcaster, I have developed respect, trust, and friendships with numerous TV news professionals. I wanted to interview some of them to see if Murrow has had an influence on their conscience and careers more than four decades after his death. I wanted to know if Murrow was relevant today. Interviews were conducted in a number of ways ranging from e-mailed questions, recorded telephone interviews, and in-person interviews. I chose these individuals for their integrity, professionalism, and specialties.

Those interviewed were photojournalist and teacher Kenny Irby, student reporter Miles Doran, local news reporter Ron Olsen and CBS News Vice President of Standards Linda Mason. In addition, Poynter Institute Dean Keith Woods, Murrow scholar Crocker Snow, CBS News foreign correspondent Terry McCarthy and CBS News feature reporter Steve Hartman. To round out the list of professionals, I also interviewed ethicist Dr. Robert M. Steele of the Poynter Institute and NBC News reporter Bob Dotson.

The questions asked of the professionals were appropriate for the individual. They were not the same questions for every person: Many researchers successfully use that technique, but it is inappropriate here. These were in-depth interviews. The Vice President of Standards at CBS News needs a different line of questioning than a local reporter in Los Angeles, as does a broadcasting intern in college. But one of the incredible findings from the interviews was this: two generations after his death, Murrow's impact on journalism and journalists is still profound.

I sought different insights on the same themes of Murrow's influence (if any) on their career and their thoughts on broadcast ethics today. Murrow, as a true pioneer in television and radio news, set the standards to follow for generations. But was Murrow still relevant today? I wanted to see from this sampling if TV journalism was in as bad of shape as so many regard it to be in this age of TMZ, corporate influence, and dwindling audiences. In addition, I needed some insights to see if Murrow's style of reporting and appetite for accuracy still had relevance in the 21st century. As recently as September 9, 2009, President Obama had some pointed remarks about journalism, speaking at Walter Cronkite's memorial in New York City.

These journalists were picked on the basis of their experience, background, and my accessibility to them to make these conversations possible. Much more importantly, I selected these journalists because I have great respect for them and the quality of their work. These are among the best at what they do and I wanted to have them share their considerable knowledge and perspectives on ethics in broadcast journalism. Most are directly involved in some way in radio or television news, but first; we start with a photojournalist who has never broadcast a word, but really understood Edward R. Murrow and his ethics.

The order in which the journalists and educators appear reflects, how in a journalistic pursuit, one source of information can lead to...or at least inspire...another. It was much more than trying to find different "sides" of Murrow, but search for Murrow's relevance and impact on today's journalists.

I started out with Kenny Irby, a photojournalist and teacher at the Poynter Institute who has never broadcast a word, but has terrific insights on Murrow. His

youthful exuberance (though Irby is in his 50s) for Murrow reminded me I needed a younger perspective to see if Murrow was still relevant to today's journalism student. That interview was with Miles Doran of the University of Florida, who as of March 26, 2010 has been offered a job at three major networks (ABC, CBS, and NBC) straight out of college.

Miles' perspective from a successful college student led me to think of the opposite end of the spectrum: a recently retired major market TV news reporter Ron Olsen. But I needed diverse perspectives from management and academia: so interviewing Linda Mason, VP for Standards at CBS News was critical. Her interview on ethics led to ethicist and race expert Keith Woods of Poynter.

Thanks to a suggestion from Professor Barney McCoy, a natural transition from Mason and Woods was to interview Crocker Snow, Jr. Snow's expert perspectives on Murrow made me realize that I was still lacking critical thinking from others in journalism: I needed someone grounded in international hard news coverage (Terry McCarthy), a comparison of local vs. network coverage as well as the ethics of feature stories (Steve Hartman) and a renowned ethicist for a balanced and academic perspective (Bob Steele). Finally, I needed a terrific senior correspondent outside of my employer of CBS News for his perspectives on ethics and the value of journalistic work (Bob Dotson).

Together, these journalists and academics represent the past, future, and current ethical impact not only of Murrow, but the current standards in place for broadcasting. Together, they give an insight into the state of broadcast news ethics with many revelations on where the industry is going.

KENNY IRBY (See Appendix A for transcript)

Kenny Irby is the Visual Journalism Group Leader for the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Florida. Irby started the photojournalism department at Poynter as well. Originally, Irby was a visiting faculty member because of his involvement with international ethics issues in 1995. Irby was the photo manager for the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta and the 2002 Salt Lake City Olympic Winter Games. Kenny Irby is a former Deputy Director of Newsday in New York. Irby is as passionate about Murrow as he is about ethics remarkable considering he is a still photojournalist and has never been employed in either form of broadcasting.

“Murrow was a pioneer; you can’t typecast him as a radio or television journalist,” Irby said, noting that if anyone who ever embodied, “...the principle of journalism, to give a voice to the voiceless, and hold the powerful accountable...it’s Edward R. Murrow.” It was Murrow who inspired Irby to appreciate multi-sensory learning. Irby was diagnosed early as a dyslexic and was told he would never read. Irby believed that, “Murrow brought a vivid understanding to his reports. Murrow was a pioneer in terms of form.” Kenny Irby found Murrow to be deep, insightful, informative and emotional. Irby thought Murrow was unique amongst broadcasters of his time with his vivid details, the cadence in his voice and his ability to decipher and present in compelling ways.

Irby not only admires Murrow’s’ speech to the RTNDA but uses that speech to teach values and principles “...of what journalism should represent, Murrow was a legend,” said Irby (Irby, 2008). Irby studied Murrow in Boston University and would always intone, “Murrowisms” along the way. The parallels between what a photo editor

does for a paper and what Murrow held true in his reporting was evident to Irby from his first promotion to editor; “Murrow stood up against the McCarthy era, stood up against government and held the powerful accountable.”

Irby felt this was exactly what editors do: help the journalists in their organizations, speak truth to power and ask the difficult questions. Journalists should shine a light; “...in the dark places that Murrow typified and demonstrated in an uncanny way. There are few journalists that you would put on the same plateau in terms of commitment to free society, democracy, and freedom” (Irby, 2008).

I asked Irby what exactly made Murrow *Murrow*. He thought that it was his tenacity and a sense of social justice. Irby believes that Murrow had an insatiable “...thirst for righteousness and justice on behalf of those who cannot defend themselves.” Milo Radulovich comes to mind here: “Whether a soldier, immigrants, the poor in America, he saw a responsibility to help improve the condition of life. He saw the responsibility that every journalist should see. Not only a responsibility, but an opportunity to improve the human condition” (Irby, 2008).

Kenny Irby notes that Murrow believed that the American model of a free press insures an informed citizen. Murrow had a quest to bring truth and invariably a sense of, “This is what’s happening now...” A story can be shaped and spun: but this is the authentic story as close as Edward R. Murrow could get to it. Irby noted that: “He had an amazing desire to get to the heart of the story, to be in the places where he could be, what I call, the ‘authentic witness in a most confirmed way’” (Irby, 2008).

Irby felt that Murrow’s style of journalism was more like a still photojournalist than any other form, for Murrow was always putting himself in harm’s way. Murrow was

always willing to go to the front lines. Irby believes many journalists today are too comfortable and not willing to do that: “Today, there is a lot of journalism that is produced in newsrooms, behind desks, over telephone conversations, whereas photojournalists realize you have to be there to do the work” (Irby, 2008). Irby cited that as a broadcast journalist or a still photographer: “...you have to be there to witness. There is no way to do your craft other than physically be present.”

Irby knows this is not a perfect world, but is encouraged by some students who have the right mindset, temperament and skill to continue meaningful and compelling journalism. “If this were a perfect world,” Irby notes, “journalists would hope that the best of Edward R. Murrow’s essence would be embodied, embraced, and expanded. That’s not where we are. This is a societal problem; the values and principles of a free press are not as valued by this society” (Irby, 2008).

Irby understands that news stories are more than two separate opinions on opposing sides, and that Murrow would challenge that as well. Irby notes that: “the objective truth, being there are two sides, when in fact we live in a very complex world where there are more than two sides. Meaningful reporting today has to be nuanced and complex and journalists have to inject themselves into the complexity and present narratives over time and not in one package.” Murrow would challenge this Irby believes, and what journalists do today is a lot of surface coverage...the parachuting reporter syndrome. That leads to a lot of fragmented coverage, and frustrated viewers. Irby’s final remark was an essential idea from Murrow’s RTNDA speech, “We’ve allowed finance to drive decision-making over genuine purpose” (Irby, 2008).

MILES DORAN (See Appendix B for transcript)

A few hours north of Irby in Gainesville, Florida is twenty-one -year-old Miles Dornan, a senior in journalism at the University of Florida. He has interned for CBS News, New York and most recently was a paid news associate there. In addition, he works for ABC News On Campus as a one man band (aka VJ) for all platforms for ABC News. He also is a freelance multimedia reporter for the *New York Times* and also reports for WRUF-AM and WRUF-TV, his on-campus stations. I met him when he was a high school journalist at the Florida Scholastic Press Association convention in 2004. This interview was conducted by email, June 18, 2008.

Question: When you approach a story, do you wonder somewhat in the process what Murrow's take on it would be? Do you strive for his standards?

Doran: "I think Murrow once said 'We cannot make good news out of bad practice.' That statement says a lot. While I don't think of Murrow whenever I'm working on a story, when it comes to ethics and standards his name immediately comes to mind".

Question: Would Murrow have a place in today's marketplace? Where would Murrow work...who would hire him?

Doran: "I think a guy like Murrow is desperately NEEDED in today's society. But would he fit in? I am afraid not. It is not just because smoking on TV is frowned upon these days. In an age of news crawls, graphics swooshing in and out, reporter and anchors hired for their looks rather than their talent, and networks closing down their bureaus overseas, even if Murrow was here today, I don't think he would like what he was seeing."

Miles' perspective gave realistic yet encouraging insights from a member of the next generation of journalists. Ron Olsen's remarks below gave a veteran's perspective as to why Murrow mattered.

RON OLSEN (See Appendix C for transcript)

Ron Olsen, a veteran local news reporter, is not as young as Doran, but at 61 shares the same passion even with decades more on the beat. I have never worked directly with Olsen, but have seen him nearly daily on the streets of Los Angeles for twenty years. Recently retired, he was respectable and honorable competition; having worked for KTLA-TV (a CBS-Warner affiliate) as a multi-award winning reporter since 1987 through 2009, whom I met at the O.J. Simpson trials. Ron's website, *workingreporter.com* has several links involving Edward R. Murrow. With this broadcast veteran, I asked but one question; "Tell me your thoughts on Murrow." Here is a partial response and summary from his June 9, 2008 e-mail. He gives remembrances of seeing him on TV, as well as perspective and respect of his hero.

Olsen: "Edward R. Murrow is the first broadcast journalist I remember as a small child and the TV signal in rural Minnesota would be terrible but Ed Murrow's presence demanded attention, even through the 'snow' in the picture that was characteristic of so many early TV signals in outlying areas. Whatever people were doing, conversing or knitting or whatever; they would stop and listen when Murrow came on. It wasn't his face that grabbed their attention; it was his voice and the credibility he represented. They believed what he said because Ed Murrow was believable. He was a journalist and not an

entertainer and he did his very best to give you true information. You had the sense that Murrow felt that the work was more important than he was” (Olsen, 2008)

LINDA MASON (See Appendix D for transcript)

Linda Mason is the Senior Vice President of Standards and Special Projects for CBS News. She wears many hats, but her primary purpose is to oversee the application of the standards and practices of CBS News as well as update the standards handbook, which is known around CBS News as the “Blue Book.” She headed the internal panel that examined the mistakes of Election Night 2000, the results of which led to a restructuring of the CBS News Decision Desk and changes in CBS News election night procedures (Sims, 2005).

Mason also was the sole CBS News liaison with the independent panel that investigated a flawed September 2004 report on *60 Minutes Wednesday* involving President George W. Bush and his service in the National Guard. That panel produced a 224-page report critical of the procedures used to prepare that piece and resulted in several procedural changes of CBS News, including the elevation of Mason to a more prominent role in the oversight of all investigative and sensitive reports (Sims, 2005).

On June 22, 2009, Mason spoke at a mandatory standards meeting at the CBS News Bureau in Los Angeles. Some of her remarks from that meeting involved what an employee of CBS News can and cannot do. For example, she wants us to watch our Facebook and Myspace messages that may give away opinions. We may not blog on hot button issues and cannot favor one side or the other. We cannot use our position to seek

freebies or discounts EVER. “NO campaign contributions, end of discussion,” she nearly shouted (Mason, 2009).

She added that being perceived as fair is crucial; we are not blank slates and have opinions but must rise above that. “We regard standards seriously, fairness rests with us...we must follow through and find out what is really happening and HAVE to be accurate,” she said. (Mason, 2009).

Mason responded to questions on ethics, standards, and Murrow for this paper following the meeting. The conversation took place in a producer’s office and was recorded with a Sony XD Camera for sound only and without a picture. The numbers reflected at the beginning of the response or an answer are time code numbers from the disc and are indicated in the transcript as well.

“HLR,” “Les,” “Rose” and “Question,” is the interviewer and “Mason” represents her on the complete transcript, which is available in the Appendix D. The text and edited portion (excerpts) and any other remarks made at the staff meeting Mason made are ONLY for use in this paper and may not be reprinted in any way or form. The numbers indicated are time code numbers from the disc for guidance with the appendix.

Rose: “Tell me about your relationship with Edward R. Murrow...was he a guiding force with you at all?”

Mason (1:24): “Edward R. Murrow is the reason I got into television journalism, he was an idol of mine, yes, I loved what he did and the way he did it. Yes, he was a big hero.”

Rose(3:33): “Do you feel his level of broadcast ethics is still alive and well today, or in the middle of infotainment are we away from it as most people believe? “

Mason: “I think that his...ethics change, our values change, that we...not the core values, but the way we look at things changes with technology. I think CBS likes to distinguish itself by being a network of ethics that follows certain standards to make sure that we’re fair and that we are accurate, in the manner of Murrow. I think there are other organizations that don’t spend as much time worrying about the things we worry about and they give us all a bad name.”

Note: Mason discussed specifics with the Dan Rather *60 Minutes Wednesday* report on George W. Bush’s military service, two months before the election. CBS News got elements wrong, which resulted in the cancellation of the show, Dan Rather’s firing, and a loss of credibility to CBS News. She tells what happened leading up to that segment, a rare look into network news ethics, priorities and a news organization wanting to do the right thing.

Mason (7:40): “On the Tuesday before they aired it Wednesday there wasn’t a script...and you can’t take a story about the President of the United States in a close re-election effort two months before the election and not vet the script early, so that was the first mistake. Second mistake was the misinformation as I described it (see 5:57). The third mistake was they talked with Barry (“Ben”) Barnes who had been deputy governor of Texas during this time, and he was responsible for the waivers (to not serve in Vietnam). And he picked this time to talk: it was September...He was the head of Texans for Kerry. It was political. And it was a way to destroy Bush.”

Mason’s story of how many ways a segment can go astray is a cautionary tale of journalism gone wrong. It proves a journalistic tenet that Murrow knew to follow: accuracy, checking and double checking sources, and always trying to get both sides (and

more) of a story. She spoke about how one of the very best producers (Mary Mapes) who got THE story of the decade (7:40) (Abu Ghraib and the torture there) was also assigned this problematic story on George W. Bush's military service.

Mason (7:40): "...there have been controls put on that story (Abu Ghraib) that were incredible: instead of two sources, the executive producer at *60 Minutes 2* didn't use some of the pictures. And this story (Bush) there was no...vetting."

Rose (15:58) "If you were to teach ethics or if you could talk to every ethics or every broadcast teacher in America...what advice would you want to tell them?"

Mason (16:16) "I would tell them we have a lot of power; the press has a lot of power. And you have to use that power very responsibly. In addition, that means when you report something you have to have standards of fairness and you have to be accurate. And those are the only two things that I ask of the people with CBS News. Now in fairness it means going the extra mile to find the other opinion, to find the reason that this company is being accused of something. It is not a "gotcha," a quick 'they refuse to talk to speak to us' or 'they're wrong'. In accuracy, it means that you verify, verify, verify."

Rose(18:02) "What are the biggest ethical dilemmas broadcast journalists have today; is it the lack of time, which has always been the biggest excuse?"

Mason(18:09) "...yes, and I don't buy that as an excuse. The best advice I can give people is if it does not feel right in your gut, it isn't, and don't do it. Find out why it doesn't feel right; and that is true under enormous pressure as well. There is no excuse for doing something that you know isn't right just because it fills the slot in the time frame that you need it done. It's wrong. It's a misuse of your power."

Mason said she worried as well about the shrinking budgets of local news and spoke also of Fox News. She had some closing thoughts about the Murrow/McCarthy battle, which I had not seen in print before. She had ominous questions about Murrow's power and techniques. She worried if Murrow's popularity affected his coverage and wondered if McCarthy's side of the story was investigated.

Rose (23:43) "Anything you would like to add?"

Mason: "No, I think you covered it and I think that in the area of journalism that which Murrow set down we need to follow because he is the father of journalism. I think we did a documentary on Murrow and the Murrow-McCarthy broadcast in particular. My feeling was that they were very brave to do it because it was a time of terror in this country and McCarthy had powers that surpassed any ordinary human being and if you spoke against him you could get yourself in a lot of trouble. (The show) came off a bit one sided because McCarthy came on, no makeup, just stuttering along and you might say, well that is what he was. On the other had I think it was scary to me because supposing Murrow was...wrong. I think you have to give him up to fail. I'm not saying we set him up to fail but without giving him any instruction, he wasn't used to television and Murrow was...so that always rankled a little bit with me."

Rose (25:26) "Even when you have this force, that history showed us McCarthy was at the time, the truth is there were a few Communists out there and he got it partially right. I have seen it (the McCarthy-Murrow showdown) several times and the way CBS let McCarthy dig his own grave and it was just him saying those things with obviously the 'uber-professional' Murrow coming to get him. That has been one of the criticisms.

At the same time, we gave him a response, but by that time the damage was already done.”

Mason (26:15) “Yes it was, and the public had turned as well. It turned out to be a good thing. But I question our way of getting there. The means to the end isn’t always the right way to go” (Mason, 2009).

KEITH WOODS (See Appendix E for transcript)

Keith Woods is the Poynter Institute Dean of Faculty, author, and teacher of race, ethics and diversity. He is also the previously discussed Kenny Irby’s boss. Woods is a man who gets his students and colleagues not only to “talk the talk,” but taking small steps toward “walking the walk” when it comes to race. Having attended his seminars for years when I am a guest faculty member at Poynter, there is not a moment when he does not challenge, confound, and dumbfound. For example, when a video clip is shown of a newscast that says, “The suspect is a 19-year-old black male...” Woods will get students to describe exactly what that may mean. “Male” and “19” are easy enough: the definition of a black male is *not*.

Woods will ask if it is someone black like himself (who is lighter skinned), black like James Earl Jones, an extremely light-skinned black that looks white to many people, or a “high yellow” kind of black person. The truth is, they are all black people, and calling someone “black” is a lousy way to describe a suspect, and does damage to the community. He puts it this way; “My color is brown. My race is black. We’ve made color and race synonymous but it is not. Yes, we are looking for a man with light brown skin, and dark eyes. That’s a description. If you are looking for a black man, what are you

looking for? Sometimes race is important to the story: the guys who attacked James Bird and dragged him behind their truck: white men who had hatred for black men. Their race and his race are important to the story” (Woods, 2008). He emphasized that it is not about sensitivity: it is about accuracy, precision and facts. We as journalists drift away and get “...into the universe of opinion and assumption, which would fall apart in most other journalism.”

All of which is a very basic Murrow (and journalistic) tenet: Get it right. Keith Woods believes that getting ethics right goes hand in hand, at least in part, with how a journalist approaches issues of diversity and race. It is ethically wrong as a journalist to not be knowledgeable (he prefers that term over “sensitivity”) on race and diversity: from their approach to their script or print copy itself.

One ethical issue every journalist faces every day is use of language in his or her copy; “All language changes over time. Either the power of the word or the actual meaning of the word can change, sometimes better, sometimes not. I would hope that someone would take out of that moment; that what we need here is knowledge of language, not sensitivity to it” (Woods, 2008). He gave a well known example that an “Oreo” is an insult to blacks, meaning a sell out or “Uncle Tom.”

But there were other less well known examples: an Apple is an insult to Native Americans, a Coconut is an insult to Chicanos and Latinos, and a Banana is an insult to Asian people. They all mean the same thing, but for the respective different cultures. “Those terms are known in the culture, not outside of it. What is interesting is that black people who know ‘Oreo’ really well have never heard the term ‘apple.’” He emphasized

that just because you learned something about a culture, it is only a *piece* of that culture; you can't know how far to take something you've taught (Woods, 2008).

For example in a use of language, Woods cites President Obama calling a female reporter in 2008 "sweetie," and many found it an insult. "Journalists need to ask the question, 'What did he mean?' If he says, 'I didn't realize that I used that word' or if he blows you off and says, 'Don't be so sensitive...' I know something else about him," Woods said, continuing with, "Any one of those paths leads me to a greater truth and that is what I am after. Not judgment" (Woods, 2008).

Woods then explained the journalistic statement, "It's unclear yet how this will affect his candidacy." With a line like that, it *would* affect the candidacy. He finds it unethical and base; "It's a way for journalists to stir the pot. It's everything that people accuse us (journalists) of and what I'm constantly fighting against. Sensationalism...it's hard to defend when you see stuff like that" (Woods, 2008).

He emphasized other examples of word usage that an untrained or insensitive journalist would use and be offensive. "When I say 'Indian giver' most people in this country would cringe. They understand that it is a tremendous insult. But I can show you over and over where we use the word 'Gyp' and people don't know where it came from. First of all it is capitalized, because it is a reference to Gypsy. 'Welsh' on a bet, 'Gyp' someone, and 'Dutch-treat', all have the same origins," Woods explained. He noted that in all three cases, they came from England as an insult for a perceived moral flaw. The English people thought that people from Wales were not honorable, Gypsies steal, and that people from Holland are cheap and would not pay for a meal.

Woods not only questioned the ethics of misunderstanding a word's history and risk insulting a portion of the audience, but also found that many journalists are flawed when it comes to picking their story sources. Murrow made sure that his sources were impeccable and met them face to face. Whether it was President Roosevelt, Churchill, or McCarthy, Murrow had the influence, drive, and credibility to get *direct* sources and not representatives for the sources.

Woods discussed Rev. Jesse Jackson as a "go to" person for black issues, and he was fine with that only if it involved areas such as civil rights and black men in the courts system...or issues he was uniquely qualified to speak on. The problem is in the assumption that he is the *only* person that knows that history, and therefore you feel compelled to go to him. Woods wants all journalists to expand their Rolodex and their sources; "When you don't recognize there is so much more to the story and he's not the guy to tell you about it. (Using the L.A. riots as an example) what's simmering in Simi Valley, to what's happening in south central L.A., all that is peculiar to that place, all of which has a whole collection of people who can talk about it," explained Woods (Woods, 2008).

Woods feels it is unethical to get the story wrong; to propagate stereotypes, to foster insensitivities, and to endorse ignorance with not carefully choosing words in writing about race and diversity. Murrow viewed himself as an educator first, and had little tolerance for journalists being loose with the facts. Few chose their words more carefully than Murrow.

Woods also believes that worst of all is to ignore the topic altogether and to shy away from the conversation. To be ethical can be what is written, but to be unethical can be what is ignored.

CROCKER SNOW JR. (See Appendix F for transcript)

Crocker Snow Jr. is the Director of the Edward R. Murrow Center at The Fletcher School, Tufts University, in Medford, Massachusetts. Snow is a veteran journalist and is a two-time Pulitzer Prize nominee. On November 4, 2009, he answered my questions, sent a few times prior the month before, via email, but noted that he found his answers in his draft box. I am glad he did: in a very few words, like a true journalist, he gave a terrific perspective on Murrow.

Murrow never wrote down his views on ethics, but chose to lead by example. The famed R.T.N.D.A. speech came close to laying down his priorities, but I wanted to know from Snow what constituted Murrow's ethics and practices. Snow went immediately to Murrow's upbringing; "Murrow started as an educator and from a Quaker background. So I think the notions of fairness, integrity...and balance were ingrained. It's these valuable notions that informed his priorities on good journalism practice and ethics." Fairness, integrity, and balance: so simply put and what every great journalist to this day chooses to emulate. There is no fairness or integrity if the story is imbalanced, nor balance and integrity if the story is not fair. All three virtues must be in place, and certainly all require the story to be accurate.

I asked Snow if he saw those same journalistic principles being applied today, to which "Rarely" was his immediate response. "Most journalism today borders on

infotainment,” noting that the combination of the limited attention spans of the public, multiple media sources, and excessive competition were to blame. But Snow also provided some insight with the ease in which Murrow’s reputation ascended; “Remember Murrow virtually had the field to himself when he made his name as a broadcaster during the Battle of Britain, so he could define ‘best practice’ based on his own ethics and his personal best practices.” In other words, it is once again Murrow being in the right place with the right skills, at the right moment in the beginnings of broadcasting, with one of the greatest stories in human history to cover The Rise of the Third Reich.

I then asked Snow if the ethical standards in broadcast journalism today are being followed, abused, or ignored. I hoped he could also consider and compare local, network, and cable news. I also wanted his perception of Fox News and that organization’s ethical standards. Snow acknowledged he is no longer a broadcaster, but rather a consumer thereof. “I think,” Snow noted, “most broadcast news persons, though a diminishing number, try to follow proper broadcast ethics and standards for objectivity and fairness, but the competitive pressures internally (for air time) and externally (for their medium and network or station) coupled with commercial pressures mitigates against this.”

Worse yet, he believes that the line between analysis and reportage, commentary and punditry are “...blurred in most online media and increasingly in broadcast media, be it local, regional or national.” His comparisons of cable news with local news was a revelation: “I believe that CNN, BBC, and yes, Al Jazeera, make the best effort at proper ethics, and local news organizations for the most part leave that up to the big boys.”

I asked Snow, in closing, what his thoughts and insights were on Murrow’s ethics, legacy, and his personal story. I particularly wanted to know what made Murrow,

Murrow. Once again, Crocker Snow Jr. responded with few words, “What made *Murrow* is the rare combination of a Calvinist upbringing, curiosity, international interest and sensitivity, and a nose for news and news sources.” Snow thought *Murrow* combined all of this with a “fine platform to exercise and display all of this, initially with CBS Radio and then T.V. at the height of their powers.” Snow acknowledged that *Murrow* had the London beat almost to himself. Snow also believed that at his core, *Murrow* was an educator and did not pander to his audience. Finally, Snow wrote that, “All the attributes gave him (*Murrow*) the confidence to let his own passions show through as a cosmetic of his reporting if not the meat and potatoes of it.”

TERRY McCARTHY (See Appendix G for transcript)

Irish born Terry McCarthy is a foreign correspondent for CBS News (starting in 2009) and based in Los Angeles. He covers Asia as well as Afghanistan and Iraq when required. He arrived at CBS News from a three-year stint at ABC News and before that was with *Time* magazine in Shanghai for two years. He also was a newspaper reporter in London for a year and a half and worked in Bangkok for about five years. For these reasons, I wanted McCarthy’s perspectives of foreign press ethics. His remarks were at once honest, surprising, and eye opening to the profound differences in ethics elsewhere.

I asked McCarthy about *Murrow*’s influence on him as a journalist; “I started out as a freelancer but I knew who he (*Murrow*) was and I know his reputation. I think in those early days of broadcasting he certainly served as a benchmark. Let’s not get misty-eyed about this: journalists have been forever peddling stories that were snake oil.” He said that as far back as the 1800s, newspapers in those days were “...essentially rags for

the owners for their political or commercial gain or whatever. So it's not like we come from a golden age and our standards as journalists have always been susceptible to pressures of those times." McCarthy felt that the times in which Murrow reported were something special; "I think Murrow brought a...of course he was grounded in very solemn times, World War II, reporting the news was very serious business" (McCarthy, 2009, 11:10).

McCarthy pulled no punches with the foreign press; "I would say that in the United Kingdom, which is the foreign press I know best, that ethics are significantly lower than they are in the U.S." In Afghanistan, he saw U.K. reporters and photographers staging (or faking) scenes as "...if they are in battle, when they are several miles from the front line" (McCarthy, 2009, 02:47).

I asked him for other examples of things he saw that stood out during war coverage. McCarthy's response was astounding; "Oh, atrocious stuff. In Afghanistan, people paying artillery crews to fire off shells so they could get on the air, get them on film. Those shells could blow, could kill someone, (and) the fact that a journalist would pay for that to happen to me is beyond belief" (McCarthy, 2009, 12:47). I then asked if those were American journalists, and he simply (or perhaps coyly) responded, "Nyet".

He also mentioned another form of unethical behavior, noting that the British press is known for paying for information, especially the tabloids. But it doesn't stop with the U.K.; "There are several problems with the Japanese press as well...they do that too (paying for interviews). It inflates the market: once people are used to being paid for interviews then they want money from everyone. That shuts out everyone." We discussed

how CBS News and virtually every U.S. legitimate journalistic enterprise do not pay for interviews (McCarthy, 2009, 02:47).

Worse yet, McCarthy believes, paying for interviews results in a lower quality of information. McCarthy feels that; "...you get to the stage where people will tell you what you want to hear. And it almost leads to some sort of 'sponsored speaker' kind of scenario" (McCarthy, 2009, 04:04). McCarthy believes this has led to some contentious relationships in the United Kingdom between the journalists and the consumers of journalism.

He told of the Cambodian coverage of the Japanese journalists. It was the first time since World War II that Japanese soldiers were posted overseas and the Japanese press was all over it. "They were throwing money left and right and everywhere, completely distorting the coverage of news in that country (McCarthy, 2009, 13:33).

He also noted a problem journalists have in Asia; instead of paying for an interview, it was just the opposite and may be at least as bad ethically. This particular point of contention involved a singular type of coverage. McCarthy spoke of the problems: "I know there are a lot of problems in Asia with commercial (business) coverage. You interview a company president in certain countries in Asia, South Korea is one of them, and they give you a white envelope when you leave, and there's money in it" (McCarthy, 2009, 14:06). McCarthy explained that it is not a quid pro quo per se, they are not saying, "you will write this story," but this is a "sweetener." The thought process is that you will be complimentary to this company when you write this story.

In another Asian country, this bribery process takes a much broader and darker turn. McCarthy speaks with experience; "In Thailand, I lived in Thailand for four years

and they have a pretty well established system of the opposite of blackmail.” McCarthy explained that it works like this: Journalists will threaten companies, politicians and wealthy individuals with unflattering stories unless they are paid off. Which, McCarthy says, “...probably explains why so many journalists get killed in Thailand” (McCarthy, 2009, 14:53).

McCarthy provided some further insight into foreign journalists and their lack of ethics. McCarthy believes it just might be the journalists’ education, or rather, the lack of it; “it is worth pointing out that going to J school (journalism school) is a lot more common in the U.S. than in Europe. Most journalists in the U.K. start out as freelancers and pick it up and make mistakes along the way. There aren’t any J schools, so there isn’t anybody going to J schools” (McCarthy, 2009, 05:35).

Largely, McCarthy believes that “...a lot of the journalistic ethics in the U.S. are higher than overseas. I would say that network news has greater reliability than some print media. Generally the evening shows are better than the morning shows.” McCarthy thinks that morning shows not only have lighter material, but can be “...pretty unscrupulous when it comes to booking guests or stealing guests and there are always problems with stealing pictures...they kind of push the envelope in the morning” (McCarthy, 2009, 06:29:00).

McCarthy did not have a high opinion of the standards of most blogs and “so-called” news websites. McCarthy believes that though some of the sites are good, “...we in the mainstream media, as we are sometimes called, must pay attention at all costs. Because why it might be fun to throw something up on the blog because it sounds sensational, outrageous, or interesting, for established news organizations to follow that

without properly confirming are severely in danger of disenfranchising. It takes years to develop that” (McCarthy, 2009, 07:18). He echoed the same concerns that CBS News V.P. of standards Linda Mason has journalists, especially younger journalists, can be too trusting of the information from the Web (Mason, 2009).

Speaking of younger journalists, I asked McCarthy for some advice for starting journalists. We spoke of the “line in the sand” with ethics, using the darkening of O.J. Simpson’s face from *Time* magazine as an example. McCarthy said that, “the problem is when you make one little alteration like that (the O.J. face example) you raise doubts because it is in their minds. It’s ‘...what else have they changed, how much more is inaccurate, how can we trust these people’” (McCarthy, 2009, 18:33)? McCarthy believes that if you are faking a story, it is not worth it because “...you will be found out. And once you have done it, it becomes a pattern. And then all that you think you have gained you are probably into negative territory because you won’t get another job in our industry” (McCarthy, 2009, 19:12)

McCarthy, like the Steve Hartman conversation to come, noted that it is about a greater sense of dedication if you go into the journalism profession. “I think to go in this industry, like people that go into medicine, they need to have a great sense of dedication. Unless you really feel some sense of mission to educate people with your reporting which can be frustrating with odd hours and all sorts of things, without that greater goal I don’t think you are going to enjoy the experience” (McCarthy, 2009, 19:12).

STEVE HARTMAN (See Appendix H for transcript)

Steve Hartman is a features correspondent for CBS News. In addition, I have worked with him for over 15 years in both local news and the network (full disclosure). He has been a reporter in Toledo, Minneapolis, New York City, and Los Angeles at KCBS-TV where we met (Hartman, 2009, 9:51). During an interview with him, he presented a completely different take on Murrow at times, as well as his ethics and the ethics of others.

Hartman went to college at Bowling Green State and got his first job in journalism at WTOL-TV in his home town of Toledo, Ohio (where he was also an intern). Hartman usually focused on features in his career that took him from Toledo to KSTP-TV in Minneapolis to WABC in New York to KCBS-TV in Los Angeles (where I started working with him) to a gradual transition to CBS News. He has won every major award in the business, including a Murrow, Columbia-DuPont, and a national Emmy. When he was in local news, he won about 26 or so local Emmys.

Hartman noted that when he went into TV news, when he thought about what he wanted to do for a living, “I decided I wanted to something that was bigger than just a job. Something that seemed to have a greater purpose to serve mankind. Edward R. Murrow...was sort of the centerpiece of journalism...TV journalism ethics and he was the cornerstone on which we built on until that time. And Walter Cronkite was the next stone above the cornerstone” (Hartman, 2009, 01:10). Hartman realized that he wanted to be part of a profession that people might someday look up to him, like they looked up to Murrow and Cronkite. “I thought I had the character to be like them and they just seemed to live for something more than themselves,” he added.

But Murrow's ethics at the time were far from perfect, Hartman believes. "It's funny because there are some ethics we consider 'ethical issues today' that he had no issue with, like he would do advertisements and he didn't see that as a conflict of interest or didn't have a choice" (Hartman, 2009, 05:02). But Hartman remembers Murrow's bigger contributions when it came to ethics and getting it right: sticking up for the little guy and exposing injustice.

I asked him if, as a lifetime feature reporter, there was a greater or lesser line with features reporting over the lead story, "Ethics in general is a gray line. There is certainly some black and white, but those are easy. The most interesting part, the most challenging part of the ethics discussion is what is in the gray. In addition, there are gray lines with hard news just as there are gray lines with feature news, they are just different and at different places (Hartman, 2009, 10:40). Hartman notes that features have many ethical issues; being fair to subjects, how you edit the story, and how you get the story. Hartman believes that ethics are not something you encounter once a week or month, noting; "It's something you deal with whether consciously or subconsciously every ten minutes when you are on a story. You know; 'How do I phrase this question?' 'How do I get the b-roll that I need to get?' And finally, 'How do I ask this person to help make the story happen without, you know, altering the story?'" (Hartman, 2009, 11:51).

Hartman believes that the very nature of TV News is different from print news because it is not possible to be unobtrusive like a print journalist. "By the very nature of us doing the story, we have altered reality. We capture the story, the facts, and the vibe, and the feeling. As realistically as you possibly can, without telling people what to say.

But on occasion, getting people doing things they usually wouldn't be doing in that (particular) moment" (Hartman, 2009, 12:47).

"I think sometimes with ethics people get caught so caught up with the indecision of what is right and wrong, they want hard and fast rules" (Hartman, 2009, 15:02).

Neither of us in our discussion felt that having people do what they would normally be doing for the camera is "staging," nor is an interview or lighting "staging." There are different processes one has to do to get a TV news story on the air.

Hartman puts his journalistic ethical philosophy, in part, this way; "My ethics are: I want to tell the story thoroughly and accurately. I am not going to tell their (the subjects' story with a bunch of falsehoods. But at the same time, I want to convey that story to others. I am doing it for a reason. I want them to feel something, to understand something, and learn something and be able to relate to something" (Hartman, 2009, 16:25). Like everyone else at CBS News, Hartman would never tell a subject what to say, how to say it, or influence the story in any way. "To me, that is the ultimate no-no. It is just a matter of phrasing the question creatively. That is the great thing about being ethical; you are not sacrificing anything to be ethical. Usually by being ethical you make the story better. Ethics are not roadblocks; they are just guidelines for how to tell the best possible story" (Hartman, 2009, 17:23).

Hartman is cognizant of how a strict self-imposed ethical "code" can paralyze the process of telling a story on television. Hartman worries about journalists who come up with rules that have no purpose; "Like, don't turn on that light because it wasn't on naturally." On the other hand, he notes, some could take it to the extreme and rely only on what is observed, such as, "Don't ask people questions because they naturally

wouldn't be answering them (laughs). Any interview by its nature is staging. So there are certain things we do to make the job happen, and it may affect the story in some way" (Hartman, 2009, 19:21). Lighting a police press conference, Hartman believes, might make a police officer behave a little differently than he would have otherwise: but that is the world we live in. "A moral code or an ethical code is something that a company may have a book devoted to it, but it's a very individual thing. It is a very flexible thing; it can change within the corporation or can change within the individual, based on what the times are or even what the individual is going through" (Hartman, 2009, 20:35).

Hartman said if the journalist involved is broke and really needs to keep his or her job, then that person may revise his or her ethics to do a story on a car show because the local auto dealer sponsored it. The reporter has a child to feed, and is not doing any real harm. The reporter feels that, "Yes, I am doing a news story that my employer is having me do because an advertiser wants it done." Hartman realizes that a scenario like that "...makes us feel uncomfortable because we want our ethics for the moment to let that happen, to be able to do this story. This makes us feel uncomfortable because we want our ethics to be solid, straight, and never changing. But that is just not reality; they change within all of us" (Hartman, 2009, 20:58).

Hartman continues with a very personal perspective, "I am much more ethical now. I can afford to be much more ethical now than I ever could before because I have a great deal of job security. CBS isn't going to fire me. So if they ask me to do something, which they never have...that I felt was unethical, I can say NO. It is very easy for me. If the story is going to be really, really dull unless I stage some event to make the story great, I don't need to do that because I can afford to have a story that is terrible (laughs)"

(Hartman, 2009, 22:50). Hartman feels that at this point in his career, he has enough good ones. But more importantly: staging makes the story worse. “That is why I say ethics are not negative things but they are positive things. Not following them usually makes your story much worse than it would have been otherwise” (Hartman, 2009, 22:49).

I asked Hartman about his perspective on Fox News, MSNBC, and their standards. “MSNBC is definitely just as guilty,” Hartman said, “Where Fox News and MSNBC go wrong is there is no clear delineation between their news content and their...I don’t know...entertainment/opinion shows. In fact, I have gone back and forth between them and they will be in the middle of some opinionated show and they will go on a newsbreak. But even within the news breaks or the news programs, depending on who is presenting it or who the writer was, I still recognize from my perspective...to be slanted, unethical reporting” (Hartman, 2009,40:29). Hartman believes in the end, we are all trying to walk the middle. It is just that Fox News disagrees where the middle is. “To balance, you need to know where the fulcrum is and if you cannot define where the middle is, and then you cannot be balanced. So balance is really something that they cannot claim to be, and neither can quote ‘the mainstream media’ claim to be” (Hartman, 2009, 41:45).

In closing, Hartman had some thoughts on Fox’s and MSNBC’s viewers, and other network’s audiences as well. He proposed a completely different takes on a journalist’s ethical standards. It is great if the journalists have them, but viewers’ ethics matter the most. Hartman feels that; “You are only as good as your audience cares about how good you are. Unless the audience values ethics as much as we (journalists) do, it doesn’t matter. If the audience is going to keep watching TV reporters and TV programs

that have proven they to be unethical in the past, if they are not voting with their clickers, then this is the worst thing that can happen for journalism ethics. Because there is really no reason for those motivated within themselves to be ethical to continue to be ethical” (Hartman, 2009, 27:26).

ROBERT M. STEELE, PhD (See Appendix I for transcript)

Robert Steele (“Bob” to his friends) is the Eugene S. Pulliam Distinguished Visiting Professor of Journalism at DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana. In addition, he is also the Nelson Poynter Scholar for Journalism Values at The Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Florida. It was there I befriended him as a visiting lecturer and attended numerous seminars he taught on ethics and the media. I sent him some questions via email on November 4, 2009 and here are some of his remarks when he responded on December 2, 2009.

I asked Steele what he thought were Murrow’s ethical priorities, and he responded, “Murrow was first and foremost a storyteller. He had the desire and the ability to go where the stories were and take his listeners (and eventually) his viewers with him. He knew how to tell a powerful story with vivid descriptions” (Steele, 2009). Steele added that he did not know much about Murrow’s ethics, but hoped “...he honored the core values of accuracy and fairness. And one has to believe that Murrow believed strongly in journalistic service to the public. That was, of course, a core element of his “lights in a box” speech” (Steele, 2009). Steele further believes that Murrow believed in journalistic independence and championed a kind of journalism that; “...should not be

undermined by the undue commercial, governmental or political pressures” (Steele, 2009).

When asked if those same journalistic principles were being applied today, Steele said that there were certainly journalists who honor Murrow’s principles that believe there is an obligation to tell substantive, compelling stories that “...take people where they need to go. The best journalistic storytellers provide the public with insight and information about both courageous and corrupt leaders, about heroism and horror on battlefields, and about the good, bad, and ugly that takes place in our communities every day” (Steele, 2009). Steele believes you cannot separate journalistic and ethical principles and that the very best journalists place a premium on accuracy and fairness (Steele, 2009).

Steele wrote of the struggles of the immediacy of news clashing with the business of news and what can be put to the back burner. “Reporters, photojournalists, and producers are expected to produce more stories more quickly. Immediacy is often the driving force in news coverage” (Steele, 2009). And that means for Steele, accuracy, fairness, and other journalistic and ethical values can be trumped. “...the realities of a financially-struggling journalism industry mean that the journalistic values too often lose out. Journalistic independence is often eroded in this era by those who run news organizations” (Steele, 2009).

I asked what made Murrow *Murrow* and if Murrow’s ethics were still applicable today. Steele believed that Murrow was not perfect, and like all of us, had his shortcomings. Murrow’s reporting from England and Europe during World War II produced an image of a journalist that has lasted well beyond Murrow’s life time. Steele

closed with; “He had his flaws, but he was a powerful journalistic storyteller, and he used his fame to make strong statements about the role of journalism in society. His ‘lights in a box speech’ was a rallying cry for journalistic quality and integrity. The message is just as applicable today, maybe more so” (Steele, 2009).

BOB DOTSON (See Appendix J for transcript)

Bob Dotson has won four national Emmys, a DuPont-Columbia award, and virtually every award (over a hundred) possible while working since 1975 for NBC. His feature; “American Stories with Bob Dotson” airs on the Today Show as well as the NBC Nightly News (Knapp, 2008). I am fortunate to call him “friend” for many years now, and respect him as a terrific competitor and even better storyteller.

I gave him some questions in November of 2009, but he chose to respond, as I suspected he might, with a thoughtful essay on Murrow, ethics, and journalism today. His remarks not only hit home to me, but with some luck will stand the test of time. As with all of my interviews, the complete responses are in the appendixes. Dotson’s summary appears below, but a terrific and complete read awaits you in appendix J.

On Murrow’s legacy, Dotson notes that Murrow told his stories in “...such a way that he would not insult the intelligence of a college professor, but if a bus boy were listening, he’d be fascinated too. That’s Murrow’s legacy” (Dotson, 2009). Dotson has a point with his summation of Murrow’s legacy: he was smart without being cocky, a great writer without using “big words” to the layman, and knew how to tell a story with passion and heart. Dotson says that, “He (Murrow) made an effort—all of his career—to look behind the media mirror that reflects celebrity and power to find compelling tales

about the rest of us” (Dotson, 2009). Bob Dotson notes that Murrow covered people in all occupations and of all ages with good ideas. Dotson thinks that today’s quotes from modern journalists of celebrities and politicians sound more like “stuck records.”

“Ed Murrow,” writes Dotson, “...wondered what ordinary people did between wars and hurricanes. In disaster, we seek them out, but it’s easier to go to a politician or celebrity for answers, even though they might not be the ones with real insight” (Dotson, 2009). Dotson compared covering news today with working in a circus: we as journalists spend most of our time marveling at the tent, but “...no one comes to a circus to marvel at the tent. They come to watch the trapeze act. Our ‘act’, the careful crafting of writing to picture, gets scant attention as we scamper from Tweet to Tweet” (Dotson, 2009).

Dotson believes the 24-hour news cycle is to blame in no small part for an overall journalistic demise. “Given our ever-shrinking deadlines and increased workload, newsroom stress levels are at an all time high. Non-Stop News does not allow much time to teach ethics. A lot of journalists are freelance. They get paid to produce a lot of stories. Few news managers have time to check if journalistic standards were met” (Dotson, 2009).

Dotson closes with some great remarks (and reminders) to working journalists; “All of us on journalism’s fast track—heading into the unknown—must find stories from the other side of the mirror—the ones the rest of the media isn’t showing us. Tell the truth and well. There’s more to this job than just airtime. We’re not just writing on smoke” (Dotson, 2009).

Indeed, virtually the only smoke coming from Edward R. Murrow was from his constant Camels. Murrow’s life and legacy left a blueprint for broadcast journalists to

follow to this today. Actually, all journalists worth their salt want to get the facts straight and simply tell the truth in an intelligent but understandable fashion. Ethical behavior, even 60 years later, never goes out of style.

PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA (See Appendix K for transcript)

Walter Cronkite was hired by Murrow, and some very kind remarks were said by numerous friends and journalists at his memorial. Included among Cronkite's mourners was President Barack Obama, who not only said kind words about the loss of Cronkite, but also echoed a pursuit for quality journalism that both Edward R. Murrow and Cronkite stood for. Though the President is not a journalist, Obama's remarks were a journalistic call to arms to the listening news department chiefs, their respective journalists, and the public listening at home.

In between his speech to the nation's schoolchildren on September 8, 2009, and his speech on health care to congress the next evening, President Obama flew to New York to speak at Walter Cronkite's memorial service. Obviously, those in attendance expected remarks about Cronkite's life and career. They heard those words, but midway through his speech, he changed tone, and Mr. Obama made a plea for better journalism. I heard this while watching a closed circuit feed in the CBS Los Angeles newsroom, and was immediately struck by what I was hearing. Much like the previously discussed RTNDA speech of Murrow's, Mr. Obama used Cronkite's memorial to celebrate Walter Cronkite (who was hired by Murrow) but also to take the packed crowd of journalists and managers to task. He lamented what he believes to be the lack of great journalism today. The parallels with Murrow's standards are remarkable and insightful.

Obama addressed the economy as it relates to journalism, “Even as appetites for news and information grow, newsrooms are closing.” Later he noted that Walter Cronkite wasn’t an idealist and understood the challenges and the pressures facing journalism in this era. President Obama, speaking of Cronkite but definitely echoing Murrow’s era as well, said: “He believed that a media company has an obligation to pursue a profit, but also an obligation to invest a good chunk of that profit back into news and public affairs” (Obama, 2009).

The similarities in the 1958 Murrow RTNDA speech (to a gathered group of journalists) and Obama’s 2009 speech (to a gathered group of journalists and Cronkite’s family) are poignant and immediately apparent. Murrow on broadcasting’s economy, “If radio news is to be regarded as a commodity, only acceptable when saleable, then I don’t care what you call it—I say it isn’t news” (RTNDA, 1958). Further echoing of Murrow’s RTNDA speech, the President said, “We seem stuck with a choice between what cuts to our bottom line and what harms us as a society. Which price is higher to pay? Which cost is harder to bear” (Obama, 2009).

President Obama also disliked the lack of journalists being able to have a specialty and really digging deep into a subject: “Despite the big stories of our era, serious journalists find themselves all too often without a beat ‘What happened today?’ is replaced with ‘Who won today?’” (Obama, 2009). Murrow offered this advice, 51 years prior and with even more bite, “But this nation is now in competition with malignant forces of evil who are using every instrument at their command to empty the minds of their subjects and fill those minds with slogans, determination, and faith in the future”

(RTNDA, 1958). The frustrations of corporate run media have continued for more than 50 years, with both frustration and hope in sight.

Remember that Edward R. Murrow ended his RTNDA speech with a Stonewall Jackson quote; “When war comes, you must draw the sword and throw away the scabbard.” And finally: “The trouble with television is that it is rusting in the scabbard during a battle for survival” (RTNDA, 1958).

Obama, wrapping up his Cronkite eulogy (and a call to arms for journalists), ended on a cautious but positive note: “And if we choose to live up to Walter’s example, if we realize that the kind of journalism he embodied will simply rekindle itself as part of a natural cycle, but will come alive only if we stand up and demand it and resolve to value it once again, then I am convinced that the choice between profit and progress is a false one-and that the golden days of journalism still lie ahead” (Obama, 2009).

REFLECTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As CBS News Vice President Linda Mason indicated, an entire generation believes the majority of what is written on the Web is true, leading to misinformation. Also, many younger newsroom employees are confused about a basic ethical issue journalists have: accepting free tickets or considerations that the regular public does not have access to. They do not understand their position is what the publicists are interested in. The chief complaint among many of those interviewed is a lack of ethics taught in journalism schools; it seems to be a topic left on the back burner. To that end, journalism school students' reactions to ethical decision-making practices could be an informative study.

But is that really the case with regards to a lack of ethics education? A study and survey of journalism colleges about the teaching of ethical practices could put any question that the current generation of journalists may lack an ethical background to rest or perhaps, confirm it. It may very well be revelatory, and address perception vs. reality of ethics education for journalists. The multiple complaints journalists are facing about their ethics or lack of it, is worthy of further study, with an emphasis on solutions to improving the standards.

There is much written about the "Murrow Boys," the journalists who Murrow hired along the way. Little about them was included here because of Murrow's incredible back story, influence and accomplishment. That said, profiling Murrow's boys and their impact on journalism could be a study worthwhile on journalistic integrity and the birth of television news.

There is value in town hall meetings about journalism. Al Tompkins from the Poynter Institute recently conducted one with Lynn French from KPNX-TV in Phoenix and sought feedback from some citizens in Kansas City, Missouri (Tompkins, 2009). 40 journalists observed the meeting and the town hall folks were verbal about what they didn't like about TV News. Among the complaints: endless teases, questioning the integrity of the stories, and efforts to sensationalize the news. A town hall meeting with a scientific, quantitative approach on how TV news consumers perceive journalistic ethics could be a valuable lesson in improving newscasts and the viewer's perception of it.

A closer look at Murrow's access to Churchill and Roosevelt during a time of war could be an insightful study. This could very well be the leading example of a journalist's influence on world leaders; or perhaps the leader's influence on him. Freedom of the free world was at stake during this time, and Murrow was not only a central figure covering it but also had an influence on international policies given.

A paper on Murrow's *Person to Person* show and how he did that show to make *See It Now* air would be a great moral study: a journalist with the highest possible principles doing entertainment journalism (perhaps inventing it). This is the same journalist gave the RTNDA speech about the decline of television itself by filling the tube with fluff for programming. Yet here was the bastion of journalism that wrote about that premise that contributed to his view of television's demise.

Immediacy as both a key virtue of television and its Achilles' heel would be a great study. Murrow practically invented broadcast immediacy with his work on London rooftops during the war bombings from the Germans. Today, with the Fort Hood mass killing incident of November 2009 (where the gunman was first reported killed, when he

was really alive) and the hoax of a child alone in a balloon in Colorado are prime examples of the downside of the 24/7 news cycle.

The “casting” of news (i.e. picking a subject for a specific reason like looks, accent, or situation) was an unknown during Murrow’s era and would certainly go against his grain. The thought of one subject’s appearance trumping another subject’s superior news value and story, as if casting a part in a movie, was not a consideration.

Along those lines, Murrow also had several battles with CBS News over his choice of personnel. He would choose a great reporter with a mediocre voice, while CBS’ preference seemed to be tonal quality as a first consideration. This too was “casting” but it was casting of journalists. How far does “casting” go in television news today?

In addition, as recently as February 1, 2010 CBS News laid off approximately 150 workers out of 1,400 worldwide. My bureau in Los Angeles lost 11 of 44 employees. A study of a network’s coverage and content before and after layoffs could be an informative survey. Also, a look at newsroom morale, perhaps a survey of optimism or the lack there of, could be valuable to see how morale affects news content. Finally, ethical reporting and multiple added responsibilities (on an already tough job) are worth a serious look. A question remains: are today’s “VJ’s” or “backpack” journalists taking the time to get it right ethically while shooting, editing, writing, reporting and producing their stories.

APPENDIX A

Kenny Irby 8/20/08 Interview at Poynter Institute, St. Petersburg, Florida
 Recorded on cassette tape, transcribed by Jessica Milligan
 (LR): Les Rose
 (KI) Kenny Irby
 (EM) Edward Murrow

Two part title:
 Visual Journalism Group leader
 Diversity Director of Poynter Institute
 * Ordained Elder in African Methodist Episcopal Church

Bio:
 Still Photo Journalist, Designer, Writer all with various small papers from Boston, Massachusetts to Pontiac, Michigan.
 Deputy Director of Newsday in New York.
 1995 (? Clarify date)- started photo journalism program at Poynter.

Photo manager to two Olympic Games;
 1996 Atlanta; in charge of the Alexander Memorial Coliseum and boxing venue.
 2002 Salt lake; leading Ice palace, Delta Center, Short Track Speed Skating, Figure Skating.
 Venue where all big news happened: “Skate Gate”, “Apollo Ono Craze”.
 Supposed to go to Beijing, but Olympic Beijing would not negotiate with foreign staff.
 Was offered a 32 day contract but could only do 30 days.

(LR) Do you miss shooting?
 (KI) Doesn't miss shooting, never saw myself as a shooter. Believes that documentation is about storytelling and interactions. “I miss telling the best stories”.
 In 1987, was told I would be a great editor and in '88 was encouraged by an editor at Oakland Press to go beyond basic reporting. “I need someone who can help shape the daily vision of the newspaper”. Editors do that on the inside, but the newspaper believed that I could still stay connected to the street. Thought that I would have the big view of what was happening. I was made the Assistant Picture Editor, which meant 1 hour a day in the building, packaging the newspaper and designing the front page. I had to know to utilize the best visuals, most dynamic pictures available. Did that for a year, then looked for other papers. Was offered two jobs: USA Today with a 3/2 (3 days documenting, 2 days on desk), and Newsday.

Was hired by Newsday as a staff photographer, and worked the streets for 2 years. Went on to be Night Picture Editor and 1st Sports Picture Editor. Hit glass ceiling with Newsday. Was the Deputy Director for Photography and had the ability to dispatch photographers to anywhere for any story, but had no say for what got in the newspaper.

Had worked on Pulitzer pieces and photos weren't getting in. After discussion, Newsday offered more money and an MBO (management by objective bonus), but my objective was not met. Newsday was not prepared to go in that direction.

Got an offer from Portland Oregonian.

1995: was a visiting faculty member to Poynter, because of involvement with international discussions about photo ethics (i.e. "Fire and Ice", Newsday).

1995, started the photo journalism program, "with a vision of one day Poynter being a place where photo journalism would be integrated across its discipline".

1999 was asked to become part of the management structure of Poynter Institute, as a group leader.

(LR): How did Murrow influence your career?

Poynter is no perfect place in its inclusion of the broad range of journalism.

Radio: an occasional seminar.

Magazine: almost no representation.

"Trading Places" –an experiment I did with Lane Nicholson. Went to Sarasota Herald Tribune (one of first Multimedia publications {summer of '96}).

Lane worked as a still photographer. I worked as a broadcast journalist. Lane learned Photoshop. Traded equipment published for 40 days and then wrote up experience for Poynter. There has been a lot of crossover without having an actual program.

Also partnered up with Andre Jones, Regina Macomb, Les Rose as broadcast journalists without having a program.

Murrow was a pioneer. Can't typecast him as a radio or television journalist.

"If there's anyone who ever embodied the principal of journalism to give voice to the voiceless, and hold the powerful accountable, it's Edward R. Murrow."

"You don't have to sacrifice quality when you have people who have the passion and the capacity and courage (don't leave out the courage) because most of his work was very meritorious and courageous work".

"Inspired me to appreciate multi-sensory learning."

Diagnosed (KI) early as dyslexic, told never be able to read, Murrow brought vivid understanding to his report. Murrow was a pioneer in terms of form. Deep, insightful, informative and emotional. Vivid detail, cadence of voice, able to decipher and present in compelling ways, unlike any of his counterparts.

In courses that I teach across disciplines, I use The Artine A. (?) Speech to think about values and principles of what journalism should represent. Murrow was a legend, on the icon shelf of contributors.

(LR) Influence?

(KI) As a student of Boston U., would always intone "Murrowisms". John Robatim (Time Magazine War Correspondent) always said, "What would Murrow do?"

I did my own research on Murrow:

Murrow stood up against the McCarthy Era.

Stood up against government, “holding the powerful accountable”.

That’s what editors really do. Help their journalists in their organizations, speak truth to power and ask the difficult questions, and shine a light in the dark places that Murrow typified and demonstrated in an uncanny way. There are few journalists that you would put on same plateau in terms of commitment to free society, democracy and freedom.

(LR) What made Murrow, Murrow?

(KI) Tenacity and sense of social justice. Human beings have insatiable thirst for justice. Murrow had an insatiable thirst for righteousness and justice on behalf of those who can’t defend themselves. Whether a soldier, immigrants, the poor in America, he saw a responsibility to help improve the conditions of life. He saw this responsibility that every journalist should see. Not only a responsibility, but an opportunity to improve the human condition. For EM, the American Model of free press is essential to democracy, because a free press insures an informed citizen and his quest to bring truth, and invariably a sense of, “this is what’s happening now”. You can shape it, you can spin it, but this is the authentic story as close as I (EM) can get to it.

He was not a journalist who wrote from his desk, 2nd or 3rd hand accounts. He had an amazing desire and capacity to get to the heart of the story, to be in the places where he could be (what I (KI) call) the authentic witness in a most confirmed way.

(LR) He actually got Pneumonia a couple of times during war coverage (plus he smoked 60-80 cigarettes a day).

(KI) He put himself in harm’s way. A lot of journalists today want to be comfortable and are not as willing to go to the front lines.

Another connection I feel w/EM’s approach: He conducted himself more like a photojournalist than an anchor or a writer. Today, there is a lot of journalism that is produced in newsrooms, behind desks, over telephone conversations, where as photojournalists are more aware that you have to be there to do the work. As a broadcast journalist or a still photographer, you have to be there to witness. There is no way to do your craft than physically being present.

(LR) In an age of affiliates, to gather info, the reporter isn’t physically there because of the rush for deadlines; satellite time is cheap, etc. If EM were seeking a job today, where would he work and could he?

(KI) EM typifies the desires and capacities of a lot of people today. Recently, I’ve encountered students with the right stuff; the mindset, temperament and skill set to continue meaningful and compelling journalism, and they say to them, “Where do I get a job?” Walter Middlebrook from Detroit News is hiring kids like that. He is the exception in this current economy and journalistic confusion that we are going through. EM could work at the Washington Post, New York Times, CNN if he had the right look (he would have to modulate habits to work today), but Murrow, in the best of who the man was,

could work today in a number of publications (not as many). Maybe BBC, 60 minutes. CBS has a place where Murrowism is still celebrated. If this were a perfect world, journalists would hope that the best of EM essence would be embodied, embraced and expanded. That's not where we are. It's a dream and it doesn't happen because American citizens don't know what a treasure that they had for that period of time. This is a societal problem; the values and principles of a free press are not as valued by this society. There is culpability across the board. Government has not espoused the importance of free press, hasn't helped citizens to understand that the constitution protects free speech but it doesn't fund it. People don't see their responsibility to hold the press accountable in ways that are justifiable. So much media bashing. We are not having a clear conversation like a cell phone in a tunnel. We are not having a clear dialogue about that. American media has been caught up in its ownership, for profit, solely minded mega companies and citizens looking for continued profits and investments. People don't see what that is doing to the American journalistic infrastructure.

(LR) EM detractors- too liberal, stories should be in black and white, tell it like it is and not supposed to fight the good fight. Clearly criticized for the RTNDA speech at CBS. Can journalists today still walk that line-doing that type of journalism with that type of battle of the corporations or are we too complacent?

(KI) American media has been labeled with a "liberal spin" but when you look at history, it has had a very conservative bend for a longer period of time. The problem is that all media has been labeled under one banner, with few exception: Washington Times, Fox. The bigger challenge is the amalgamation of American media. EM would challenge (if he were around today) this whole idea of objectivity. The objective truth, being there are 2 sides, when in fact we live in a very complex world where there are more than two sides. Meaningful reporting today has to be nuance laced and complex and journalists have to inject themselves into the complexity and present narratives over time, not in one package. Murrow would challenge this. What we do today is a lot of surface coverage. We parachute in, look at the story and tell it from 20,000 feet, not from the ground. So we have a lot of fragmented coverage. People are quick to say, "wait, you missed this whole element." Because we are rolling in and rolling out.

(LR) The circus has come to town.

(KI) Good examples: Columbine, Virginia Tech- stories with a high degree of excitement. Will Durant analogy: We focus on the raging river and miss the banks where people make love and have families, where everyday life goes on. The capacity that EM had to be in the middle of the raging river and look up and say, "wait a minute, what about these people and what's the broader view?"

The best journalism schools and educators continue to instill his values and produce a richer journalism that also speaks to the fact that there is a subjective reality. You have a life experience that will shape what you encounter and feel initially. You have to go deeper to validate, substantiate and discount some of those experiences. Your earlier

perceptions are not the relevant truth. The story that you are telling is like Rick Warren's "A Purpose Driven Life". The story is not about you and journalists have to accept that. It is about the individual or the group experience that you are reporting on. Set yourself (not shed yourself) out of it.

(LR) It's not about us, it's about the story.

(KI) Right. The story always has people involved in it. You can take stories that look like 'object' stories, but when you dig deeper, invariably the story is about an individual. There is a character, a human being that has a story to be told, whether it is about a factory, the computer, the people behind the story is where we make the Great Connection...when we see the human level of these stories.

(LR) CBS wouldn't allow Murrow to use recorded sound. He went up to the roof to bring the sound of London being bombed. Finally, he got permission to record sound for his radio show. Just one of his innovations that no one saw coming. Naysayer: EM was the one to blame for entertainment journalism because he did the show, "Person to Person". He was robbing Peter to pay Paul.

(KI) He made a compromise. In all lives we find points of compromise in order to do what we find most valuable. The Liberace Interview; he was a phenomenon and newsmaker. "Person to Person" humanized celebrities.

The treatment that we have brought to the media...we have to accept our responsibility in the way things have gone. We haven't been transparent with our motives, and about the values of why we do what we do. What has motivated the continuity of this is how much money they make. We've allowed finance to drive decision making over genuine purpose.

APPENDIX B

Email questionnaire from 6-18-2008

NAME: Miles Doran

STATION: WRUF / WUFT / CBS News

JOB TITLE: Producer / Reporter / Anchor / Intern

NUMBER OF YEARS IN THE BIZ: Uhh, if internships count: 4

The Questions:

1) How has ERM impacted your career and do you think about his principles when you go to work?

--- Edward R. Murrow has given me (and I'm sure countless others) something to shoot for. He was the best of his craft and anyone who doesn't want to strive for what he believed in is in the wrong line of work. I think that movie, *Good Night, and Good Luck*, really deserves a lot of credit for introducing Murrow to young people who were not around when he was. I'm interning at CBS News in New York where Murrow comes to mind every day I step foot in the building. You can't miss his portrait hanging in the lobby at 524 West 57th. As for my career, I've been lucky enough to win a couple Murrow awards in radio/TV. Even though when I told my mom the exciting news she replied with "What's a Murrow?" I am still more proud of those awards than any others.

2) What specific knowledge, principles, or skills have you gained from studying ERM?

--- Murrow was one of the first to show us how radio and TV can be used to present the world to ordinary people sitting at home. Fifty years ago at the RTNDA convention he said "This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, and it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise, it is merely wires and lights in a box."

3) How did the knowledge improve, enhance, or change your attitude due to a new skill?

--- It makes me want to go farther, dig deeper, and bring home the sights and sounds of places most people may never see in their lifetime.

4) When you approach a story, do you wonder somewhat in the process what Murrow's take on it would be? Do you strive for his standards?

--- I think Murrow once said “We cannot make good news out of bad practice.” That statement says a lot. While I don’t think of Murrow whenever I’m working on a story, when it comes to ethics and standards his name immediately comes to mind.

5) What makes Murrow...Murrow? He's the standard of broadcast journalism, but why?

--- Simple answer: Murrow stood for a lot.

6) Would Murrow have a place in today's marketplace? Where would he work...who would hire him?

--- I think a guy like Murrow is desperately NEEDED in today’s society. But would he fit in? I’m afraid not. It’s not just because smoking on TV is frowned upon these days. In an age of news crawls, graphics swooshing in and out, reporter and anchors hired for their looks rather than their talent, and networks closing down their bureaus overseas, even if Murrow was here today, I don’t think he would like what he was seeing.

APPENDIX C

Ron Olsen's Email Response Regarding Murrow (Sept. 28, 2008)

Les-

Here's a bit about Ed Murrow.

Edward R. Murrow is the first broadcast journalist I can remember watching. I was a small child and the TV signal in rural Minnesota would be terrible but Ed Murrow's presence demanded attention, even through the "snow" in the picture that was characteristic of so many early TV signals in outlying areas. Whatever people in the room were doing, conversing or knitting or whatever; they would stop and listen when Murrow came on. It wasn't his face that grabbed their attention; it was his voice and the credibility he represented. They believed what he said because Ed Murrow was believable. He was a journalist and not an entertainer and he did his very best to give you true information. You had the sense that Murrow felt that the work was more important than he was.

I hadn't looked into Murrow's life all that much until I picked up a copy of the Murrow biography "Prime Time" by Alexander Kendrick. This was the first "Prime Time" and not the second book with the same title that appeared some years later. It described how Murrow, as a young reporter in England during the blitz, kept defying an increasingly frazzled Bill Paley by going out on bombing runs over Europe and then filing reports upon his return. Paley, according to the book, repeatedly threatened to fire Murrow if he kept going out on the missions but Murrow didn't care. He felt the only way to find out what was really going on was to be there, so he went. His reports were a sensation and Paley never carried out the threat of terminating his employment with CBS News. There was also Murrow's investigation and exposure of Sen. Joe McCarthy. Journalism's most important role may be its calling to protect "we the people" by keeping us informed of what our political leadership is doing and why. Somebody has to hold the politicians feet to the fire. The founders knew this when they created the First Amendment. Murrow knew it and stood up for it when he went toe-to-toe with Sen. Joe McCarthy, a move that could easily have destroyed his career. As a cub reporter, I admired Murrow's style and saw his standards as the bar we should all try to reach.

By my way of thinking, Edward R. Murrow represents the best of broadcast journalism. Following his lead, I have tried to remember that the work is more important than I am, that journalism is more important than hair, makeup and overnight ratings and that a job well done will garner good numbers with or without the promotional smoke and mirrors and emphasis on entertainment that dominates contemporary TV news. Murrow brought in the numbers. So did Cronkite. Neither were male models and it's safe to say that both worried more about the work than about their hair and makeup. They were the two most successful reporters in the history of broadcast news, but in the current climate neither would be considered for a TV anchor job at even the local level, much less on network

television. They don't have the right "look." They don't "pop" when they appear on the screen. They aren't right for the demographic the advertisers cherish. And so, much to the detriment of our society, TV news appears to be increasingly condemning itself to failure by rejecting that which once made it great--the standards established by Edward R. Murrow.

Ron Olsen

APPENDIX D

CBS News Vice President of Standards and Practices Linda Mason Staff Meeting

Linda Mason
 June 22, 2009
 9 am

MANDATORY standards meeting....Los Angeles CBS Bureau

We don't print gossip or manufacture news....worked with Mike Wallace in her start in radio giving her tips...

Was told women cannot be producers....did Evening News with Cronkite...became VP...started Eye to Eye with Connie Chung and Saturday AM News Senior VP/Standards and Special Projects....Sunday morning, 60 Minutes and Sunday Morning report to her

Premise behind standards: fair and accurate.

Get the name and places right: chips away at credibility if you get it wrong.....makes people wonder what else you got wrong.

Web is an easy way to make corrections.

We regard standards seriously...fairness rests with us...looked at moon walking bear video...basketball players passing ball....must follow thru and find what is really happening have to be accurate...

Being perceived as fair is crucial....no blogs or public opinion on hot button issue...cannot favor one side or another....we are not blank slates, we have opinions but rise above that.

9:15a

NO campaign contributions...END OF DISCUSSION...

Global warming: no opinion but

Watch Facebook messages that may give away opinions...blogs ok but she wants to know...

Nothing in email that you don't want to see later...

Freebies: early show gave away samples...one person sold freebies on EBAY...happened TWICE...

CANNOT use your position to seek discounts or freebies EVER...

Disneyland is a blanket thing that is OK...because it is with ALL media...

Linda Mason June 22, 2009 10:44am Los Angeles Bureau in Melissa Sanford's office
Senior Vice President, Standards and Special Projects
NUMBERS are time code numbers on original Sony XD Disc, recorded with sound and color bars only on an XD Camera.

HLR: Paper is...this is for a University of Nebraska thesis...I do have your permission to put it in the thesis...

LM: Yes you do...

HLR: Tell me about your relationship with Edward R Murrow...was he a big part of your journalistic "upbringing"...was he a guiding force with you at all?

01:24 LM: Edward R. Murrow is the reason I got into television journalism, he was an idol of mine, yes. I loved what he did and the way he did it, I didn't know in those days how it was done...but I just knew I wanted to be in the same place doing what he was doing. Yes, he was a big hero...

1:49: He was one of the people that drew me to CBS.um, when I came to NY to look for a job, I must say my paperwork went far and wide but there were no jobs at CBS, but finally got a job in radio and worked my way up

2:12 HLR: Did you ever meet any of Murrow's "boys"...

LM: Yes, I worked closely with Richard Hottelet who was at the UN...um...who else...um...the list is long...Richard Hottelett came immediately to mind...total gentleman...remember what it was like to work in those days...Don Hewitt used to work with Murrow...Walter Cronkite was hired by Murrow...Eric Severeid , one of Murrow's boys...

3:33H LR: Do you feel like his level of...and this gets into your job...his level of broadcast ethics...is still alive and well today...or in the middle of infotainment are we away from it as most people believe?

3:48 LM: I think that his...ethics change, our values change, the way we...not the core values...but the way we look at things changes...as the way we gather news changes with technology...as the way the plethora of news outlets....I think CBS likes to distinguish itself by being a network of ethics that follows certain standards to make sure that we're fair and that we are accurate....in the matter of Murrow. Um, I think that there are other organizations that don't spend as much time worrying about the things we worry about and they give us all a bad name.

4:40 LM: I think that the Web has come aboard and has been kind of the Wild West. And raises a lot of questions as well so we have to fight all of this to maintain our course and it is interesting to see as young people join the network how you have to instruct them and do areas of what's right and what's wrong and the way to do things...uhhhh,,

because it is not immediately apparent and they have spent their life on the internet and anything goes.

05:09 HLR Do you think it is a double-edge sword...clearly the internet played a part in the Dan Rather "episode"...was it bloggers that caused attention to the document first? I know you were part of that...

5:28 LM: I think they might have...this was something that was going to happen...it happened more quickly because the uh internet (HLR: "right") brought it to the forefront more quickly...but it was going to happen because the documents still have not been authenticated so we still don't know even if they were true or false. And that was a terrible situation to be in.

05:47 HLR: From what I remember the situation was...the situation was...the information was true but the physical document was not...if that makes sense.

5:57 LM: Some of the information was true...the document we have not ascertained whether it was true or not. (HLR: "RIGHT")...the information...the thesis of the report was that George Bush got special dispensation so that he can avoid service in Viet Nam. And in fact, he...at that time in Texas there were positions held in the National Guard for the sons of prominent Texans...well his father was a Congressman so he falls in the prominent Texans class...but Bush chose to be a pilot, which was a 7 day a week job. Some people went in the National Guard and they spent two weekends a month and two weeks in the summer. He spent 7 days a week and he was a good pilot. 6:45 And there was a time to uhm...was a time when people were asked to volunteer to relieve Viet Nam pilots for four or five months, and he volunteered. And he had like 250 hours and other pilots had like 500 hours and so he wasn't chosen. And in the beginning, he was doing a fine job. This was in the producers' notes. And...there is no doubt that George Bush left the National Guard under a cloud and he just...left. But in those beginning days...and that's what we were talking about in this piece...he was just fine. So the information was not accurate. And the documentation...was...we still haven't documented.

7:35 HLR: What...more importantly, in the wake of that, how CBS News changed.

7:40 LM: Well, it was a wakeup call. It was a very destructive time at CBS News. Very destructive. And it had repercussions that went through the whole organization. One of our best producers...first I have to ask you, you aren't publishing this are you...it will be...it will be, sitting on a shelf...her: ok, fine...but if won't, yeah...one of our best producers produced Abul Ghrab...which was THE story of the decade and in finding those pictures of torture and reporting the story...there have been controls put on that story that were incredible...instead of the usual two sources, the executive producer at 60 Minutes 2 asked for three sources. So any picture that didn't have three sources wasn't used and it means they didn't use some of the pictures. And this story (Bush) there was no...vetting. On Tuesday before they aired it on Wednesday there wasn't a script...and you can't take a story about the President of the United States in a close re-election effort.

Two months before the election and not vett the script early. So that was the first huge mistake. Second mistake was the misinformation as I described it. The third mistake was they talked with Berry Barnes who had been deputy governor during this time and he was the one responsible for the waivers. And he picked this time to talk and what nobody said was he picked this time to talk it was September...he was the head of Texans for Carey...it was political. And this was a way to destroy Bush.

9:55 LM, continued they talked to a person who was supposed to be the assistant to the Colonel...but he served on a different air force base. And he was... (Unintelligible)...he might have worked for the colonel at one point it certainly wasn't the close relationship that it sounded like...
(More about investigations...)

11:07 LM: If you reviewed the whole transcript he never in any way said anything meaningful about George Bush.

11:19 HLR: Ok...had to ask you that one...it won't be in book form but it will...it is just part of the academic library at University of Nebraska...if that's ok..Sure...

11:47 HLR: How do I describe your job at CBS News and do other networks have a similar person like yourself?

11:48 LM: Yes. Every network...each network has a person who is concerned with the standards of the network. What it means is I am constantly working with the lawyers...um...as new things develop. I am constantly working with people at CBS News...can we do this...can we do this...how do we do this...um, it's a dynamic job and it's constantly evolving. I mean you can't keep saying the same thing because the world keeps changing every situation is different a new one

12:18 HLR: What's your biggest "aha" of the past five years of how the Web has come into being and in your meeting here in the newsroom you mentioned that that the Web has changed the game fairly profoundly as to access and that sort of thing...and you never said don't trust the Web...you just said "verify" (she repeats "verify")...doesn't that go back to Journalism 101?

12:46 LM: Yes it does. Yes it does. I think that people who aren't journalists think that they can find everything on the Web and what they find is correct. I can remember in the old days when I was working for Walter Cronkite the Evening News would give you a clip from the New York Times...go do this story for today. And I found mistakes in the New York Times...and if you find mistakes in the New York Times, you will find mistakes in the Web. And all I am asking is that you confirm all the information that you use.

13:14 HLR: Morley Safer was quoted as saying, "I don't trust a citizen journalist even as much as I would trust a citizen surgeon." I am pretty sure that was the gist...do you feel the same way...that citizen journalists lack the training?

13:40 LM: I think that some citizen journalists are very good. I think that some citizen journalists don't use the controls that journalists use and therefore aren't so good but I think you can tell by reading the material...they only seem one side...discount other arguments...they have thought of the broader picture...I think you can judge for yourself that you are not getting the whole thing. The whole fact.

14:02 HLR: How do you feel about Fox News? Or the Fox News Channel, I should say.

14:07 LM: I would say they have a place in the American viewing because they are very popular, and they tell a story from a different point of view which is something we have never had in this country and it's very interesting to see.

14:23 HLR: Do you think it is anti-journalism? Do you think it is reprehensible?

14:27 LM: No, I think they just see it from a different way. They would say that they don't slant the news that we tend to be very liberal and they will point to examples from the beginning of our own ride...part of our reasoning for the enthusiasm Obama was greeted with was it was new, it was fresh, it was something different, he was the underdog. And we always favor the underdog. I think that they felt...Fox felt...that we weren't tough enough in our questioning...that we were tough on Bush...and we weren't tough enough on Obama. And that is a different point of view. I think you have to take that into account. I think it's good that they are here.

15:10 HLR: You do?

15:11 LM: Yes I do. I think America needs various points of view, prominently...uh prominently displayed prominently available. Yes I do.

15:22 HLR: Most of the criticism for FOX clearly comes from the Sean Hannitys and the Bill O' Reillys because they are commentators who are within the Fox News Channel. They are on the Fox News channel so therefore sometimes their opinions get intertwined with Fox News responsibilities. If you are a local Fox News reporter here in this town (Los Angeles) it sorta drives them crazy because they are Fox and democratic candidates...

LM:...everybody feels it is Sean Hannity or Bill O' Reilly...

HLR: RIGHT.

15:58 HLR: If you were to teach ethics or if you could talk to every ethics or every broadcast teacher in America, and they were all in front of you...and you wanted to give them advice on what to teach college students today...what advice would you tell them?

16:16 LM: I would tell them we have a lot of power...the press has a lot of power. And you have to use that power very responsibly. And that means when you report something, you have to have standards of fairness and you have to be accurate. And those are the only two things that I ask of the people within CBS News. Now in "fairness" it means going the extra mile to find the other opinion...to find the reason that this company is being accused of something...it's not a GOTCHA...a quick "they refuse to speak to us" or "they're wrong"...in accuracy, it means that you verify verify verify. So that the facts that you are reporting are correct. The best spokesmen are people who have a passion one side or the other...and they use the facts...and if you have statistics you can use them to prove anything...they use the facts to their advantage. And you have to make sure you wade through that and come out with what reality is.

17:21 HLR: what are you seeing from new newsroom employees of the past few years that you didn't see 20 years ago?

17:26 LM: 20 years ago I didn't do this job!

HLR: should we go for 10? (Laughs).

LM: I think there is a...there's two things...first more and more people new employees came from journalism schools. So they did have some ethics classes. On the other hand, many of them are used to the freedom of the Web because that's how they have been communicating...that's how they've been getting the news during their college days and so we have to stress the ethics they learned in class are something to be carried out in real life as well.

18:02 HLR: what are the biggest ethical dilemmas broadcast journalists have today...is it the lack of time, which has always seemingly been the big excuse?

18:09 LM: Yes, and I don't buy that as an excuse...I think that if it's...um...I give people. The best advice I think I can give people is if it doesn't feel right in your gut, it isn't...and don't do it. And find out why it doesn't feel right...and that is true under enormous pressure as well. There is no excuse for doing something that you know isn't right just because it fills the slot in the time frame that you need it done. It's just...it's wrong. It's a misuse of your power.

18:40 HLR: I asked you this briefly in the meeting (earlier today she spoke to the CBS Staff in LA on ethics and standards, see notes above) but do you feel that...I get the feeling that The Early Show almost has a different psyche than Evening News as does Sunday Morning etc...The Early Show truthfully seems to be the black sheep of the family because they are more entertainment oriented...do we have different ethics for different sh..

19:02 LM: The standards apply...base standards applied...but 48 Hours is the most produced show at CBS News...it airs on Saturday night at 10p, so it takes place on prime time and its competitors are prime time broadcasts. (Uh huh). So they push the envelope about as far as they can. The Executive Producer, Susan Zirinsky, comes from hard

news...when I screen those shows...and I say "we gotta pull back a little bit" she understands totally. But they do use music, they do very elaborate editing...all within the standards. I will sometimes ask...there was a time...when they were in the car, retracing the path...but it looked like we were with the perp...I said, how did we get with the perp! I mean, he didn't know he was coming in the car. It was a re-do...so I said we have to say the Police took us on the path...uhm, one time they showed a cottage outside a neighborhood...it was a pebbled driveway...and they had the sound of footsteps and the pebbles...I said, c'mon...we can't do that...and so they took it out...for the most part, they follow the standards...I am more flexible there...I allow more things there...60 Minutes is the other end of the scale, and they just stick with the old fashioned standards...they add nothing new...and that's the range...every show has its own heart and soul and we deal with it accordingly.

20:35 HLR: Here's a situation that happened to me...we are arriving at the CSI special effects...it's a completely separate stage...the bullet goes into the deal...it was supposed to happen I believe at 11 o'clock...I am shooting this for The Early Show and um, we had traffic...welcome to LA...and we didn't get there until 11:45...despite our best circumstances...the producer said, "we have to do that again"..Right...I was appaled because you would never ask a normal news situation to have a new press conference and on and on. But she said it was ok because it was entertainment and they were sorta demonstrating it for us anyway though it was part of the real shoot...

21:24 LM: If we said, "Joe Blow the special effects guy demonstrated for us how they make a bullet go into the heart, that's fine. As long as that is what you mean by accurate...you are not just showing it as if it's happening but you are describing that so and so is running a demonstration for you, that's fine. LES Gotcha

21:44 HLR: what is a typical day in your life...what is a typical call you get about an ethical situation?

LM: Well, everyday is different but most recently I had a call from LA on the Lakers...can we use footage of the basketball finals because there was the talk about an ad in the parade...and we decided if you used three seconds, then we would call it fair use and needed it as a flavor to spark up the parade, so I had that call. Uhm, on the same day...I had a call about uhm...using the hidden camera to go on a story about hotel safety. Um... they wanted to go and check in and to various hotels and see how women...it was a story about women and safety...to see how women would fare in getting their key, quietly, so that any men standing around wouldn't necessarily get a chance to hear the room number and or the key...um...whenever using a hidden camera you have to talk to me...I got a call from the law department, we were discussing a case that is pending against CBS and what to do in that...and I do a lot of other things as well...

23:05 HLR: How do you feel about ethics in local news...or is it...I mean...they get profoundly...and you raise a question...I wonder if local news has someone like you in some of their news departments and corporate heads?

23:20 LM: I don't know...because local news across the country has shrunk. So I think it might be considered a luxury...so I don't know if they do, to be honest.

23:32 HLR: truthfully, wouldn't it be a luxury until you get sued for a zillion dollars- YES-exactly, exactly...it's short sided...LES Suddenly you're a bargain?

LM: Yeah, its short sided.

23:43 HLR: I know your time is valuable, anything you would like to add? No, I think you covered it and I think that in the area of journalism that which Murrow sat down we need to follow because he is the father of broadcast journalism. I think we did a documentary on Murrow and the um and the Murrow McCarthy broadcast in particular. My feeling was that they were very brave to do it because it was a time of terror in this country and McCarthy had powers that surpassed any ordinary human being and if you spoke against him you could get yourself in a lot of trouble and people on the broadcast had to sign...they refused to sign waivers if they were going to do...however, by the time that broadcast aired...it was very...with Murrow being as power as he was and having the tools of the trade...it came off a bit one sided because McCarthy came on...no makeup...just stuttering along and you might say...well, that's what he was. On the other hand I think it was scary to me because supposing Murrow was wrong. So I think that we have to measure that power, with some responsibility. And we can't...even though somebody's a demagogue the way McCarthy was...and in retrospect very wrong...I think you have to give him his best chance to make a best case and not set him up to fail...I'm not saying we set him up to fail but without giving him any instruction, he wasn't used to television and Murrow was so that always rankled a little bit with me.

25:26HLR: That was the best point in this interview for me...even when you have this force that history showed us McCarthy was at the time, um, the truth is there were a couple of communists out there and he got it partially right...and apparently even in our...and basically the way...I've seen it several times. And the way it was set up...we basically...we at CBS let McCarthy dig his own grave and it was just him saying these things with obviously the uber-professional Murrow coming to get him. That has been one of the criticisms...at the same time we gave him a response, but by that time the damage was already done.

26:15 LM: Yes it was...and the public had turned as well. It turned out to be a good thing. But I question our way of getting there...the means to the end isn't always the right way to go.

26:26 HLR: Harvest of Shame...any notes on that?

26:31 LM: It was an excellent broadcast that...did I wanted to go into documentaries because of it...it did what documentaries should do which made you see and feel how other people live and want to help make change.

26:46 HLR: I'm not making a story pitch here, but we could do it again...

26:48 LM: We did it...we did a CBS reports on Harvest of Shame-Revisited in the 90s...and it was the same

26:59 HLR: so sad...thanks so much

27:00 LM: you are welcome!

APPENDIX E

Keith Woods 8/20/08, recorded on cassette tapes, transcribed by Jessica Milligan Kief

Dean of Faculty at Poynter

(LR) Quick bio:

(KW) 16 years in New Orleans, my hometown. Sports writer for 10 years, News reporter for 18 months, Assistant City editor, City Editor, Editorial writer and Columnist.

(LR) Why did you come to Poynter?

(KW) The question for me was A) was teaching the way I wanted to go? And B) to have a platform of 250 journalists, or thousands in the industry to talk to. That was persuasive argument for coming. To be able to talk to many more people about issues with journalists. Race and ethnicity is my focus. Coverage of race and ethnicity in a forum of journalists and being able to have that conversation with the industry was very attractive to me.

(LR) What's a class of yours like?

(KW) Equal parts of instruction and reflection. Because to move the media around issues that are sensitive you have to move yourself and I can't do that for someone, I can't teach that, I can't move someone. One of my intentions is to get you (the student) thinking about how you view things and figure out if there is movement there that needs to happen, and any changes you need to make yourself as a journalist.

(LR) Is the hope that they go down the path and you teach sensitivity or knowledge of different races?

(KW) I would say that if I had a choice in language, I would choose 'knowledge' over 'sensitivity'. Sensitivity in many cases makes people gun-shy, afraid to do things. Knowledge empowers people to do it. I'd much prefer people to act it, not react to it. The intention is to make you more aware of the world out there and how race influences and plays a role in that world.

(LR) [Recants 'spear-chucker' story and students reaction to it]

Is the word spear-chucker dead, and no longer insulting, or is it only insulting to a smaller percentage of people?

(KW) All language changes over time. Either the power of the word or the actual meaning of the word can change, sometimes better, sometimes not, I would hope that someone would take out of that moment; What we need here is knowledge of language, not sensitivity to it. Because the audience encompasses everyone in the room, all

different races, gender and ages. You can't use language without the knowledge of how it will affect the broad spectrum of your audience. You can communicate successfully with your audience if you know how they will receive your language.

(LR) "Is it Something I Said?" You gave food examples; Oreo is a hateful term, as is Apple, Coconut, and Banana. Can you explain?

(KW) All those words have the same inter-cultural meaning. Basically the term is a sell-out or Uncle Tom. In each case it's about what is on the inside and what is on the outside. They are all white on the inside. Native Americans refer to other Native Americans as an apple; this is insulting them, calling them a sell-out. These terms are known in the culture, not outside of it. What is interesting about this is that black people who know Oreo really well have never heard the term 'Apple'. White people may have heard none of them or maybe only one, depending on what group they have come in contact with. The universality of those 4 terms is interesting enough to spend time with.

(LR) Except for Oreo, I had never heard them before. They really use those terms?

(KW) You have to be careful with every extrapolation you make on language. I think the most complex piece of this puzzle is just when you think you learned something, you have to recognize the limits of what you just learned, so in Native American culture, there are people who will refer to another Native American as an "Apple" but you are also likely to run into a Native American who has never heard that word. Like my 23 year-old black son had never heard 'spear-chucker' before I showed him that story. You've learned something about a piece of culture, but until you can really study the depth and breadth of every culture, you can't know how far you can take something you've learned. Its information and a way of understanding the complexity of language and being more purposeful about using words.

(LR) What did you think about the story on Obama calling a journalist 'sweetie'? Is that too sensitive?

(KW) I push back on the word sensitive because everything is sensitive to somebody. What you are trying to do is find the accuracy and truth. First when Obama uses the word, 'sweetie' he enters the context of our culture, where women have historically been reduced to 'sweetie'. Just as if you were to turn to a woman colleague who is at least your equal and say, "Can you get us a cup of coffee?" there is a good chance (despite that the comment is not sexist) that you are entering a context in which the meaning can be changed. I can totally understand where the sensitivity arises. Where I object is when journalism (I specifically say journalism as we have a different task than talk radio) doesn't interrogate anything long enough to determine if it is worth the indignation. I want to know some things first. Does he do it with all women? Because if he does, we have a problem. Is he like me who refers to his wife and children as 'sweetie' and is subject at any point to slip-up and call someone who doesn't fit that description? All I want is for journalism to spend enough time understanding context and to be able to

explain why it is of any concern to anyone and answering the question, “what did he mean?”. If he says, “I didn’t realize that I used that word” or if he blows you off and says, “Don’t be so sensitive” I know something else about him. Any one of those paths leads me to a greater truth and that is what I am after. Not judgment. The story you had sent me had gone to judgment immediately. It asked a classic journalistic rhetorical question, “It’s unclear yet how this will affect his candidacy “. Well, that makes the assumption that it would affect his candidacy. It’s a way for journalism to stir the pot. It’s everything that people accuse us (journalists) of and what I’m constantly fighting against. Sensationalism. It’s hard to defend when you see stuff like that.

(LR) What’s your advice to kids in their 1st newsroom, and you can start with dealing with different races. What’s the big picture, what do they need to take away from this conversation about how to handle journalistic encounters?

(KW) The mantra of diversity is this country constantly uses the phrase, “In an increasingly diverse society” and the truth is it has always been a substantially diverse society and there is no more reason today than 50 years ago to get good at this. However, the degree in which you can shutter your ignorance or feign knowledge decreases with the increasing diversity and therefore the need to get knowledge and conversant will get more significant over time. Additional motivation is the market forces in journalism are doing two things. 1) They are shrinking the larger audience, and 2) are segmenting it. The battle that wages over time in broadcast and print journalism is to capture as much of a share as you can. You cannot do that if you turn people off because you fail to cover them or recognize their existence in your community. You can’t do that if every time you cover them, they are reflected poorly in stories about crime and other pathologies. You can’t do that if you blow pronunciations in names and understanding cultural events because you got to the story before you learned anything. On the less threatening side of that continuum is the better you are at navigating this varied universe that we occupy, the more your value increases as a journalist because you can tell more stories with greater depth and clarity and attract a broader audience to those stories. There are lots of reasons to get good at this. What it means to get good is a pretty significant assertive search for insight and knowledge: Reading books, exposing you to cultures, people and experiences by simply getting out and getting around. Intentionally putting yourself on a path of new learning every way that you can. Asking yourself constantly, “What did I learn?” because if the answer is nothing, that means you’re standing still, and that will not bode well for you when something breaks. A couple of years ago, with the big protest in the illegal immigration issue across the country: Suddenly, if you have never looked at the issue of illegal immigration from the southern border, you are thrust into a story which is about more than just a bill. It’s about history of people and the country and their roles on a daily basis, their sense of belonging and the nation’s views on whether or not folks belong. All of that is part of the story. You walk in knowing none of that and it’s going to be hard to tell a story that has any value to anyone past who, what, where and why.

(LR) An example; L.A. is the third city for Korean population behind Seoul and the place that makes the Hyundai and they are a completely ignored population. Surely a large part

of them speak English, buy cars, go to restaurants, etc., yet they are not represented on any mainstream television stations.

(KW) What happens when you have a situation like what happened at Virginia Tech, with a Korean kid killing all those students? Something as fundamental as his name Sue (sp?) being his first or his last name, and should it be spoken first or last, is something that most journalists did not know. Some had the presence of mind to call someone to check, others did not and had to learn the hard way, by speaking first and then having someone react. That is simple info that you could learn right now, know, and not have to learn again. You don't need a Korean journalist to teach you that and I think we are trying to outsource our knowledge by depending on the one black person or one Latino in the room to know these things. Just because my heritage is black, doesn't mean I spent 5 minutes studying Martin Luther King. It does not reside in any person's race or ethnic history this native immediate knowledge.

(LR) How do you address this current generation to be culturally sensitive?

(KW) We overstate our progress as much as we undervalue how far we've come. Intra-racial marriages do not cause the Klan to march, but I have a nephew who dates a white girl whose parents won't speak to her anymore. This is not gone in this country but the degree to which this has been an issue has changed. The same way younger people have grown up with gays and lesbians normalized in society, could look around and say, "What do you mean there is a problem with sexual orientation issues?" There is. It's huge and still here. It resides in the church and the family and the schools. It's just not what it used to be and we mistake the calm for peace. And those are not the same thing. Some of these issues: Using the terms African American vs. black. My father would have gotten angry with you for calling him African American. He grew up in a generation of black men for whom Tarzana was the standard of representation of black people on TV and Africans were the natives of Tarzan and he didn't want any part of that Africa. He objected reverently to that term when it was introduced by Jesse Jackson. Me? Wait a second. That's a proper noun and you have to capitalize it for the first time (black is not capitalized). I'm not so upset with that. Frankly, it doesn't matter to me. I remember when Jesse Jackson introduced it and I remember asking myself that question and I remember asking my dad too. Recognize that you need to know how the language is pinging in the community and how it is resonating to understand why people are reacting in one way and still others another way. Because 'black' had the same life as a new term when it replaced 'colored' in the lexicon of the race of this country. There were black people who didn't want to give up the word 'colored' because there was some negative association to the word 'black'...

(LR) I always think about the water coolers and signs that said "colored people only" over them, so I steer clear of that term.

(KW) Right. You, Les, don't want to use the word 'colored' but other people heard the word 'black' used by slave masters and sharecroppers and heard it used as a weapon.

(LR) What confuses white people is that NAACP hasn't changed their name. Why is that?

(KW) I have no idea. I've never had that conversation directly with the organization. I can give you examples:
Listen to NPR. You will rarely hear it be called National Public Radio.

(LR) Just like CBS is no longer Columbian Broadcasting System?

(KW) I never knew that is what it stood for. We have ring tones. When was the last time a phone actually rang? You don't dial a number anymore but we still say dial. It's more of a societal thing than a racial thing. It's easier. You don't want to give up your letters. The National Conference of Christians and Jews is no longer that. They have the same initials but now it stands for Community and Justice. They didn't make a big deal about changing their name and there is something about holding onto the same letters.

(LR) You don't have to know what NAACP stands for, you just have to know that it stands for an organization that helps out this particular population.

(KW) And you probably have a fair amount of people who don't know what it stands for. What do those letters mean? They just represent the name.

(LR) Like Scuba.

(KW) Yes, most people don't know that Scuba is an acronym. When you look at names (this also depends on which personality type you are; A or B) people need to know the answer. What do we call people? African American vs. black, Native American vs. Indian vs. First People vs. Indigenous People, and so on. Latinos vs. Hispanic. All of these are variations on the theme and there are journalists who say, "It has to be one or the other" and I say, "No, it doesn't". You want to get as broad as possible when you have to be universal and specific whenever possible.

Chicano is on the ground. It is very specific and only a small group of people would be comfortable being called that. If you call the wrong person Chicano, you've insulted them. High up in the stratosphere is 'Hispanic' which is a universal term or 'Latino' which I regard as even more universal simply because Hispanics is seen as a made-up term by the census bureau. But if you come down and are talking to Les Rose, he may prefer to be called Mexican American or he may prefer to be called Hispanic. On an individual level, you simply have to ask the question. It's not an insult. "I want to refer to you by your ethnicity. How do I refer to you?" The open-endedness allows the individual to be respected by the journalist. "How do I refer to you, Keith?" "It doesn't matter. You can call me black or African American".

(LR) How did Oriental become bad and Asian become good?

(KW) I don't know. Let's use the example 'broad' for women and 'Jap' for Japanese, which were at some point acceptable in American culture and never acceptable to women or Japanese Americans. Asians would not refer to themselves in Asia as Orientals, but many have adapted to the term in the US to simply get along. Many things have gone out of vogue in this country that were bad all the time. That's one of the things we lose when we have a dialog about language in general. "Damn, I can't say anything." I'll give you an example I like to use because so many of us across cultures use this;

1) Indian giver. We who are not Native Americans know there is a problem with that term.

(LR) That's like saying, "He Jewed me." That gets back to the 50's.

(KW) Well, I've heard that phrase out of the mouths of two people in the last 15 years. One was my child's teacher and the other was my older sister. This stuff did not go away and we have to stop pretending that it did. Obama being the Democratic nominee does not change a damn thing when it comes to the stuff that is happening on the ground. It proves something profound on how this country has changed but it does not prove who we also are. When I say Indian-giver, most people in this country will cringe. They will understand it as a tremendous insult. But I can show you over and over where we use the word Gyp and people don't know where it has come from. First of all, it is capitalized, because it is a reference to Gypsy. Welsh on a bet, Gyp someone, and Dutch-treat, all have the same origins. All came from England as an insult to someone else for a moral flaw. Gypsies steal. The English people thought that people from Wales were not honorable. Dutch-treat; that they are cheap and wouldn't even pay for a meal.

(LR) I always think that Dutch-treat stemmed from the dating scene; and not necessarily a bad thing.

(KW) You probably would not find someone of Dutch descent who would gasp if you said that. But you have to understand where it comes from and then choose to use it. In the US, in the greater Baltimore area is one of the largest populations of Armenian Gypsies in the country and if you went around saying, "Gyp this, Gyp that" there is a good chance you will bump into someone who is a Gypsy and it is a bonified insult. Native Americans are 1% of the American Population. You could use Indian-giver and never hit the ears of a Native American and it is still an insult. That is the point. To go back to the question of the NAACP. We have to know where we came from and that this is about making choices. If you choose to use the phrase, "Jew them down" I don't care because you have made a choice that is informed and you have accepted the consequences of your language. There is no good excuse for, "I didn't know". I can Google these things and learn them in seconds.

(LR) How does a young journalist reach out on racially sensitive topics? Do they ask someone older? Someone of that race?

(KW) I would say that Google is my first answer. The ability to go from ignorance to something in a nanosecond. We don't need more resource; we need more thought and humility. I want my journalists coming out of school thinking that they don't know everything. I want them coming out thinking, "Oh my God, there is so much I don't know". The less confidence they have, the more questions that will be asked and the greater the knowledge they will ultimately wind up with. I'm sitting in the newsroom in New Orleans and someone calls over their shoulder, "Keith, what's that new rap groups called?"

[change tape/lost train of thought]

(KW) I'll give you two examples: Bret Hume used that word (spear-chucker) completely out of any context I understand. What people have suggested is that he really meant spear-holder which is a point man.

(LR) A place of honor in an African tribe.

(KW) Ultimately, in a military sense, the guy who is in front. Spear-chucker came out of his mouth. That's a different issue. Perhaps this kid thinks he using the word spear-holder and what he means is guys who use spears against tanks. And that's what he should have said. But you have to know that you are in this territory to begin with before you have enough sense to stop and question your language. What I find is that I am less certain over time about what I know, when I'm in this arena, and I know a lot now and can go pretty far into a conversation before I hit this point, but when I do, at which I'm not so certain of what I'm going to say, and in those circumstances, I'll do a couple of things; I'll say to the person that I'm speaking to, "I'm in uncomfortable waters, I'm not sure about this." Or I'll ask a question, if I'm talking. If I'm writing, I'll Google. You take a word like spear-chucker and type it in the search box and hit send and you will immediately learn that there is a problem. But you have to know to ask.

(LR) Is that the problem with kids today? Not specifically kids, with any age. If Bret Hume can do it, anyone can do it.

(KW) Sure. Our belief about who we are and our goodness stops us from asking questions. "I am a good person, so I couldn't possibly say anything racist, therefore I don't question the thing I've said or written." What we need is a little less certainty and a little more checking. That's just good journalism, but when we are talking about this subject where your prejudices may arise that you didn't know existed or a slur may come out that you didn't know was a slur, or simple ignorance may make you juxtapose something which then changes the meaning of what you were trying to say. All of those things are possible. Cautionary flags should go up whenever you are dealing with race and ethnicity or any difference. Make sure you are rechecking everything. I tell people all the time that I never spell-check my bi-line. My name is Keith Woods. How can I get that wrong? And yet, I have a clip of my bi-line reading Keith Woods, because I typed too fast and didn't check it. The point is that there are things we are so certain about, it never even occurs to us to check. All my effort to educate on race and ethnicity is really to get

us to question what we think we already know. You said earlier in the conversation that you were referring to the Miami African American community and you said African American may be the wrong term because people may be black and from Haiti, Cuba, etc. I would say to you that there are very few people of black color and we don't question with any vigor our assumptions describing the physical characteristics of a person. In yesterday's Newspaper (LR) The classic bank robber story; 26 year-old black male...

(KW) Yes, the two rapists on the loose in Polk County were described as Hispanic. They may in fact be Hispanic, I'm not questioning that. But what I would present to the journalists, to help me draw the picture, to conjure in my head. It's presented as though it is a true description. The word Hispanic then indicates a specific nose, a particular set of eyes, mouth, hair. Or it doesn't. If it doesn't, what have you told me? If black doesn't actually describe my skin color (and it doesn't) then what did you conjure up in your head when you heard that Keith Woods was a black man and is it the same person who is sitting next to you? If one person heard Hispanic and thought Mexican and yet another thought Columbian, have you seen the same person? And so you haven't told the reader, listener, viewer anything other than heritage.

(LR) If they think that the general public can help, legitimately how should they go about descriptions? Do they say light-skinned Hispanics?

(KW) Do I look Hispanic to you? What about Lebanese or Mexican?

(LR) Yes, you could be all those things.

(KW) My point is if there is a bad guy out there and you told me he had caramel brown skin, dark brown hair with lots of grey on the sides and a mustache, and then you described me. If you told the viewers I was Hispanic, they wouldn't have been able to add anything to that mental picture they didn't already know. What I described was what I look like. The point that I am making is that we think culturally we are all saying the same thing when we say Hispanic, Asian, black or white. We imagine in our heads that we are saying the same thing. If you were to go to the average black neighborhood in America and say, "Tell me about the way the newspaper reports race on TV" they would say, "They always identify the suspect as black when they are black and never white when they are white". That's not true, first of all. I can tell you as a person who has studied this for 20 years, but it is truer than it sounds. 'Never' and 'Always' is always bad. The fact of the matter is, a white journalist describing a white suspect is more likely to use words like, "fair complexion, blonde hair, eyes" etc. because they are familiar enough with the whiteness to not see it as an issue. A black person will be described as black, not light brown or caramel brown as my skin is. That's what the black community picks up when they see this on TV.

(LR) Spike Lee- School Days. That was my first exposure to words like Wannabes and Jigaboos.

(KW) Which is an interesting inter-culture prejudice. That is universality in the world. Go into an Indian community, Japanese, Chinese or black and ask about skin color, and those kinds of delineations exist. I've never figured out if that is because racism is so universal and the white standard is shared around the world, or if it is something worse and that it is just human nature that this portends. Spike Lee hit on it and many people think it is a black thing- to have these opinions of skin with one another. It is a world thing, and I think that for anyone who is interested in race and ethnicity the most mind blowing part of this work (and the best way to come against it) is to see how universal it is. Within the white community, the word 'fair' means pale. The whitest white. "Mirror mirror, on the wall," is about how white you are. So if you are Greek and white, Italian and white, or black Irish, you have experienced the same phenomenon as the black person in New Orleans who is darker than the Creoles. It is only when we see these things in their most individual cases, that we start saying, "you people do these things", well, actually, it's "we people" and that's a universal we. It is helpful when you understand something like that as a journalist. A classic journalistic example is the Reverend Write thing...

(LR) Just to clarify...

(KW) Rev. Jeremiah Wright who said some pretty outlandish things in a Chicago church. Some of it to me was outlandish (like AIDS was a conspiracy), and some of it was not outlandish (regarding racism in America). But it got Obama in all sorts of trouble. What happens if you know nothing, or very little, about churches in America or the world, and if you know even less about black churches in America or the world, then you might think that you just learned something about the black church, by what happened in Chicago. So you had a classic journalistic response that studies the black church and what they called the Wright or Obama church, Black Liberation Theology. If you don't know much, you think you have just discovered the Truth about the black church. The minute that you realize that the church goes around the world and that the African Methodist Episcopal church in the US is a combination of at least 3 different cultures; For the experience of that church, you would have to find the Episcopal European church, the African church (from whichever country in Africa) and the black American experience all combined into one church. It is not the same as going to a black Catholic church. To suggest the black church is a single entity is the height of ignorance and it sends the journalist off onto this search for the black church as though it is something to be found. And there are silly conversations happening on TV in which the white commentator asks the black person to name the black church.

(LR) It's like saying drugs to include aspirin, alcohol, heroin and prescriptions. It's so broad. You are saying the term, 'black church' so broadly; most journalists did not know what they were talking about when it happened. I mostly associate it with A.M.E. mostly because I'm from LA and it is very active, but you mentioned the Black Catholic Experience.

(KW) Yes, but you could go through the list of churches from the Evangelical to the traditional Baptist and the National Baptist Convention which has its own bi-lines and behaviors. Some black churches have bishops and higher, some don't. The notion that you have captured the one thing from a church in Chicago is simply ignorant.

(LR) It's a tiny microcosm.

(KW) What's important to recognize every time we think we are about to say something profound about a people, we should step back and say, "Let's make sure this isn't true for all of us in some other way". The boomerang of the Wrights story was the rediscovery of the guy who kept repeating Ocala's middle name, Hussein, and was endorsing McCain. I can't remember his name, a white pastor who was given to saying nutty things from the pulpit regularly. At what point do you launch the investigation into the white church?

(LR) And what the hell is the white church?

(KW) It's so much easier to see that as a white journalist, then going out and then seeing the absurdity of searching for the black church. I try to say every time- there are some real nut cases running around the black church. Well, let's talk about the white churches. Are there any nut cases there? I try to pull away from the immediate assumption that this is a racist thing, that this is a truth about a culture. We do this with Muslims, Arabs, Latinos, Mexicans and other various groups as soon as we find out they are doing those things we assume it is exclusive to that culture.

(LR) Particularly Muslim. I don't know what it's like to be Muslim and I can only imagine that...

(KW) It's harder than ever before. And the Japanese will say, "Hey, we know this experience". The Germans (not talked about a lot) that were rounded up in the US in WWII. They weren't put in the same concentration camps as the Japanese, but they know something about being rounded up by virtue of some unchangeable part of your constitution. What you have to be able to do in any of these events is help people understand immediately that this problem has a context and it's not whether we are safe from the terrorists (and only about that), it's about how we react as a nation and what we've learned, or haven't from previous experiences. If your able to do that as a journalist, you're able to tell a better story than if you don't know, and you haven't spent time with the comparative history of the forced march of Native Americans on to reservations, the Chinese Exclusion Act as a reaction to the immigration and exportation of Chinese to build the railroad in the US, the legislation against Mexicans in the early 20th century. Germans in the US who were captured and interrogated in the US while Hitler was marching across the border. If you don't know what happened in the Yellow Peril, not just the removal of the Japanese but the disenfranchisement, the stealing of their land, all of the other things that happened as a result of this period. If you know none of that then you don't understand the American reaction and the incarceration of Muslims after 9/11.

(LR) I was a history minor in college. Would you recommend journalism major or is it a waste of time?

(KW) Well, I failed history. I hated history, until I had a phenomenal teacher in a summer course and here's what he did; He inserted pieces of history that were left out. Things that were fascinating, and interesting, into the whole of our history. The thing about our history is this; We have not in our country, not made it a habit to tell the most embarrassing things about ourselves, so you may know some important things in history, but unless you pursue some of this...The Tuskegee experiment (<http://www.tuskegee.edu/Global/Story.asp?s=1207598>) was in none of the history books I read. I didn't make that up. And it's influence on someone like Rev. Wright is profound. A man who knows that the US is engaged in experiments on humans without their knowledge...A man who knows that has reason to believe that AIDS could be government sponsored genocide. A man who doesn't know that, would think that Rev. Wright is nuts. I don't think what he believes is true, but I can understand how he came to believe it. That's Tuskegee and most people don't know about this, even though the revelation came out in the Clinton administration. When his energy secretary revealed that these experiments were preformed mostly on the poor and Hispanic people of the southwest, experimentation that involved nuclear testing; no book that I ever read, even in books that were specific to this, for example, I read a book called 'The Underside of History' which explored the Yellow Peril in ways I have never read before.

(LR) My brother is an historian and has written 3 books and one is titled, 'A Contradiction to Brokaw's Greatest Generation'. He was trying to prove-not so much.

(KW) Brokaw's greatest generation was telling of WWII and has left out all of these atrocities we were engaged in. Also, black people were left out of the story in any meaningful way. The 555, Triple Nickel Jumpers...you have to go find that history, it's nowhere. WWII veterans who served overseas, they just get left out.

(LR) My dad used to talk about that.

(KW) To come around, if you don't know this and don't even know you don't know it, you are dangerous as a journalist when something has to be placed in context. And you're dangerous as a journalist when you continue the story of history and leave these things out.

(LR) Their lack of knowledge gets amplified because they have this marvelous platform of computer, print or broadcast and their amplifying the wrongs, not ten-fold but a million times over?

(KW) Sure. There was a period in Georgia (possible South Carolina?) when the Confederate flag, was discussed removing it from the State House. For a piece, that story raged and I collected clips (narratives) about that piece. And the most remarkable thing

about the narrative of that Confederate flag, over time, the idea that there was never anything malevolent about its existence, or racial about its connection, perpetuated, first by the proponents of members of the Confederacy and then by the journalists. Now if you don't know the story of the Civil War and the secession of the South and the issues that prompted that secession. If you don't know the degree in which the Confederate flag was carried forward from reconstruction and beyond as a symbol of holding onto the principals of the old South- If you don't know any of those things, and this guy from Tampa comes to you 3,4 months ago and says, "This is only about remembering our heritage and we just want to honor our heritage" Now you have a Confederate flag flying over the intersection of I-4 and 275, on private property, just North of downtown Tampa, as a reminder of that heritage. As a journalist, if you don't know this other stuff then you simply mouth the proponent's side and opponent's side as equal truth and you add nothing to it. By giving them equal value, you essentially inflate the value of the lie.

(LR) Most black journalists or black friends of mine, when we talk about race, the biggest thing that they object to from the news stations is the lack of reaching out for the black spokesperson. On a national level, there is Al Sharpton or Jesse Jackson and hardly anyone else. What's your advice for journalists to get someone to represent an entire group?

(KW) The first flaw is that, I don't know the person who can finish the sentence, "Black people think..." We are constantly going off to find that person and he or she doesn't exist. So I would say, "Try to stop finishing that sentence." No amount of polling could answer that question. If you were to call me as a source, I would say I know something about race relations...

(LR) The Don Imus story comes to mind.

(KW) Right. I know something about race and ethnicity. You want to talk to me about race and why what Don Imus said is problematic, call me. Only because I've given it a thought or two. I have a context to add to that subject matter. Ask only that of me and you have a good story. Go a step further and say, "Why do you think black people are upset about that?" and now you've asked me to step past what I know. I can tell you why I think what he said was offensive, but I won't step into reading the minds of a whole nation of people. Our first problem is trying to find a spokesperson in the first place. If you're looking for the person who is in front of the issue, if Jesse is leading a campaign against Anheiser Busch, you have to talk to Jesse. If Al is leading a march in New York, you have to talk to Al. If Bill O'Reilly turns to Al when trying to explain some stupid thing he said on TV, you have to talk to Al. That is a good guy to talk to. You don't want to turn to Jesse to explain black America. Ever. You want to talk about the Civil Rights issues, Jesse has got some props. You want to talk to someone who has the constituency that represents something. Jesse and Al do. So does the huge Dallas preacher (massive church- couldn't remember his name). But talk to him about what he thinks he knows and that's where we mess up over and over. We leave the realm.

(LR) There is a joke amongst cameramen that if there are more than two cameras in the area, Jesse is there. He is very media accessible. LA is burning, riots, all that and Jesse walks the walk on Civil Rights. This was about the Rodney King beating and white officers.

(KW) We begin with Jesse. The question to Jesse is not about Rodney King being beaten and the white officers being exonerated. It is the history of civil rights and black men in the courts. That is a broad context in which he is uniquely qualified to provide a position. If you're talking to Jesse about that, I'm fine. The problem I have is when you assume that he is only person that knows that history, and therefore you feel compelled to go to him, and when you don't recognize there is so much more to that story and he's not the guy to tell you about it. What's simmering in Simi Valley, to what's happening in south central LA all that is peculiar to that place, all of which has a whole collection of people who can talk about it?

(LR) Like Cecil Murray...Biggest AME church and he's the go-to guy to chat to about issues of race.

(KW) I did this very unscientific experiment with my journalists once. I said in a seminar, "If you are about to do a story on race (and I'm not going to be any more definitive than that), who do you go to first?" They immediately began with a black minister followed by a civil rights lion (Urban League, NAACP). Here is the flaw in our thinking on those fronts. The flaw is to assume that the most knowledgeable person is the most accessible and most articulate. That is not necessarily so. If you were in New Orleans and you went to the black minister in a catholic city, you've missed a good portion of the black population in New Orleans who do not belong to the traditional black Protestant church.

(LR) Yet, when you think of Catholic, you think of the Irish, Spanish,

(KW) Only because that's what you know. Catholicism is multi-cultural, it's Vietnamese in parts of Houston and New Orleans, it's Somalia in Minneapolis...

(LR) But it's 2:00pm and the boss needs a sound bite to be on air that night about what Don Imus said. Don't you, by lack of choice, have to go to the most accessible?

(KW) It's because you've created the lack of choice. That's the vicious cycle of journalism, the Catch-22. I don't know a source, I need a source, the best source is the guy I already know, and I'll just use him. The problem is that you assume it should be that way in the first place and then you don't have to build your Rolodex over time and the rest of the knowledge over time. I would push on another front. I'm not successful at this, but I'll say it anyway. When Dom Imus said what he said, there were some black women who were pissed and you want to go talk to them.

(LR) Members of the team?

(KW) Well, just being a black woman being called a nappy-headed ho, you tapped into something that they ought to speak to. There are some historians, like Cornell West or Shelby Steele, who will understand immediately the contextual problem of a white man referring to a black woman that way and can provide that. Those two things are true and I'd venture that a black person would be able to explain that knowledge to you better than a white person. However, if you ask whether or not it was offensive and to whom, as a black man, I'm offended. As a black man, I was offended when John McCain referred to the Japanese as gooks on the bus during the 2004 campaign. Come talk to me too. Don't just go to the black people because it seems that it is only an offense to black people. There are Asians that are pissed that Don Imus said that. There are Native Americans and white men who are pissed. One of the problems that we have is that the News Director says "Get me a story" –well, the story that everyone will have, will be with the minister and Jesse and Cornell. Everyone will have that. Go get me the story that includes the people who I never hear saying surprising things. Now we have a story no one else has.

(LR) Would it be a female coach on a girl's basketball team?

(KW) A white coach of girls or boys. A national coach of NBA of any race. A white guy who understands who saw "School Daze". By the way, they reference that movie. If you keep listening to Imus, he says Jigaboo. Go find me somebody who saw "School Daze" and gets it immediately but isn't a black person. It's counter-intuitive and the reason the Rolodex keeps spinning is not just because the predominate white newsroom only knows a handful of black people (that is one of the problems)... You have to step back. That's the way you do every story. If it's a story about playgrounds, I'm going to find the same old folks being interviewed and it is endemic to the way we do our journalism, not just the way we cover black people. If a news director wants change, you don't just change the way you cover black people, Asians, Latinos, you change the way you cover folk, so that you are not always going to the same place, for the same quotes from the same people. You just got to stop it.

It's Ok if you quote one of those folks in the story, especially if you get jammed up. But if you can stop and say, "Who can we get for this story that no one expects to hear from?" and then go out and find that voice, you will wind up with a story that goes beyond everyone else's story. We recognize that going to the same old folks is just checking off boxes and if you recognize that pattern, then I bet so does your audience and they are bored by it. I find stories with new voices much more interesting. Everyone *does* in fact, have a story, everyone has a view and a perspective, not just the people who are most clearly implicated as would a black woman in the Imus story.

(LR) How do you define prejudice to the girl who grew up in Iowa from a small town with 5% Hispanic, 5% black? How do you do it to someone who hasn't walked the walk?

(KW) Everyone's experienced it, depending on how you are trying to teach someone. What you are looking for is their connection to the experience, whatever that is. Prejudice by itself (or bigotry) is universal but its effect on individuals based on race, is not. Many girls know the experience of weight or size as a bias, and they know their own internal

reactions. They also know the visceral reaction (a reaction that I have before I can stop it) I may have to someone who is heavy or skinny, to someone who is blonde or brunette, or who I think is pretty or not. If I want you to understand prejudice, I take you to someplace universal first and then to the specific place. Interesting thing that I talk about with language; I'll often make the point with language (and what we bring to it) by asking a white woman and a black woman a question. "What happens to your hair when you get a perm?" The white woman will say it's curled and the black woman will say it's straightened. It's a simple truth. Black women don't even use the word perm, even though the box says perm. The word perm means opposite things depending on who spoke it and who heard it. If you want to push people to recognize that intention is all that matters, you need to see the difference between intention and outcome in something as simple as language. I intended for you to think curly and you thought straight. That's an upside down from of communication. When I work with people, I throw stuff at the wall until I hit something, because no two people access this the same way. If you understand prejudice, I can move forward, but if I have to start with something as simple as that, then that's where I start. You can't expect everyone to be in the same place.

(LR) How are kids of that age (under 25) in your classrooms getting it right and getting it wrong in regards to race and their journalism skills?

(KW) I might come across as pessimistic here... There are some major sins, the old stuff (chauvinism and bigotry) is recognizable to them and most of that is gone. The enduring things have either sustained themselves or gotten worse and it's because of how we think or rationalize. Over time our opinion has become fact in some important areas and the failure to think through and to challenge our assumptions about ethnic groups (and this extends to other areas, it doesn't just have to do with race). Example: Identifying people by race goes unchallenged in their minds.

(LR) But how can you not identify someone by their color if they commit a crime and the public needs to be on the look-out?

(KW) My color is brown. My race is black. We've made color and race synonymous and they are not. Yes, we are looking for a man with light brown skin, and dark eyes. That's a description. If you are looking for a black man, who are you looking for? What does he look like? I'm trying to shift that very fundamental paradigm so that when people say color, mean color, and when they say race, mean race. Two men of one race attacking another man of another race (because they didn't like people of that race) is a racial story, not a color story. A black man and a white man. It doesn't matter that one was caramel brown and one was fair complected. Their race is what made their story significant. It was bigotry that was behind their actions. The guys who attacked James Bird and dragged him behind their truck: White men who had hatred for black men. Their race and his race are important to the story. If two black men attack a white man because he was alone and vulnerable and wouldn't matter if he was white, Hispanic or black...it's not a story about race. It's a story about two men, one with ebony skin, one with mahogany skin who attacked a man who was fair complected.

(LR) I'm trying to apply it to the Matthew Sheppard story, who got attacked clearly because of his sexual preference.

(KW) On another soapbox issue for me (and the Matthew Sheppard story is a good example, although it has gotten muddled over time): If we assume the basic facts for this story are true, that the men who attacked him did so based on his sexual orientation. Let me give you two constructions to that story;

- 1) She was raped because she was wearing a short dress.
- 2) She was raped because the men were looking for a victim.

One puts the blame on the woman for the size of her dress and the other puts the blame on the men for their actions.

Let's go to Matthew Sheppard.

- 1) He was attacked because he was gay.
- 2) He was attacked because they hated gays.

The construction is identical to the rape construction but we tossed that language out years ago as journalists. It assumes that they couldn't help themselves. "If she hadn't been wearing that damn dress, she would have been fine." The problem must not be the dress at all. I've never had anything happen to me because I am black other than I tan slower than white people. Everything else that has happened to me has been because of the motive of the person acting. Matthew Sheppard was attacked because he was gay. Where's the perpetrator? You've absolved the perpetrator of responsibility of the act and all the blame by default goes to the other person. If he wasn't gay, he'd be fine.

(LR) So that silly Matthew Sheppard was attacked because he was gay so therefore it's his fault. Because he chooses to be gay, he had the attack coming.

(KW) They couldn't help themselves. The rest of that story is the perpetrator said, "Well, he propositioned us." Well, that justifies it. "You should have killed him." The simple switch is the construction; James Bird was not attacked because he was black. James Bird was black every blessed day of his life and no one dragged him behind a truck and then one day someone did. If it was because he was black, he would be getting dragged behind trucks everyday of his life. This is the most important thing; if I force you to change the structure; you have to know more because now I've said to you, "No, it's the motive of the person acting." Now you have to know that he hated gays, and if you can't write that, you didn't have a story in the first place. It's not about sensitivity, it's about accuracy, precision and facts (especially around issues of race) and we drift away and get into the universe of opinion and assumption, which would fall apart in most other journalism.

(LR) I did a story about post-riot LA, how one store in the middle of the burn zone didn't burn. It was owned by a Korean store keeper and he had hired a black person to be his

right arm. The black person determined who got loans for food, and made sure that people got their necessities. We got into cultural differences such as a Korean in their culture would put the change on the counter so that the black person would have to take the change, whereas a white to black transaction would be to put the change in the person's hand so there is contact. Also, the Koreans hire their family to work the store, but they didn't live in the riot zone, they lived in Korea town. The story is all about this one shopkeeper whose store did not burn because he had the foresight to hire a black man and because he gave out scholarships to the kids in the neighborhood.

(KW) You have to look for the story around it for the complexities that it presents. Here are some truths about LA and blacks and Koreans in that community. It is true that there is resentment in many black communities around the country when another group (Vietnamese, Korean, and Arab) come in and own what the community members couldn't.

(LR) But they also provide services that the community members can't.

(KW) They take over groceries and other stores and it's a reminder of what hasn't been achieved or achievable. Just a simmering irrational, misplaced resentment. Then you have the cultural differences. If you go beyond the change example, (I'm speaking out of my element here) and this is observational...The way people communicate (in some cases of people who are not native to this country) sometimes sounds like a harsh way of speaking. So you don't touch my hand and now you have this abrasive tone. Some of those things are innocent and misunderstood and many groups (Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Africans) come to this country with biases of their own. There is a Sambo's restaurant in Japan which tells you what might be lingering in that country in the view of black Americans. You saw what happened with the Argentineans and Spaniards with the slanty-eyed pictures they took. The notion that prejudice is the domain of only one group against another is simply wrong. Everybody's got something about somebody else. The black person who feels like he's being watched by the Korean shop keeper, maybe in fact is feeling what he thinks he's feeling. All of that comes into the story. You can't tell the story based on a simple, "Yes, you are, no, I'm not" way that most journalists want to tell the story. The truth is, "Yes, and...I am not what you think I am...and I am." The same is true about the people who are coming into the grocery. "I am not a shoplifter and yet..." You may be afraid of shoplifters and it's a rational fear, but you've applied it universally to all of us.

(LR) This blew up specifically in LA with the [Leticia Holloway sp?] case. The Korean shop keeper accidentally (or not) shot and killed a young 14 year-old girl. That was the kindling for the LA riots because it literally spoke to the Korean vs. black pressure in these communities.

(KW) Let's take intention vs. accident out of the question. If your response to shoplifting is to lift a gun, my fear of your nervousness is justified. My sense that you don't trust is profoundly justified by your action. And everyone feels vindicated. "I told you that they stole." "I told you that they hate us." The journalist needs to climb into the middle of that

and tell the complex story of the victim being the perpetrator and the perpetrator being the victim.

(LR) We use the term ‘they’ but the truth is that this is just one woman behind the counter and one teenage girl shoplifting. It’s not the whole black population or the whole Korean population.

(KW) Talk about adding context to the story...The context of the LA riots is this story and a hundred other small stories like this. You may not be able to draw a line between this event and that event or say, “If not for this event, that wouldn’t happen” but you can provide an assemblage of information well reported that demonstrates these things were kindling and they didn’t help when this thing sparked. You don’t get there unless you are open enough. One of the three elements in these stories is complexity (the other two being context and voice). You have to go in saying it’s probably not as simple as I think.

Let’s go back to the Don Imus story. I’d like to challenge how that story is viewed. You have two white men (Imus and his producer) marveling at a black women’s basketball team and making a clear racial slur. People didn’t hear all the way to the end of that sentence to hear (what I’m convinced of as a sexual orientation slur) the words ‘hardcore ho’- a suggestion that they are lesbians.

(LR) I thought it just meant street-tough.

(KW) It could be. Or it could be the word means ‘total’ but I believe that they were using the word for lesbian and would have used the word ‘dyke’ if they could have gotten away with it. That’s my view. I would have interrogated the story a little more to find out if I was right, but no one bothered to ask these questions. Were they making a racial slur? As you listen to them talk, particularly Imus, you hear the reference to Jigaboos and Wannabes. A white man saying Jigaboo?

(LR) In 2007? Spike Lee movie. He knew enough to cite it. He understood that when he’s making the distinction between girls (there are mostly black women on this court) and so when he talks about the other team being more attractive...he’s not saying that white women are more attractive than black women (although that may be in there somewhere)- suddenly they are talking about Jigaboos and Wannabes which was the competition between the dark skin girls and the bright skin girls in ‘School Daze’. He knows enough about this that he can cite it at this level. Is he making the same kind of slur as a white man who knew none of that and pulled out ‘nappy-headed ho’?

(LR) No, because he was making a cultural reference on a movie.

(KW) The complexity of that bite was far more than the fairly narrow context in which it was debated, because it served everybody well to keep it that tightly focused. It isn’t the truth (now let me be clear on this- He shouldn’t have said it, he deserved to lose his job). Sorry, you’re on national radio. You can’t afford stupidity on that level, but have I declared that he’s the bigot he appears to be? You have hardly proven that, because there is too much else surrounding it. I think our job in journalism around race and ethnicity is

to recognize every time the complexity that goes beyond the conflict in front of you. The context is necessary to understand the conflict. If you don't provide it, people provide their own and they are usually wrong. So your story with Steve in which the woman reveals her prejudice about her son-in-law...

(LR) Geraldine Spring.

(KW) Is a complex story because she's a good woman. You feel that the whole time you're talking to her and then she reveals this thing to you and all of the sudden, she's not a good woman any more. But she is still the same woman she was before she opens the drawer and pulls out the picture. So what do you do with that? Journalistically, you have to understand her context. Who is she, where did she come from, how did she wind up here, to understand this moment. You have to accept the notion of complexity because the granddaughter still loves her grandmother and the in-law has a relationship with her. How can that be, knowing what we know? It is complex and you need to understand context to understand fact.

Voice is the piece that I left out of it and that is only about making sure that people are heard, and you're not just talking about them. If you are talking about the black community, you should be having a conversation with them. If it's a story about Koreans, you are speaking to them. Those three pieces come from the book (insert plug here) that we did called, The Authentic Voice.

(LR) That will be attached to your chapter. Any other advice you have for students of color, interns of color, and journalists of color (or not)? Are you just saying your overall advice is when it comes to issues of race; it doesn't hurt to Google it and it helps to get another voice or two inside the newsroom?

(KW) Humility. Know enough that you don't know enough and act on that. Learning and setting yourself on a course of learning is huge. One of my biggest lessons as a teacher is having patience with you. I have become a better teacher as I have learned worse things about me. Our task as teachers is not to demand that students meet us where we are, but to meet them wherever they are. If you are still trying to figure out why black people get so upset with the 'N' word, but black people say it themselves, then I can't bring you along further in the conversation to where I am. I got that covered a long time ago. "How come you can talk about your sister, and I can't? It's the same thing". I want to say-get over it and move on, but I can't. If that's where you are, then that's where I'll go and spend our time. It's the same way when you are interviewing someone. For example, Geraldine Spring. She is where she is, and you see it clearly for what it is. Even she does. She's living uncomfortably with her bias. You can't go in and say, "Why can't you not be this way?" You go in and say, "Who are you now and how do you feel about that?"

(LR) Since clearly race hasn't gone away, then why aren't we covering issues of race until it blows up?

(KW) I think it is very hard, and we don't do very hard, very well. I talked to Steve while he was teaching a seminar on broadcasting 6 or 7 years ago. We were back in the amphitheatre and Steve had shown a few stories. One about the elderly black woman who fed people at her church (Suzanne Lee) and the story about the little girl who was in the country illegally (Amy Mendoza). I turn to Steve and I ask, "How do you suggest that journalists get to these kinds of stories?" My group was covering race relations and his group is covering power broadcasting and we are meeting for the first time that night. Steve says, "I don't think everybody can do what I do" but this is not arrogance. What he says then is, "I hear some of the worst things come out of the mouths of people that you would here anywhere, and they won't say those things in front of a lot of people, especially people of color" which played to gasps in the room. How come I don't see it on TV if it happens as frequently as you say it does? His answer (and I've heard this from other journalists) was- It wasn't the story. It wasn't the story because he essentially decided it wasn't the story. It could be the story every time, but who wants that? The problem is that Geraldine Spring stands out as an anomaly. Even to herself, she seems that way if she watches E.H.A.S. because nobody else talks that way.

We create journalistically, our own (now this is just my view) next surprise and then report it as if we had nothing to do with it. We create the next O.J. moment and then are aghast as anyone else. We see things differently in this country. Look at how the white people reacted to the verdict and how the black people reacted to the verdict. You would have known that without equivocation had we covered race relations the way they should every day.

(LR) I'm not blowing my own horn, that was a high point for me and Steve, when Andre Jones, the black CNN journalist said we did more in three minutes with the Geraldine story than 'Black in America'. He watched 'Black in America' and just shrugged his shoulders and said OK. He referred to Geraldine as that woman, who didn't like brothers, but he was being grateful to Geraldine and we were too, because it finally showed the America she grew up in, how she felt and her struggles.

(KW) I would not hang this problem on Steve's door or yours and say, "You're out there every day; you have got to be the one." However, I would say that the truth that you know needs to be told because you know it and someone else doesn't. While I wouldn't make the guy with the chicken suit about race, at some point though, this garbage, this junk called 'Black in America' that CNN put on TV, has to be improved by the journalist who knows the whole truth. A series about being black in America that only talks to blacks and is about prejudice is a screwed-up series. The victim talking about being victimized, well, where's the journalism in that? If something exists, prove it. Go talk to the victim and perpetrator or disprove it. But if I've got a bunch of people saying, "This happened to me, that happened to me" and then another bunch of people saying, "No it didn't, no it didn't" what have I learned? Nothing. I just have my opinion which is what I had before you showed me that crap. You (Les Rose) have been out talking to America. I would say, "Tell me that story in a big way for a 'Race in America' series, but do it based on what you now know. Pull all those bites together that ended up on the cutting room floor."

(LR) Do you think there is truth to what Steve said? Andre mentioned it today. Do you think that Geraldine would have had that conversation if Steve had a black photographer? Or if Steve had been black, could she have shared her feelings?

(KW) This is where I think he is most wrong. The huge lie in American culture regarding race, is that no one wishes to talk about it. It's all we want to talk about. We are preoccupied with it beyond words as a nation. What I need is an opportunity. I have heard some incredibly harsh, rub-the-skin-off-your-body, raw things said to me in talking to people about race in South Africa (I guess it shouldn't surprise me that it happened in South Africa). Remarkable things said to me about people who look like me. This happened in the Antilleans with white people I interviewed. Here's the thing. It's like a person who speaks Spanish talking to another person who speaks Spanish. The advantage they have walking through the door is that they remove the linguistic barrier and that's it. Everything else they still have to prove. They walk in with a little bit of advantage. A white person walking into a conversation with another white person about bigotry walks in with an advantage that a black, Latino, Asian doesn't have, but that's it. Your skill is everything else. Your ability to make me feel like I want to have a conversation with you, and your ability to ask the right questions, that's the whole kit and caboodle. I have no doubt that I'm as qualified a journalist right now to get out there and find that story. I may need 10 extra minutes or 5 extra questions than you, but I'll get to it. I have the eternal faith that you want to talk to me. You want to talk to me about you and you want to talk to me about us and we may stumble because you'll be conscience of your language. You may say 'blaab' instead of black because you are trying to figure out if it's appropriate to say black. I shared a fence with a woman for 5 years (an 81 year-old Polish immigrant) who would inform me of the happenings of all the black people in the neighborhood on a regular basis and said things like, "I told the Garden Club that you were OK". No self-consciousness with this conversation. I believe that this is a testament to my ability to make her comfortable enough to speak to me, and once we are there, we are there. I could have that conversation with Geraldine so easily...

(LR) Just as we did with Suzanne Lee even though we only touched upon race a little.

(KW) I would say that the consequences for a black person asking a white person about race are not nearly as severe as a white person asking a black person about race. Most of the time a black person is talking about injustice and the only person implicated in that conversation is a white person. When it's the other way around (the black person interviewing Geraldine) she has to deal with the guilt and the possibility a judgment will come from the person sitting next to her. White people have told me this story for years, of getting into a taxicab with a white driver and having them espouse the most bigoted things about New Orleans they have ever heard and the reason the cabby felt comfortable talking to the white person is the faulty assumption that the person is safe and will not judge him, and that a black person is not safe and will judge. In a conversation about race, that is the mountain, the hill or speed bump the reporter has to climb. Everybody has a version of this. A man talking to a woman-not so sure he's going to get into it with her, a rich person to a poor person, going to the Appalachians and having an educated

white person talk to the locals. There is distrust at the beginning of the conversation they have to overcome.

My push back to Steve on that point was, if you look at it with a narrow context...

TAPE ENDS.

APPENDIX F

Crocker Snow Jr., Author and Director of the Edward R. Murrow Center for Public Diplomacy at Tufts University response to my email from October 25, 2009.

jjflashla@aol.com wrote:

Dear Professor Snow,

You were recommended to me from Professor Barney McCoy at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. I am writing a thesis on Murrow and would love to have your views and remarks to be part of my research.

I have just a few questions, and it would make my thesis (entitled "Edward R. Murrow: Life, Legacy, and Broadcast Ethics Today) more enriching for the future generation. As a CBS News staff employee, I greatly respected Murrow and his work, but wanted to know > a great deal more.

Here are just a few questions for your consideration about Murrow and broadcast news ethics:

- 1) Murrow never actually wrote down his views on ethics but led by example. The famed RTNDA "lights in a box" speech came close, but what do you think were his priorities with good journalism practice and ethics?
- 2) Do you see those same journalistic principles being applied today?
- 3) Are ethical standards in broadcast journalism today being followed, abused, or ignored? Please consider and compare local news, network news, and cable news. Also, what is your perception of Fox News and ethical standards?
- 4) Your thoughts and insights on Murrow: his ethics, legacy, and personal story. What made Murrow /Murrow? /Is his level of ethics > still applicable today? Does he have an influence on the current crop of journalists?

THANKS so very much! I appreciate your time and consideration with this.
Les Rose, CBS News, Los Angeles (and UNL Grad Student)

From: Crocker Snow <crocker.snow@tufts.edu>
to: jjflashla@aol.com
Sent: Wed, Nov 4, 2009 8:58 am
Subject: Re: Murrow's legacy and standard of ethics
Mr. Rose,

Nice to get your query. Here are my answers to your questions (I believe I sent this 10 days ago, but found it in my drafts box, so maybe not):

1. Murrow started as an educator and from a Quaker background. So I think the notions of fairness and integrity balance and integrity were well ingrained. It's these valuable notions that informed his priorities on good journalism practice and ethics.

2. Rarely. Most journalism today borders on infotainment. The combination of excessive competition due to multiple media sources and limited spans of public attention is the reason why. Remember Murrow virtually had the field to himself when he made his name as a broadcaster during the Battle of Britain, so he could define 'best practice' based on his own ethics and his personal best practice.

3. Wow, I'm no longer a broadcaster per se, but rather a consumer thereof. I think most broadcast news persons, though a diminishing number, try to follow proper broadcast ethics and standards for objectivity and fairness, but the competitive pressures internally (for air time) and externally (for their medium and network or station) coupled with commercial pressures mitigates against this. It's clear that the line between reportage and analysis, commentary and punditry are blurred in most online media and increasingly in broadcast media, be it local, regional or national. I believe that CNN, BBC and yes Al Jazeera make the best effort at proper ethics, and local news organizations for the most part leave that up to the big boys.

4. What made Murrow Murrow is the rare combination of his almost Calvinist upbringing, curiosity, international interest and sensitivity, nose for news - and for news sources - and the fine platform he had to exercise and display all this, initially with CBS Radio and then TV at the height of their powers. As earlier, he had the rare advantage early on of having the London beat almost to himself. And he was an educator deep down so did not pander to his audience. All these attributes gave him the confidence to let his own passions show through as a cosmetic of his reporting if not the meat and potatoes of it.

I hope this is helpful, Crocker Snow
Director, Edward R. Murrow Center
The Fletcher School

APPENDIX G

Terry McCarthy, Los Angeles bureau Correspondent CBS News, August 10, 2009 4pm PST on the I-5 freeway (recorded on a Sony XD camera) northbound on the way back from an assignment. Time code numbers included here from original disc.

00:00:50 ROSE: Please give us a synopsis of your career as a journalist.

00:00:53 Terry McCarthy (TM) I started out as a newspaper reporter. My first foreign experience was Central America in the mid 1980s. Then I was in London for a year and half...in Bangkok for four and a half years for a paper, then in Tokyo for another 3 and a half years...came to NY and joined Time Magazine...in 1997...they sent me to China I was in Shang Hai for two years...and in 2000 came to LA where I was the bureau chief.

00:01:40 ROSE: LA bureau chief for Time?

00:01:42 TM: until 2000 to 2005. Then I joined ABC News 2006-08, and in 2009 I joined CBS News.

00:02:05 ROSE: We can start with the foreign press. The topic of my thesis is Edward R. Murrow (and ethics). Murrow seems to have some of the highest ethics in broadcasting and he was one of the architects. You had a couple of stories of foreign press ethics...

00:02:47 TM:I would say that in the United Kingdom which is the foreign press that I know the best...ethics are significantly lower than they are in the US. People are addicted to staging, by which we mean and I have seen this with reporters and photographers in conflict areas getting soldiers to pose as if they are in a battle, when they are several miles from the front line...I saw that in Afghanistan. And the British press is also particularly the tabloids is known for paying for information. There are several problems about the Japanese press as well. I was in Japan as well...they do that too. It inflates the market: once people are used to being paid for interviews then they want money from everyone. That shuts out a lot of people (ed note: CBS News does NOT pay for interviews, McCarthy's (and my) employer).

00:04:01 ROSE Is this mostly broadcast?

00:04:04 TM: I am talking across the board now. But print media is probably worse. It also you get to the stage where people will tell you what you want to hear. And it almost leads to...some sort of sponsored speaker kind of scenario. Just not what we are doing...the newspapers...different kinds of newspapers have a pretty bad reputation for sometimes just making stuff up or completely blowing stories out of context so that what was originally said or done appears in newspapers something completely different. At least there is a pretty contentious relationship in the UK between consumers of media and journalists. Generally regarded as pretty unreliable. (muffled) there is some of that in the US I think it is less...It is also worth point out that going to J school is a lot more

common in the US than it is in Europe. Most journalists in the UK...uh, I don't know where they come from...start out as freelancers and pick it up and make mistakes as they go along. There aren't any J schools...so there aren't any people going to J schools...

00:05:35 TM: I am not sure if that contributes to a sense of or a greater sense of reticence. By in large I would say that a lot of the journalistic ethics in the US are higher than...overseas. I think that in the US I would say network news has greater reliability than some print media. Generally the evening shows are better than the morning shows...morning shows pushing to get lighter material and they can be pretty unscrupulous when it comes to booking guests or stealing guests and there are always problems with stealing pictures and matter...they kinda push the envelope more in the morning.

00:06:29 TM: One of my previous employers Time Magazine taught me the value of fact checking which is now not that common in newspapers. They just don't have time they are turning over a lot of text...very quickly on a daily basis they don't have time to fact check every single story...Time Magazine when I worked there in 1997-2005 every single item that would appear in print was checked not only by two editors, a senior editor and a top editor but then also by a fact checker. There are several levels of control over what was reported in the magazine.

00:07:18 TM: I would say that the proliferation of blogs and so-called news sites on line some of which are good some of which are not have contributed to a lowering of standards that we in mainstream media as we are sometimes called must pay attention at all costs. Because why it might be fun to throw something up on the blog because it sounds sensational or outrageous or interesting....for an established news organization to follow that...without properly confirming...are severely in danger of franchising...takes years to develop that.

00:08:22 TM: I think it was 60 Minutes Morley Safer whose quote was, "I don't trust a citizen journalist any more than I trust a citizen surgeon." Are you along those lines or do you feel different?

00:08:36 TM: I think that citizen journalists...how do you define...people that see things happen in front of their eyes...the other day we saw some very startling footage taken of the London underground bombings taken by cell phone videos just because people were there and there were no TV crews there. I think people who call up those stations with stories can have usefulness.

00:09:22 TM: There is also the danger that...when you...are in a situation as a potential victim of a terrorist attack or plane incident or bank robbery or whatever it might be...your view is...you are pretty much centered on yourself and your own experience...trying to survive the particular situation...plane incident or bank robbery or whatever it might be. Your judgment gets a bit clouded. I think it is important not to devalue people's

experiences...citizen journalists bring freshness to the perspective...and to realize they might not be getting the whole point of the story.

10:08:11TM: ... and I think that is the key thing...that journalists ALWAYS need to keep in mind that there are always at least two sides of the story. Some things you think are absolutely clear cut. There is a bad guy...did something really bad...there is always a reason why he did things. That's what journalists...professional journalists...bring to the craft that citizen journalists are not trained to do. Now surgeons...a whole 'nother scale, I don't think anyone would attempt to take out an appendix on the street...citizen journalists have a role to play but lack training.

00:10:50 ROSE: Many times it is not two sides of the story it is several several sides of the story. Was Murrow your moral compass...did you study him in college?

00:11:10 TM: I never studied journalism. What I explained to you...I had the European model...I started out as a freelancer...but I know who he (Murrow) is and I know his reputation...I think in those early days of broadcasting he certainly served as a benchmark...because...let's not get misty eyed about this: journalists have forever been peddling stories that were snake oil...go back to the 1800s...newspapers in those days were essentially rags for the owners for their political or commercial or whatever...so its not like we come from a golden age...and our standards as journalists...have always been susceptible to pressures of those times. I think Murrow brought a...of course he was grounded in very solemn times...the Second World War...reporting the news was a very serious business.

00:12:27 ROSE: Speaking of war, you mentioned earlier an incident in which a journalist tried to make it appear things that were not (the war zone and the photographer). Can you think of any other examples of just things that stand out..

00L12:47 TM: Oh, atrocious stuff. people in Afghanistan...people paying artillery crews to fire off shells so they could get them on air...get them on film. These shells could blow...could kill someone...the fact that a journalist would pay for that to happen to me is beyond belief.

00:13:17 ROSE: These were American journalists?

00:13:21 TM: Nyet.

00:13:33 TM: The circus in Cambodia with the Japanese journalists was famous...first time Japanese soldiers were posted overseas...since World War II...the Japanese press were all over that...they were throwing money around left and right and everywhere...completely distorting the coverage of news in that country.

00:14:01 ROSE: Getting out of the war zone, have you seen anything similar with regards to those unethical tendencies?

00:14:06 TM: No, I am sure it exists I just never saw it personally. I know there are a lot of problems in Asia with commercial coverage (business news)...you interview a company President (as we just did in Orange County of an online game company) in certain countries in Asia...South Korea is one of them...they give you a white envelope when you leave, and there is money in it. It's not a quid pro quo per se...they are not saying "you will write this story"...but...this is a sweetener...that you will be complimentary to this company when you write this story.

00:14:53 TM: In Thailand, I lived in Thailand for four years and they have a pretty well established system of the opposite of blackmail by media where journalists will threaten companies and politicians and wealthy individuals with unflattering stories unless they are paid off. Which probably explains why so many journalists get killed in Thailand.

00:15:24 ROSE: How do you compare American network TV News with American local TV news in the modern era?

00:15:44 TM: They are two different parts completely. Local news is catering to a limited audience with a very low threshold of fact gathering a lot of it is chatter and gossip. Their reporters will go out there and they will be on the scene and do their piece to camera in front of the house that is burning or the police tape for someone that has been shot.

00:16:35 TM: quite often they don't have the resources to dig deep, like cable, they are reacting to the latest story...they won't often stay with the story to find out what really happened because they are on to the next story. There is no sense that they are laying down a story for record...that people will come back to. There are network standards: as I understand them, it's the first take on history, as was famously said. They were there when Kennedy was shot or the planes crashed into the towers in NY on 9-11. Half of their pieces are used and reused and referred to for many years. Perhaps the crucial need to get it right so far as you can get it right in those early days of a story...to not embellish...to not make up, to not in any way alter the facts just to suit your story.

00:17:50 ROSE: Do you feel we are "documenting"?

00:17:53 TM: It's what we attempt to do. Sure we get it wrong. Often there is stuff that we don't know about at the time. It's one thing to be unsure of something; it is another thing to attempt to change something just because it makes it a better story. You asked me about Time magazine: I forgot the other big scandal Time magazine had when they darkened OJ's face. And they explained it wasn't a photograph it was an art work or some sort of bit.

00:18:33 TM: The problem is when you...when you make one little alteration like that you raise doubts because in their minds it's, "what else have they changed...how much more...is inaccurate, how can we trust these people?"

00:18:50 ROSE: Exactly. If you don't draw the line in the sand, where is the next one? Do you have any advice for journalism students?

00: 19:12 TM: There is the inevitable pressure in our industry to get scoops: people are rewarded for scoops, they get prizes, they get raises, they get promotions, they get recognition. But if you are faking it, it's not worth it because you will be found out. And once you have done it once it becomes pattern. And then you all that you think you have gained you are probably into negative territory because you won't get another job in our industry. It is hard to resist it when you see how you can take a short cut to get a great story, but you will lose in the end. And I think to go in to this industry, like people that go into medicine, they need to have a great sense of dedication...if you just want a 9 to 5 job you probably shouldn't be a doctor. Same way with journalists: unless you really feel some sense of mission to educate people with your reporting which can be frustrating with odd hours and all sorts of things...without that greater goal I don't think you are going to enjoy the experience.

00:20:49 ROSE: Is it almost a "calling"?

00:20:51 TM: I don't know...it sounds a bit (much) for journalism, but I know what you mean. It sounds fun to go on a plane and fly somewhere exotic and talk to someone but unless you really think there is a greater value in this, then find some other vocation then. It is a great job, an important job, no less important now than it was in the heyday of network TV or heyday newspapers for that matter. There is still a crucial need for information. In some ways even more crucial than before with the globalized world we live in.

00:21:51 ROSE: I would like to think that being a journalist is just as important in these times of a lousy economy and a war going on and yet we are losing journalists by the bucket load.

00:22:09 ROSE:, continued. I think we have lost 20,000 print jobs in the last three years. An imprecise figure but pretty close.

00:22:22 TM: This may not be your topic but frankly newspapers got very lazy. They had a cash cow which was classified ads, and a constant stream of full and half page ads from car companies and farmer companies. And another page of text on the other side...often quite shallowly written, boring, dutiful 2000 words of a not surprising press conference. I think newspapers if smart, have a future and will look different than what they looked like in the past.

00:23:05 ROSE: what about...where were you working when the Dan Rather thing hit?

00:23:14 TM: I was at Time.

00:23:17 ROSE: As a journalist: did it just seem like CBS had their head cut off...a sinking ship? How was it regarded?

00:23:33 TM: I think that CBS probably did a good job to localizing it around town and I think that people had a sense of Dan's political view points and in some ways it didn't come as a huge surprise...but was a disappointment. But I think Dan Rather had done himself a lot of damage even before the Bush story came out. He seemed to have some pretty transparent political views which I think is something not healthy for a journalist particularly an anchor in such a prominent position.

00:24:21 ROSE: Let's discuss that, and it's a little hard to explain to generalize but the bulk of people reading this will be educators and students, that hopefully will have a journalism background, but how is a journalist different than the average person? Can we campaign? Can we join different organizations? Is that permitted? How does one lead their life if they are a full time journalist?

00:24:55 TM: I think anything that could...I emphasize COULD lead to any suspicion of conflict of interest should be avoided. So if you are a sports journalists I don't see why you shouldn't have some political activities. But if you are a mainstream news journalists. Not even a White House correspondent but just a mainstream correspondent who may at sometime in the future be assigned to some political story then I think it is inappropriate that you would be out there campaigning one side or the other. I think that the whole idea of being an objective observer on the fence suggest that becoming an advocate for one particular line is going to make your job very hard. Even if you go out with an honest attempt to be objective maybe you will go too far in the other direction trying to compensate for your professional reasons. I remember interviewing John Petras, heading the US troops in Iraq and we talked about elections and he said, "As soon as I made General I stopped voting. Not because I don't value democracy but because I didn't want to answer questions who do you vote for. That's a pretty extreme step to take and of course you can always say 'my vote is private 'but I think he did that for a valid reason. He wanted to show 'I am the military and not in grated to either political party and I do my job in service and it doesn't matter to me which party is in power. I don't think that journalists should forsake the right to vote necessarily but I think his sentiment is well taken. If you are on a job where objectivity is part of...what makes that job worthwhile well then you need to be very careful about advocacy of any type.

00:27:29 ROSE: And it is not just politics but political movements like gay marriage which...

00:27:37 TM: ..Gay marriage, gun rights. I mean there is a load of different organizations which have views that can become part of a news story. You look at the level of acrimony that has followed Michael Moore with his various movies. He is openly politically...

(phone rings, TM takes it, his wife is 8 months pregnant but that was NOT the call!)

00:28:33 ROSE: I think we have it almost covered, anything you would like to add about ethics or where the industry is going?

00:28:47 TM: Clearly the industry is going more and more online. That is going to be a real challenge because it's so much harder to...the turn rate is so much faster...stuff can be put online so much more quickly. It is so much harder to check it all the time. That is going to be a huge challenge for people to maintain standards but it's a battle we cannot give in because if we do then we lose our viewers or readers. Cannot do this without them, we have nothing.

00:29:33 ROSE: thank you Terry...TM You are welcome.

00:29:41 END OF DISC

APPENDIX H

Steve Hartman, is a correspondent for CBS Evening News with Katie Couric and I have know him for over 15 years (full disclosure). Recorded on November 5, 2009 we are driving from Lake Havasu City to Las Vegas Nevada. This interview was recorded during the drive on a Sony XD camera while driving, audio only. Time code numbers as indicated when the comments were made on the disc. SH is Steve Hartman and ROSE is Les Rose, interviewer and graduate student as well as a colleague of Mr. Hartman.

00:01:08 ROSE: Has Murrow had an impact on your career?

00:01:10 SH: Yes, Murrow has had an impact on my career. Yes, I think so! When I went into TV News...when I thought about what I wanted to do for a living, I decided I wanted to do something that was bigger than just a job. Something that seemed to have like a greater purpose to serve mankind. I really didn't know much about Edward R. Murrow other than he was sort of the centerpiece of journalism TV journalism ethics and he was the cornerstone on which we built that we had up until that point. And Walter Cronkite was the next stone above the cornerstone. And looking at those two, I decided that though I really didn't know much about them, I knew I wanted to be part of a profession that people might someday look up to me like they looked up to them. I thought I had the character to be like them and they just seemed to live for something more than themselves. To be honest in high school I didn't know much about ERM other than he smoked and he was a good journalist.

00:02:25 ROSE: Did any high school teachers tell you about Murrow? Or show you some of his own work?

00:02:34 SH: I looked up Harvest of Shame...years later...I went to the Radio and TV Museum and watched Harvest of Shame. By today's standards, production wise it is a pretty weak piece. You know, that is the only thing I really saw of his.

00:03:08 ROSE: Did teachers tell you about him?

00:03:09 SH: Teachers told me about him, but again I really don't remember much other than that basic feeling that he was the cornerstone. I don't remember many specifics about him.

00:03:31 ROSE: When you interned, would you get any advice like ...What would Murrow do? Or is Murrow "rolling over in his grave"?

00:03:46 SH: That is the one thing people would say. When I started out in the business and I might have gotten something wrong or done something that was unethical...I don't even know what that would have been...the phrase, "You're making Murrow roll over in his grave!" And I found out years later he was cremated! (Laughs). So now people should say...more laughs...

00:04:17 ROSE: Did you know he was the standard intuitively?

00:04:32 SH: He wasn't, I mean maybe the older generation would talk about Murrow but we certainly didn't talk about Murrow in high school or college. He was long gone and I never saw any of his stuff and it wasn't until his pieces became available at the Radio and TV Museum that I was even able to SEE what he had done (at the museum in LA).

00:04:51 ROSE: What do you think Murrow stood for ethically?

00:05:02 SH: I think about him...I think of him as...its funny because there are some ethics that we consider "ethical issues today" that he had no issue with, like he would do advertisements, and he didn't see that as a conflict of interest or didn't have a choice.

00:05:35:00 SH: But in that sense, he was remarkably unethical...by today's standards. But there are other things which he still a model is for. You know: standing up for the little guy, you know...exposing injustice and that kind of thing.

00:06:00 ROSE: Let me basically pose the question: Murrow vs. McCarthy certainly ended up well for CBS and for Murrow, but what if he was wrong? What if McCarthy had something: communists working for the government? Do you think the checks and balances were in place back then?

00:06:22 SH: If he was wrong...I think it would have come out that McCarthy was right and Communists were infiltrating America. I think that would have come out eventually. I don't think he had any doubt that he (Murrow) was right, I think that is a hypothetical....

00:06:56 ROSE: Murrow was accused of being pretty liberal and his critics...and yes, he did have critics, would say that he leaned on the liberal side: would you find that to be true?

00:07:07 SH: I think that's...well, I wouldn't have thought that was true. Nowadays, the definition between what is liberal and what is conservative and what is main stream and what is moderate...you know...seems to be...it is not a solid line, it's a shifting line and its defined by whoever is defining it. So...I mean back then maybe things were a little more clear cut and what is and defining a liberal...defining a liberal is a little more clear when you said, "A person's a liberal...what it meant...and sort of it meant standing for civil rights and first amendment rights and now a days it is less clear what it stands for.

00:08:16 ROSE: He always credited a good teacher that got him in debate class and aided his writing and helping him along the way. Did you have a single teacher that helped you along the way?

00:08:27 SH: Yes, and I think that first teacher is very important. That first person, the first teacher who gets you interested in journalism also gives you your reason for why you want to be in journalism. And the man who got me interested in going in this profession followed a lot of this profession, followed a lot of Walter Cronkite, he was very interested in ethical journalism. I imagine if I had somebody who thought it would be really, you know, “You should do this job because it would be really fun and you could be a star,” you know, but I went into the business because that teacher was guiding me...it probably would shape who I am.

00:09:28 ROSE: What was the name of the teacher?

00:09:31 SH: Thomas Harms. High School, still there, still at my high school...

00:09:34 ROSE: Wow, that’s impressive.

00:09:37 ROSE Let’s back up a second: give us a quick resume’...where did you go to college...tell us about the stations you have been to...

00:09:51 SH: Ok, went to college at Bowling Green State University and majored in Broadcast Journalism. I got my first job at WTOL-TV in Toledo, Ohio. That is where I started my junior year in college as a general assignment reporter...and then after graduation became a weekend producer and general assignment reporter. I focused mostly on features, in that first job and then after that all I have done is news features. Going from Minneapolis KSTP-TV to WABC in New York to KCBS in Los Angeles and then gradually transitioning to CBS Network television...

00:10:33 ROSE: As a feature reporter is there a greater line if you will with ethics...or is it as strict as the lead story.

00:10:40 SH: Ethics in general is a gray line. There is certainly some black and white, but those are easy. The most interesting part, the most challenging part of the ethics discussion is what is in the gray. And there are gray lines with hard news and there are gray lines with feature news....they are just different, at different places. Different issues: features have a lot of ethical issues ranging from being fair to the subjects, to how you edit the story, to how you get the story. I mean, ethical decisions...ethics in TV news aren’t something that you encounter once a week or once a month. It’s something you deal with whether consciously or subconsciously every ten minutes when you are on a story. You know, “How do I phrase this question?”

00:11:51 SH: “How do I get the b-roll that I need to get?” How do I ask this person to help make the story happen without you know, altering the story.

00:12:06 ROSE: You and I, when we encounter a subject, we always say, “What would you be doing if we weren’t here?”

00:12:13 SH: Right

00:12:14 ROSE: Their number one answer is; “watching television”...and we always say, “Other than that...”

00:12:17 SH: Right...well, the very nature of TV news is different than print news because if we were just going to be a fly on the wall like a print journalist sometimes can be, we would be sitting there in a room with people staring at us with our big TV cameras. Ask people, to try to be ethical, “to just be yourselves, we want to videotape you doing what you would naturally do.”

00:12:47 SH: And what they would naturally be doing, in all honesty...with us there, is sitting there talking to us. And asking us questions like, “What’s that big microphone for? What kind of tape do you use...Beta? Really? We stopped using Beta 10 years ago!” So by its very nature of us doing the story, we have altered reality. To me, ethics, for TV news feature reporting, hasn’t been like, “Don’t tell people what to do...” But capture the story, the facts, and the vibe, and the feeling...as realistically as you possibly can...without telling people what to say. But on occasion, getting people doing things they usually wouldn’t be doing in that moment.

00:13:37 SH: Not getting people to do things they would NEVER do in a million years, but sometimes, getting people at that moment to read the paper if they read the paper. Or whatever it is...if we *didn’t* do that, we’d be radio.

00:13:57 ROSE: If we (Hartman and I) pride ourselves on anything, its capturing a real human moment with someone. And it is hard to explain in a feature story...I stage nothing, WE stage nothing, but we try to get...uhm...we just keep fishing, we keep rolling. We roll and we roll and we roll until they are bored with us...quite often I will send you out of the room, because it is one more person they (the subjects) don’t have to deal with. And there is no real trick to it other than being part shrink and anticipating what human being is going to do.

00:15:02 SH: Sometimes when you...ya know...we ask people to do whatever they would be doing...because we need to get some videotape of them. They might be doing dishes, the might be making coffee...they might be reading the paper. Often times what I might be interested in isn’t any of those things but it might be what happens as soon as they think we are done shooting those things or before we start shooting those things. I am constantly trying to make people unaware of the camera, be themselves. And I think sometimes with ethics people get so caught up with the in deciding of what is right and wrong...they want hard, fast rules...they want to say, uh, well I guess the classic one is “NO STAGING.” And they want to make people comfortable with their jobs. And with their own ethics they feel like they have to come up with some definition as to what that means: no staging. And then they want to stick with that...when really, it’s not that easy.

00:16:20 ROSE: If there were no staging, there would be no interview...

00:16:25 SH: Right...and it is too limiting. My ethics are: I want to tell the story thoroughly and accurately. I don't really care that much about this idea of staging...I don't want the subject I am doing the story on to think that TV news is phony...so I am not going to ask them to do things that they normally wouldn't do. I am not going to tell their story with a bunch of falsehoods. But at the same time, I want to convey that story to others. I am doing it for a reason. I want them to feel something...to understand something...and learn something and be able to relate to something.

00:17:09 ROSE: But it is never false, and it is always the real deal. And for me staging, as far as an interview goes...is telling people what to say.

00:17:19 SH: That is my definition too.

00:17:22 ROSE: "I need you to say this..."

00:17:24 SH: YES

00:17:26 ROSE: Which has happened...you know...Linda Mason (CBS VP of Standards) uses it in her demonstration of what NOT to do in an interview.

00:17:33 SH: Right, right. Yeah, that to me is the ultimate no-no. I would never say, "What I need you to say is...oh, that you really love your job...for this reason or that..." It is just a matter of phrasing the question creatively. That is the great thing about being ethical, is that it doesn't take anything from the story to be ethical. You are not sacrificing anything to be ethical. Usually by being ethical you make the story better. Ethics are not road blocks, they are just guidelines for how to tell the best possible story.

00:18:24 ROSE: Clearly on a breaking news event, you cannot tell a highway patrolman or a police officer;"I need you to do this..." That has happened, if you remember the historic case of the Chicago Democratic Convention where apparently a news cameraman handed a Molotov cocktail to a protester. So he could get the video of him throwing it: that is clearly abhorrent. At the same time, at completely the other end of the spectrum, I have had news photographers yell at me because I have boosted the light levels in a darkened room simply so that the camera can "see". And they say that is staging because it wasn't how the room was. And I am not changing the course of news events...I am allowing the camera to do its job.

00:19:21 SH: Well that's why I say, that is the danger of getting into people taking ethics too strictly. They come up with rules that have no purpose. Like, don't turn the light on because that light wasn't on naturally. Or take it to the extreme: don't ask people questions because they naturally wouldn't be answering them (laughs)...any interview by its nature is staging. So there are certain things we do to make the job happen, and it may affect the story in some way. Brightening up a room may make a police officer giving a press conference answer a little differently than if he was in shade. OK? That is the world we live in (laughs) and we are going to live with that.

00:20:10 ROSE: Linda Mason also said that ethics are a living, breathing thing basically that they are perpetually changing with the times. It is a Rock of Gibraltar yet the rock can shift...I am thinking of the internet and the ethics involved with that...and that has its own ethics that may not have played with Murrow's code from 50 years ago.

00:20:35 SH: A moral code or an ethical code is something that a company may have a book devoted to it, but it's a very individual thing. It is very flexible thing...it can change within the corporation or can change within the individual, based on what the times are or even what the individual is going through.

00:20:58 SH: If you are broke and you really need to keep your job, you may revise your ethics to say...well, the local station wants me to do a piece on the local auto show because they have auto dealers sponsoring it. I got a child to feed...I am not really doing any harm. Yes, I am doing a news story that my employers having me do because an advertiser wants it done. It's not my ideal ethics but I have decided as an individual that it's not spreading swine flu across the country either...it's not going to do a whole lot of harm either so I am going to change my ethics for the moment to let that happen...to be able to do this story. That makes us feel uncomfortable because we want our ethics to be solid and straight and never changing. But that is just not reality; they change within all of us. I am much more ethical...now...I can afford to be much more ethical now than I ever could before because I have a great deal of job security. CBS isn't going to fire me. So if they ask me to do something to do something, which they never have...that I felt was unethical, I can say NO. it is very easy for me...if it looks like a story is not going to be very good...unless, I don't know...I have never thought of it so I never even had the situation.

00:22:50 SH: If the story is going to be really, really dull unless I stage some event to make the story great...I don't need to do that because I can afford to have a story that is terrible (laughs). I got enough good ones...so I don't need to...but the other thing about staging is that always make the story worse. That is why I say ethics they are not negative things they are positive things. Not following them usually makes your story much worse than it would have been otherwise.

00:23:18 ROSE: Do you think that with budget constraints or a lack of training or a lack of experience that there is greater ethics at the network level than there is at the local level? Local stations do not have the budgets and they don't have a Linda Mason and they don't have training and they don't have someone at every local station saying these are the standards and practices.

00:23:49 SH: That is exactly true. I mean at CBS, they are going to understand and LIKE it if I say...you know...Trey Pyles wasn't going to let a balloon go today, but we asked him to show us how (citing a feature story we did together). They are not going to mind that little bump in the road in the script because it is ethical and we are being honest with the viewer. At the local level, because they don't have the experience, because they often

don't have the mentors, and they don't have the mentors...that kind of thing is less likely to happen. I think that is where moral and misjudgments happen. You don't see a lot of...I don't see a lot of moral misjudgments at the network level. I see MANY more as I travel the country and watch local news.

00:24:52 SH: The tape I brought you...you know, that I brought to show you happened at local news at KCBS in LA (where we both worked). I was sitting in an edit room watching some raw tape of a story I had seen on the evening news that night which began with a wide shot of police surrounding a car with guns drawn and you hear audio. "Get back, get back, get back, get back!" and as I am watching the raw tape of that shot, there is no audio on the tape...only later do we see the cameraman getting too close to the scene and the policeman yelling at the CAMERAMAN, "Get back, get back, get back..." and so the reporter, in an effort to make that story more dramatic, took that audio and moved it to a different shot, completely out of context and you know I think the networks weed out those people and have no tolerance for it...if that had been discovered at the local level by the news director, I doubt if that person would have gotten fired. It might be, "hey, you probably shouldn't do that..." They don't value the ethics so much; they are so pressed for ratings.

00:26:10 ROSE: OK, I freely admit I don't like Fox News Channel, but remember when Geraldo reported that he was in such and such a zone in Iraq when in fact he was 65 miles away.

00:26:29 SH: Yes

00:26:31 ROSE: ...and they didn't fire him!

00:26:32 SH: No...Geraldo Rivera...I am hearing this second hand, second person...apparently Geraldo Rivera in New Orleans was doing a stand up about the flooding and he wanted some people in a boat behind him. So he asked these people to get in a boat and while he is delivering his stand up can you sort of paddle your boat behind me? Geraldo Rivera....you know...there are many stories about him being unethical.

00:27:02 ROSE: My thing is...your correspondent on Fox News lied to me about a damn major story about Iraq and a battle and he was reporting it 65 miles away claiming he was there, and who's to say the other reporters (at FNC) aren't doing that?

00:27:21 SH: Right.

00:27:21 ROSE: I mean, it is a huge point because you are only as good as your weakest link.

00:27:26 SH: And you are only as good as your audience cares about how good you are. Unless the audience values ethics as much as we do, it doesn't matter. If the audience is going to keep watching TV reporters and TV programs that have proven themselves to be

unethical in the past, if they are not voting with their clickers, then...that is the worst thing that can happen for journalism ethics. Because there is really no reason for those motivated within themselves to be ethical to continue to be ethical.

(Pause in driving and interview)

00:28:49 ROSE: We're back; we were comparing local and network. So when you went from local to network, in addition to, you know, stepping up your game for writing and storytelling did you also get the feeling that they treat every line of your copy much more seriously?

00:29:14 SH: Yeah, it is definitely...I don't know if it is a stark difference but there is a clear difference between local news ethics...local TV news ethics and network TV news ethics. At the network, you know they not only care about the facts...that is the obvious thing...get the facts right. They watch for the subtleties in what you're saying...the implications you may be making. How the video is married to the words and what that may be saying. They are much more in tune with the complexities of how a story can have a flaw in it and they are quicker to catch those things.

00:30:11 ROSE: And the effort to be fair to realize not just both sides of the story but several sides of the story just seems that much more apparent.

00:30:21 SH: Fair doesn't necessarily mean two sides of the story. Sometimes fair means NOT letting a lunatic crazy fact less side get the same credence as the other side. And I think that is something...that is a subtlety that doesn't necessarily get realized in local news.

00:30:44 ROSE: That was actually a point that most scholars about Murrow talk about is how is that not once did he consider...when he was being bombed on London rooftops...to give the German side of things.

00:31:00 SH: Right, right...

00:31:02 ROSE: these days you have to say, "Oh these poor (fill in the blank) enemy..." to get their perspective.

00:31:09 SH: Right, right. Of course war isn't as black and white as it once was either. Unfortunately, not every war comes with a masked evil doer and a Superman.

00:31:26 ROSE: Have you ever had any personal ethical dilemmas doing local news or network?

00:31:33 SH: Well, Amy Mendoza (a story from our "Everybody Has a Story" past we did together about an illegal immigrant family).

00:31:45 ROSE: Go right ahead and explain this part.

00:31:45 SH: It was an Everybody Has a Story piece and we had picked out to profile of a young grade school girl who was in the country illegally. Yet part of the public school system. We did a profile of her, we even interviewed her parents, and we are set to put it on the air. And CBS...Linda Mason said, I believe...anyway, my management at CBS said I had not gone far enough in...was that an ethical decision? Sometimes I don't even know if this was an ethical thing....maybe it was more of a moral thing. Because others might say..."You just tell the story. Why are you protecting these people? They are in the country illegally!" So it may not be an ethical dilemma now that I think about it.

00:32:40 ROSE: Certainly it was a moral dilemma but wasn't the whole thing resolved by a producer chatting with someone from INS?

00:32:49 SH: Yeah, we were trying to protect this girl, this family; we didn't want them to be deported. The mother was pregnant but certainly in today's environment there might be some people that would say we might be unethical in doing that. We came across this illegal family and we should have turned them in. whenever you come across some illegal activity you are supposed to notify authorities...I guess not any illegal activity, that is another gray line...if it is a murder you come across you are supposed to notify authorities otherwise you are part of the crime.

00:33:40 ROSE: Weren't you pressed as a local reporter to do that "car" story?

00:33:35 SH: Yeah, I was asked to be part of a TV program that highlighted and showed off the new cars of the season at the local auto show. Because the local auto show was going to be a big sponsor of our news. And this wasn't a story that I had chosen to do, that my editors had chosen to do because we thought it had a NEWS value; this was a story that...an assignment that came directly from the sales department. And I told management that I wouldn't do it. That's just a...I don't report to the sales department, I report to the news department. And fortunately I had enough power, for lack of a better word, enough...maybe I was in the middle of my contract and they couldn't fire me but for whatever reason I was able to say no.

00:34:31 SH: So what they did is they went to some other people at the station and told them they had to do it, and for whatever reason these people didn't feel like they could say no..OR...didn't feel like it had violated their ethics.

00:34:56 ROSE: I have to ask...what station was it?

00:34:59 SH: KCBS (where we met and both worked) .

00:35:07 ROSE: With regards to the photojournalists...I truthfully feel really conflicted about that...as a news photographer I pride myself on my ethics and they need five cameras in this car show...can you just wear the hat of a production photographer that day? Is it unethical for me to do it?

00:35:33 SH: I don't think so because I think you CAN wear multiple hats as a TV news journalist. As an on-camera news journalist I CAN'T wear multiple hats because people will immediately associate my face with my main job, my only job which is to report TV news. Let's not you know make the mistake and thinking the auto show, the sales department doesn't recognize that by having a news person "reporting"...that's in quotes...on the auto show lend a little more credibility, BELIEVEABLITY, to whatever promotional material they are spewing. So I think it is a different thing.

00:36:24 ROSE: Life is nothing but gray areas. If you try and get people to donate blood to the Red Cross, then are you wronging the same people at Cedars Sinai hospital...know what I mean? Basically promoting one group to give blood to that group...doesn't that take blood away from the other group? I know it is not as gray...

00:37:02 SH: In a case like that...your money is helping the Red Cross but at the same those dollars might have gone to a program that saves the Amazon forest...

00:37:18 ROSE: Perhaps the better thing is: if a TV station gets in bed with the Red Cross, what happens if the Red Cross has a financial scandal? Can you cover them with both barrels?

00:37:27 SH: Yeah, I think so because what would the Red Cross be giving you? The Red Cross isn't paying you anything...in fact you are getting something from the Red Cross...you (as a station) are getting something from their good PR image by aligning yourself with them...

00:37:45 ROSE: When you and I were at KCBS...I believe you were that when this happened...the United Way on a financial scandal...

00:37:45 SH: Yeah, yeah...

00:37:57 ROSE: Remember the Vice President took a no interest loan for his home...and as a result...we as a news organization, KCBS, no longer donate to the United Way. That was because...how would it look if we had our employees donate to the very company we investigated for bad practices?

00:38:19 SH: Right...at the same time what was the motivation there?

00:39:00 (Steve trying to find my questions on the blackberry while I drive.)

00:40:26 ROSE: What is your perception of Fox News and its standards...or MSNBC?

00:40:29 SH: MSNBC is definitely just as guilty. Where Fox and MSNBC go wrong is there is no clear delineation between their news content and there...I don't know...entertainment/opinion shows. In fact, I have cut back and forth between them

and they will be in the middle of some opinionated show and they will go a news break. But even within the news breaks or the news programs, depending on who is presenting it or who the writer was I still recognize from what my perspective is...to be slanted, unethical reporting. But, again, we are trying to walk the middle. Folks who follow Fox News just disagree on where the middle is. To balance, you need to know where your fulcrum is and if you cannot define where the middle is...then you cannot be balanced. So balance is really something that they cannot claim to be, and neither can the quote "mainstream media" claim to be.

00:41:45 ROSE: But yet, in my 33 years of doing this I have never heard anyone say, "Let's be liberal on this story" or "Let's be conservative" on this story.

00:42:00 SH: No, but at Fox they may say, "Hey, we need to get the liberal opinion in here. Yeah, put in something that not everybody hates Obama..." (laughs). It is just who knows...they probably think they ARE being balanced...and fair. I don't know if they sit down at their meetings and say, you know, "how are we going to make the Republicans look good today..."

00:42:25 ROSE: I think that's a whole different paper.

00:42:25 SH: Yeah, it is another paper.

00:42:30 SH: (Reading from the blackberry with some of the questions). Does Murrow an influence on the current crop of journalists? No.

00:42:40 ROSE: If Murrow was working today, where would he work?

00:42:46 SH: He might be a PBS...if Murrow was around today. Depends on what kind of context he would have.

00:43:07 ROSE: I thought NPR or 60 Minutes.

-----END-----

APPENDIX I

Ethicist and Professor Robert Steele, PhD Nelson Poynter Scholar for Journalism Values at The Poynter Institute and Director of the Janet Prindle School of Ethics at DePauw University. On Nov 4, 2009, at 7:14 AM, JJFlashLA@aol.com wrote:

Hey Bob!

Hope you are well and happy. Was at Poynter last August and sad to see so many friends gone with the buyouts. I believe in that place and quality, truthful, journalism more than ever. Hope to teach half as well as you and help shape a generation of journalists that have integrity, are ethical, and truthful. And not believe everything they see on the Web.

I would appreciate your thoughts on Edward R. Murrow, the subject of my thesis. I have just a few questions, and it would make my thesis (entitled "Edward R. Murrow: Life, Legacy, and Broadcast Ethics Today) more enriching for future journalists. If you have just a few moments, I would greatly appreciate a few minutes to help this work.

Here are just a few questions for your consideration about Murrow and broadcast news ethics. Please feel free to answer any or all of these questions.

1) Murrow never actually wrote down his views on ethics but led by example. The famed RTNDA "lights in a box" speech came close, but what do you think were his priorities with good journalism practice and ethics?

BOB:.... Murrow was first and foremost a storyteller. He had the desire and the ability to go where the stories were and take his listeners (and eventually) his viewers with him. He knew how to tell a powerful story with vivid descriptions. His words were accompanied by a compelling delivery that was equally important in grabbing listener's attention. I don't know much at all about Murrow's ethics, but I hope that he honored the core values of accuracy and fairness. And, one has to believe that Murrow believed strongly in journalistic service to the public. That was, of course, a core element of his "lights in a box" speech. He also strongly articulated the principle of journalistic independence, championing a form of journalism that should not be undermined by undue commercial, governmental or political pressures.

2) Do you see those same journalistic principles being applied today?

BOB:.... Certainly there are journalists who honor those journalistic principles, who believe there is an obligation to tell substantive, compelling stories that take people where they need to go. The best journalistic storytellers provide the public with insight and information about both courageous and corrupt leaders, about heroism and horror on battlefields, about the good, bad and ugly that takes place in our communities every day.

And since you can't really separate the journalistic and ethical principles, the best journalists tell place a premium on accurate and fair stories. That said, the pressures on journalists in this era are immense. The economic, technological and operational equations have changed dramatically. Reporters, photojournalists and producers are expected to produce more stories more quickly. Immediacy is often the driving force in news coverage, and that means accuracy, fairness and other journalistic and ethical values can be trumped. There is, to be sure, great tension between journalism values and business values. Both can be legitimate if handled well in the proper proportion. However, the realities of a financially-struggling journalism industry mean that the journalistic values too often lose out. Journalistic independence is often eroded in this era by those who run news organizations. We know of way to many examples where stories are produced and reported because of commercial interests rather than journalistic merit.

3) Are ethical standards in broadcast journalism today being followed, abused, or ignored?

BOB:..... As I reflected in my answer to question #2, I believe all three of those realities exist in terms of both journalistic and ethical standards.

4) Your thoughts and insights on Murrow: his ethics, legacy, and personal story. What made Murrow *Murrow*? Is his level of ethics still applicable today? Does he have an influence on the current crop of journalists?

BOB:..... I'm not a student of Edward R. Murrow, though I've always had great respect for his accomplishments. He was and is an icon. My sense is that Murrow's reporting from England and Europe during WWII produced an image of a journalist that has lasted well beyond his lifetime. I imagine that he, like all of us, had his shortcomings, and we saw some of those in the recent movie about him. He wasn't perfect in his professional work. He had his flaws, but he was a powerful journalistic storyteller, and he used his fame to make strong statements about the role of journalism in society. His "lights in a box speech" was a rallying cry for journalistic quality and integrity. The message is just as applicable today, maybe more so.

I don't know how much influence Murrow has on the current crop of journalists. Certainly there are some journalists who invoke his name and champion his contributions. Whether there is truly a knowledge base for that respect or whether it's blind 'hero worship,' I just don't know.

THANKS so very much! I appreciate your time and consideration with this.

Les Rose, CBS News, Los Angeles (and UNL Grad Student)

Robert M. Steele, Ph.D.
Eugene S. Pulliam Distinguished Visiting Professor of Journalism
DePauw University
Greencastle, Indiana
and
Nelson Poynter Scholar for Journalism Values
The Poynter Institute
St. Petersburg, Florida

APPENDIX J

Email response from a 1-17-2009 email from NBC News Today Show Correspondent Bob Dotson

Thoughts on Edward R. Murrow's Legacy
Bob Dotson
NBC News

Ed Murrow used to tell his stories in such a way that he would not insult the intelligence of a college professor, but if a bus boy were listening, he'd be fascinated, too. That's Murrow's legacy.

He made an effort -- all of his career -- to look behind the media mirror that reflects celebrity and power to find compelling tales about the rest of us. He covered people of all ages -- in all walks of life -- with good ideas. Today, those who labor in Murrow's profession are chasing celebrities and interviewing politicians. Their quotes sound like stuck records.

Those big layoffs at newspapers and Television stations aren't just happening because of the bad economy. We run the risk of becoming irrelevant.

There's a whole area of journalism that's under reported -- everyday life. Reporters too often focus only on life's flat tires. Ed Murrow kicked the other tires and asked why they were still working? He wondered what ordinary people did between wars and hurricanes. In disaster, we still seek them out, but it's easier to go to a politician or celebrity for answers, even though they might not be the ones with real insight.

Murrow looked beyond the headlines for stories, others missed because he thought they could tell us who we are.

Covering news these days is a lot like working in a circus. We spend most of our time marveling at the tent. We slap ourselves on the back when we post bite size Twitters. No one comes to a circus to marvel at the tent. They come to watch the trapeze act. Our "act," the careful crafting of writing to picture, gets scant attention, as we scamper from Tweet to Tweet.

We're all faced with constant deadlines these days. The twenty-four hour news clock slices time too thin for thought. Journalistic ethics get muddled.

Wherever I go these days, I hear a disturbing chorus of complaints from other journalists:

"Knowing is no longer a big priority in our newsroom. APPEARING to know, you build your career."

"We parrot the same three facts because there's so little time to do much reporting."

"If it's news, its news to me."

Given our ever-shrinking deadlines and increased workload, newsroom stress levels are at an all time high. There always seems to be someone who's had eight hours sleep and has something for you to do.

Non-Stop News does not allow much time to teach ethics. A lot of journalists are freelance. They get paid if they produce a lot of stories. Few news managers have time to check if journalistic standards were met.

Journalism didn't used to work that way, you say?

Well, maybe not in Murrow's day, but a hundred years ago the Counsel General of Great Britain was having dinner with a friend in New York City, a fellow by the name of Spaulding, who manufactured Sporting equipment. Spaulding was quite proud of a new line of baseball gloves he had for sale.

"Oh, do you Americans play our children's game? Rounders?"

"No, baseball is 100 percent American," argued Spaulding.

"It is played with a bat and ball. Pitcher. Catcher? Do the batters run the bases? Three strikes and you're out?" wondered the Counsel General

"Well, yes," Spaulding said.

"Then it's the British game of Rounders!"

The next morning Spaulding hired an out of work journalist to prove the Counsel General wrong. The reporter was to find the American who designed America's favorite sport.

A couple of weeks later he came back with the wonderful story. A civil war hero, named Abner Doubleday, invented baseball in Cooperstown, New York. Spaulding ran an ad in all the papers trumpeting the "news." Doubleday was still alive and other reporters asked him if it were true?

"No," he told them. "The year I was supposed to have invented the sport, I wasn't anywhere near Cooperstown. I was having trouble with my studies at West Point and never went home that summer."

So, the ads were debunked. But years later, the town father's came across them in Cooperstown and made a pitch for the baseball hall of fame. You know the rest of that story. Doubleday should be remembered for other things.

- He fired the first shot from the Union side during the Civil War.
- He was the first person to be given a ticker tape parade down Wall Street.
- And he helped start the San Francisco Cable Car Company.

But we celebrate Baseball at Cooper's Town because of an old journalist who spin doctored a story people wanted to believe.

All of us on journalism's fast track -- heading into the unknown -- must find stories from the other side of the mirror -- the ones the rest of the media isn't showing us. Tell them truly and well. There's more to this job than just airtime. We're not just writing on smoke.

Bob Dotson
American Story with Bob Dotson
NBC News Today Show
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112

APPENDIX K

President Barack Obama

(Washingtonpost.com, September 9, 2009)

President Obama delivered remarks at the memorial service for Walter Cronkite at Lincoln Center in New York Wednesday. A transcript of his remarks follows.

To Chip, Kathy, and Nancy, who graciously shared your father with a nation that loved him; to Walter's friends, colleagues, protégés, and all who considered him a hero; to the men of the Intrepid; to all of you who are gathered here today; I am honored to be here to pay tribute to the life and times of the man who chronicled our time.

I did not know Mr. Cronkite personally. And my regret is made more acute by the stories that have been shared here today. Nor, for that matter, did I know him any better than the tens of millions who turned to him each night in search of the answer to a simple question: "What happened today?" But like them and like all of you, I have benefited as a citizen from his dogged pursuit of the truth, his passionate defense of objective reporting, and his view that journalism is more than just a profession; it is a public good vital to our democracy.

Even in his early career, Walter Cronkite resisted the temptation to get the story first in favor of getting it right. He wanted to get to get it first, but he understood the importance of getting it right. During one of his first jobs in Kansas City, Walter's program manager urged him to go on the air reporting a massive blaze -- and we just heard how much he loved fires -- a massive blaze at city hall that had already claimed lives. When Walter reached for the telephone, his boss asked, "What are you doing; get on the air!" Walter replied that he was calling the fire department to confirm the story. "You don't need to confirm it," the manager shouted, "My wife is watching the whole thing!"

Needless to say, Walter made the call, and even as the program manager took to the air himself to broadcast the unfolding tragedy, Walter discovered that it had been nothing more than a small fire that hadn't resulted in any injuries. He lost his job -- but he got the story right.

Walter wasn't afraid to rattle the high and the mighty, either; but he never dared to compromise his integrity. He got along with elected officials, even if they were wary of one another's motives. One politician once remarked, "Walter, my friend, you've got to believe me, fully 85 percent of everything I told you today is the absolute truth." (Laughter.)

He shared a complicated relationship with Presidents of both parties, who wanted him on their side even as they were convinced that he wasn't. President Johnson called Walter after the evening news from time to time to voice his displeasure over a certain story. But Walter knew that if he was receiving vociferous complaints from both sides, he must be

doing his job.

His endless inquisitiveness about our world, I can imagine, came from a mother who sold encyclopedias for a living. As a boy, Walter spent countless hours getting lost within their pages, endlessly sidetracked by new and interesting entries that branched off from one another, fascinated by the world around us and how it worked.

And that's the way he lived his life -- with curiosity, exploring our planet, seeking to make sense of it and explaining it to others. He went everywhere and he did everything. He raced cars and boats; he traveled everywhere from the Amazon to the Arctic; he plunged 8,000 feet below the sea, trekked 18,000 feet up into the Himalayas, and experienced weightlessness in the upper reaches of our atmosphere -- all with one mission: to make it come alive for the rest of us.

And as our world began to change, he helped us understand those changes. He was forever there, reporting through world war and cold war; marches and milestones; scandal and success; calmly and authoritatively telling us what we needed to know. He was a voice of certainty in a world that was growing more and more uncertain. And through it all, he never lost the integrity or the plainspoken speaking style that he gained growing up in the heartland. He was a familiar and welcome voice that spoke to each and every one of us personally.

So it may have seemed inevitable that he was named the most trusted man in America. But here's the thing: That title wasn't bestowed on him by a network. We weren't told to believe it by some advertising campaign. It was earned. It was earned by year after year and decade after decade of painstaking effort; a commitment to fundamental values; his belief that the American people were hungry for the truth, unvarnished and unaccompanied by theatre or spectacle. He didn't believe in dumbing down. He trusted us.

When he was told of this extraordinary honor that he was the most trusted man in America, he naturally downplayed it by saying the people had not polled his wife. (Laughter.) When people of both political parties actually tried to recruit him to run for office, without even asking for his stances on the issues, he said no -- to the relief of all potential opponents. And when, even a decade and a half after his retirement, he still ranked first in seven of eight categories for television journalists, he was disbelieving that he hadn't won the eighth category, "attractiveness." (Laughter.)

Through all the events that came to define the 20th century, through all our moments of deepest hurt and brightest hope, Walter Cronkite was there, telling the story of the American age.

And this is how we remember him today. But we also remember and celebrate the journalism that Walter practiced -- a standard of honesty and integrity and responsibility to which so many of you have committed your careers. It's a standard that's a little bit

harder to find today. We know that this is a difficult time for journalism. Even as appetites for news and information grow, newsrooms are closing. Despite the big stories of our era, serious journalists find themselves all too often without a beat. Just as the news cycle has shrunk, so has the bottom line.

And too often, we fill that void with instant commentary and celebrity gossip and the softer stories that Walter disdained, rather than the hard news and investigative journalism he championed. "What happened today?" is replaced with "Who won today?" The public debate cheapens. The public trust falters. We fail to understand our world or one another as well as we should -- and that has real consequences in our own lives and in the life of our nation. We seem stuck with a choice between what cuts to our bottom line and what harms us as a society. Which price is higher to pay? Which cost is harder to bear?

"This democracy," Walter said, "cannot function without a reasonably well-informed electorate." That's why the honest, objective, meticulous reporting that so many of you pursue with the same zeal that Walter did is so vital to our democracy and our society: Our future depends on it.

Walter was no naive idealist. He understood the challenges and the pressures and the temptations facing journalism in this new era. He believed that a media company has an obligation to pursue a profit, but also an obligation to invest a good chunk of that profit back into news and public affairs. He was excited about all the stories that a high-tech world of journalism would be able to tell, and all the newly-emerging means with which to tell it.

Naturally, we find ourselves wondering how he would have covered the monumental stories of our time. In an era where the news that city hall is on fire can sweep around the world at the speed of the Internet, would he still have called to double-check? Would he have been able to cut through the murky noise of the blogs and the tweets and the sound bites to shine the bright light on substance? Would he still offer the perspective that we value? Would he have been able to remain a singular figure in an age of dwindling attention spans and omnipresent media?

And somehow, we know that the answer is yes. The simple values Walter Cronkite set out in pursuit of -- to seek the truth, to keep us honest, to explore our world the best he could -- they are as vital today as they ever were.

Our American story continues. It needs to be told. And if we choose to live up to Walter's example, if we realize that the kind of journalism he embodied will not simply rekindle itself as part of a natural cycle, but will come alive only if we stand up and demand it and resolve to value it once again, then I'm convinced that the choice between profit and progress is a false one -- and that the golden days of journalism still lie ahead.

Walter Cronkite invited a nation to believe in him -- and he never betrayed that trust.

That's why so many of you entered the profession in the first place. That's why the standards he set for journalists still stand. And that's why he loved and valued all of you, but we loved and valued Walter not only as the rarest of men, but as an indispensable pillar of our society.

He's reunited with his beloved Betsy now, watching the stories of this century unfold with boundless optimism -- every so often punctuating the air with a gleeful "oh, boy!" (Laughter.) We are grateful to him for altering and illuminating our time, and for the opportunity he gave to us to say that, yes, we, too, were there.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

REFERENCES

- AMPAS. (2009). *The Official Academy Awards Data Base*. Retrieved February 19, 2009, from Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences:
http://awardsdatabase.oscars.org/ampas_awards/BasicSearchInput.jsp
- Andison, F. (1977). "TV Violence and Viewer Aggression: A Culmination of Study Results 1956-1976". *Public Opinion Quarterly* , 323.
- Avila, E. (2006). *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Baker, P. a. (2008, December 6). *Obama Pledges Work on a Vast Scale*. Retrieved February 17, 2009, from nytimes.com:
<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/07/us/politics/07radio.html>
- Barnouw, Erik (1975) *Tube of Plenty: The Evolution of American Television, Second Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barnouw, Erik (1978) *The Sponsor: Notes on a Modern Potentate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bayley, E. R. (1981). *Joe McCarthy and the Press*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Berkeley, U. (2006) *University of California Berkeley Library*. Retrieved 7 2008, August, from Media Resources Center:
<http://lib.berkeley.edu/MRC/murrowmccarthy.html>
- Bernard, V. O. (1973). *Sanctions for Evil: Sources of Evil Destructiveness*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Bernstein, P. L. (2000). *The Power of Gold*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley and Sons.

Berta, M. (2006, April). *About America: Edward R. Murrow Journalism At Its Best*.

Retrieved July 3, 2008, from USINFO.STATE.GOVE:

<http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/murrow/murrow.htm>

Betka, M. (2008, June 1). *Edward R. Murrow: A Life*. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from

America.gov, Telling America's Story: [http://www.america.gov/st/freepress-](http://www.america.gov/st/freepress-english/2008/June/20080601085135eaifas3.513736e-02.html)

[english/2008/June/20080601085135eaifas3.513736e-02.html](http://www.america.gov/st/freepress-english/2008/June/20080601085135eaifas3.513736e-02.html)

Bialik, C. (2008, November 6). *The Numbers Guy*. Retrieved 2009, from wsj.com: from

class/unl source...available with subscription to wsj

Bigresearch. (2009). *News*. Retrieved March 11, 2009, from bigresearch.com:

<http://www.bigresearch.com/>

Block, D. (2007, September 26). *50th Anniversary Celebrated of US Civil Rights Act of*

1957. Retrieved February 17, 2009, from voanews.com:

[http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2007-09/2007-09-26-](http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2007-09/2007-09-26-voa42.cfm?CFID=118544388&CFTOKEN=39488489&jsessionid=84302a08a23f8ea5ff8c59135b6c4d25b385)

[voa42.cfm?CFID=118544388&CFTOKEN=39488489&jsessionid=84302a08a23f](http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2007-09/2007-09-26-voa42.cfm?CFID=118544388&CFTOKEN=39488489&jsessionid=84302a08a23f8ea5ff8c59135b6c4d25b385)

[8ea5ff8c59135b6c4d25b385](http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2007-09/2007-09-26-voa42.cfm?CFID=118544388&CFTOKEN=39488489&jsessionid=84302a08a23f8ea5ff8c59135b6c4d25b385)

Brookings Institute. (1996). *Brookings Paper on Economic Activity: Macroeconomics*.

Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Buderi, R. (2000). *Engines of Tomorrow: How the World's Best Companies Are Using*

Their Research Labs to Win the Future. New York: Simon and Schuster.

CBS News. (2008, September 9). *CBS News September 9, 2008*. Retrieved September 9,

2008, from cbsnews.com:

<http://search.cbsnews.com/?source=cbs&q=immokalee+slavery&x=18&y=10>

Centor, E. (2008, April 10). *Layoffs at Traditional Media Outlets Leave Journalism*

Students Optimistic. Retrieved April 17, 2009, from blogher.com:

<http://www.ask.com/bar?q=journalism+optimism+reporters+blogher&page=1&qsrc=2417&ab=0&u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.blogher.com%2F layoffs-traditional-media-outlets-leave-journalism-students-optimistic>

Charters, A. (1994 (reprinted)). *Kerouac*. New York: Macmillan.

Clark, N. a. (2008). Exploring the Limits of Social Cognitive Theory: Why Negatively Reinforced Behaviors on TV May Be Modeled Anyway. *Journal of Communication* , 407-427.

CNN. (2008, February 17). *Obama's remarks on signing the stimulus plan*. Retrieved February 17, 2009, from cnn.com:

<http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/02/17/obama.stimulus.remarks/>

Congress.Org. (2009). *Roll Cal/Congress.org media guide*. Retrieved 1 2009, March, from Congress.org: <http://www.congress.org/congressorg/dbq/media/>

Cooper, J. S. (1999, December 10). *Election Surprises: Truman's 1948 Victory*. Retrieved 11 March, 2009, from suite101.com:

http://www.suite101.com/article.cfm/presidents_and_first_ladies/29362

Corliss, R. (2009). *Watch the Skies! 1950s Sci-Fi Movies*. Retrieved February 19, 2009,

from time.com:

http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1866039_1866042,00.html

Davis, B. a. (2009). *Mass Communication Theory, Fifth Edition*. Boston: Wadsworth
Cenage Learning.

Dirks, Tim (2009). Main Film Genres. *Filmsite.org* Retrieved August 11, 2009.
<http://www.filmsite.org/genres.html>

Doherty, T. P. (2003). *Cold War, Cool Medium*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dominick, W. A. (2006). *Mass Media Research: An Introdcution*. Belmont,
California:Thomson Wadsworth.

Doran, Miles (2008) *Results of an Online Questionnaire with Miles Doran*, 6-18-2008,
Les Rose, interviewer.

Doty, C. (2005, January 17). *Drilling Down/Television News Scandals; For Better or
Worse*. Retrieved July 3, 2008, from nytimes.com:
<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E04E4D71538F934A25752C0A9639C8B63&n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/Subjects/R/Ratings%20and%20Rating%20Systems>

Dowshen, S. M. (2007, December). *Polio*. Retrieved February 19, 2009, from Kids
Health for Parents:
http://kidshealth.org/parent/infections/bacterial_viral/polio.html

Ebert, Roger (2009, November 18) *Planet 51*. Retrieved November 23, 2009, from

rogerebert.com:

<http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20091118/REVIEWS/911189999>

Edgerton, G. (n.d.). *Murrow, Edward R. U.S. Broadcast Journalist*. Retrieved September 6, 2008, from The Museum of Broadcast Communications:

<http://www.museum.tv/archives/etv/M/htmlM/murrowedwar/murrowedwar.htm>

Edwards, B. (2004). *Edward R. Murrow and the Birth of Broadcast Journalism*. (H. Lane, Ed.) Hoboken, New Jersey, United States of America: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Eisenhower Presidential Library. (2009). *Civil Rights Act of 1957*. Retrieved 2009, from The Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum Homepage:

http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/Research/Digital_Documents/Civil_Rights_Civil_Rights_Act/CivilRightsActfiles.html

Ellis, J. C. (2005). *A New History of Documentary Film*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Ertelt, S. (2005). *China encourages couples to have girl babies in new program*. Retrieved May 9, 2006, from lifenews.com.

Farrar. (2006). "Contextual Features of Violent Video Games, Mental models, and Aggression". *Journal of Communication* , 387-405.

Fellow, Anthony R. (2009) *American Media History*. (Fellow, 2009) Cengage Learning, Florence, Kentucky

Feshbach, S. (1961). "The Stimulating versus Cathartic Effects of a Vicarious Aggressive Activity". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* , 381-385.

Feshbach, S. a. (1971). *Television and Aggression: An Experimental Field Study*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Finkelstein, Norman H. (1997) *With Heroic Truth: The Life of Edward R. Murrow*. New York, Houghton Mifflin Company.

Frank, R. G. (2006). *Better But Not Well*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Friendly, F. (Director). (1960). *Harvest of Shame* [Motion Picture].

Friendly, Fred W. (1967). *Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control*. New York. Random House.

Gahrn, A. (2008, September 8). *E Media Tidbits: How Important is Local, Really?*

Retrieved March 11, 2009, from Poynter.org:

<http://poynter.org/column.asp?id=31&aid=150146>

Goldman, Eric F. (1956) *The Crucial Decade—and After: America 1945-1960*. New York: Random House.

Google. (2008, September 9). *Google*. Retrieved September 9, 2008, from google.com:

<http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=Paris+Hilton+Dog>

Google.com. (2008, September 9). *Google Immokalee slavery*. Retrieved September 9, 2008, from google.com:

<http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=Immokalee+slavery&btnG=Google+Search&aq=f&oq=>

Goss, B. M. (2007). An analysis of reader-composed comment threads in "the Nation". *Journalism Studies* , 366.

Gould, J. (1953). Video Journalism Treatment of Radulovich History by "See It Now" Is

- Fine Reporting. In J. Gould, & L. L. Gould (Ed.), *Watching Television Come of Age: The New York Times Reviews* (pp. 82-84). University of Texas Press.
- Gould, J. (1953, October 25). Video Journalism: Treatment of Radulovich Case History by "See It Now" is Fine Reporting. *New York Times* .
- Gray, H. (2004). *Watching Race*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Griffith, R. (1987). *The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate*. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Grundmann, S. (2005). *The Einstein Dossiers: Science and Politics--Einstein's Berlin Period with an Appendix on Einstein's FBI File*. Basel, Switzerland: Birkhauser.
- Halberstam, David (1979). *The Powers That Be*. New York: Alfred Knopf Inc. and Dell.
- Halberstam, D. (1993). *The Fifties*. New York: Villard Books.
- Hammond, P. (2000). "Reporting 'Humanitarian' Warfare: propaganda, moralism and NATO's Kosovo War." *Journalism Studies* , pp. 365-386.
- Hanania, R. (2007, June 28th). *Networking Arab Journalists Around the World*. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from Mideast Youth: Thinking Ahead:
www.mideastyouth.com/2007/06/28/networking-arab-journal...
- Harris, R. J. (1999). *A Cognitive Study of Mass Communications*. Mahwah, NU: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Hendershot, C. (1999). *Paranoia, the Bomb, and 1950s Science Fiction Films*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Popular Press.
- Henry, W. (1986, June 9). *A Voice in the Wilderness Murrow (a book review)*. Retrieved

February 19, 2009, from time.com:

<http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,961546,00.html#>

Hunter, L. (2005). "What's Natural About it?": A Baseball Movie as Introduction to Key Concepts in Cultural Studies. *Film and History* , 71-77.

Isaacson, W. (2007). *Einstein*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Isaacson, W. (2007). *Einstein: His Life and Universe*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Jamieson, K. H. (2007). Justifying the War in Iraq: What the Bush Administration's Uses of Evidence Reveal. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* , 249-274.

John. (2009). *Mutants, monsters, and martians: the importance of sci-fi films of the fifties, a personal view*. Retrieved February 19, 2009, from The Golden Age of Sci Fi Cinema: http://www.awdsgn.com/Classes/WebI_Fall02/WebI-Final/JBusser/

Joseph, P. E. (2007). *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America*. New York: Macmillan.

Kapp, Lauren (2008, October 20) *Bob Dotson NBC News national correspondent, TODAY*. Retrieved December 30, 2009 from <http://www.msnbc.com/id/6694528/>

Karp, S. (2007, August 28). *Helping Journalists Thrive, Network, and Collaborate on the Web*. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from publish2 blog: <http://blog.publish2.com/2007/08/28/helping-journalists-thrive-network-and-collaborate-on-the-web/>

- Kempton, M. (1957, February 9). "The Way It's Got to Be". *New York Post* .
- Kendrick, A. (1969). *Prime Time The Life of Edward R. Murrow* (3rd Edition ed.).
Boston, Mass., United States of America: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Kerouac, J. (1951, 2003 (reprint)). *On The Road*. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Krebs, A. (27, November 2003). *Food As Corporate WMD*. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from Corporate Agribusiness Research Project:
www.thecalamityhowler.com
- Lamb, B. (1999, July 25). *Deadlines and Datelines: Essays at the Turn of the Century by Dan Rather*. Retrieved June 17, 2008, from www.booknotes.org:
www.booknotes.org/Transcript/index_print.asp?ProgramID=1525
- Landsberger, S. (2006). *Population policy*. Retrieved May 14, 2006, from International Institute of Social History: <http://www.iisg.nl/-landsberger/pop.html>
- Lasswell, H. (1927). *Propaganda Technique in the World War*. New York: Knopf.
- Lee, A. (1952). *How to Understand Propaganda*. New York: Rinehart and Company.
- Linton, C. (2006). *Courageous Conversations about Race: A field Guide for Achieving Equity in Schools*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Litan, R. e. (1988). *American Living Standards: Threats and Challenges*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Lowen, R. (1997). *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Macarthur, J. R. (1992). *Second Front: censorship and propaganda in the Gulf War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mangano, J. J. (1998). *Low-Level Radiation and Immune System Damage: An Atomic*

Era Legacy. London: CRC Press.

Marketwire. (2009). *Social Media: Your 2009 Marketing Strategy*. Retrieved March 11,

2009, from marketwire.com: marketwire.com

Mason, Linda (2009) *Interview with CBS News Vice President Linda Mason*, June 22,

2009, Les Rose interviewer.

Master, C. (2009, April 10). *Media Insiders Say Internet Hurts Journalism*. Retrieved

April 17, 2009, from theatlantic.com:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200904u/media-insiders>

Max, D. T. (2001, October 7). "The Making of the Speech". *New York Times Magazine*.

Mc Nichol, D. (2005). *The Roads that Built America: the Incredible Story of the US*

Interstate System. New York: Sterling Publishing.

McChesney, R. W. (1995, December). Public broadcasting in the age of communication

revolution. *Monthly Review* , p. found online at

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1132/is_n7_v47/ai_17923332.

McIntosh, N. a. (2003). *The Baffled Parents' Guide to Coaching Youth Soccer*. New

York: McGraw-Hill Professional.

McLain, J. (2007, May 27). *Colleges keep turning out optimistic print journalists despite*

the newspaper crunch. Retrieved April 11, 2009, from venturacountystar.com:

www.venturacountystar.com/news/2007/may/27/www.venturacountystar.com/news/2007/may/27/the-paper-chase/

Meltzer, D. a. (2008, February 22). *Protecting our children against measles*. Retrieved

February 18, 2009, from signonsandiego.com:

http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20080222/news_lz1e22meltzer.html

Merriam-Webster. (2008). *mccarthyism*. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Merriam-Webster.com: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mccarthyism>

Miller. (2005). *Communication Theories: Perspectives, Processes, and Contexts*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Moore, M. (2007, April 5). *European papers optimistic on future--with Web's help*.

Retrieved April 17, 2009, from Mail&Guardianonline (sp):

<http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-04-05-european-papers-optimistic-on-future-with-webs-help>

Murray, M. D. (1999). *Encyclopedia of Television News*. Phoenix, Arizona, United States of America: Greenwood Publishing Group (Oryx group).

Murrow, E. R. (1954, March 9). *University Honors*. Retrieved July 7, 2008, from honors.umd.edu:

<http://www.honors.umd.edu/HONR269J/archive/Murrow540309.html>

News, C. (Producer). (1992). *Edward R. Murrow The McCarthy Years with Walter Cronkite* [Motion Picture]. United States of America: Fox Video.

Obama, Barack (2009, September 9) *Obama Speaks at Memorial for Cronkite, "The Most Trusted Man in America"* Retrieved September 9, 2009 from

[washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com):

http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/09/09/obama_speaks_at_memorial_for_c.html

O'Donnell, V. (2003). Science Fiction Films and Cold War Anxiety. In P. Lev,

Transforming the Screen: 1950-1959. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Olsen, Ron (2008) *Comments on Edward R. Murrow, June 9, 2008*. 6-9-2008,
interviewer Les Rose.

Olson, J. S. (2000). *Historical Dictionary of the 1950s*. Santa Barbara, California:
Greenwood Publishing Group.

ONA and PEW. (2009, Jan. 8). *ONA partners with Pew on first in-depth survey of digital
journalists*. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from journalists.org: source:

http://journalists.org/resource/resmgr/docs/online_journalists_survey_re.pdf

Painter, N. I. (2006). *Creating Black Americans: African American History and Its
Meanings 1619-Present*. New York: Oxford University Press, US.

Pasrrih, M. (2007). *Pink Plastic Lawn Flamingos*. Retrieved February 17, 2009, from
Rewind The Fifties:

http://www.lotl.com/fifties_history/Pink_Plastic_Lawn_Flamings.htm

Patrick, B. A., & Thrall, A. T. (2007). Beyond Hegemony: Classical Propaganda Theory
and Presidential Communication Strategy After The Invasion of Iraq. *Mass
Communication and Society*, 87.

Patterson, J. T. (1997 (10th Edition)). *Grand Expectations The United States 1945-1974*.
Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

PBS. (2009). *American Masters*. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from pbs.org:

<http://www.pbs.org/wnet/americanmasters/episodes/edward-r-murrow/this-reporter/513/>

Perisco, J. E. (1988). *Edward R. Murrow An American Original*. New York, New York,
United States of America: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Price, J. (2000). *Flight Maps: Adventures with Nature in Modern America*. New York:

Basic Books.

Project, P. (2009). Retrieved April 12, 2009, from State of the News Media:

http://www.stateofthemedial.org/2009/narrative_networktv_newsinvestment.php?cat=4&media=6

Roberts, G. a. (2007). *The Race Beat*. New York: Vintage Books.

Rocky Mountain News staff. (2009, February 27). *Goodbye Colorado*. Retrieved March

11, 2009, from rockymountainnews.com: rockymountainnews.com

Rosenthal, R. a. (1969). *Artifact in behavioral research*. New York: Academic Press.

Rovere, R. H. (1982). *Senator Joe McCarthy* (Canadian editor ed.). New York , New

York, USA: Harper Collins.

RTNDA. (1958). *Edward R. Murrow Speech*. Retrieved July 12, 2008, from RTNDA

The Association of Electronic Journalists:

http://www.rtna.org/pages/media_items/edward-r.-murrow-speech998.php

RTNDA. (2008). *Edward R. Murrow Awards*. Retrieved September 5, 2008, from

RTNDA The Association of Electronic Journalists:

http://www.rtna.org/pages/media_items/edward-r.-murrow-awards100.php?id=100

RTNDA/Murrow. (2008). *RTNDA-Industry Leaders-Edward R. Murrow Speech*.

Retrieved August 4, 2008, from RTNDA-The Association of Electronic

Journalists: http://www.rtna.org/pages/media_items/edward-r.-murrow-speech998.php

- Saivetz, M. K. (2007). The Israeli-Hezbollah War of 2006: The Media as a Weapon in Asymmetrical Conflict. *Press/Politics* , 43-66.
- Salinger, L. (2004). *Encyclopedia of White-Collar and Corporate Crime*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Santayana, G. (1905). *Life of Reason, Reason in Common Sense*. Scribner's.
- Schewe, S. (2008, July 3). *Five social networking sights for journalists*. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from editorswebblog.org A Publication of the World Editors Forum: http://www.editorswebblog.org/web_20/2008/07/5_social_networking_sites_for_journalist.php
- Schmidt, R. (2000). *Red Scare: FBI and the Origins of Anti-Communism in the United States, 1919-1943*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Museum Tusulanem Press.
- Scott, A. (2005, September 23). *Good Night and Good Luck. News in Black, White and Shade of Grey*. Retrieved July 2008, 2008, from nytimes.com: <http://movies.nytimes.com/2005/09/23/movies/23luck.html>
- Seib, P. (2007). *Broadcasts From The Blitz: How Edward R. Murrow Helped Lead America Into War* (1st Edition ed.). Dulles, Virginia, United States of America: Potomac Books.
- Shaou-Whea Dodge, P. a. (2008). "It's Okay to Have a Girl": Patronymy and China's One Child Policy. *Women and Language* , 13-22.
- Shaw, Tony (2007) *Hollywood's Cold War* Amherst, Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts Press.
- Sikov, E. (2007). *Dark Victory: The Life of Bette Davis*. New York: Macmillan.
- Simons, H. W. (2007). From Post 9-11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq: A Rhetorical

History. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* , 183-193.

Sims, Mike (2005). *Linda Mason, Senior Vice President, Standards and Special Projects*,

CBS News. cbsnews.com:

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/08/23/broadcasts/main637877.shtml>

Soerber, A. M. (1998). *Murrow: His Life and Times*. (C. N. Hickey, Ed.) Bronx, NY,

USA: Fordham University Press.

Sopronyi, J. P. (2006, April). *Watching the Radio. America in WW II The Magazine of a*

People at War , p. found online at

<http://www.americainwwii.com/april2006.html>.

Sperber, A. (1986). *Murrow: His Life and times*. New York, New York, United States of

America: Freundlich Books.

Sperber, A. (1986). *Murrow: His Life and Times*. New York: Freundlich Books.

St. John, B. I. (2007). Newspapers' Struggles with Civic Engagement: The U.S. Press and

the Rejection of Public Journalism as Propagandistic. *The Communication*

Review, 249-270.

Stanksy, P. (2007). *The First Day of the Blitz*. Bury St. Edmunds, United Kingdom: Yale

University Press.

Stauber, R. a. (2006). *The Best War Ever: Lies, Damned Lies, and the Mess in Iraq*. New

York: Tarcher/Penguin.

Stollznaw, K. (2008). Dehumanisation in language and thought. *Journal of Language*

and Politics , 177-200.

Stone, K. K. (1993, Autumn). Career-Related Characteristics of male and Female News

Directors. *Journalism Quarterly* , pp. 542-549.

Stout, M. (2001). *The Feel Good Circillum: The Dumbing Down of America's Kids in the Name of Self Esteem*. Cambridge, MA.: Da Capo Press.

Taylor, N. S. (2006). The Revival of the Propaganda State: US Propaganda at Home and Abroad since 9/11. *The International Communication Gazette* , 389-407.

The Associated Press. (2008, June 6). *Military engineers defuse large World War II bomb in London*. Retrieved June 9, 2008, from iht.com (International Hearld Tribune):

<http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2008/06/06/europe/EU-GEN-Britain-Old-Bomb.php>

The Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. (2008). *What is a dollar worth? (a calculator on the right hand side)*. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from The Federal Reserve

Bank of Minneapolis: <http://woodrow.mpls.frb.fed.us/index.cfm>

This is Murrow. (1957, September 30). Retrieved June 2, 2008, from Time.com:

<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,891371-1,00.html>

Time. (1978, June 12). *The Beneficent Monster*. Retrieved February 20, 2009, from

time.com: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,948160,00.html>

Time. (1959, November 16). *The Tarnished Image*. Retrieved February 20, 2009, from

Time.com: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,811464,00.html>

Time. (1979, February 19). *The Year of Dr. Einstein*. Retrieved February 20, 2008, from

time.com: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,912381-12,00.html>

Time. (1959, March 02). *Don't See It Now*. Retrieved July 22, 2008, from time.com:

<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,892275,00.html?iid=chix-sphere>

Tompkins, Al (2009, September 16) *RTNDA Focus Group Sounds Off on News Media,*

Coverage. Retrieved September 19, 2009, from Poynter.org:

<http://www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=2&aid=170072>

Turner, Richard Brent (2003). *Islam in the African-America Experience, Second Edition.*

Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

United States Census Bureau (1957), *Current Population Reports, Consumer Income.*

Retrieved August 11, 2009. <http://www2.census.gov/prod2/popscan/p60-024.pdf>

University of Texas College of Communication. (2009, April 6). *Optimism About*

Journalism's Future: A Revolutionary Act. Retrieved April 17, 2009, from

communication.utexas.edu:

http://communication.utexas.edu/news/PROD75_025277.html

USDOT. (2008, December 28). *Highway History: John Steinbeck vs. Charles Kuralt.*

Van Doren, Charles (2008, July 28) *All The Answers* from newyorker.com.

http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2008/07/28/080728fa_fact_vandoren

Wall, M. (2006). Blogging Gulf War II. *Journalism Studies* , 112.

Wang, X. (2007). For the Good of Public Health or for Political Propaganda: "People's

Daily" Coverage of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Epidemic. *China*

Media Research , 25-32.

Weaver, J. (2008, September 4). *Farm Bosses in Immokalee plead guilty in slavery*

scheme. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from miamiherald.com:

<http://www.miamiherald.com/news/southflorida/story/671209.html>

Wershba, J. (n/a). *Edward R. Murrow and the Time of His Time*. (E. Berliner, Editor)

Retrieved July 14 2008, 2008, from Eve's Magazine: A Prestigious Magazine of Writing, Music, and the Arts: www.evesmag.com/murrow.htm

Who said it first? Retrieved February 22, 2009, from U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration:
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure/first.cfm>

Williams, A. B. (2008, 3 September). *Five Plead Guilty in Immokalee slavery case.*

Retrieved September 9, 2008, from news-press.com Fort Myers, Florida:
<http://www.news-press.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=2008809030373>

Wimmer, R. (2009). *Brief Guide for Focus Groups.* Retrieved February 27, 2009, from www.rogerwimmer.com: <http://rogerwimmer.com/mmr/mmrfocusgroups.htm>

Wisconsin Historical Society. (1996). *Remembering McCarthy A Visual Biography, 1908-1957.* Retrieved July 23, 2008, from wisconsinhistory.org:
www.wisconsinhistory.org/whi/feature/mccarthy

Woods, K. (2001, October 16). *The Essence of Excellence.* Retrieved September 1, 2008, from Poynter.org:
http://poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=5048#Discrimination

Woods, Keith (2008) *A Conversation with Keith Woods, Dean of Faculty, The Poynter Institute.* Recorded on cassette tape on August 20, 2008 at the Poynter Institute, St. Petersburg, Florida. Interviewer Les Rose.

Young, W., & Young, N. (2004). *The 1950s.* Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood Publishing Group.