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FOREWORD

The Journalism Department of the University of Arizona feels that the John Peter Zenger Freedom of the Press award which it presented for the first time on November 21, 1954, will accomplish two ends.

It will honor those editors who by influence and example protect press freedom;

It will answer the question which every journalism class asks its instructors: "Is the American press willing to fight for the right to tell the people what they have a freeborn right to know?"

The second accomplishment is as important as the first, for the students who sit at college typewriters and copydesks today will be the editors and publishers of tomorrow. Unless they enter newspaper work with a belief in the integrity of the press—its willingness to meet its responsibilities—the rights we cherish will surely vanish.

The selection of Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of The Denver Post, as the recipient of the first award has met with wide approval. His speech of acceptance struck sparks which will kindle fires in the hearts of editors and publishers of small as well as great newspapers.

Although Mr. Hoyt's address has been widely quoted in part, the Journalism Department believes that the full text will be welcomed in the library of every Journalism classroom and of every editor and publisher.

Tucson, Arizona

Douglas D. Martin
Head, Department of Journalism
University of Arizona
Thank you, Douglas Martin. Dr. Harvill, Members of the Arizona Press Club, gentlemen:

As recipient of the first John Peter Zenger Freedom of the Press Award, I accept this high honor most gratefully and most humbly.

It is, of course, altogether fitting and proper that this award should be named in honor of John Peter Zenger, whose fearless publication of criticisms of Governor Cosby of New York in 1734 was the first and major occurrence in a series of events that firmly established the principle of press freedom in the New World.

John Peter Zenger is a great name in journalism, and it is a tribute to Mr. Martin, the department of journalism of the University of Arizona and the Arizona State Press Club, that this great annual award for service to the cause of Freedom of the Press should be named for John Peter Zenger, who did so much to establish the basic freedom of public comment in this America long before the Revolution and long before this press freedom was guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The case of John Peter Zenger had many significant aspects and results. His acquittal on the charge of libel by a jury established for the first time that truth was a defense against libel. Before the Zenger decision, it had been held that the greater the truth, the greater the libel.

Zenger was tried after spending nine months in jail. He was brilliantly defended by Andrew G. Hamilton of Philadelphia, who successfully contended that free men have a right to remonstrate publicly against official abuses of power and (2) it is up to a jury, and not the judge, to say whether a statement is libelous.

In order that we may take a full look at the significance of the award which you have established in the name of John Peter Zenger, let's take a brief look at the guarantee of Freedom of the Press in this great republic of ours. Let us first note and remember that the constitutional guarantees of this basic privilege of freedom are made on pieces of paper that can be and have been violated in this country by reckless, daring or unprincipled men highly placed in our national councils.

So let us then note and remember: unless the principles of Freedom of the Press and all our other freedoms are deeply graved in the heart of every American, constitutional protections may go for naught no matter how finely worded.
In other words, it is your business and it is my business and that of all Americans always to remember and never to forget that freedom is not a static thing bound to endure without thought or aid as might a mountain made of granite, but that freedom is a dynamic, living thing to be rewon and reaffirmed by every passing generation and to be graved again in the hearts of all free men.

That, if you please, is what has been done and that is what has made America sturdy, strong and great. And that, if you please, is what this generation must do, and do yet again if we are to hand down our freedoms to those yet unborn, our freedoms clearly earmarked as mankind's most precious possessions beyond all gold, or fine incense or jewels; beyond all wealth or empire; beyond all conquest and beyond all, even life itself.

We are fortunate in this country in many ways, but not the least has been our opportunity to see freedom come and go in other lands. We can recall that freedom was the practice under the Weimar republic in Germany, and we can recall that along came a nondescript housepainter, christened unimposingly enough, Adolph Schickelgruber. Germany knew him as Adolph Hitler and minority groups vied with each other in yielding their individual rights to the promises of better days to come. Once Germany had put its trust and its life in the hand of the dictator, things began to happen. Newspapers were seized over night, and made not to speak the truth, but rather the facts as Adolph Hitler saw them; the radio was preempted; universities were suddenly controlled and the churches began to glow with a new faith—faith in Aryan supremacy and the Hitler concept of superman.

The pattern quickly showed itself in other countries awed or conquered by Hitler. Came finally the war; Hitler found the ignoble grave of a suicide, but there was another dictator to take his place with bigger moustaches and bigger ideas. The Baltic states fell, Poland, Hungary, Roumania, Czechoslovakia. Newspapers in those blighted lands ceased to print the news; radio stations became preoccupied with communiques. Censorship became the accustomed pattern of the day. Civil rights vanished as completely as though they had never existed. The individual became tool and ward of the state, privileged to think only in prescribed terms, doomed to an uncertain end.
In our America freedom is a tougher, more sturdy thing, but still expendable unless it is actively loved and strongly guarded by those who enjoy its blessings and profit by its opportunities.

In the forefront of the guardians of our Freedoms must be the newspapers. In this role, the newspapers of America must assume increasingly the mantle of greater responsibility. There are many reasons why, but not the least is that the newspapers are the unlicensed medium of mass communication closest to the people. This is important, as witness the fact that less than a year ago Senator Joseph R. McCarthy bullied the television networks into granting him a half hour of time to answer former President Harry S. Truman who had made a brief mention of McCarthyism on a similar hook-up. Senator McCarthy, in his turn, barely mentioned Harry S. Truman, but spent his time attacking Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States.

Why did the networks grant Senator McCarthy "equal time" on such a thin excuse? Because the Wisconsin senator had two friendly appointees on the Federal Communications Commission, and the big wheels of radio and television might have been afraid to do otherwise. The possibilities of government reprisal that all licensees must feel is clearly shown by this incident.

Thus it is necessary for newspapers to function more sharply, more adequately than ever before. And, believe me, there is nothing wrong with this country that repeated strong dosages of the facts will not correct. Even McCarthyism will melt away before this treatment.

Newspapers would do well to remember that while freedom of the press is guaranteed under our laws, freedom of information is a matter of the individual initiative, integrity and ingenuity, and public office holders are apt to believe in censorship as far as their conduct and the conduct of their offices is concerned.

☆ ☆ ☆

Much attention fortunately has been paid of late to the question of freedom of information with powerful newspaper groups actively concerning themselves with the problem of obtaining all necessary facts for the public at every level of government. The American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, and Sigma Delta Chi, a national professional journalism fraternity, have all been active and effective in this regard.
Thus, journalism itself recognized with increasing clarity that news is the great prophylactic against irregularities in government and per se the greatest champion of civil rights, the very cornerstone of democracy.

It is necessary for us, as newspaper people, constantly to bear in mind what freedom of the press really means. My favorite definition of this term is: “The People's Right to Know,” with the connotation that freedom of the press can never be the publisher's franchise to present false, misleading or incomplete information.

In connection with Freedom of the Press I have the feeling that the most sacred obligation that can be undertaken by a newspaperman is that of presenting the facts squarely day by day in so far as time and space permit, looking toward that totality of fairness that all newspapers must hope to achieve if they are to call themselves newspapers.

The unspoken vow of a real newspaperman should be more sacred even than the famed oath of Hippocrates to which all doctors must subscribe, because newspapermen deal with the very souls of men, with their reputations and with their sacred honor.

Thus, I say, no newspaperman has the right knowingly to twist or distort the news. Such procedure is more than sharp practice; it is more than political manipulation. It is plain dishonesty.

As with other editors, I find some of my time taken up with people who would have me print no news of crime or violence, who would have none of the chronicling of political scandal, who would have our newspaper reflect only sweetness and light.

My answer to such good citizens, I fear, has become somewhat stereotyped. It goes something like this:

“As I see the daily newspaper, it is a mirror of contemporary life. It must, if it is to be a good public servant, reflect life as it is. If crime and violence be a part of our life, then the mirror must show crime and violence as it must also show constructive and unselfish actions. All elements of our life must be shown in the mirror of the daily newspaper in this proper relation and balance.”

There is deep significance in this all-important phase of a newspaper's concept. Let me illustrate:

Several years ago The Denver Post was very actively pointing out highly irregular matters in connection with the
operation of the state penitentiary. These matters, both financial and humanitarian, concerned the wards quite intimately.

A business leader in Denver was so vocal in his criticisms of The Denver Post that I heard of it and invited him into my office. I told him of the reports that had reached my ears.

He swallowed hard and said, "Yes, I have been criticizing the Post. I didn't like the guy you supported for the senate, and I don't like your criticisms of the warden of the penitentiary."

"Mr. Blank," I said, "let's forget the senate, but do you doubt that the warden of the penitentiary is violating the law as we charge or that he has been so doing for 22 years?"

"Oh, no," he replied, "I'm sure all your charges are true, but you're giving the state a bad name."

"Mr. Blank," I replied, "a few weeks ago I had lunch with you and some other Denver business men. The luncheon voices blended finally into a hymn of hate against Harry Truman and his administration. You were violent against the five per centers; you were enraged over the scandals in the RFC; you were bitter about some of the President's associates. Now, let me ask you, if there be wrongdoing in Washington, if there is waste and extravagance in the capital, if there be a toleration for law violation, then where do you think the type of Washington climate that permits that sort of thing is created and who do you think is responsible?"

My visitor allowed as how he didn't know.

"I'll tell you," I said, "where that Washington climate is created and who is responsible. The Washington climate you pretend to detest is created in Denver, Colorado, and you're the man responsible."

My visitor was shocked.

I went on to explain, "When you, a businessman in Denver, Colorado, can tolerate graft and wrongdoing at home, when you don't want it exposed because it will hurt the town and when you don't want to disturb a nice cozy little status quo of intrigue and evil, then you are responsible. So, if you as a businessman and a taxpayer can justify wrongdoing at home, then don't criticize it in Washington."

And so it is. The political climate in Washington is set and established in Denver, in Tucson, in Phoenix, Red Oaks, Los Angeles, Las Vegas and all the other towns and cities and hamlets that make up our glorious country.

And so with newspapers. Afghanistanism is a fine thing in Afghanistan but it is a bad thing in Denver and Tucson.
and when it is practiced in these towns, it is a bad thing in Washington, D. C., too.

Generally speaking, the newspapers of the United States, individually and collectively through their organizations, such as the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors, have been zealous and effective guardians of the freedom of the press, a right guaranteed the people by the Constitution.

For this they are deserving of the highest praise. In protecting their own interests they have by fighting every move to abridge or destroy that freedom patriotically served the national interest and the cause of humanity.

Certainly, without a free press no other freedom can long survive. It is not surprising that in every land where democracy has been replaced by a dictatorship practically the first move made by the despot has been to shackle the press, destroy its freedom and make it a servile mouthpiece of the totalitarian regime.

But let us never forget that freedom of the press is only one of the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. There are others. There are also, to name only some of them, freedom of speech and the right of trial by jury, and the right of an accused to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation and to be confronted with the witnesses against him and to have counsel for his defense. These and the other rights included in the Bill of Rights all form part of an inseparable pattern of restraint of government which distinguishes our system from totalitarian regimes.

There can be no freedom of the press, certainly not for very long, where there is no freedom of speech. Freedom of the press and freedom of speech cannot long survive where the fundamental rights of individuals are curbed or destroyed.

For its own sake, therefore, as well as for the higher good of the nation, it would seem to be the inescapable duty of our newspapers to combat with all the vigor they can any infringement on any of the basic rights.

I wish it could be said that this has altogether been the case. It has not. I need only point out in this connection that during the years in which the dark shadow of Joe McCarthy has spread over the landscape by no means have all newspapers shown him up for what he is—a grave threat
to all our basic liberties by his contemptuous flouting of the rights of individuals.

And that business of the flouting of the rights of individuals may not be done with impunity and with the active or tacit consent of those in authority. This is particularly true if the individual thus wronged is helpless by reason of poverty or of ignorance and more so if he be without friends or champions.

In the New Testament there is a verse that I think applies particularly to one of Joe McCarthy's victims:

The quotation, Matthew 25, Verse 40:

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you,

"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me."

These beautiful Bible words apply to a simple and ignorant colored woman who lost her job because Joe McCarthy and his Faceless Informers made a mistake, a tragic blunder. I would like to quote a page from the new book, "An Almanac of Liberty" by William O. Douglas, justice of the Supreme Court of the United States: The Case of Annie Lee Moss

"The manner in which committees have trenchcd on the liberties of citizens is shown by a March 1954 hearing before the McCarthy committee investigating government operations. Roy M. Cohn was cross-examining Annie Lee Moss, a widowed colored woman, unskilled and with little education, who 'transmitted' messages for the Army but never worked in the code room. She had an attorney, but McCarthy refused to allow him to speak. Mrs. Moss was now unemployed, for when the investigation started she had been suspended. It appeared that there were three Annie Lee Mosses in Washington, D. C. This Mrs. Moss hotly denied she was or ever had been a communist or attended any communist meetings. No testimony was offered against her.

"Mr. Cohn adopted the tactic of smearing by innuendo, 'We have the testimony of Mrs. Markward, the undercover agent for the F.B.I., stating that an Annie Lee Moss was a member, a dues-paying member of the communist party, the Northeast Club of the communist party. We have corroboration of that testimony by another witness who ... gave a sworn statement to the effect that she also knew Mrs. Moss was a member of the Northeast Club of the communist party.' But those witnesses were not called to con-
front the accused and to establish that *this* Mrs. Moss was *the* Mrs. Moss to whom Cohn referred and to give *this* Mrs. Moss the opportunity to defend against the charge.

"McClellan protested, saying that if there was evidence against Mrs. Moss, she was entitled ‘to have it produced here in her presence.’ Mundt ruled that the statement of Cohn be stricken.

"McClellan’s protest took up the earlier challenge by Eisenhower:

“‘In this country, if someone dislikes you or accuses you, he must come up in front. He cannot hide behind the shadows, he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry will inflict. . . . If we are going to continue to be proud that we are Americans, there must be no weakening of the codes by which we have lived. By the right to meet your accuser face to face, if you have one . . .’”

☆ ☆ ☆

Thus the President speaks on Faceless Informers and all good men and true hold with him. And yet the Faceless Informer speaks on. Who and what is the Faceless Informer?

The Faceless Informer is one who from the cloak of “official position” and the darkness of “security” makes charges against another without revealing his identity, the source of the charges or the proof.

A few months ago in Colorado all who respect civil rights and the due process of law were shocked and startled, yes, and frightened when the governor named six teachers, five in public school systems and one in the university, as ones whose loyalty might be questioned.

The governor distributed this derogatory information about the teachers, but utterly refused to identify the source from which it came, except to say that it was “reliable” and “an official source.” He hinted at the F.B.I., the Central Intelligence Agency, the Army, Navy and Air Force intelligence bureaus, and the State Highway Patrol. He said the governors of all the states were receiving such information, by request, and transmitting it to school authorities.

The cases of these teachers were handled summarily, in all but two instances. They got no hearings for one reason or another, never were told who accused them, or even what specific charges stood against them. In short, they were denied fundamental *due process* on an issue of the gravest importance to them, to the schools and to national security.
The Denver Post determined to find out whether as the governor had indicated, that was the state of things generally, or anywhere outside Colorado. The distinguished Associate Editor of The Denver Post, Mr. Lawrence Martin, was assigned to that inquiry. He went from coast to coast, into a dozen states in all. Here, in brief, is what his research disclosed:

The Faceless Informer we are referring to is one who, behind the screen of individual or high official anonymity, has been and is continuing to put out information reflecting on the loyalty of school teachers, most of it imputing guilt by association—and in most instances, association in the past, not the present.

The dissemination of such anonymous information has become routine procedure in many states, perhaps in all, through governors, attorneys general, state and local school administrators.

In some communities, its source has either been directly revealed as the F.B.I., or indirectly linked to the F.B.I. in "confidential" statements by state and local authorities.

When sent out from official sources, such information is customarily defined as an "alert" to school officials—not as charges or accusations.

As handled locally, the information, however, at once takes on the nature of charges, and an immediate compulsion is felt by local school administrators to act upon it, whether they have facilities for checking upon it, evaluating it, or not.

In few, if any, cases has information from federal government sources—either from the executive agencies or legislative investigators—been supported by evidence or proof.

Names of suspected subversives have in many instances been bandied about, resulting in damaging publicity before any conference, hearing, formulation of charges or other due process has been had.

Laws in several states, designed to protect schools from subversive infiltration have been weighted against the suspects or defendants, putting on them, rather than on their accusers the burden of proof. The result has been establishment of the rule of presumed guilt, until innocence has been proved—in itself a flagrant violation of the established judicial rule of innocence until guilt has been proved.

The rights of teachers as professionals have been so intermingled, confused and combined with their rights as citizens
that in many cases both sets of rights have lost their clear identity. This is seen in the customary resort to such blanket charges as "conduct unbecoming a teacher" in dealing with cases of teachers suspected, or anonymously informed against, as possible subversives. In such cases, the subversion issue has been sidestepped and the accused is neither convicted nor acquitted.

The fundamental, inalienable right of any person put under suspicion or accusation to confront an accuser is everywhere violated in the so-called preliminary consideration of cases. Decision is made customarily by weighing the unsupported word of the accuser against the unsupported word of the teacher.

As a result, more than twice as many suspects have resigned or retired as have gone to hearing. No one knows today whether the imputation of subversion to those teachers is justified or not. Fear has become their grand jury, judge, and prosecutor and has forced from them an implied confession, in the form of a resignation.

☆ ☆ ☆

It is my belief that Joseph R. McCarthy has not only split the Republican party, harmed the administration, including the chief executive, but has made a shambles of the dignity of the U.S. Senate and the American press.

It is now apparent in this the fifth year of the McCarthy siege against the American mind that U.S. Senators and U.S. editors all too often suffer from the same vitiating malady.

That ailment might be described as the insulation of sophistication. In other words, a senator and an editor depend too much on the fact that they ought to know rather than the fact that they do know. Take the senators. They are busy men. Vast volumes of information hit their desks. They seek knowledge by proximity and association just as Joe establishes guilt by association and accusation.

How many senators do you imagine are fully informed about the man who has led them around by the nose for four long years?

How many senators have read the Hennings report? or the Benton report? or the Congressional Record for February 20, 1951, which chronicles the U.S. Senate's feeble attempt to find out whether Joe McCarthy said in Wheeling, West Virginia, on February 9, 1951, that there were 205 card-carrying communists in the State department, or 81,
or 57? The noble senators, by the way, never did get an answer to that question.

Or how many senators have read "McCarthy, The Man, The Senator and The Ism"? Or how many have read the 45th annual edition of Progressive magazine devoted entirely to the strange antics of the junior senator from Wisconsin?

Or how many have read that master job of research "McCarthy and the Communists" which thoroughly documents McCarthy's false charges, false starts and false representations?

Or how many newspaper editors either?

Or how many editors realize the hoaxes that Joe McCarthy has involved them in or care?

In early 1951 as editor of The Denver Post I created a mild storm in journalistic circles by sending a memorandum to the news staff on how to handle McCarthy and others careless of facts who used official immunity to attack without proof. The memorandum was little more than a cautioning hint but it did result in demands for proof and did result in equal space for the accused but it didn't stop the hoaxes.

Let's look at a couple:

On July 13, 1953, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy called a gratuitous press conference at which time he gave out some following amazing information which included generally these charges: That on an unspecified date three unnamed and unidentified employees of the U.S. State Department received a bribe, specified sum $150,000, from an unnamed ambassador to do certain unspecified acts (presumably illegal) in behalf of an unnamed foreign country (presumably Latin or South America).

The country was electrified. The papers had built Joe up by that time until he was generating a lot of power. And after all, wasn't he a U.S. Senator? Newspapers the country over played the story prominently, many with big banner lines, certainly virtually all with substantial space on page 1.

There was no follow-up but there was one paper that asked the state department, the department of commerce, the department of justice, the F.B.I. and Joe McCarthy for some facts. That paper was The Denver Post and the questions were asked through the Post's bureau and through the wire services. The answer was always the same—no comment. The wire services got sick of their job. The Denver Post became the Denver Pest. But we kept after it.
Finally after two and a half weeks Joe spoke up. He'd been silent so long. He said:

"Oh, that story. I don't know anything about that. I got that from some reporter in San Diego."

What was the outcome? Well, I can tell you that, too. In mid-January of 1954 R. W. Scott McLeod, credited with being McCarthy's boy in the state department, issued a formal announcement that after a three months investigation the department had concluded that there was absolutely nothing to it.

What did the papers do with that? I am afraid the second story drew no banners. In the case of the World-Telegram and Sun in New York City the three-inch item drew an inconspicuous place on page 6.

A hoax if there ever was one and we fell for it.

Another hoax on a vastly larger scale was the Fort Monmouth case.

Here are the facts, briefly told, of the scandalous recklessness of Senator Joe McCarthy in his sabotage of Fort Monmouth, one of the free world's most vital security installations:

McCarthy made headlines with his own words about Monmouth when he charged:

"It has all the earmarks of extremely dangerous espionage. If it develops, it may envelop the entire Signal Corps."

"It appears to be a case of current espionage of an extremely dangerous nature."

"(It) definitely involves espionage (relating to) our entire defense against atomic attack."

"There is no question now, from the evidence, that there has been espionage in the Army Signal Corps."

"We have uncovered very, very current espionage."

All this he said, and yet the record written since those charges were broadcast shows not a single case of current espionage uncovered, not one official or employee at Fort Monmouth charged, much less convicted, of espionage. Not a single scientist at Fort Monmouth has so much as taken refuge in the Fifth Amendment, and all have offered proof they have no communist affiliations. Not one instance of anything related to espionage at Fort Monmouth has been disclosed by the Army, F.B.I. and other thorough investiga-
tions. And no official report on McCarthy's investigation of Monmouth has ever appeared.

☆ ☆ ☆

One needs no more damning instance of the McCarthy technique than the Ruth Levine references made by him in the Monmouth case.

Here is the stage business of that black little side-drama:

Secretary of the Army Stevens told McCarthy's committee that to his knowledge there were no communists at Monmouth, and that none had invoked the Fifth Amendment.

McCarthy came back with, "When the secretary of the army makes ... a statement which is so clearly false, known to us to be false, the only way I can correct it is to pick up a few of the individual cases which show that he is not speaking the truth."

He cited the case of "a Ruth Levine who had top-secret clearance in telecommunications" who was "subpoenaed December 13 (1953), appeared December 16 and took the Fifth Amendment as to conspiracy to commit espionage. I don't think you want to make that misstatement of facts, Mr. Secretary."

Now for the facts. There was a Ruth Levine, all right. She had been subpoenaed, she had resigned her job, and she had pleaded immunity under the Fifth Amendment.

But the one mighty fact was this—Ruth Levine wasn't, and never had been, an employee at Fort Monmouth!

She had been an employee of the Federal Telecommunications Laboratory, a private concern, subsidiary of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.

Through this and the hideous travesty of the whole Fort Monmouth episode, an irreparable blow has been dealt to American defense, and to the security of the free world. Morale at Fort Monmouth has been dealt an almost fatal blow. Its effectiveness as a bastion of scientific study, experiment and development against communist aggression has been reduced as effectively as if most of its physical plant and personnel had been wiped out by bombs. In fact, maybe the damage is even greater than it would have been by physical violence, for physical attack gives rise to greater resolution among survivors, whereas McCarthy's salvos of slander, accusation and suspicion have left their survivors with little heart to pick up from where the disaster left them.
The hurts done by the McCarthy offensive against Fort Monmouth have been to Americans, and to the United States as a nation and her allies. The only ones benefited by his assault have been Soviet Russia and other enemies of freedom. Was it sabotage? Was this treason?

☆ ☆ ☆

It is true that the number of newspapers critical of McCarthy has grown during the last year or two. But there are still many of them who are his supporters, his apologists, even his devotees.

Those newspapers, the Chicago Tribune, the Hearst press and others like them are, from the long-run point of view, as short-sighted as they are self-destructive. McCarthy is not and never has been a believer in a free press. Proof of this is to be found in the way he has tried to smear every journalistic critic as communist or pro-communist. They are all part of what he calls "the left-wing press, or branches of The Daily Worker," a category in which he includes The New York Times, The Christian Science Monitor, The Denver Post, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch and latterly, the Scripps Howard newspapers—in fact all who oppose him, all of them he would have us believe are doing the work of Moscow.

Liberty, like peace, is indivisible. Once we permit any demagogue to lay hands on the rights of individuals and let him get away with it, it only becomes a matter of time before all other rights guaranteed under the Constitution, including freedom of the press, are placed in mortal jeopardy.

Many years ago back in 1789 a well-informed and realistic member of the Congress, Edward Livingston, made a very interesting statement which could be uttered today, as descriptive of our present scene. He said, and I quote, "If we are to violate the Constitution . . . the country will swarm with informers, spies and all the odious reptile tribe that breed in the sunshine of a despotic power to convey your words distorted by calumny to the secret tribunal where fear officiates as accuser and suspicion is the only evidence that is heard."

In this era of moral turmoil, it is increasingly obvious that the Constitution must be protected, if freedom of the press is to be guaranteed. It is equally obvious that the American newspapers must form the bulwark of that defense. God grant them the wit to see and the strength to strike.