

THESIS



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
A COMPARISON OF BLACK AND WHITE DAILY NEWSPAPERS'
EDITORIAL OPINIONS REGARDING A SELECTED SET
OF EVENTS RELATED TO THE U.S. INVOLVEMENT
IN THE VIETNAM WAR: A SYSTEMATIC
CONTENT ANALYSIS
presented by

Wanda Herndon Murphy

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for
Masters degree in Journalism

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Vishnu M. Mishra".

Major professor

Date November 19, 1978



OVERDUE FINES ARE 25c PER DAY
PER ITEM

Return to book drop to remove
this checkout from your record.

<p>30 R 277</p> <p>10</p> <p>OCT 20 82</p> <p>8331</p> <p>R 112</p> <p>UK</p> <p>JUL 05 83</p> <p>206 L59</p>	<p>8</p> <p>H-236</p> <p>JAN 05 85</p> <p>APR 28 1994</p> <p>118</p> <p>MAY 13 1997</p> <p>142</p> <p>JAN 05 1993</p> <p>113</p> <p>80</p>	<p>JUN 1 60</p> <p>JUN 27 1996</p> <p>550</p> <p>MAY 9 8 1993</p> <p>FEB 9 2000</p> <p>5 APR 14 2001</p> <p>OCT 16 2002</p>
---	--	---

© Copyright by
WANDA HERNDON MURPHY
1978

A COMPARISON OF BLACK AND WHITE DAILY NEWSPAPERS '
EDITORIAL OPINIONS REGARDING A SELECTED SET
OF EVENTS RELATED TO THE U.S. INVOLVEMENT
IN THE VIETNAM WAR: A SYSTEMATIC
CONTENT ANALYSIS

By

Wanda Herndon Murphy

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

School of Journalism

1978

Accepted by the faculty of the School of Journalism,
College of Communication Arts and Sciences, Michigan State
University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Master of Arts degree.

Vishwa M. Mishra

Director of Thesis

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF BLACK AND WHITE DAILY NEWSPAPERS' EDITORIAL OPINIONS REGARDING A SELECTED SET OF EVENTS RELATED TO THE U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN THE VIETNAM WAR: A SYSTEMATIC CONTENT ANALYSIS

By

Wanda Herndon Murphy

This study content analyzed the editorial opinions related to the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War carried in the Atlanta Daily World, Atlanta Constitution, Chicago Defender and Chicago Tribune. The sample time frames for the study were July 27 to August 9, 1964; January 1 to January 15, 1966; January 24 to February 8, 1968; and December 17 to December 31, 1970.

The findings indicated that (1) editorial opinions in the sample black and white daily newspapers did not reflect black public opinion toward the Vietnam War; (2) social, economic and political factors did not affect the nature or pattern of the editorial opinions on the Vietnam War; and (3) the sample black and white daily newspapers had the same rather than different editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War during the sample time frames.

Wanda Herndon Murphy

The study pointed out the need for further research with a larger sample of newspapers drawn over a longer time frame.

To my Husband,

Michael

Your support throughout this
very trying year and a half
will always be remembered
and sincerely appreciated.

Thanks for helping me
reach one of my goals.

Love,

Wanda

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people contributed to my being able to successfully complete this thesis, and I am deeply grateful to all of them.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Vishwa M. Mishra, a brilliant man, who in the midst of confusion and frustration saved my research and helped me to mold it into a scholarly study. The many, many hours he devoted to directing my thesis, his encouragement and friendship will always be appreciated.

I am grateful to Dr. Maurice R. Cullen for understanding my dilemma. If he had not suggested that I contact Dr. Mishra for assistance, I doubt if this thesis would have been completed. I am equally grateful to Dr. George A. Hough 3rd for his encouragement and assistance throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies at Michigan State University.

I would also like to thank my friends, Annette "Robi" Robinson, Tina Magee, Beverly Davis, Pam Sherrod and Michael, for helping me with the typing of the rough draft and for running several errands for me.

My special thanks are given to my mother, Jeanne Herndon, whose understanding and moral support helped me to persevere through these difficult times; to my father, Nelson L. Herndon, Sr., for encouraging me to set high standards for myself and for instilling the desire to achieve in my personality; to my sister, Mary Matthews, whose wit lifted my spirits on many a day; and to my brother, Nelson L. Herndon, Jr., whose faith in me was a source of inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	1
INTRODUCTION.	1 x
The Vietnam War: A Brief Historical Perspective.	1
The U.S. Public Opinion Arena and the Vietnam War.	5
The News Media, Editorials and Public Opinion	9
The U.S. Black Perspective on the Vietnam War.	19
BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS	35
RATIONALE.	37
II. THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	39
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	39
CONCERNS OF THE STUDY.	40
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	41
ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE STUDY	43
III. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.	44
HYPOTHESES	44
METHODS	46
SAMPLING	49
CODING AND PROCESSING OF DATA	54
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	55
NATURE AND PATTERN OF EDITORIAL OPINIONS	55
The "Our Enemies" Category	57
The "War" Category	61

Chapter

The "Government Acts" Category	65
The "Politics" Category	67
The "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" Category.	71
The "Economic Activity" Category	73
The "Our Nation" Category.	74
The "Race Relations" Category	75
 DIRECTION OF EDITORIAL COVERAGE SCOPE . .	78
INDICATORS OF EDITORIAL COVERAGE SCOPE . .	102
AN OVERVIEW	108
 V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	110
 SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. EDITORIAL OPINIONS ON THE VIETNAM WAR APPEAR- ING IN SAMPLE NEWSPAPERS DURING SAMPLE TIME FRAMES	56
2. FINDINGS PERTAINING TO CONTENT CATEGORIES OF EDITORIAL OPINIONS.	58
3. DIRECTIONAL TREATMENT ANALYSIS OF EDITORIALS IN ALL SAMPLE NEWSPAPERS.	79
4. DIRECTIONAL TREATMENT ANALYSIS OF EDITORIALS IN ALL SAMPLE NEWSPAPERS ACCORDING TO SAMPLE CONTENT CATEGORIES	80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The Vietnam War: A Brief Historical Perspective.

The U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War can be traced back to World War II in that certain events during and after this period laid the foundation for American intervention in the war.

Indochina was a French-administered possession of Japan for five years during World War II. When the Japanese surrendered, the Communist-led Vietminh quickly gained control over the country. Emperor Bao Dai was forced to step down as head of the government in favor of Ho Chi Minh, who announced the formation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) on September 2, 1945. However, the French regime began a campaign to regain control of the country. This effort, which officially began on September 23, 1945, drove the Vietnamese Communists and anti-Communists into armed resistance. By March 1946, France had officially reorganized the DRV, but relations

between France and the Vietminh gradually worsened. On December 19, 1946, the Vietminh attacked French forces throughout Vietnam, thus beginning the French war in Indochina. Despite U.S. financial and military aid, French forces could not conquer the Vietminh and an agreement to end the war was concluded in Geneva on July 21, 1954. At that time the country was divided into two parts and elections which would unite the country under one government were scheduled for July 1956. Following this agreement, President Dwight D. Eisenhower pledged American support to the South Vietnamese. The elections were never held and the country remained divided.

In 1957, the Viet Cong Communist guerrillas began attacking villages in South Vietnam. With the assistance of the international communications network, Ngo Dinh Diem, the president of South Vietnam, appealed to the world for assistance. He managed to convince the United States that his policies in South Vietnam were correct for the entire country, despite the fact that he was trying to rid the country of the former Vietminh government's cultural and political influences through the use of propaganda and police and army terrorism. Because Diem communicated the military need of South Vietnam so well, he was able to secure large amounts of U.S. foreign aid of which 80 per cent went into building up both the army and secret service.

Throughout 1960 and early 1961, the Viet Cong executed several successful guerrilla attacks in South Vietnam. During that period, there were 750 United States military advisers stationed in the country. President John F. Kennedy, then, escalated U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War in order to prevent the fall of South Vietnam. He ordered an increase in military aid and personnel, and by February 1962, approximately 2,700 U.S. military advisers were in South Vietnam. By November 1963, when President Kennedy was assassinated, there were 16,300 American soldiers in South Vietnam.

In August 1964, two U.S. destroyers were attacked by North Vietnamese PT boats in the Gulf of Tonkin. After this incident, President Lyndon B. Johnson asked Congress for and received powers "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."¹ The Congressional authorization was contained in the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Some scholars state that President Johnson used the incident to win Congressional endorsement for his pre-conceived policy of escalation of the Vietnam War.

Early in 1965, the process described as the Americanization of the Vietnam War began. By July 1965, 75,000 U.S. combat troops were stationed there. The

¹Neil Sheehan and others, The Pentagon Papers (New York: Bantam Books, 1971), pp. 264-65.

figure continued to climb until 1968 when 510,000 U.S. troops were actively involved in fighting the war. In January and February 1968, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong launched the Tet Offensive. Many historians consider this to be the turning point of the war because on March 31, 1968, President Johnson ordered a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam and announced that he would not seek re-election. The United States and North Vietnam began formal peace talks in May of that year.

In June 1969, President Richard M. Nixon began his policy of Vietnamization in which U.S. troops were withdrawn from Vietnam and replaced by South Vietnamese troops. Troop withdrawals continued until finally in January 1973, a cease-fire agreement was signed by the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam and the Viet Cong. This agreement provided for complete withdrawal of U.S. troops and the return of all prisoners within sixty days. However, the South and North Vietnamese continued to fight the war until 1975 when the South Vietnamese forces suffered a series of setbacks. The war ended on April 30, 1975, when South Vietnam surrendered to the Communists.²

²Detailed accounts of the Vietnam War are found in The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 1974 ed., s.v. "Vietnam War," The World Book Encyclopedia, 1974 ed., s.v. "Vietnam War," by Roger Hilsman.

The U.S. Public Opinion Arena and the Vietnam War.

As a result of the war in Vietnam, a number of questions were raised about the relationship between U.S. public opinion and political decision-making.³ Many scholars have stated that U.S. policy in Vietnam was greatly influenced by public opinion. Many public opinion polls sought to discover the disposition of the public on this issue. An appraisal of public opinion on the Vietnam War from 1964 to 1969 by George Gallup found that the American public shifted its initial position of support of the war to disapproval of it. Erskine⁴ stated that on the whole, all sectors of the population were steadily shifting opinions on the war during those years. The shifting of views during these years has been attributed to various events of the war and domestic developments in the United States.

After the Gulf of Tonkin incident in August 1964, the American people were overwhelmingly in support of the president's decision to retaliate.⁵ However, the polls

³Sidney Verba and Richard A. Brody, "Participation, Policy Preference and the War in Vietnam," Public Opinion Quarterly 34 (Fall 1970):325.

⁴Hazel Erskine, "Polls: Is War a Mistake?" Public Opinion Quarterly 34 (Spring 1970):135.

⁵George Gallup, "Public Opinion and the Vietnam War, 1964-1969," The Gallup Opinion Index, Report No. 52, October 1969, p. 4.

showed that frustration over the war increased at a constant rate after the event. In August 1965, 24 per cent of all persons interviewed said they believed it was a mistake to become involved in the war. By 1966, this response had risen to 35 per cent, then to 46 per cent in 1967, 53 per cent in 1968 and 58 per cent in 1969.⁶ Student demonstrations against U.S. policies in Vietnam began to mount in the fall of 1965, but by a ratio of 2 to 1 the American people said that the administration had not made a mistake in becoming involved in Vietnam.⁷ In spring 1966, the public began to doubt whether the South Vietnamese could form a stable government. This doubt was attributed to the internal strife in that country. Because of this opinion the proportion of Americans who felt U.S. involvement in the war was a mistake rose from 25 per cent to 36 per cent. By the fall of 1966, the response had risen to 46 per cent due to the mounting death tolls and increased troop commitments.⁸ Even a 1966 Newsweek poll found that 35 per cent of blacks were opposed to the war and 25 per cent thought the draft "unfair" to the black community.⁹

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 8.

⁸Ibid., p. 9.

⁹Anonymous, "Report from Black America," Newsweek, June 30, 1969, p. 19.

In early 1967, a study by Verba and others¹⁰ found that the war was recognized as a problem by the majority of the respondents in their study. They reported that 61 per cent of the respondents were worried about it more than about the following four other public issues: crime and juvenile delinquency (51%), black-white relations (32%), inflation and cost of living (46%) and air and water pollution (27%).

Verba and Brody¹¹ also found that in the spring of 1967 the clear message Vietnam activists were saying to political leaders through the mail, demonstrations and marches was one of dissatisfaction. However, at the end of 1967 public opinion generally appeared to be more in favor of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Then the Tet Offensive occurred in January and February 1968. The mass media covered this event extensively and brought the reality of the Tet Offensive to the people. Gallup said Tet represented the turning point in opinions toward the war in the United States. A poll taken immediately following the event found, for the first time, that substantially more people said the war was a mistake than said it was not.¹²

¹⁰Sidney Verba and others, "Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam," American Political Science Review 61 (June 1967):319.

¹¹Verba and Brody, op. cit., p. 332.

¹²Gallup, op. cit., p. 9.

Following the Tet Offensive, President Johnson's popularity sunk to a new low and was at its lowest point on March 31, 1968, when he announced his decision not to run again for the U.S. presidency.¹³

Even with a new president and with revised Vietnam policies, the U.S. public opinion on the war in Vietnam remained negative. A 1969 Gallup poll indicated that by the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium Day demonstration six persons in ten were of the opinion that the United States had made a mistake getting involved in Vietnam.¹⁴ In 1969, as on other occasions, with one exception, the Vietnam War had been named the nation's top problem by respondents to a Gallup survey. The exception was in the summer of 1968 when the racial crisis was named equally as often.¹⁵

Another Newsweek poll of black Americans taken in 1969 found that 56 per cent of black Americans opposed the war and 47 per cent thought the draft "unfair."¹⁶ This sample of blacks believed that the war depleted the community of young men, sapped available resources from it and stifled the homefront war on poverty.¹⁷

¹³Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶"Report from Black America," op. cit., p. 19.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 19-20.

The News Media, Editorials and Public Opinion.

Research has found that in general, the mass media communicates information on important issues,¹⁸ influences the audience's decisions and is a source of public opinion.¹⁹ Throughout the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War, the mass media communicated public opinion and information on the Vietnam War. Because of the communication and information function of the media, they may have influenced the feelings and opinions of their audience's regarding the Vietnam War.

The mass media achieve their influence through their editorials.²⁰ Thus, it can be assumed that the editorials in the mass media played an important role in shaping and guiding public opinion on the war. Several scholars on public opinion have studied the effects of editorials and found that editorials do tend to influence public opinion. A review of their findings clarifies the opinion function of editorials.

¹⁸V. O. Key, Jr., Public Opinion and American Democracy (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1961), p. 395.

¹⁹Bernard C. Hennessy, Public Opinion (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965), p. 272.

²⁰Key, op. cit., p. 353.

In identifying the relationship between public opinion and editorials, Bird and Merwin²¹ suggested that the editorial "is a most important part of the relationship between the press and the public."

According to several scholars, editorials shape,²² guide,²³ and influence²⁴ public opinions. It has also been established that editorials even bring about opinion change²⁵ as well as stimulate public debate and discussion on important issues.²⁶

In that research findings have established that the mass media have the ability to influence the opinions of the audience, the media perspective of the Vietnam War

²¹George L. Bird and Frederick Merwin, eds., The Press and Society (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951), p. 330.

²²Herbert L. Lewis, "Foreign Policy on the Newspaper Editorial Page," Journalism Quarterly 26 (March 1949):426.

²³Gayle A. Waldrop, Editor and Editorial Writer (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1955), p. 56.

²⁴Maxwell McCombs, "Editorial Endorsements: A Study of Influence," Journalism Quarterly 44 (Autumn 1967):547.

²⁵Del Brinkman, "Do Editorial Cartoons and Editorials Change Opinions?" Journalism Quarterly 45 (Winter 1968):726.

²⁶Hal Davis and Galen Rarick, "Functions of Editorials and Letters to the Editor," Journalism Quarterly 41 (Winter 1964):109.

merits consideration. Several studies have assessed the impact of various sources of information on the acquisition of certain opinions.

A study by Haavelsrud²⁷ found evidence that the mass media and friends provided high school students with information on which to base their attitudes and opinions about war and peace. Gregg²⁸ found that newspapers, through editorial endorsements, do exert influence on the voting public. After an examination of ten "prestige" newspapers' editorials during the 1964 presidential campaign, Myers²⁹ found that the foreign affairs content of these editorials were prime factors in President Johnson's victory over U.S. Sen. Barry Goldwater. Hooper³⁰ found that the major source of variation that distinguishes one Democrat from another and one Republican from another is newspaper editorial endorsements.

²⁷Magnus Haavelsrud, "Learning Resources in the Formation of International Orientations," Communication Review 20 (Fall 1972):229.

²⁸James E. Gregg, "Newspaper Editorial Endorsements and California Elections, 1948-1962," Journalism Quarterly 42 (Autumn 1965):532.

²⁹David S. Myers, "Editorials and Foreign Affairs in the 1964 Presidential Campaigns," Journalism Quarterly 45 (Summer 1968):211.

³⁰Michael Hooper, "Party and Newspaper Endorsements as Predictors of Voter Choice," Journalism Quarterly 46 (Summer 1969):305.

A study of public opinion trends by Laing and Stevenson³¹ established that those who viewed the Water-gate hearings on television were more likely to favor impeachment and were likely to base their decisions on information obtained from the viewed hearings.

Their findings are not surprising because other knowledgeable persons in this area have found that television is the major source of news for the majority of Americans and is also the most believable mass medium. Research conducted by commercial firms and by academicians has established that there is a rising dependence on and credibility of television news.³² According to several Roper Studies³³ television has emerged as the most believed medium for public affairs news.

³¹Robert B. Laing and Robert L. Stevenson, "Public Opinion Trends in the Last Days of the Nixon Administration," Journalism Quarterly 53 (Summer 1976):294.

³²See for example: John D. Abel and Michael D. Wirth, "Newspaper vs. TV Credibility for Local News," Journalism Quarterly 54 (Summer 1977):371-75; Richard F. Carter and Bradley S. Greenberg, "Newspapers or Television: Which Do You Believe?" Journalism Quarterly 42 (Winter 1965):29-34; Bradley S. Greenberg, "Media Use and Believability: Some Multiple Correlates," Journalism Quarterly 43 (Winter 1966):655-70; Harvey Jacobson, "Mass Media Believability: A Study of Receiver Judgments," Journalism Quarterly 46 (Spring 1969):20-28; and Bruce H. Westley and Werner J. Severin, "Some Correlates of Media Credibility," Journalism Quarterly 41 (Summer 1964):325-35.

³³Burns W. Roper, Trends in Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media, 1959-1974 (New York: Television Information Office, 1975), p. 4.

Atwood and Sanders³⁴ have found that the subjects of their study received most of their political campaign information from television. The influence of the mass media in general was established by Jones and Saunders³⁵ in a study which found that after a five-week mass media campaign to make citizens more aware of privacy problems, attitude changes were produced on three of five measures and on four of five measures for heavy media users.

The foregoing show that the mass media have become very important to the public. They have a great impact upon public opinion processes. Therefore, it is important to look at how it interpreted and evaluated the war in Vietnam.

Two researchers have conducted systematic studies of press content on the Vietnam War. A study of the periodical business press by DiBacco³⁶ revealed that this press consistently supported the war from August 1964 to

³⁴L. Erwin Atwood and Keith R. Sanders, "Perception of Information Sources and Likelihood of Split Ticket Voting," Journalism Quarterly 52 (Autumn 1975):428.

³⁵E. Terrence Jones and Joan Saunders, "Persuading an Urban Public: The St. Louis Privacy Campaign," Journalism Quarterly 54 (Winter 1977):669.

³⁶Thomas A. DiBacco, "The Business Press and Vietnam: Ecstasy or Agony?" Journalism Quarterly 45 (Autumn 1968):426.

October 1967. Bailey³⁷ found that from August 20, 1965, to August 20, 1970, there were news stories on television 1,305 weekdays. His data showed that CBS covered the war 83 per cent of the time; NBC, 78 per cent and ABC, 72 per cent. In another study, Bailey³⁸ found that the network anchormen in bringing the news to the audience read short stories of the events of the war without much interpretation.

The media, especially the electronic media, covered the war thoroughly. The war was covered so extensively that it was dubbed the "television war." For the first time, the sights and sounds of war appeared on television screens in homes every evening in America. As a result, the war was no longer "over there," instead it was in the living rooms of the American public.³⁹

In concluding his 1976 study, Bailey⁴⁰ commented that other scholars have said the media coverage of the Vietnam War had a great impact on public opinion,

³⁷George Bailey, "Television War: Trend in Network Coverage of Vietnam, 1965-1970," Journal of Broadcasting 20 (Spring 1976):149.

³⁸Idem, "Interpretative Reporting of the Vietnam War by Anchormen," Journalism Quarterly 53 (Summer 1976): 323.

³⁹Anonymous, "Living Room War," U.S. News and World Report, March 4, 1968, p. 28.

⁴⁰Bailey, op. cit., p. 157.

individual sensibilities and even on the conduct of the war. According to Strouse⁴¹ the media spotlighted the reality of Vietnam in its reports on the drug problem, the killing of thousands of civilians, the corruption and instability of South Vietnam's government and the false stories told by the American military command to the news media. But, what position did the media take on the war?

In 1968, the news commentators began to openly editorialize on the war. The war had altered the cautious network tradition of discouraging editorials on matters other than local affairs.⁴² This trend was begun by Walter Cronkite in February 1968 when he presented a series of critical essays aimed at piercing the administration's optimism about the war.⁴³ NBC news correspondent Frank McGee ended a March 10, 1968, hour-long review of the Tet Offensive by expressing his viewpoint. He said:

Too many of the buildings now lie in rubble and too many of the people lie dead. The time is at hand when we must decide whether it's futile to destroy Vietnam in an effort to save it.⁴⁴

⁴¹James C. Strouse, The Mass Media, Public Opinion and Public Policy Analysis (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1975), p. 21.

⁴²Anonymous, "Escalating Opinion: Vietnam Editorials on Television," Newsweek, March 25, 1968, p. 97.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Ibid.

In mid-March 1968, ABC correspondent Howard K. Smith called for full escalation of the war so that it could be ended quickly.⁴⁵ Also in 1968, a national survey had found that an increasing number of newspapers had defected from the administration's course on the Vietnam War.⁴⁶

A close analysis of the print media established that at first they supported the war, but as the United States became more involved, their opinion shifted to opposition. As of 1968, 90 per cent of the total U.S. magazine readership was concentrated in Life, Look, Time, Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report, Reader's Digest and Saturday Evening Post.⁴⁷ A sample of their editorials was analyzed by Wright⁴⁸ and further documented by the researcher. Selected excerpts from four of the magazines show the opinion shift of the magazines on the war.

During the initial stages of the Vietnam War, several news magazines published articles and/or editorials which supported the United States' role in Southeast Asia.

⁴⁵"Escalating Opinion," p. 97.

⁴⁶Anonymous, "Shifting on the War," Newsweek, March 25, 1968, p. 84.

⁴⁷James D. Wright, "Life, Time and the Fortunes of War," Trans-Action, January 1972, p. 43.

⁴⁸Ibid.

This can be attributed to the fact that the general public felt the United States should be involved in the war.

An editorial in the January 8, 1965, issue of Life said negotiations in Vietnam were "a euphemism for American withdrawal and a Communist victory"⁴⁹ and in February 1966, the magazine published an editorial supporting an escalation of the war.⁵⁰

In 1964, an article in Time said that if Vietnam were to fall to the Communists, the "domino theory" would prevail.⁵¹ Another Time editorial during the early stages of the Vietnam War urged the United States to fight Communist aggression in Southeast Asia or otherwise be faced with it another day under worse conditions.⁵² A Look editorial during the same period stated that if the United States were to let South Vietnam fall, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand would fall like dominoes, and India would be exposed to an Asian Communist bloc.⁵³ A Post

⁴⁹Anonymous, "To L. B. J.: What Is Our Aim in Vietnam," Life, January 8, 1965, p. 4.

⁵⁰Hedley Donovan, "The War Is Worth Winning," Life, February 25, 1966, pp. 27-32.

⁵¹Anonymous, "The Prince and the Dragon," Time, April 3, 1964, p. 34.

⁵²Anonymous, "Vietnam: The Right War at the Right Time," Time, May 14, 1965, p. 30.

⁵³Anonymous, "What Johnson Faces in Vietnam," Look, January 28, 1964, p. 19.

editorial said that if the United States pulled out of South Vietnam the result would be a shift in the balance of power.⁵⁴

By 1967 and 1968, the new magazines cited earlier began to question and criticize U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. In 1967, the editors of the Post criticized President Johnson for stating that he had no alternative in the Vietnam War because they felt that he had not investigated the possible choices available to him.⁵⁵ In another editorial, the editors of the Post called the war an "embarrassment" because in their opinion, the United States was fighting a war on behalf of a government that did not represent anyone.⁵⁶ By 1968, Time, Life and Look said that the war was a mistake and urged that it be de-escalated and then ended.⁵⁷ It is possible that this opinion change can be attributed to the Tet Offensive which was said to be the turning point in the Vietnam War.

⁵⁴ Anonymous, "The Stakes in South Vietnam," Saturday Evening Post, June 13, 1964, p. 80.

⁵⁵ Anonymous, "Vietnam: A First Step," Saturday Evening Post, February 11, 1967, p. 86.

⁵⁶ Anonymous, "A Small Step Forward in Saigon," Saturday Evening Post, April 22, 1967, p. 96.

⁵⁷ Anonymous, "Re-Examining the Conduct of the War," Life, January 5, 1968, p. 5; Anonymous, "How the War in Vietnam Might End," Time, August 9, 1968, p. 22.; and Anonymous, "An Editorial," Look, May 14, 1968, p. 33.

Many of the national circulation newspapers had come out against the war prior to 1968; among them were The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Christian Science Monitor and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.⁵⁸ However, it appears that it took the news magazines four years to change their opinions on the war in Vietnam. In contrast, negative black public opinion on the war, which was primarily expressed by black opinion leaders, was evident as early as 1965. It would seem that this negative black public opinion would have been reflected in the editorials of the black newspapers prior to 1967. If so, this would imply that black newspapers shifted their opinions from support to opposition sooner than the white media.

In reflecting on the foregoing discussion of U.S. public opinion on the war and the media's perception of it, it is clear that the shifting opinions of the public and the white media's opinion shift on the war go hand in hand.

The U.S. Black Perspective on the Vietnam War.

When the United States became involved in the Vietnam War in 1964, the majority of the black population, like the other segments of the country's population, supported the

⁵⁸Wright, op. cit., p. 45.

U.S. war effort. But, in time, many blacks became confused about the U.S. role in the Vietnam War.

Black supporters of the war wondered; should the black man help the white man kill the yellow man? On the other hand, black opponents of the war wondered if it was just good sense for a black man to go to war if it took him out of the ghetto.⁵⁹ The black population's mixed feelings left them embattled at home and abroad which resulted in a conflict of sympathies.⁶⁰ Whitney M. Young, Jr., former executive director of the National Urban League, summed up this frustration in 1969. He said:

I am totally convinced that this war has an extra dimension for black people that it does not have for many whites. We are suffering doubly. We are dying for something abroad that we do not have at home. At the same time we are victims of backlash among the white majority--a backlash greatly sharpened by the tensions of the war.⁶¹

The frustrations of blacks described by Young were so intense that all fragments of black support for the war dwindled away when blacks saw a relationship between the war and loss of interest in the problems of the black community.

⁵⁹ Marvin Kupfer, "The Negro View: A Special Anguish," Newsweek, July 10, 1967, p. 34.

⁶⁰ Alan F. Pater and Jason R. Pater, eds., What They Said in 1969: The Yearbook of Spoken Opinion (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Monitor Book Company Inc., 1970), quoting Whitney Young, Jr., p. 252.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 36.

The Vietnam War was of special concern to the black community because it was the first war in which black soldiers were integrated into previously all white units.⁶² The formula used to integrate blacks into these previously all-white divisions eventually resulted in a disproportionate number of black soldiers in Vietnam. This caused many black leaders and scholars to become concerned that the commitment of U.S. troops to the Vietnam War was based on racism.

The increased participation of blacks in the war led to increased vocal opposition to U.S. foreign policy by blacks. Katz⁶³ noted that as the black revolution moved toward the goal of political power, its organizations became increasingly critical of United States foreign policy and particularly of the use of black soldiers fighting in Vietnam against nonwhite people. The solidarity of black public opinion against the Vietnam War was the result of the black population's growing interest in the foreign and domestic policies of the United States government.⁶⁴

⁶²Anonymous, "Only One Color," Newsweek, December 6, 1965, p. 42.

⁶³William Loren Katz, Eyewitness: The Negro in American History (New York: Pittman Publishing Corp., 14th printing, 1971), p. 525.

⁶⁴Robert S. Browne, "The Freedom Movement and the War in Vietnam," Freedomways 5 (Fourth Quarter 1965):468.

In examining black opposition to the war, Verba and others⁶⁵ found that blacks were unimpressed by arguments that our commitment in Vietnam was necessary to preserve freedom and justice for ourselves and others in Southeast Asia. This feeling can be directly attributed to their general dissatisfaction with the war. The afore-said researchers' findings were supported by Gamson and Modigliani⁶⁶ who advanced a tenable hypothesis that "the greater the attachment to the mainstream, the greater the degree of conformity of one's foreign policy opinion to official policy." Historically, blacks have not lived in the mainstream of American life. Therefore, their negative opinions toward a war they could not justify or see its relevance to the black community is not surprising.

Black opinion on the war in Vietnam was effectively communicated to the black community during the war by black opinion leaders. They played a crucial role in shaping the community's opinion toward the Vietnam War at that time. In this context it is useful to briefly browse into opinion leadership research. Katz and Lazarsfeld⁶⁷

⁶⁵Verba and others, op. cit., p. 325.

⁶⁶William A. Gamson and Andre Modigliani, "Knowledge and Foreign Policy Opinions: Some Models for Consideration," Public Opinion Quarterly 30 (Summer 1966):189.

⁶⁷Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence (New York: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 116-20.

state that opinion leaders are influential disseminators of news because information flows from the mass media to the opinion leaders, then from the leaders to the lesser active members of their community, making the opinion leaders influential channels for the interpersonal dissemination of informal opinion. Other studies, however, have established that there is more than the two-step flow of information. There is also multi-step flow in as much as the information may flow directly from the mass media to the audience and also from the opinion leaders to the audience. These findings enable the researcher to establish relationships between the black community and its opinion leaders, as their role is now known. Opinion leaders' statements on the Vietnam War merit consideration because they exerted influence over public opinion and were conduits of the black community's opinions to other members of society.

Blacks perceived the war as a force which exerted negative economic, social, political and attitudinal impacts on the U.S. black community. As a result, many black leaders criticized the war on the basis of these four perceptions.

Throughout his July 1, 1965, report to the annual convention of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), James F. Farmer, the organization's former director, criticized the federal government's inability to mount

a decisive war against poverty and bigotry in the United States while it poured billions into the war in Vietnam.⁶⁸

Newsweek in its August 8, 1966, issue echoed the sentiment of black leaders that the war was having a diversion-effect on many programs designed to help blacks. The article stated that the "war on poverty," a federally funded program, had turned into the will-o-the-wisp of American politics. It is also stated that it was the war, which was using so much of the budget, that the administration and Congress were pointing to it in holding down anti-poverty spending.⁶⁹ It is clear that the disparaging economic condition of the black community was not a priority of the administration in 1966.

Speaking on the Vietnam War's negative impact on black Americans, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. voiced his opinion in a 1967 speech at Riverside Church in New York:

There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Vietnam and the struggle I, and others, have been waging in America. A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle. It seemed as if there was a real promise for the poor--both black and white--through the Poverty Program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the buildup in Vietnam and I watched the program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war, and I knew that America

⁶⁸James F. Farmer, Annual Report to the CORE National Convention (Durham, N.C.: Congress of Racial Equality, July 1, 1965).

⁶⁹Anonymous, "War on Poverty: Present Danger," Newsweek, August 8, 1966, pp. 21-22.

would never invest the necessary funds or energies in the rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Vietnam continue to draw men and skills and money like some demoniac destructive suction tube.⁷⁰

King reiterated his stand on the war in 1968 when he said that the economic problems of the black community were overshadowed by the Vietnam War.⁷¹ During the March 12, 1968, session of Congress, U.S. Congressman Robert Nix of Pennsylvania, a black, said that programs to assist blacks were being hampered by the war effort.⁷²

Julian Bond criticized the lack of a financial commitment in the ghetto during the war:

In the comparison of tactics in Vietnam with black Americans, there is one huge significant difference: the nation was willing to spend billions of dollars a year in Vietnam, where there was no comparable financial commitment in the ghetto. At one point we were spending roughly \$30 billion per year to interfere with the political future of eighteen million Vietnamese. We surely ought to be able to spend that much on twenty-two million black Americans whose future affects the country much more than the lesson in democracy being taught in Southeast Asia.⁷³

⁷⁰Martin Luther King, Jr., "Beyond Vietnam," in Vietnam and Black America, ed. Clyde Taylor (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1973), pp. 81-82.

⁷¹Idem., "Showdown for Non-Violence," Look, April 16, 1968, p. 23.

⁷²U.S. Congress, House, Congressman Robert Nix speaking on the Report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 12 March 1968, Congressional Record 114:6197.

⁷³Julian Bond, A Time to Speak, A Time to Act (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972), p. 7.

The Vietnam War had a strong negative social impact on the black community, especially on the Civil Rights Movement. The movement and the war were in motion simultaneously, but the war affected the movement more than the movement affected the war. However, civil rights leaders were generally careful not to relate the progress or regress of the movement to the war due to the fact that early in the war those who spoke out against it were considered disloyal. Therefore, leaders of the Civil Rights Movement usually avoided comments in public that would arouse the enemies of blacks and divert attention from the black fight for legal rights and an end to poverty.⁷⁴ Possibly due to these leader's silence on the war, in 1965 the Vietnam War was gradually replacing civil rights as the top story of the sixties.⁷⁵ By that time, leaders within the movement began to speak out on the war. Some black leaders like King and Stokely Carmichael, leader of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in the late sixties, openly opposed the war, while others like Roy Wilkins, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), felt the

⁷⁴Thomas A. Powers, The War at Home (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973), p. 139.

⁷⁵Browne, op. cit., p. 469.

need to disassociate themselves with anyone who took an anti-war stance.⁷⁶

Because of these differences, the Civil Rights Movement became splintered with the various organizations going their own way.⁷⁷ SNCC was a noted refugee from the movement because of its extremely radical stand. The effect of the war on the movement was noted by black U.S. Sen. Edward Brooke, who in 1967 acknowledged that the war in Vietnam had brought the Civil Rights Movement to a dead halt.⁷⁸

In Congress, black representatives were beginning to focus their attention on the Vietnam War. On August 1, 1967, two black Congressmen, John Conyers of Michigan and Augustus Hawkins of California, recognized the negative impacts of the war on black ghetto dwellers. They were among ten Democratic Congressmen who spoke out in the House, urging the administration to redirect its attention from the war back to the cities. The Congressmen said that never before had the nation's national priority been more seriously unbalanced.⁷⁹ The U.S. representatives feared

⁷⁶L. Deckle McLean, "The Black Man and the Draft," Ebony, August 1968, p. 63.

⁷⁷Powers, op. cit., p. 141.

⁷⁸Anonymous, "Senator Brooke and Dr. King," The Nation, April 10, 1967, p. 453.

⁷⁹U.S. Congress, House, Congressmen Burton, Conyers, Dow, Edwards, Roybal, Hawkins, Helstoski, Kastenmeier,

that this imbalance would cause ghetto residents, who were predominately black, to riot.

Malcolm X was one of the first black leaders to oppose the war. In 1965, he claimed that the U.S. government was "causing American soldiers to be murdered every day, for no reason at all."⁸⁰ King joined Malcolm X in dissent against the war by protesting against its negative impact on the black population. Speaking at a July 5, 1965, meeting of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), King said:

I'm not going to sit by and see war escalated without saying anything about it. . . . It is worthless to talk about integration if there is no world to integrate in. I am certainly as concerned about seeing the defeat of Communism as anyone else, but we won't defeat Communism by guns or bombs or gases. We will do it by making democracy work. . . . The war in Vietnam must be stopped.⁸¹

This statement by King noted a direct relationship between the attitudes of civil rights activists and the war. On January 6, 1966, SNCC, the first black organization to take a public stand on the war, issued a statement to the press announcing its opposition to U.S. involvement in

Rosenthal and Ryan speaking on War, Riot, and Priorities, 90th Cong., 1st. sess., 1 August 1967, Congressional Record 113:20851-20852.

⁸⁰Howard A. Ploski and Ernest Kaiser, eds., The Negro Almanac (New York: Bellwether Publishing Co., Inc., 1971), p. 581, quoting Malcolm X.

⁸¹William Robert Miller, Martin Luther King (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1968), p. 236.

Vietnam.⁸² In 1967, boxer Muhammed Ali decided he would not fight with the Viet Cong and said he was not going 10,000 miles to help murder, kill and burn the people simply to help continue the domination of white slave-masters over the dark people of the world.⁸³

By 1969 every major black organization except the NAACP had denounced American policy in Asia as a reflection of racism at home.⁸⁴ One particular organization to decry U.S. policy in Vietnam was GIs United Against the War in Vietnam. In 1969, this predominantly black group stated that "our country suffers while the slaughter goes on. The vast resources and sums of money the government squanders in support of a corrupt dictatorship in Saigon belong to the American people."⁸⁵ However, the opinion shift of other black leaders, especially black Congressional leaders, was evident in 1968 as they became increasingly more concerned with the politics of the war and its effects on the black community. In addition to these leaders, such

⁸²"Statement on Vietnam: SNCC Press Release," in Vietnam and Black America, pp. 258-59.

⁸³Katz, op. cit., p. 525, quoting Muhammed Ali.

⁸⁴William Loren Katz, "The Afro-American Response to U.S. Imperialism," Freedomways 11 (Third Quarter 1971):285.

⁸⁵Fred Halstead, GI's Speak Out Against the War (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), p. 97.

radical black leaders as Eldridge Cleaver, voiced their dissent on the war. In Soul on Ice, Cleaver said that the aggressive U.S. role in Vietnam showed the very intimate relationship between the way human beings were being treated in Vietnam and the treatment they were receiving here in the United States.⁸⁶ Black Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm said:

I am deeply disappointed at the clear evidence that the no. 1 priority of the new administration is to buy more and more and more weapons of war, to return to the era of the cold war, to ignore the war we must fight here--the war that is not optional. There is only one way, I believe, to turn these policies around. The Congress can respond to the mandate that the American people have clearly expressed. They have said, "End this war. Stop the waste. Stop the killing. Do something for our own people first."

We must force the administration to rethink its distorted, unreal scale of priorities. Our children, our jobless men, our deprived, rejected and starving fellow citizens must come first.

For this reason, I intend to vote "No" on every money bill that comes to the floor of this House that provides any funds for the Department of Defense.⁸⁷

Congressman Ronald Dellums of California made several statements about the political nature of the war. At one point he said that the United States should get out of Southeast Asia as quickly as it could.⁸⁸ He later

⁸⁶Eldridge Cleaver, Soul on Ice (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1968), p. 115.

⁸⁷U.S. Congress, House, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm speaking on the Department of Defense Budget, 91st Cong., 1st sess., 26 March 1969, Congressional Record 115:7765.

⁸⁸Washington Post, 29 January 1971, sec. A, p. 4.

called the U.S. involvement in Indochina illegal, immoral and insane.⁸⁹ And in still another statement, he said that the United States had been beaten in Vietnam.⁹⁰ In 1972, Sen. Brooke criticized Congress for not being able to control the war. He said that Congress had failed to take a central part in shaping past policies toward the war and that a U.S. policy for disengagement should have been adopted.⁹¹

Many black opinion leaders expressed concern about what they considered to be a disproportionate number of blacks fighting the war. In January 1966, SNCC circulated a press release which stated that 16 per cent of the draftees from this country were blacks who had been called on to preserve a "democracy" which did not exist for them in the United States.⁹² In 1967, King⁹³ said in his speech at Riverside Church that the war was sending blacks to fight and die in extraordinarily high proportions

⁸⁹U.S. Congress, House, Congressman Ronald Dellums speaking on the Involvement in Indochina, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 24 March 1971, Congressional Record 117:7912.

⁹⁰San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle, 21 May 1972, sec. A, p. 11.

⁹¹The Dallas Times Herald, 3 March 1971, sec. A, p. 17.

⁹²Taylor quoting SNCC, "Statement on Vietnam," pp. 258-59.

⁹³King, "Beyond Vietnam," pp. 81-82.

relative to the rest of the population. In 1968, Cleaver⁹⁴ stated that the fact that 16 per cent of the troops in Vietnam were black was an indication that there was a relationship between the black revolution and the Vietnam War. During a news conference in New York City on October 13, 1963, Whitney Young, Jr. said that blacks from working class families were among those who were dying in disproportionate numbers in Vietnam.⁹⁵ And historian William Loren Katz noted that black soldiers accounted for 23 per cent of the total soldiers stationed in Vietnam during the United States' involvement there.⁹⁶

Several authorities cited data which supported their assertions. Ploski and Kaiser⁹⁷ found that in 1965, statistical information released by the Department of Defense showed that almost 15 per cent of the infantrymen in Vietnam were black. Congressman Hawkins⁹⁸ reviewed the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and found that (1) only 5 per cent of the blacks

⁹⁴Cleaver, op. cit., p. 115.

⁹⁵Pater and Pater, op. cit., p. 252, quoting Whitney Young, Jr.

⁹⁶Katz, Eyewitness: The Negro in American History, p. 524.

⁹⁷Ploski and Kaiser, op. cit., p. 581.

⁹⁸Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 10,000-01.

drafted could obtain deferments as college students whereas 95 per cent of the drafted whites were so deferred, (2) blacks were found in combat four times as frequent as eligible whites, and (3) blacks constituted 22.8 per cent of all combat personnel in Vietnam, resulting in a black death rate of 22.4 per cent of all combat fatalities.

According to 1971 Department of Defense data, black draftees represented 10.5 per cent of all draftees serving in Vietnam in 1967, 11 per cent in 1968, 12.6 per cent in 1969 and 12.6 per cent in 1970.⁹⁹ The data also revealed that blacks accounted for 16 per cent of all service deaths in Vietnam from January 1961 to December 1966, 12.7 per cent in 1967, 12.9 per cent in 1968 and 10.8 per cent in 1969.¹⁰⁰

The print media also carried articles which supported the statement of black leaders. In 1967, the Economist noted that one out of every eleven American men between the ages of nineteen and twenty-nine were black, but two out of every eleven of the Army's enlisted men killed up to 1966 were black.¹⁰¹ An article in the

⁹⁹Secretary of Defense, Negro in the Armed Forces: A Statistical Fact Book (Washington, D.C.: Office of Secretary of Defense, September 1971), p. 230.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., pp. 231-32.

¹⁰¹Anonymous, "Negroes Go to War," Economist, April 15, 1967, p. 255.

National Review also cited data which indicated that blacks were disproportionately represented in Vietnam.¹⁰² The Nation noted that black re-enlistment rates were down because the black community felt that too many black soldiers were dying in Vietnam.¹⁰³ Prior to this article, The Nation had said that 12 per cent of the Army in Vietnam was black and 21 per cent of all Army deaths in Vietnam from January 1961 to July 1967 were black deaths.¹⁰⁴

While the data and assertions may or may not be supported, the fact remains that these articulations of the feelings of black leaders have reflected the black population's agony in Vietnam. As indicated, the impact of the Vietnam War on the U.S. blacks was a major concern of the black community. Therefore, it is natural to expect that black newspapers would have reflected the concern. This is moored into certain basic assumptions regarding an interplay between the media and the community they serve. For example, Lasswell stated that the media which serve a community will (1) transmit the viewpoints

¹⁰²Anonymous, "King Talk," National Review, April 18, 1967, p. 396.

¹⁰³Anonymous, "One War: Negro Disillusionment with Vietnam," The Nation, October 14, 1968, p. 357.

¹⁰⁴Charles R. Eisendrath, "The Black Hessians," The Nation, January 29, 1968, pp. 146-48.

of its members on important issues to the entire community, (2) disclose any threat against the community, and (3) will attempt to respond to the threat in its editorial content.¹⁰⁵ It would then seem logical that the editorials of the black newspapers would have reflected black public opinion on the Vietnam War. It would also seem logical that black daily newspapers would oppose the war sooner than white daily newspapers because blacks opposed the war sooner than whites. Likewise, it is reasonable to assume that white daily newspapers did not reflect black opinion on the war because the white media has traditionally excluded black expression from its pages.¹⁰⁶

BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS

On the basis of the foregoing presentation, several background assumptions germane to this study can now be made.

It can be assumed that:

1. The Vietnam War was perceived as an important issue in the black community as well as in the white community.

¹⁰⁵Harold D. Lasswell, "The Structure and Functions of Communication in Society," in Reader in Public Opinion and Communication, eds. Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz, 2d ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1966), p. 189.

¹⁰⁶Kerner Commission, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 383.

2. The frustration created by the Vietnam War in the black community would have been reflected in the editorial opinions of the sample black daily newspapers.
3. The frustrations created by the Vietnam War in the white community would have been reflected in the editorial opinions of the sample white daily newspapers.
4. The sample black daily newspapers would be concerned about presenting the opinions of their audience on the Vietnam War.
5. Black public opinion on the Vietnam War was not reflected in the white mass media.
6. The editorials in the sample black daily newspapers would reflect opposition to the war sooner than the editorials in the sample white daily newspapers.
7. After black and white public opinion converged on the Vietnam War, the editorials in the sample black and white daily newspapers would reflect the same opinion on the war.

Another basic assumption that has guided this writer in the execution of this study relates to the functions performed by editorial opinions communicated by the media of news communication. These editorials are perceived as important sources of information by the

consumers of the media. As such, the editorials either modify or directly influence the opinions in a free society. Additionally, the editorial opinion is an expression of such variables as public opinions on the various issues of public concern. It is axiomatic, then, to suggest that the social condition of blacks as well as whites in the United States during the Vietnam War, the cultural background of the American blacks, the economic deprivation of blacks as well as whites, the living conditions of blacks as well as whites and the changing political opinions of the American people would be important factors in determining the nature as well as pattern of editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War.

The central proposition for the study, then, is that the aforesaid factors are necessary components of editorial opinions expressed in both the black and white daily newspapers in the United States and that the relationship between these factors and expressions of editorial opinions in these newspapers are constant and cumulative.

RATIONALE

The study envisaged here is important since it could attempt to assess any differential treatments assigned to the Vietnam War in the editorial columns of black daily newspapers vis-a-vis white daily newspapers.

Additionally, the study is a legitimate area of concern because to an important extent, the genuine understanding of black aspirations in the American pluralistic society is contingent upon the expression of black public opinion even through the editorial pages of black newspapers. Besides, no such study seemed to have been conducted in a systematic fashion. It is hoped that this study will contribute toward the enrichment of the knowledge about the relationships between mass communication processes in the United States. It is also hoped that the findings of this study will contribute toward the development of a middle-range theory concerning the effects of editorial opinion on black public opinion in the United States.

CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The basic objective of the study centered around the examination of the problem question pertaining to a comparative content analysis of the sample black and white daily newspapers' editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War during four sample time frames.

Specifically, the study was designed:

1. To delineate the pattern of editorial opinions on the Vietnam War in the sample black and white daily newspapers during the sample time frames of July 27 to August 9, 1964, January 1 to January 15, 1966, January 24 to February 8, 1968, and December 17 to December 31, 1970;

2. To explain similarities as well as differences in the aforesaid editorial opinions of the sample black and white daily newspapers;

3. To examine the interaction between a selected set of factors such as the social conditions of blacks as well as whites in the United States during the Vietnam War, the cultural background of the American blacks, the

economic deprivation of blacks as well as whites, the living conditions of blacks as well as whites and the changing political opinions of the American people and the articulations of editorial opinion toward the Vietnam War during the sample time frames in the sample newspapers;

4. To generate some conclusions regarding the nature and pattern of the editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War in the sample black and white daily newspapers.

CONCERNS OF THE STUDY

The study was concerned with the examination of the following problem questions:

1. To what extent did the American blacks' perception of the Vietnam War as a socially unjust event influence the editorial opinions of the sample black daily newspapers toward the Vietnam War?

2. Were the fears, frustrations and alienation of whites as well as blacks toward the Vietnam War reflected in the similarities as well as differences in the editorial opinions toward the war in the sample newspapers?

3. Were the sample black daily newspapers representing black public opinion toward the Vietnam War in their editorials?

4. To what extent were the editorial opinions in the sample black daily newspapers indicative of the fact

that the Vietnam War was perceived as an important issue of public concern by black Americans?

5. Did the editorials of the sample white daily newspapers reflect black opinions on the Vietnam War?

6. To what extent did such factors as the cultural background of American blacks, the economic deprivation of blacks as well as whites, the living conditions of blacks as well as whites and the changing political opinions of the American people affect the nature as well as pattern of the editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War in the sample newspapers?

7. Was the high degree of involvement of blacks in the Vietnam War a factor accounting for differences or similarities in the sample black and white newspapers' editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War?

These are only some of the major problem questions that the study has attempted to explore. It is hoped that the findings of the study will provide some data for building a middle-range theory on the interplay of editorial opinion and public opinion among blacks in the United States.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Certain terms have been used in a technical sense in the study. Therefore, their definitions are offered as follows.

Black Daily Newspaper.--A black daily newspaper was defined as the daily newspaper which is published at least four times a week and is owned, published, operated, edited and managed exclusively by blacks and intended principally for the black audience.

White Daily Newspaper.--A white daily newspaper refers to the daily newspaper which is published at least four times a week and is principally owned, published, operated, edited and managed by whites.

Domino Theory.--Domino theory was defined as the construct through which it was assumed that if one country in Southeast Asia were to fall to the Communists, all the other countries in the region would fall, one after another like dominoes.

Editorial Opinion.--An editorial opinion was defined as an unsigned opinion column, appearing daily in approximately the same place on the editorial page or section, which provided commentary which sought to evaluate or monitor events within and outside the community.¹

¹Donald L. Shaw and Michael Bishop, "Editorial Function and Societal Stress," Journalism Quarterly 49 (Autumn 1972):582; John W. Windhauser, "Content Patterns of Editorials in Ohio and Metropolitan Dailies," Journalism Quarterly 50 (Autumn 1973):563.

ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

The remainder of the study is organized in three additional chapters and a bibliography.

Chapter III discusses the methodological considerations for the study.

The findings of the study are reported in Chapter IV.

Chapter V provides conclusions and some generalizations derived from the study.

A comprehensive bibliography follows Chapter V.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

HYPOTHESES

To test the central proposition related to the objectives of the study, the following descriptive hypotheses were formulated:

H₁:

The sample black and white daily newspapers will extend support to the Vietnam War in the early sample time frame of the war rather than in the later sample time frame of the study.

H₂:

The sample black and white daily newspapers are more likely to have the same rather than different editorial opinions on the Vietnam War during the Gulf of Tonkin incident than before the incident.

H₃:

The sample black daily newspapers' editorials will shift from support to opposition of the Vietnam War after the Gulf of Tonkin incident whereas the sample white daily newspapers will continue to extend their editorial support to the Vietnam War.

H₄:

The sample black daily newspapers are more likely to disseminate opinions of black opinion leaders on the Vietnam War in their editorial opinions throughout the four sample time frames of the study than the sample white daily newspapers.

H₅:

The sample white daily newspapers' editorials are more likely to disseminate negative reactions to black opinion leaders who opposed the Vietnam War than will the sample black daily newspapers' editorials.

H₆:

The sample white daily newspapers are more likely to ignore black public opinion on the Vietnam War than the sample black daily newspapers.

H₇:

The sample black daily newspapers' editorials are more likely to bring attention to the various effects of the Vietnam War on the black community than the sample white daily newspapers' editorials.

H₈:

The sample black daily newspapers are more likely to have a higher percentage of editorials opposed to the Vietnam War than will the sample white daily newspapers during the sample time frames of the study.

H₉:

The editorial opinions of the sample black daily newspapers on the war will be congruent with black public opinion.

H₁₀:

The sample black newspapers' editorials are more likely to protest the disproportionate representation of blacks in Vietnam than the sample white daily newspapers' editorials.

H₁₁:

The sample black daily newspapers' editorials are more likely to characterize the Vietnam War as an extension of racism in the United States.

METHODS

The methods utilized in the execution of the study consisted of both quantitative as well as qualitative content analysis. Several methodologists have provided various definitions of content analysis. However, Berelson's definition is considered adequate. He states that "content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication."¹

To supplement the data obtained through content analysis, analytical and documentary techniques of historical research were also utilized.

Before setting up the content categories, the writer was guided by the facts that the content categories

¹Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis in Communication Research (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952), p. 17.

should (1) reflect the purposes of the research,² (2) be comprehensive,³ and (3) be mutually exclusive.⁴ Following these three basic precepts of category construction, the writer adopted Bush's⁵ categories with modifications.

The following are the modified content categories and indicants thereof:

1. "Our Enemies": This category includes editorial expressions regarding most political and economic events in Communist-controlled nations which may affect the security of the American people and expressions concerning the defense of the nation.

2. "War": This category includes editorial comment concerning actual armed conflict between the United States and Vietnam.

3. "Government Acts": Included are editorial opinions referring to presidential acts and legislative decisions.

²Richard W. Budd, Robert K. Thorp, and Lewis Donohew, Content Analysis of Communication (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1967), p. 40.

³Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 99.

⁴Guido H. Stempel III, "Increasing Reliability in Content Analysis," Journalism Quarterly 32 (Fall 1955):455.

⁵Chilton R. Bush, "A System of Categories for General News Content," Journalism Quarterly 37 (Spring 1960):206-10.

4. "Politics": Editorial expressions noting the political views of city, state and federal elected officials. Also included are expressions of candidates and criticisms of government activities laden with political implications.

5. "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations": Included are editorial opinions concerned with diplomatic relations between the United States and other nations. Specifically, diplomatic efforts of the secretary of state to explain the U.S. role in Vietnam to other nations. Also included are comments regarding peace in Vietnam.

6. "Economic Activity": This category includes editorial comment concerning the financial commitment of the United States in the Vietnam War. Also included are comments about the allocation of funds for domestic government programs.

7. "Our Nation": Included are editorial opinions on national security and viewpoints which almost all readers might identify with as a member of the nation.

8. "Race Relations": This category includes editorial expressions concerning the effect of the Vietnam War on the black community. Also included are comments or expressions of black leaders and comments about segregation and conflict between the races.

The unit of analysis was the entire editorial.

Each category within the unit of analysis was evaluated for its directional dimensions. These dimensions included (1) positive (those editorials that reflected support of the Vietnam War), (2) negative (those editorials which opposed the Vietnam War), (3) neutral (those editorials which had neither positive nor negative opinions of the Vietnam War) and (4) mixed (those editorials in which conditional assertions were made such as "If the war stops today, the \$30 billion being used for the Vietnam War will be poured into urban renewal.").

SAMPLING

In the interest of efficiency, a purposive sample of the four daily newspapers, the Chicago Defender, Chicago Tribune, Atlanta Daily World and the Atlanta Constitution, was drawn.

The criteria for selection of the four daily newspapers included (1) daily publication of the newspaper, (2) relatively large circulations of the newspapers, (3) the newspapers' publication in some large population centers with the black and white population mix in the United States,⁶ and (4) the white newspapers'

⁶In 1970, the population of Chicago was 6,977,267 of which 17.6 per cent was black and 1,596,517 population in Atlanta of which 21.7 per cent was black. U.S. Bureau of Census, County and City Data Book, 1977: A Statistical Abstract Supplement (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977), p. 548.

characterization as "elite" newspapers.⁷ Additionally, it was determined that the Chicago Tribune represents the "white establishment" press. Likewise, the Chicago Defender represents the "black establishment" press. The Atlanta Daily World, still a black daily newspaper, represents the libertarian spirit of the press and the Atlanta Constitution, still a white daily newspaper, also represents the libertarian spirit of the press especially when it was edited and published by the late Ralph McGill. A brief background of the four daily newspapers follows below.

The Chicago Defender, a black daily newspaper located in Chicago, Illinois, was founded as a weekly in 1905. In 1956, it began publishing Monday through Thursday. The Friday, Saturday and Sunday editions are contained in a Big Weekend edition. It has a circulation of 22,212. The newspaper relies heavily on AP and UPI wire copy for national and international news, but has a correspondent assigned to cover Washington, D.C. It is part of the Sengstacke chain of black newspapers, with John H. Sengstacke as editor and publisher.⁸

⁷John C. Merrill, The Elite Press (New York: Pittman Publishing Corporation, 1968), pp. 30-31.

⁸William J. Luedke, '78 Ayer Directory of Publications (Philadelphia, Pa.: Ayer Press, 1978), p. 287.

The Chicago Tribune, a white daily newspaper located in Chicago, Illinois, was established in 1847. It is the oldest daily newspaper in Chicago and has a weekly circulation of 752,861; 701,124 on Saturday; and 1,114,966 on Sundays. The newspaper has national and foreign correspondents. Clayton Kirpatrick is the editor.⁹

The Atlanta Daily World, a black daily newspaper located in Atlanta, Georgia, was established as a daily in 1928. During the four sample time frames of this study, the newspaper was published Monday through Saturday. However, it is presently publishing on Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. The newspaper depends on AP and UPI wire copy for national and international news. It has a circulation of 23,000. C. A. Scott is the editor and publisher.¹⁰

The Atlanta Constitution, a white daily newspaper located in Atlanta, Georgia, was established in 1868. It is published Monday through Saturday by the Atlanta Newspapers Corporation. It is combined with the Atlanta Journal for its Sunday edition. It has a weekly circulation of 212,888 and 415,447 on Saturday. It depends on

⁹Luedke, op. cit., p. 299.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 257.

AP and UPI wire copy for national and international news. Hal Gulliver is the editor.¹¹

Additionally, the Atlanta Constitution and the Chicago Tribune were among fifteen daily newspapers classified as "most superior for news coverage, integrity and public service."¹² Features of the free elite newspapers are (a) independence, financial stability, integrity, social concern, good writing and editing; (b) strong opinion and interpretative emphasis, world consciousness, nonsensationalism in articles and make up; (c) emphasis on politics, international relations, economics, social welfare, cultural endeavors, education and science; (d) concern with getting, developing, and keeping a large, intelligent, well-educated, articulate and technically proficient staff; (e) determination to serve and help to expand a well-educated, intellectual readership at home and abroad; desire to appeal to and influence opinion leaders everywhere.¹³

All issues of the four newspapers published during the following four sample time frames were analyzed for editorial content on the Vietnam War:

¹¹Ibid., p. 256.

¹²Anonymous, "Nation's Editors Pick 15 'Superior' Papers," Editor and Publisher, April 12, 1960, p. 12; William L. Rivers, The Mass Media: Reporting, Writing, Editing, 2d ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 37.

¹³Merrill, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

July 27 to August 9, 1964--The criterion for selecting this time was that on August 2, 1964, the U.S.S. Maddox and U.S.S. Turner Joy were attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin by North Vietnamese PT boats. As a result of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the decision was made to make the Vietnam War a major U.S. war.

January 1 to January 15, 1966--This time frame was selected for study because no major incidents were reported during this period. It was also selected because usually at the beginning of the year editors are taking stock on important issues.

January 24 to February 8, 1968--This period was selected because the North Vietnamese army and the Viet Cong launched a surprise attack on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, Hue, Khe Sanh, Da Nang, Nha Trang, Ban Me Thuot, Kontum, Hoi An, Qui Hhon, Pleiku, Long Binh Post, Bien Hoa Air Base and Tan Son Nhut Air Base. The offensive lasted one month and is considered the turning point of the war as far as the United States involvement was concerned.

December 17 to December 31, 1970--The decision to use this time period was based on the fact that there were no major incidents during this period and by the end of the year, editors are usually repenting their opinions they had made at the beginning of the year.

The researcher used contiguous two weeks during the four selected time periods to allow for before, during and after event comment and analysis.

CODING AND PROCESSING OF DATA

All issues of the newspapers which were published during the four sample time frames of the study were obtained.

With the aid of the content categories and indicators, the writer first scanned the editorials then coded them.

The writer trained two additional coders to make judgments about the directional categories of the study. The coding by the two coders was supervised by the writer.

The level of inter-coder agreement, or coefficient of reliability, was .89 per cent.¹⁴

The processing and statistical analysis of the data were done at Michigan State University.

¹⁴Holsti, op. cit., p. 140. The formula used in this study:

$$\text{inter-coder reliability} = \frac{3M}{N_1 + N_2 + N_3}$$

where:

M = average number of coding decisions on which all coders agreed. $N_1 + N_2 + N_3$ = number of coding decisions made by the three coders.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study have been reported here under the following rubrics: (1) the nature and pattern of the editorial opinions in the sample black and white daily newspapers during the sample time frames of the Vietnam War; (2) the direction of the opinions; (3) a set of indicators of similarities and differences in the editorial opinions as analyzed through the descriptive hypotheses; and (4) an overview of the preceding three rubrics.

NATURE AND PATTERN OF EDITORIAL OPINIONS

The findings indicate that 184 issues of the sample newspapers were examined for editorial opinions on the Vietnam War. Seventy-one editorials on the Vietnam War were found in the four sample daily newspapers during the sample time frames. Nine of these editorials were carried in the Chicago Defender, twenty-six in the Chicago Tribune, thirteen in the Atlanta Daily World and twenty-three in the Atlanta Constitution. This is indicated in Table 1.

TABLE 1
EDITORIAL OPINIONS ON THE VIETNAM WAR APPEARING IN SAMPLE NEWSPAPERS
DURING SAMPLE TIME FRAMES

Newspapers	1964	1966	1968	1970	Total
<u>Chicago Defender</u>	n = 1 (.08%)	n = 5 (23%)	n = 1 (.04%)	n = 2 (15%)	n = 9 (13%)
<u>Chicago Tribune</u>	n = 7 (53%)	n = 4 (18%)	n = 12 (55%)	n = 3 (23%)	n = 26 (37%)
<u>Atlanta Daily World</u>	n = 1 (.08%)	n = 5 (23%)	n = 5 (22%)	n = 2 (15%)	n = 13 (18%)
<u>Atlanta Constitution</u>	n = 4 (31%)	n = 8 (36%)	n = 5 (22%)	n = 6 (46%)	n = 23 (32%)
Total	n = 13 (18%)	n = 22 (31%)	n = 23 (32%)	n = 13 (18%)	N = 71 (100%)

However, a cross-tabulation of the general findings indicated that the sample black daily newspaper had fewer editorial opinions (N = 22; 31%) during the four sample time frames than the sample white daily newspapers (N = 49; 69%) than expected. This can be attributed to the fact that the sample black daily newspapers were not published as often as the sample white daily newspapers.

The quantitative analysis of the editorial coverage assigned to the Vietnam War under the eight categories is indicated in Table 2. From the analysis, it appears that the majority of the sample daily newspapers' editorials dealt with "War," "Politics," "Our Enemies" and "Race Relations," while very few editorials dealt with "Government Acts," "Economic Activity," "Our Nation" and "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" categories.

The "Our Enemies" Category. Of the editorials found in the sample daily newspapers, nine (13%) dealt with the "Our Enemies" category. None of the Chicago Defender's editorials dealt with this category whereas six (67%) of the Chicago Tribune's editorials, one (11%) of the Atlanta Daily World's editorials and two (22%) of the Atlanta Constitution's editorials were assigned to this category. The sample white daily newspapers had more editorials in this category than the sample black daily newspapers. This can be explained in terms of the availability of news sources for the sample black and

TABLE 2

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO CONTENT CATEGORIES OF EDITORIAL OPINIONS

Category	Chicago Defender (n = 9)	Chicago Tribune (n = 26)	Atlanta Daily World (n = 13)	Atlanta Constitution (n = 23)	Total
1. "Our Enemies"	n = 0 (0%)	n = 6 (23%)	n = 1 (.08%)	n = 2 (.09%)	n = 9 (13%)
2. "War"	n = 3 (33 1/3%)	n = 13 (50%)	n = 6 (46%)	n = 13 (56%)	n = 35 (49%)
3. "Government Acts"	n = 0 (0%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 2 (.09%)	n = 2 (.03%)
4. "Politics"	n = 3 (33 1/3%)	n = 2 (.07%)	n = 4 (31%)	n = 2 (.09%)	n = 11 (15%)
5. "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations"	n = 0 (0%)	n = 4 (15%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 4 (.06%)
6. "Economic Activity"	n = 1 (11%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (.04%)	n = 2 (.03%)
7. "Our Nation"	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (.03%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (.01%)
8. "Race Relations"	n = 2 (22%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 2 (15%)	n = 3 (13%)	n = 7 (10%)

white newspapers. Black daily newspapers did not have the same news sources as the white daily newspapers. Therefore, the editors of black daily newspapers may not have been as well informed about the activities of the North Vietnamese as the sample white daily newspapers. Therefore, the sample black daily newspapers may not have perceived the North Vietnamese as enemies.

The Chicago Tribune's editorial opinion on August 8, 1964, was the only editorial in "Our Enemies" category during the 1964 sample time frame. It commented on the North Vietnamese attacks in the Gulf of Tonkin and the United States decision to retaliate in defense of the nation.¹

The Atlanta Daily World's editorial opinion in the above-mentioned category centered on the seizure of the U.S.S. Pueblo, as did four of the Chicago Tribune's editorials. The Atlanta Daily World's editorial mentioned that it was the first time in one hundred years that an American vessel had been seized and that the United States should act immediately to secure its return. The first editorial dealing with the above-mentioned incidence included the same information. Both suggested that the Pueblo seizure was designed to divert the United States' attention from the Vietnam War. The Atlanta Daily World said that this was possibly a diversionary tactic by the

¹Editorial, "Mr. Stevenson Speaks for America," Chicago Tribune, 6 August 1964, p. 10.

Communists to attempt to take the United States' attention off North Vietnam so that the Communists could prepare a new offensive against U.S. forces in South Vietnam² while the Chicago Tribune questioned whether this act was designed to instigate a major spread of hostilities on the Asian mainland.³ The Atlanta Constitution did not editorialize on the Pueblo crisis. Instead, it discussed the deteriorating relationships between Red China and the Soviet Union. The editorial opinion said that it was no wonder that China's foreign minister had launched a bitter attack on the Soviet Union, accusing it again of conspiring with the United States to stop the war and inflict peace, and accused the Soviet Union of doing nothing to immobilize the U.S. military buildup in Vietnam by creating incidents elsewhere in the world.⁴

The similarity in the editorials of the Atlanta Daily World and Chicago Tribune in "Our Enemies" category can be explained in terms of commonality of opinion among black and white newspapers on the Pueblo crisis. However, the Chicago Defender may not have had editorial opinions

²Editorial, "A Grave Danger of Spreading the War," Atlanta Daily World, 26 January 1968, p. 6.

³Editorial, "A Direct Challenge from the Reds," Chicago Tribune, 24 January 1968, p. 14.

⁴Editorial, "Chinese Tiger Is Losing Riders; That's Gain for the Russian Bear," Atlanta Constitution, 6 January 1966, p. 4.

in the "Our Enemies" category because it did not receive the information that the other three sample newspapers did. Why the Atlanta Constitution chose not to express an editorial opinion on the Pueblo crisis is not known, but the editors may have just chosen not to discuss it.

The "War" Category. A majority of editorials (N = 35; 49%) in the sample newspapers dealt with the "War" category. The editorials were distributed as follows: three in the Chicago Defender, fourteen in the Chicago Tribune, six in the Atlanta Daily World and thirteen in the Atlanta Constitution.

A qualitative analysis of the editorials dealing with "War" indicates that the Atlanta Daily World, Chicago Tribune and the Atlanta Constitution expressed editorial opinions on the Tonkin Gulf incidence encouraging the United States to retaliate against the acts of aggression by the North Vietnamese. The Chicago Defender did not carry an editorial opinion under the "War" category during the July 27 - August 9, 1964, sample time frame. The Atlanta Daily World, the Chicago Tribune and the Atlanta Constitution editorialized on the Tet Offensive. During the Tet Offensive the Chicago Defender chose to discuss the Pueblo incidence as not being a war issue.⁵ It is possible that the Chicago Defender did not have editorial

⁵ Editorial, "Cautious Mood," Chicago Defender, 1 February 1968, p. 4.

opinions on these two incidences in the war because the editors were not properly informed about the issues due to their sole dependence on wire service copy as it did not have a foreign correspondent in North Vietnam.

The Chicago Tribune questioned if the Tonkin Gulf incidence resulted in full-fledged war, would the United States' allies aid the United States in the war. The newspaper felt that they would not.⁶ The Atlanta Daily World said the international crisis which had developed over the attacks against the U.S. ships in the Gulf of Tonkin should be resolved as soon as possible and regardless of politics, all Americans should be united in the defense of the national interest.⁷ The Atlanta Constitution called the Gulf of Tonkin incidence a test of the United States' naval preparedness and the maturity of its diplomatic judgment.⁸

The editorial opinions on the Tet Offensive were very similar in the Atlanta Daily World, the Chicago Tribune and the Atlanta Constitution. The Atlanta Daily World discussed Tet in relation to new calls for greater

⁶Editorial, "Summer Friends and Sunshine Allies," Chicago Tribune, 7 August 1964, p. 16.

⁷Editorial, "The Vietnam Crisis," Atlanta Daily World, 7 August 1964, p. 4.

⁸Editorial, "Political Maturity as Well as Our Navy Are Tested in Troubled Asian Waters," Atlanta Constitution, 4 August 1964, p. 4.

troop commitments in Vietnam while the Chicago Tribune in five of the editorials discussed the implications of Tet for the American people. The Atlanta Constitution in two of its editorials evaluated the impact of Tet and the U.S. military commands' ability to defend South Vietnam during the offensive. During this sample time frame, the Chicago Defender did not express an editorial opinion on the Tet Offensive. Instead, it chose to state that the Pueblo incidence should not become an issue in the Vietnam War. The similarity in editorial coverage in these three sample newspapers can be attributed to the fact that the black and white segments of the population had not yet become fearful of and frustrated with the Vietnam War as it was in its early stages.

Several differences in the editorial coverage between the sample black and white daily newspapers were found. The Atlanta Daily World in its January 27, 1968, editorial opinion discussed the South Vietnam Catholic Bishop's criticism of the South Vietnamese government and suggested that Saigon and Washington, D.C. investigate their charges.⁹ On February 3, 1968, the Atlanta Daily World suggested that the war be reviewed so that those who did not support the war would change their

⁹Editorial, "The Bishops Speak," Atlanta Daily World, 27 January 1968, p. 6.

minds.¹⁰ On December 18, 1970, in an editorial entitled "Bad Vietnam News," the Atlanta Daily World reported the findings of a guerilla warfare expert who stated the South Vietnamese and American effort to eliminate the Viet Cong in North Vietnam had failed.¹¹ In its editorial expression on December 27, 1970, the Atlanta Daily World discussed a coming end to the Vietnam War as indicated by the U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam.¹²

The Chicago Defender's two editorials which appeared during the January 1 - January 15, 1966, sample time frame stated that as the result of the Vietnam War, the United States was heading toward a major war with Red China¹³ and that peace may be possible if negotiations were successful.¹⁴ Other Chicago Tribune editorial opinions dealt with General Nguyen Khanh's desire to escalate the war early in 1964, the failure of the

¹⁰ Editorial, "The War in Slow Motion," Atlanta Daily World, 3 February 1968, p. 4.

¹¹ Editorial, "Bad Vietnam News," Atlanta Daily World, 18 December 1970, p. 4.

¹² Editorial, "U.S. Troop Withdrawal," Atlanta Daily World, 27 December 1970, p. 4.

¹³ Editorial, "America and Red China," Chicago Defender, 12 January 1966, p. 4.

¹⁴ Editorial, "In Pursuit of Peace," Chicago Defender, 11 January 1966, p. 4.

three-nation central commission to carefully monitor the situation in Vietnam, the outdated ammunition used by U.S. soldiers in Vietnam, the prisoner-of-war situation and efforts to end the war. The Atlanta Constitution discussed in early August 1964 the U.S. decision to send additional advisers to Vietnam, what would happen if peace talks failed, the trial of Lt. William Calley, prisoners-of-war and the American public's desire for peace.

The differences in editorial coverage between the sample black and white daily newspapers may again be attributed to the sample black daily newspapers' lack of information on all the issues covered in the editorial expressions of the sample white daily newspapers, the editors of the black sample daily newspapers may not have perceived the Lt. Calley trial, the outdated ammunition used in Vietnam as being pertinent to their black audiences because of the cultural differences of blacks and whites, and if this information were actually received by the sample black daily newspapers and not reported, this would have been attributed to the selective news judgment of the sample black daily newspaper editors.

The "Government Acts" Category. In the category of "Government Acts" (N = 2; .03%), the Chicago Defender, the Chicago Tribune and the Atlanta Daily World carried

no editorial opinions. The Atlanta Constitution carried two editorial opinions under this category.

The Atlanta Constitution's editorial opinions under the "Government Acts" category were found on January 1, 1966, which was during the January 1 - January 15, 1966, sample time frame and January 30, 1968, which was in the January 24 - February 8, 1968, sample time frame. On January 1, 1966, the newspaper stated that in 1965 the country, through the 89th Congress, came to tentative grips with some of the most pressing problems, the Vietnam War being one of those problems. And that hopefully, the United States could look forward to 1966 being a year of growth; however, it could be marred by the Vietnam War and its explosive possibilities.¹⁵ On January 1, 1966, the newspaper discussed President Johnson's proposed budget for 1968 and criticism of it. The editorial stated that the budget was \$185 billion, of which \$79.8 billion was for defense-- \$26.3 billion of that was earmarked for the war in Vietnam and it asked where would the critics of the budget make the cuts.¹⁶ The other three sample newspapers may not have carried editorials under this category because the

¹⁵ Editorial, "U.S. Closes the Door on Eventful 1965 and Hopefully Welcomes the New Year," Atlanta Constitution, 1 January 1966, p. 16.

¹⁶ Editorial, "Or, the Path of Responsibility," Atlanta Constitution, 30 January 1968, p. 4.

editors chose to concentrate on editorial expression on different aspects of the Vietnam War.

The "Politics" Category. Under the "Politics" category eleven (15%) editorials were carried in the four sample newspapers. The Chicago Defender carried three editorials and the Chicago Tribune carried two editorials. On the other hand, the Atlanta Daily World carried four editorials and the Atlanta Constitution carried two editorials that dealt with the above-mentioned category.

The sample black daily newspapers probably had more editorial expressions in this category due to the 1966 Julian Bond incident. In the "Politics" category the sample black daily newspapers published almost totally different editorial opinions from the sample white daily newspapers except on one topic. In four of its editorial expressions, the subject was then-representative-elect Julian Bond who had been denied his seat in the Georgia Legislature because he endorsed a Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) press release opposing the Vietnam War and urging black men to resist the draft. On January 12, 1966, its editorial stated that the Bond incident would hurt the Civil Rights Movement.¹⁷

¹⁷ Editorial, "Harm to All," Atlanta Daily World, 12 January 1966, p. 6.

On January 13, 1966, an editorial discussed the march to the Georgia Capital which was planned in support of Bond.¹⁸ An editorial on January 15, 1966, discussed the outcome of the march and the effects of such marches on the black population.¹⁹ The Atlanta Constitution in one of its two editorials under the "Politics" category discussed the political nature of the U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam. The editorial stated that from a political point of view the expedition of troop withdrawals was understood, but the security of those U.S. military personnel remaining in Vietnam had to be considered.²⁰ On July 27, 1964, the Chicago Tribune attributed the increase in the number of U.S. military advisers to politics in the United States.²¹ While the Chicago Defender discussed the articulated opinion of U.S. Sen. Barry Goldwater on the Vietnam War and the United States' decision to retaliate against the North Vietnamese, this editorial stated that as soon as the White House released the

¹⁸ Editorial, "Why A March?" Atlanta Daily World, 13 January 1966, p. 4.

¹⁹ Editorial, "Getting on the Bandwagon?" Atlanta Daily World, 15 January 1966, p. 6.

²⁰ Editorial, "How Past Out?" Atlanta Constitution, 20 December 1970, p. 18-A.

²¹ Editorial, "More Involvement in the South Pacific," Chicago Tribune, 27 July 1964, p. 22, Sec. 1.

presidential order to strike back at North Vietnam, Sen. Goldwater began to create the impression that his criticism of the administration's handling of the Asian confrontation was responsible for the hard-line U.S. policy.²² At the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incidence, President Johnson and Sen. Goldwater were gearing up for the 1964 presidential campaign. The Atlanta Daily World and the Chicago Defender both carried signed editorial opinions urging the black population not to vote for Sen. Goldwater who was a segregationist and in many black opinions a racist. Therefore, it is understood why the Chicago Defender in discussing the administration's course after the incidents brought in criticism of Sen. Goldwater's audaciousness on the incident. The Chicago Defender also expressed an editorial opinion on President Johnson's capabilities as president. The editorial stated that President Johnson was a master strategist who was doing a commendable job in the areas of civil rights, voting rights, housing, poverty, health, employment, the nation's economy and Vietnam.²³ On January 13, 1966, the newspaper published an editorial opinion which recognized the fact that the war in Vietnam and President Johnson's budget would be given priority consideration

²² Editorial, "The Maddox Incident," Chicago Defender, 6 August 1964, p. 17.

²³ Editorial, "The Johnson Era," Chicago Defender, 3 January 1966, p. 4.

in the second session of the 89th Congress, but urged the Congress to examine the Dirksen amendment which would restrict U.S. Supreme Court's reappointment ruling which would combine many southern congressmen's rural districts with urban districts.²⁴ However, the Atlanta Daily World, the Chicago Tribune and the Atlanta Constitution all had editorial expressions on either President Johnson's 1966 State of the Union Address or President Johnson's address to the 90th Congress.

The basic difference in this editorial coverage may be attributed to the cultural differences of blacks, the economic deprivation of blacks and the changing political views of blacks. This is vividly illustrated in the Atlanta Daily World's editorial coverage in the category as it devoted four of its five editorials to the Julian Bond issue while the Chicago Defender and Chicago Tribune did not make mention of the incident. The Atlanta Constitution did relate the Bond incident to its audience; however, it was done in such a way that those editorials which addressed this issue were assigned to the "Race Relations" category. The diversified editorial coverage during this period can possibly be attributed to the fact that blacks and whites had not focused in on one aspect of the war as a departure for discussion.

²⁴ Editorial, "A New Image," Chicago Defender, 13 January 1966, p. 6.

The "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" Category.

Of the editorials found in the sample newspapers, four (.06%) of the editorials were under this category. The distribution was as follows: four in the Chicago Tribune and none in the Chicago Defender, Atlanta Daily World and the Atlanta Constitution under this category. One of the editorials in the Chicago Tribune during the first sample time frame focused on when the United States went before the United Nations security council to complain of the North Vietnamese Communist torpedo attacks on American warships and to explain the American retaliatory attacks on Communist patrol boats and supply depots. The editorial stated that Khrushchev missed an opportunity to proclaim, through the Soviet representative in the United Nations, the devotion of the Soviet Union to international peace and security and its opposition to aggression. Instead, the Soviet spokesman adopted an attitude of skepticism.²⁵ The Chicago Tribune editorial opinion discussed the persons classified as State Department security risks who had been deemed as such in 1956 who were still working for the State Department. The editorial opinion stated that these security risks may have been responsible for the administration's vacillating manner of prosecuting the war in Vietnam and seeking any kind of deal to

²⁵ Editorial, "Khrushchev Misses the Bus," Chicago Tribune, 8 August 1964, p. 16.

disengage itself.²⁶ Another Chicago Tribune editorial opinion published during the second sample time frame was on President Johnson's envoys to various heads of governments who told them about the United States' desire for peace. The editorial said that the action showed that the United States had no tolerance for the war to suppress the Communist conquest of South Vietnam. It questioned the purpose of these diplomatic efforts and suggested that it may undermine the morale of the soldiers in Vietnam and encourage the Communists to believe that the United States lacked the will to resist Communism.²⁷ The fourth editorial of the Chicago Tribune dealing with "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" carried in the third sample time frame focused on the Johnson administration's appeal to the United Nations for assistance in the Pueblo crisis. The editorial said that the United Nations Security Council reacted indifferently to the United States request.²⁸ The factors previously referred to in Chapter II do not explain why the other three sample newspapers did not record editorial opinions in this

²⁶ Editorial, "Mr. Rusk's Roost," Chicago Tribune, 6 January 1966, p. 18.

²⁷ Editorial, "The Headless Horseman," Chicago Tribune, 7 January 1966, p. 12.

²⁸ Editorial, "The Grave Diggers of Turtle Bay," Chicago Tribune, 4 February 1968, p. 24.

category. It would then seem likely that the editors merely did not choose to express editorial opinions on the diplomatic efforts of the United States.

The "Economic Activity" Category. Only two editorial opinions (.03%) of the seventy-one recorded were assigned to the "Economic Activity" category.

The Chicago Defender and the Atlanta Constitution both recorded one editorial opinion in the above-mentioned category. The Chicago Tribune and the Atlanta Daily World did not have any editorial opinions in this category. The similarity here is that the number of sample black and white daily newspapers which had editorial expression in the "Economic Activity" category equalled the sample black and white daily newspapers which did not have editorial expressions in this category. The Atlanta Constitution's editorial opinion and the Chicago Defender's editorial opinion both appeared in the second sample time frame. The Atlanta Constitution's editorial opinion stated that the Vietnam buildup was proving increasingly more costly, which was causing the president to take actions to protect taxpayers, one of which was to suggest that steel prices be raised \$2.75 per ton instead of \$5 per ton.²⁹ However, the Chicago Defender discussed the statements of Dr. King and the U.S. Rep. Hale Boggs concerning the economic

²⁹ Editorial, "Johnson Wins Victory on Steel Prices," Atlanta Constitution, 6 January 1966, p. 4.

impact of the Vietnam War on welfare programs and the poor. The Chicago Defender stated in its editorial opinion that the U.S. Rep. Boggs feared that the conflict in Southeast Asia might preclude any large new authorizations for welfare programs while Dr. King warned that the curtailment of financial commitment to the poor would place the burden of fighting the war in Vietnam on the backs of the poor who were already broken by their economic deprivation.³⁰

The "Our Nation" Category. Of the editorials found in the sample black and white daily newspapers during the sample time frames, only one was assigned to the "Our Nation" category. This editorial expression was published in the Chicago Tribune during the fourth sample period. It appraised the year of 1970. It stated that at the end of 1970, the editors found that the anti-Nixonism of the spring and early summer was fading and that the administrative goals at that point were no longer very different from the goals of those who had been crying for peace.³¹ The writer can offer no other explanation of why the other sample daily newspapers did not express

³⁰ Editorial, "Vietnam vs. Public Aid," Chicago Defender, 10 January 1966, p. 13.

³¹ Editorial, "A Chastening Year," Chicago Tribune, 27 December 1970, sec. 1A, p. 4.

editorial opinions in this category other than that the editors merely chose not to make such expressions.

The "Race Relations" Category. Seven editorial opinions (10%) were assigned to the "Race Relations" category. Of that total two were in the Chicago Defender, two were in the Atlanta Daily World and three opinions were recorded in the Atlanta Constitution. The Chicago Tribune had no editorial expressions under the aforesaid category. The Atlanta Daily World's editorial expressions focused on the Georgia state legislature's refusal to seat Julian Bond and the effect this would have on race relationships in Georgia. Its January 8, 1966, editorial called the SNCC's negative position on the war, which Bond supported, deplorable and misleading. It further stated that the editors were fully aware that blacks in America were not receiving the full benefits of opportunities in America, but it was not a justifiable reason to oppose the United States government while it was facing enemies who would destroy the United States. It further stated that blacks had always tried to improve the relationship between blacks and whites, and had always fought to free themselves within the United States without damaging its international relations.³² The other Atlanta Daily World editorial opinion published during

³² Editorial, "SNCC Leader's Statement Is Deplorable, Misleading," Atlanta Daily World, 8 January 1966, p. 6.

the same sample time frame also focused on the Georgia legislature's refusal to seat Bond. It stated that it would be a mistake for the legislature to try to block Bond's seating because it might harm relations between the black and white races and it hoped that the Georgia legislature kept the question of race out of their deliberations concerning Bond. The Atlanta Constitution during the same sample time frame stated that if the statement issued by the SNCC on January 6, 1966, reflected the sentiment of many black Americans, it would represent the sharpest setback in Civil Rights Movement since Jim Crow. It said the SNCC news release opposing the war reeked of racism and that public opinion would turn against the Civil Rights Movement as the result of this release.³³ In its other editorial opinion in the afore-said category, the newspaper discussed the consequences if the Georgia legislature failed to seat Bond. It stated that the legislature would best serve the dignity of the state and the good of the country in the race relations area if it did not make a martyr out of Bond.³⁴ The Atlanta Constitution in another editorial during this sample time frame discussed the march to the Georgia

³³ Editorial, "SNCC: Loss of Faith, Loss of Vision," Atlanta Constitution, 7 January 1966, p. 4.

³⁴ Editorial, "Wisdom and Justice Require Seating of Rep. Bond if He Takes the Oath," Atlanta Constitution, 10 January 1966, p. 4.

capitol in protest of the legislature's refusal to seat Bond. The newspaper emphasized that the marchers were protesting the refusal to seat Bond and were not in support of the SNCC statement. The editorial said it feared that one of the results of the controversy was the danger of it turning into a black-vs.-white quarrel.³⁵ The Chicago Defender's editorials under the "Race Relations" category were published during the fourth sample time frame. Its editorial opinion on December 23, 1970, focused on racial strife in the U.S. Army. It stated that racial trouble in the armed forces had become an ugly part of the service. It further stated that army officials had a tendency to dismiss the racial problems in the armed forces with the explanation that racism in the armed forces as a reflection of racial conditions in the United States.³⁶ Another of the newspapers' editorials discussed the plight of the returning black veterans. It stated that the returning black veterans would be looking for adequate employment; however, employment alone would not remedy the anxieties of the returning black veterans

³⁵ Editorial, "What the March Doesn't Protest," Atlanta Constitution, 14 January 1966, p. 4.

³⁶ Editorial, "Racial Strife in U.S. Army," Chicago Defender, 23 December 1970, p. 15.

because the nation had not conquered its prejudices which would assure equality to the returning black veteran.³⁷

The Atlanta Daily World and the Atlanta Constitution probably focused on the Julian Bond issue because it was occurring in the city and state where both newspapers are located. The Atlanta Daily World may have also focused on the issue because Bond was black and the SNCC was predominately black. Other factors which may explain the similarities were that blacks were concerned about improving their social, economic and living conditions.

The foregoing discussion provides both a quantitative and qualitative overview of the editorial coverage assigned to the Vietnam War under the eight categories. From the analysis some noticeable differences between the sample black and white daily newspapers' pattern of editorial coverage emerges.

DIRECTION OF EDITORIAL COVERAGE SCOPE

The analysis of treatment accorded to the editorials along the four directional dimensions, positive, negative, neutral and mixed are contained in Tables 3 and 4.

From the analysis, it seems that the sample black and white daily newspapers alike appeared to be assigning

³⁷ Editorial, "Returning Black Veteran," Chicago Defender, 28 December 1970, p. 15.

TABLE 3
DIRECTIONAL TREATMENT ANALYSIS OF EDITORIALS IN ALL SAMPLE NEWSPAPERS

<u>Newspapers</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Mixed</u>
<u>Atlanta Daily World</u>	n = 7 (10%)	n = 2 (.03%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 4 (.06%)
<u>Atlanta Constitution</u>	n = 10 (14%)	n = 3 (.04%)	n = 4 (.06%)	n = 6 (.08%)
<u>Chicago Defender</u>	n = 1 (.01%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 7 (10%)	n = 1 (.01%)
<u>Chicago Tribune</u>	n = 9 (13%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 6 (.08%)	n = 11 (15%)

TABLE 4
DIRECTIONAL TREATMENT ANALYSIS OF EDITORIALS IN ALL SAMPLE NEWSPAPERS ACCORDING TO SAMPLE CONTENT CATEGORIES

Newspapers	1. "Our Enemies"			2. "War"			3. "Government Acts"			4. "Politics"			5. "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations"			6. "Economic Activity"			7. "Our Nation"			8. "Race Relations"		
	P	M	M	P	M	M	P	M	M	P	M	M	P	M	M	P	M	M	P	M	M	P	M	M
Atlanta Daily World	0 (0%) n = 1 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 1 (100%)	1 (100%) n = 2 (100%)	2 (33 1/3%) n = 6 (100%)	2 (33 1/3%) n = 6 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 2 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	3 (75%) n = 4 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	2 (100%) n = 2 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 2 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 2 (100%)	
Atlanta Constitution	2 (100%) n = 2 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	4 (31%) n = 13 (100%)	3 (23%) n = 13 (100%)	1 (7%) n = 13 (100%)	1 (50%) n = 2 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	
Chicago Defender	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 3 (100%)	2 (67%) n = 3 (100%)	1 (33%) n = 3 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	1 (33%) n = 3 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	
Chicago Tribune	3 (50%) n = 6 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	6 (46%) n = 13 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 13 (100%)	7 (54%) n = 13 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	0 (0%) n = 0 (100%)	

P = Positive
M = Negative
M = Neutral
M = Mixed

more positive or mixed treatment than negative or neutral treatment to their editorial opinions.

In terms of treatment accorded to these categories by the four newspapers along the four directional dimensions, it appears that nine out of the seventy-one Vietnam editorials found in all four newspapers dealt with "Our Enemies." Of that number (n = 9; 100%), five (55%) treated "Our Enemies" positively, and four (n = 4; 45%) were treated in the mixed direction, whereas none were treated in the negative, or neutral directions.

The editorial opinions in the "War" category (n = 35; 100%) were treated more in the mixed (n = 15; 43%) direction than in the positive (n = 12; 34%), the negative (n = 5; 14%) and the neutral (n = 3; .09%). The four newspapers tended to treat the editorial expressions (n = 2; 100%) found in the "Government Acts" category equally in the positive (n = 1; 50%) and neutral (n = 1; 50%) directions and not at all in the negative and mixed evaluative directions. In the "Politics" category, the four newspapers' total editorial expressions (n = 11; 100%) treated the editorials more in the neutral (n = 5; 46%) than in the positive (n = 4; 36%), mixed (n = 2; 18%) and no negative evaluative directions. The four newspapers' editorial expressions in the "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" category (n = 4; 100%) tended to treat the editorial expressions more in the neutral (n = 3; 75%)

direction than in the mixed (n = 1; 25%) and not at all in the positive or neutral directions. In the "Economic Activity" category, the four newspapers' editorial expressions (n = 2; 100%) treated the editorials in the neutral direction (n = 2; 100%) rather than in the positive, negative or mixed directions. Only one (n = 1; 100%) of the four newspapers' editorials were found in the "Our Nation" category. This one in the Chicago Tribune was treated in the neutral direction (n = 1; 100%) rather than in the positive, negative or mixed directions. In the "Race Relations" category the four newspapers' editorial expressions (n = 7; 100%) tended to be treated more in the positive (n = 5; 71%) than in the neutral (n = 2; 29%) and not at all in the negative or mixed directions.

Further quantitative and qualitative analyses of the editorial contents in the sample black and white daily newspapers provided another set of insights on the treatment accorded to the Vietnam War.

The Atlanta Daily World's only editorial (n = 1; 100%) in the "Our Enemies" category is treated in the mixed direction. This direction is indicated in the newspaper's statement concerning the Pueblo crisis which said that the newspaper agreed with the President that all possible diplomatic efforts be made to rectify the wrong by the Korean Communists, but the action by the

North Koreans could not be tolerated.³⁸ It seems like the editorial opinions in the "War" category were treated equally in the positive, negative and mixed direction whereas none of the opinions were treated in the neutral direction. One positive editorial carried after the Gulf of Tonkin incident stated that the entire U.S. population should be united in the defense of the nation and everyone should be willing to make sacrifices in the defense of freedom and justice.³⁹ The other positive editorial printed during the Tet offensive called the burning of draft cards unpatriotic and suggested that the objectors to the Vietnam War review the war in slow motion after which they would see that Communism was trying to strangle world democracies in order to reduce the people in South Vietnam through hunger to the brink of Communism.⁴⁰ Two negative treatments were evident in the newspapers' December 18, and December 27, 1970, unsigned editorials. The December 18 editorial stated that after the enormous amount of U.S. blood spilled, at a cost which had seriously damaged the nation in both domestic

³⁸ Editorial, "A Grave Danger of Spreading the War," Atlanta Daily World, 26 January 1968, p. 8.

³⁹ Editorial, "The Viet Nam Crisis," Atlanta Daily World, 7 August 1964, p. 4.

⁴⁰ Editorial, "The War in Slow Motion," Atlanta Daily World, 3 February 1968, p. 4.

and defense fields, the blunder and tragedy of the over-commitment in Vietnam became even more clearly and painfully apparent.⁴¹ The other negative editorial stated that the continued withdrawal of U.S. troops to de-escalate the long and costly adventure in Vietnam is not surprising.⁴² The editorials given mixed treatments discussed the South Vietnamese Catholic Bishop's disapproval of the Saigon government and suggested that the United States heed the dissent as a warning.⁴³ The other mixed directional editorial stated that if the United States continued to increase its military efforts in South Vietnam, then the sentiment for peace and general dissatisfaction with the war among the American people would be increased.⁴⁴ In the "Government Acts" category none of the Atlanta Daily World's editorial opinions were found under this category. The newspapers seemed to treat those editorial opinions (n = 4; 100%) in the "Politics" category more in the positive direction (n = 3; 75%) than in the mixed direction

⁴¹Editorial, "Bad Vietnam News," Atlanta Daily World, 18 December 1970, p. 4.

⁴²Editorial, "U.S. Troop Withdrawal," Atlanta Daily World, 27 December 1970, p. 4.

⁴³Editorial, "The Bishops Speak," Atlanta Daily World, 27 January 1968, p. 8.

⁴⁴Editorial, "More Troops Needed?" Atlanta Daily World, 7 February 1968, p. 6.

(n = 1; 25%) and not at all in the negative and neutral directions. The positive directions of these editorials were indicated by such statements as "We disagree with the SNCC and Bond position on charges made against our government's policy in Vietnam and do not believe any young men should attempt to evade the draft";⁴⁵ "The statement which Mr. Bond approved that started the controversy was packed with emotion and made unjustifiable reference to our nation's foreign policy";⁴⁶ and "We have previously stated our complete disagreement with the Lewis-Bond (SNCC) statement."⁴⁷ The mixed directional treatment was indicated in the newspaper's editorial on January 24, 1966. The editorial stated that it was in accord with President Johnson's desire for peace talks to terminate the war in Vietnam, but only if the other side did not take advantage of the halt to build up its forces.⁴⁸ In as much as no Atlanta Daily World editorials were found in the "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations," "Economic

⁴⁵ Editorial, "Harm to All," Atlanta Daily World, 12 January 1966, p. 6.

⁴⁶ Editorial, "Why a March?" Atlanta Daily World, 13 January 1966, p. 4.

⁴⁷ Editorial, "Getting on the Bandwagon?" Atlanta Daily World, 15 January 1966, p. 6.

⁴⁸ Editorial, "The President's Address," Atlanta Daily World, 24 January 1968, p. 6.

Activity" and "Our Nation" categories, no directional treatments of editorials could be found. The directional treatment of the editorial opinions (n = 2; 100%) in the "Race Relations" was 100 per cent positive. This direction was indicated by such statements as "Blacks must continue to be loyal to America particularly when they are on the threshold of receiving full equality before the law,"⁴⁹ and "We hope no young man will try to evade or refuse to respond to his responsibility under the Selective Service or draft law because we simply cannot expect to have rights without responsibilities."⁵⁰

In as far as the directional dimensions of the Chicago Defender, the findings yielded some surprising results. Since no editorials of the newspaper were found in the "Our Enemies," "Government Acts" and "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" categories, no evaluative directions could be assessed. However, the Chicago Defender's editorial opinions in the "War" category (n = 3; 100%) tended to receive the neutral treatment (n = 2; 66 2/3%) rather than the mixed (n = 1; 33 1/3%), negative or the positive treatments. The neutral directions were found in the January 12, 1966, unsigned editorial which merely

⁴⁹ Editorial, "Harm to All," Atlanta Daily World, 12 January 1966, p. 6.

⁵⁰ Editorial, "Why a March?" Atlanta Daily World, 13 January 1966, p. 6.

discussed the possibility of a U.S. confrontation with Red China as the result of the Vietnam War,⁵¹ and the February 1, 1968, unsigned editorial which merely stated that the United States was more restrained about the seizure of the Pueblo than it was in the Gulf of Tonkin incident.⁵² The editorials that received mixed treatment contained such statements as "Now that the bombing has stopped, let's see what happens along the line of conciliation."⁵³ This finding is surprising since during the years these editorials were carried, the black community was expressing negative opinions regarding the war. It appears that the Chicago Defender did not reflect this black public opinion. In the "Politics" category, the Chicago Defender's editorial opinions (n = 3; 100%) received the neutral treatment (n = 2; 66 2/3%) more often than the positive (n = 1; 33 1/3%), the negative or the mixed treatment. One editorial assessed President Johnson's handling of the presidency and mentioned that Vietnam had come under the spell of a master strategist but made no positive or negative statements on the Vietnam

⁵¹ Editorial, "America and China," Chicago Defender, 12 January 1966, p. 13.

⁵² Editorial, "Cautious Mood," Chicago Defender, 1 February 1968, p. 6.

⁵³ Editorial, "In Pursuit of Peace," Chicago Defender, 11 January 1966, p. 13.

War. Its other editorial expression with this direction merely said that the war in Vietnam would be given priority in the 89th Congress but made no positive or negative assertions about the war. The editorial found to have a positive direction was carried on August 6, 1964. In referring to the Gulf of Tonkin incidence, it stated that a provocative incident of this kind always calls for a retaliatory action.⁵⁴ In the "Economic Activity" category the editorial expression (n = 1; 100%) received the neutral treatment while no editorials had the positive, negative and mixed evaluative directions. This neutral editorial discussed the possible effect of the Vietnam War on public aid programs but did not take any position on the Vietnam War.⁵⁵ This is an unexpected finding since at the time of the editorial's publication, black opinion leaders had begun to see a relationship between the loss of funding for public programs and the Vietnam War.

In the "Race Relations" category the editorial expressions (n = 2; 100%) had a neutral (n = 2; 100%) direction more often than a positive, negative or mixed direction. One of the Chicago Defender's editorials discussed the racial strife in the U.S. Army but did not

⁵⁴Editorial, "The Maddox Incident," Chicago Defender, 6 August 1964, p. 17.

⁵⁵Editorial, "Vietnam vs. Public Aid," Chicago Defender, 10 January 1966, p. 13.

express a positive or negative position. The other editorial dealt with the returning black veterans but did not state whether or not it thought the war was right or wrong. This is surprising in that by 1970 several black opinion leaders had protested the war as being based on racism due to the disproportionate number of blacks serving in Vietnam. Other news media and government statistics supported their assertions. It was expected that the sample black daily newspapers would have discussed this.

The Atlanta Constitution did not make editorial opinions in "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" and "Our Nation" categories. In the "Our Enemies" category the editorial opinions were treated more (n = 2; 100%) in the positive direction than in the negative, neutral and the mixed. The direction of these two editorials was indicated by such statements which supported the U.S. policy of showing force against force⁵⁶ and suggestions that no Communist act should divert the United States' attention away from Vietnam.⁵⁷ The newspaper in its editorial expressions on the Vietnam War in the "War" category (n = 13; 100%) tended to give the editorials more of a

⁵⁶ Editorial, "Unsigned Tiger Is Losing Riders; That's Gain for Russian Bear," Atlanta Constitution, 6 January 1966, p. 4.

⁵⁷ Editorial, "Brink of War in Korea," Atlanta Constitution, 24 January 1968, p. 4.

mixed (n = 5; 39%) than the positive (n = 4; 31%), negative (n = 3; 23%) and neutral (n = 1; .08%) treatment.

The editorial expressions in the mixed direction were indicated by such statements regarding the Tonkin incident as:

In our attack on the PT boat bases the United States became a direct combatant in the war for the first time. This limited action against North Vietnam was intended to deter a widening of the conflict. Unless it serves that purpose, we are in danger of becoming more and more invaluable until we are fully committed.⁵⁸

In discussing the peace efforts of the United States, an editorial which had mixed treatment said that if peace efforts fail, the United States was apparently ready for further escalation, but the United States stood ready to negotiate an honorable solution.⁵⁹ During the Tet Offensive, the Atlanta Constitution gave an editorial mixed treatment when it said that if the United States de-escalated the war when the other side was escalating, it would present military as well as political difficulties to the nation.⁶⁰ In commenting on the Khe Sanh battle during Tet, the newspaper said that if a battle developed

⁵⁸ Editorial, "Congress Chooses Ranks with President in New Phase of Southeast Asia Crisis," Atlanta Constitution, 8 August 1964, p. 4.

⁵⁹ Editorial, "If Peace Efforts Fail, What Follows?" Atlanta Constitution, 12 January 1966, p. 4.

⁶⁰ Editorial, "Burning a Short Bridge," Atlanta Constitution, 31 January 1968, p. 4.

there the U.S. military command was committed publicly and unequivocally to redeem its judgment.⁶¹ In an editorial on the POW situation in 1970, a mixed treatment of opinion was found. The editorial opinion stated that as Christmas came to Southeast Asia once again practicing duplicity and it was not a very good way to stop a war.⁶² The positive treatment of the four editorials in the Atlanta Constitution was indicated by statements such as "The United States has served notice once again of its determination not to abandon Southeast Asia to the Communists";⁶³ "U.S. ships have a right to sail in international waters and they will defend that right with immediate release of fire against any attacking vessel";⁶⁴ "The nation stands behind President Johnson's decision to retaliate against North Vietnam PT boat bases harboring vessels which had made unprovoked attacks on U.S. warships

⁶¹ Editorial, "At Khe Sanh, The Test," Atlanta Constitution, 6 February 1968, p. 4.

⁶² Editorial, "Cambodia and POWs," Atlanta Constitution, 24 December 1970, p. 4-A.

⁶³ Editorial, "South Vietnam Policy Is to Win," Atlanta Constitution, 1 August 1964, p. 4.

⁶⁴ Editorial, "Political Maturity as Well as Our Navy Are Tested in Troubled Asian Waters," Atlanta Constitution, 4 August 1964, p. 4.

in international waters";⁶⁵ and "Chances for peace negotiations have receded sharply. Obviously, we do not intend to negotiate while terrorists hold temporary control of government areas."⁶⁶

Such negative assertions were found in editorials which express opinions such as "The United States stumbled into a civil war with good intentions but desperately wrong on how we could help";⁶⁷ "We have come to understand that we cannot solve the war in Vietnam, knowing, as Walter Lippmann says, that 'elephants cannot clear the swamp of mosquitos'";⁶⁸ and "Americans have been misled many times in this war, but it is still possible to hope that this Christmas will be the last for major American involvement in this tragic war."⁶⁹ The editorial which received the neutral treatment discussed the POW situation but did not take a positive or negative position on the

⁶⁵ Editorial, "President Acted on Behalf of Peace," Atlanta Constitution, 6 August 1964, p. 4.

⁶⁶ Editorial, "Worst Yet to Come," Atlanta Constitution, 2 February 1968, p. 4.

⁶⁷ Editorial, "The Party's Over," Atlanta Constitution, 22 December 1970, p. 4.

⁶⁸ Editorial, "Most Fervent Wish," Atlanta Constitution, 24 December 1970, p. 24-A.

⁶⁹ Editorial, "Year of Hope," Atlanta Constitution, 28 December 1970, p. 4-A.

war.⁷⁰ The Atlanta Constitution in its editorial opinions in the "Government Acts" category (n = 2; 100%) seemed to give equal positive (n = 1; 50%) and neutral (n = 1; 50%) treatment to the two editorials while negative and mixed treatments were not found in the category. The positive treatment was indicated in a January 1, 1966, editorial which stated that the United States had made a commitment to South Vietnam and we as a country would not shirk or evade our responsibilities and our obligations to world order and peace.⁷¹ The neutral treatment was found in the January 30, 1968, editorial, carried prior to Tet, which discussed the possible budget cuts and asked if critics would cut the Vietnam budget. However, it did not take a position on it.⁷² In the "Politics" category, the Atlanta Constitution seemed to give its editorial opinions (n = 2; 100%) equal neutral (n = 1; 50%) and mixed (n = 1; 50%) treatment. The neutral direction was indicated in a January 14, 1966, editorial which discussed President Johnson's political address and his expressions on Vietnam, but

⁷⁰ Editorial, "Well Treated," Atlanta Constitution, 29 December 1970, p. 4-A.

⁷¹ Editorial, "U.S. Closes the Door on Eventful 1965 and Hopefully Welcomes the New Year," Atlanta Constitution, 1 January 1966, p. 16.

⁷² Editorial, "Or, the Path of Responsibility," Atlanta Constitution, 30 January 1968, p. 4.

the editorial was neither positive nor negative.⁷³ The mixed treatment of editorial expression was found in a December 20, 1970, editorial which stated that the withdrawal of U.S. troops was the proper course to follow in Vietnam, but the United States had a responsibility to those who remained to provide adequate security.⁷⁴ In the "Economic Activity" category there was only one editorial opinion (n = 1; 100%) and it was treated in the neutral direction. This editorial discussed President Johnson's efforts to keep inflation down and commented on the U.S. buildup in Vietnam, but did not express a positive or negative opinion.⁷⁵ The editorial opinions of the Atlanta Constitution in the "Race Relations" category (n = 3; 100%), were treated in the positive (n = 3; 100%) direction whereas the negative, neutral and mixed directions were not found. The directions in this category were indicated by the following statements which referred to the SNCC-Julian Bond Statement against the Vietnam War: "It vilifies the United States and ignores aggressive

⁷³ Editorial, "LBJ: Sacrifice Whom?" Atlanta Constitution, 14 January 1966, p. 4.

⁷⁴ Editorial, "How Fast Out?" Atlanta Constitution, 20 December 1970, p. 18-A.

⁷⁵ Editorial, "Johnson Wins Victory on Steel Prices," Atlanta Constitution, 6 January 1966, p. 4.

challenges by the nation's enemies";⁷⁶ "We have consistently supported United States policy in Vietnam and deplored the SNCC insult to the flag";⁷⁷ "The Inquirer, while opposing the Bond-SNCC Vietnam Document, supported the young man's right to be seated. So do we."⁷⁸

The Chicago Tribune did not have any editorials in the "Government Acts," "Economic Activity" and "Race Relations" categories, therefore, no editorials could be evaluated for their directional dimensions. It seems that the editorials (n = 6; 100%) in the "Our Enemies" category were treated equally in the positive (n = 3; 50%) and mixed (n = 3; 50%) while they did not have negative and neutral directions. The positive directions in the "Our Enemies" category were illustrated by such expressions as: "These aggressors must be taught that their criminal methods would not pay,"⁷⁹ which referred to the Gulf of

⁷⁶ Editorial, "SNCC: Loss of Faith, Loss of Vision," Atlanta Constitution, 7 January 1966, p. 4.

⁷⁷ Editorial, "Wisdom and Justice Require Seating of Rep. Bond if He Takes the Oath," Atlanta Constitution, 10 January 1966, p. 4.

⁷⁸ Editorial, "What the March Doesn't Protest," Atlanta Constitution, 4 January 1966, p. 4.

⁷⁹ Editorial, "Mr. Stevens Speaks for America," Chicago Tribune, 6 August 1964, p. 10.

Tonkin incident, and "We must meet force with force,"⁸⁰ which also referred to the Gulf of Tonkin incident. On the Pueblo crisis, the editorials contained such statements as: "The fact is that the Communists by piratanical action against a U.S. Navy vessel have challenged President Johnson's mettle. He cannot stall in the face of this challenge, and the President cannot let them get away with it."⁸¹ The mixed directions were indicated by such statements referring to the Pueblo as, "The most recent piratanical attack by a pip squeak Communist navy on an American warship, however, is not apt to provoke the reaction of the Tonkin Gulf";⁸² "In a free democracy like ours, the government must be more candid with the people, and this is all the more reason why those who direct our moves on the world chessboard must continually ask themselves, 'What will happen if?';"⁸³ and "In a climate of political hypocrisy and deceit who, out of the whole Washington crowd,

⁸⁰ Editorial, "A Direct Challenge from the Reds," Chicago Tribune, 24 January 1968, p. 14.

⁸¹ Editorial, "Testing Time," Chicago Tribune, 26 January 1968, p. 14.

⁸² Editorial, "When Warships Are Attacked," Chicago Tribune, 28 January 1968, p. 22-sec. A.

⁸³ Editorial, "The Timely Merits of Chess," Chicago Tribune, 29 January 1968, p. 16.

can be trusted to tell the truth?"⁸⁴ The editorials in the "War" category (n = 12; 100%) seemed to have been treated slightly more (n = 7; 58%) in the positive direction than in the negative, neutral and mixed (n = 5; 42%) directions. Indicators of the "War" category in the positive direction were such expressions which said the demonstrators against the war were not dissenting, they were committing treason.⁸⁵ In regard to the dissenters, the following additional statements were found, "We find the heroism of past veterans all but obliterated by voices of a different sort those who despise their country, who find their country always wrong,"⁸⁶ and "It is hardly the time to take the pressure off the enemy."⁸⁷ The following statements on Tet were found, "The only way to stop the weapon supply and end the war by winning is to close North Vietnam's port, by bombing and mining if possible or by a naval blockade if

⁸⁴Editorial, "Who's To Be Believed?" Chicago Tribune, 6 February 1968, p. 12.

⁸⁵Editorial, "Treason or Dissent," Chicago Tribune, 10 January 1966, p. 20.

⁸⁶Editorial, "Is This the New Breed?" Chicago Tribune, 30 January 1968, p. 18, sec. 1.

⁸⁷Editorial, "The Cease-Fire Folly," Chicago Tribune, 30 January 1968, p. 18, sec. 1.

necessary,"⁸⁸ "We are sure that Gen. Westmoreland will be able to handle matters despite those at home who seem to want us to jump willingly into Communist traps by stopping our bombing and trusting in truces,"⁸⁹ and "The 'moral' opposition to our policy falls flat."⁹⁰

The Chicago Tribune editorial which received the mixed treatment contained such assertions as "If Gen. Khanh persists in moving the conflict up to the front of the stove, the possibility of Red China's open intervention as in the Korean War fourteen years ago would increase vastly,"⁹¹ which referred to events prior to the Tonkin incident. The editorial opinion which referred to the international inspection team in Vietnam said that "The commission in Vietnam had no better luck in preventing hostilities than similar international groups in Laos and Korea."⁹² In regard to the United States' allies, the

⁸⁸ Editorial, "Time for Decision in Vietnam," Chicago Tribune, 1 February 1968, p. 22.

⁸⁹ Editorial, "Hanoi's Treachery," Chicago Tribune, 3 February 1968, p. 8.

⁹⁰ Editorial, "The Protesters Are Silent," Chicago Tribune, 8 February 1968, p. 20.

⁹¹ Editorial, "A War Moved Up from the Back Burner," Chicago Tribune, 29 July 1964, p. 24, sec. 1.

⁹² Editorial, "The Inspection Farce in Vietnam," Chicago Tribune, 3 August 1964, p. 16.

editorial opinion said, "If the conflict in Asia spreads, the United States will find itself isolated and going it alone, tho not by choice."⁹³ The editorial opinion which referred to the Tonkin Resolution, "Innovations in the exercise of the war power deal with as momentous a subject as the Constitution treats, and innovations there can lead to innovations elsewhere, with a restrictive and stifling effect upon liberty."⁹⁴ The editorial opinion regarding ammunition used by U.S. soldiers said that, "If both the House report last fall on the Vietnam experience with the M-16 and the recent Panama tests were correct, what had happened to reverse the results and place the blame for jamming on the IMR ammunition."⁹⁵ Regarding POW's, an editorial opinion stated that, "Obviously, Vietnamese Communists expect to make political hay by working only thru groups that are opposed to the policies of the Nixon administration, which is trying to wind down war in Vietnam, but not at the expense of the POW hostages held by Hanoi";⁹⁶ and

⁹³ Editorial, "Summer Friends and Sunshine Allies," Chicago Tribune, 7 August 1964, p. 16.

⁹⁴ Editorial, "Age of Nondeclared Wars," Chicago Tribune, 9 August 1964, p. 24, sec. A.

⁹⁵ Editorial, "Never Change the Ammo," Chicago Tribune, 31 January 1968, p. 14.

⁹⁶ Editorial, "Hanoi's POW Chess Game," Chicago Tribune, 24 December 1970, p. 8.

referring to peace talks, an editorial opinion said, "The Communists want a complete surrender by the United States and South Vietnam, despite their propaganda 'end the war' trick. . . . the offer can only mean that the Communist side is really beginning to hurt."⁹⁷

In the "Politics" category the Chicago Tribune treated its editorial opinions (n = 2; 100%) in the neutral (n = 2; 100%) direction rather than in the positive, negative or mixed directions. The editorial opinions in the neutral direction discussed the possibility of additional fighting in the South Pacific as well as in Vietnam but did not take a positive direction,⁹⁸ and President Johnson's 1966 State of the Union address in which he discussed the Vietnam War, but the newspaper did not make a positive or negative assertion.⁹⁹ In the "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations" category the Chicago Tribune treated its editorial expressions (n = 4; 100%) more in the neutral (n = 3; 75%) than in the positive, negative or mixed (n = 1; 25%) directions. The editorials with the neutral directions commented on the Soviet Union's

⁹⁷ Editorial, "End the War Gimmick," Chicago Tribune, 28 December 1970, p. 5, sec. 1.

⁹⁸ Editorial, "More Involvement in the South Pacific," Chicago Tribune, 27 July 1964, p. 22, sec. 1.

⁹⁹ Editorial, "Johnson Can Get It for You Wholesale," Chicago Tribune, 14 January 1966, p. 8.

failure to take the opportunity to discuss the Tonkin attack in the United Nations,¹⁰⁰ Dean Rusk's dilemma as result of Vietnam War,¹⁰¹ and the inaction of the United Nations to intercede in the Pueblo incident.¹⁰² The editorial with mixed treatment was indicated by the assertion which referred to 1966 peace efforts, "America has no stomach for the war to suppress the Communist quest in South Vietnam."¹⁰³ In the "Our Nation" category the Chicago Tribune's only editorial was treated in the neutral direction (n = 1; 100%) rather than in the positive, negative or mixed directions. This editorial merely discussed what had happened in 1970 in the United States and commented that the opinions of the public and the Nixon administration policy were beginning to converge in regard to the Vietnam War.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ Editorial, "Khrushchev Misses the Bus," Chicago Tribune, 8 August 1964, p. 16.

¹⁰¹ Editorial, "Mr. Rusk's Roost," Chicago Tribune, 6 January 1966, p. 12.

¹⁰² Editorial, "The Grave Diggers of Turtle Bay," Chicago Tribune, 4 February 1968, p. 24.

¹⁰³ Editorial, "The Headless Horseman," Chicago Tribune, 7 January 1966, p. 12.

¹⁰⁴ Editorial, "A Chastening Year," Chicago Tribune, 27 December 1970, p. 4, sec. 1-A.

The findings indicate that the Atlanta Daily World's and the Chicago Defender's, the two sample black daily newspapers, editorial expressions (n = 22; 100%), supported the Vietnam War (n = 8; 36%) more often than they took a neutral (n = 7; 32%), mixed (n = 5; 23%) or negative (n = 2; .09%) position on the war. This finding was not expected in that the black community opposed the war as early as 1965 and continued to oppose the war throughout its entirety. It appears that the black sample daily newspapers did not reflect black public opinion on the war.

The Atlanta Constitution and the Chicago Tribune, the two sample white daily newspapers, had forty-nine (100%) editorial expressions on the war. As indicated in the findings, these newspapers' expressions tended to support the U.S. involvement in Vietnam (n = 19; 39%) than they opposed (n = 3; .06%), took a neutral stand (n = 10; 20%) or a mixed position (n = 17; 35%) on the Vietnam War. The sample white daily newspapers' support of the war was expected, but such a large number of editorials which accorded the war the mixed treatment was not expected.

INDICATORS OF EDITORIAL COVERAGE SCOPE

The indicators of the relationships among a set of variables related to the objective of the study were

contained in a series of descriptive hypotheses. Ideally, the relationships should have been statistically tested through such nonparametric or parametric statistics as chi square or Pearsonian Correlation. However, it was realized that because of the small N of editorials no such tests of correlation or significance were deemed possible. The indicators were discussed only through a set of descriptive data related to the descriptive hypotheses.

H₁:

The sample black and white daily newspapers will extend support to the Vietnam War in the early sample time frame of the war rather than in the later sample time frame of the study.

The findings indicate that this hypothesis may not be tenable since fewer editorials in the sample black newspapers lend support to the war in early or later sample time frames. For example, in the 1964 sample time frame the editorials in the sample black daily newspapers supported the war but tended to either take a neutral or mixed position throughout the other three sample time frames. In contrast, the Chicago Tribune lends editorial support to the war throughout the sample period. The findings further indicate that the sample white newspapers' editorial generally supported the war in the sample years 1964, 1966 and 1968.

H₂:

The sample black daily newspapers' editorials are more likely to have the same rather than different editorial opinions on the Vietnam War after the Gulf of Tonkin incidence than before the incidence.

The hypothesis may be tenable in three sample newspapers. The findings show that of the thirteen editorials of the four sample daily newspapers carried during the 1964 sample time frame, one editorial in the Chicago Defender, one in Atlanta Daily World's and four in the Atlanta Constitution supported the war. However, only one of the seven editorials in the Chicago Tribune supported the war and four assigned the mixed treatment and two took a neutral position on the war.

H₃:

The sample black daily newspaper editorials will shift from support to opposition of the Vietnam War after the Gulf of Tonkin incidence whereas the sample white daily newspaper will continue to extend their editorial support to the Vietnam War.

This hypothesis may not be tenable. The findings indicate that during the week following the Gulf of Tonkin incidence all the editorials found in the Atlanta Daily World (n = 1), Atlanta Constitution (n = 4) and Chicago Defender (n = 1) supported the war whereas the Chicago Tribune, as stated earlier, did not take a definitive stand. In the 1966 sample time frame, three of the sample newspapers' editorial opinions, Chicago Tribune (n = 4), Atlanta

World (n = 5) and the Atlanta Constitution (n = 8) were still 100 per cent in support of the war, whereas the Chicago Defender (n = 5) did not take a stand on the war.

H₄:

The sample black daily newspapers are more likely to disseminate opinions of black opinion leaders on the Vietnam War in their editorial opinions throughout the four sample time frames of the study than the sample white daily newspapers.

The findings of the study do not seem to lend support to this hypothesis either. None of the editorials in the Chicago Defender (n = 9) and Atlanta Daily World (n = 13) dealt with the opinions of black leaders. Likewise, the editorial opinions of the Chicago Tribune (n = 26) or the Atlanta Constitution (n = 23) ignored the blacks' opinions.

H₅:

The sample white daily newspapers' editorials are more likely to disseminate negative reactions to black opinion leaders who opposed the war than will the sample black daily newspapers.

This hypothesis may not be supported. The findings indicate that the Chicago Defender's and the Chicago Tribune's editorials did not include any opinions pertaining to black opinion leaders. However, the Atlanta Daily World and the Atlanta Constitution referred to the action of black leaders negatively. Thirty-eight per cent (n = 5)

of the thirteen Atlanta Daily World's editorial opinions on the Vietnam War contained negative reactions to a black opinion leader, specifically to Julian Bond and his support of the 1966 Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee statement which was mentioned earlier, while .09 per cent ($n = 2$) of the Atlanta Constitution's editorials negatively referred to black opinion leaders. Thus, it appears that one sample black daily newspaper devoted a high percentage of its editorial comment to negative expressions about black public opinion whereas the white daily newspaper had a smaller percentage of its editorial opinions which were critical of black opinion leaders.

H₆:

The sample white daily newspapers are more likely to ignore black public opinion on the Vietnam War than the sample black daily newspapers.

This hypothesis may not be supported in that the descriptive findings indicate that of all the editorial opinions in the sample black and white daily newspapers ignored black public opinions on the war. This finding is quite surprising because blacks protested the war as early as 1965 and continued to protest it until its end. Thus, it would seem that the sample black daily newspapers would incorporate black public opinion into their editorial opinions, but they did not.

H₇:

The sample black daily newspapers' editorials are more likely to bring attention to the various effects of the Vietnam War on the black community than the sample white daily newspapers.

This hypothesis may be tenable. For, the editorials of the Atlanta Daily World and Chicago Defender brought attention to the various socio-economic and political effects of the Vietnam War. In comparison, none of the editorials in the Atlanta Constitution and in the Chicago Tribune brought attention to the various effects of the Vietnam War on the black community.

H₈:

The sample black daily newspapers are more likely to have a higher percentage of editorials opposed to the Vietnam War than will the sample white daily newspapers.

The findings indicate that the hypothesis may be tenable because only .09 per cent of the sample black daily newspapers' editorial opinions opposed the war whereas .06 per cent of the sample white daily newspapers opposed the war. It must be noted here that the Chicago Defender and the Chicago Tribune did not have any editorials which opposed the Vietnam War.

H₉:

The editorials of the sample black daily newspapers on the war will be congruent with black public opinion.

The findings indicate that this hypothesis may not be supported because none of the editorials in the sample black daily newspapers reflected the blacks' opinions which were documented in Chapter I.

H₁₀:

The sample black newspapers' editorials are more likely to protest the disproportionate representation of blacks in Vietnam than the sample white daily newspapers' editorials.

The findings indicate that this hypothesis is not tenable.

H₁₁:

The sample black daily newspapers' editorials are more likely to characterize the Vietnam War as an extension of racism in the United States.

The findings indicate that this hypothesis is not tenable.

In this context it should be pointed out that additional research needs to be done before any conclusive statements pertaining to the indicators of the editorial opinions under study can be made.

AN OVERVIEW

From the foregoing discussion of the nature and pattern of the editorial opinion in the sample black and white daily newspapers during the sample time frames of the Vietnam War, the direction of the opinions and a set of indicators of similarities and differences in the

sample black and white daily newspapers as analyzed through the descriptive hypotheses, it appears that the majority of the editorials dealt with "War" (n = 35; 49%), "Politics" (n = 11; 15%), "Our Enemies" (n = 9; 13%) and "Race Relations" (n = 7; 10%) categories while the remaining categories had less than 5 per cent of the editorial assignments.

It further appears that the majority of the editorial opinions in the sample newspapers were treated in the positive, neutral or mixed direction rather than in the negative direction. Comparatively, the sample black daily newspapers' editorial opinions were treated more often in the positive and neutral direction rather than in the negative and mixed directions whereas the sample white daily newspapers' editorial opinions were treated more in the positive and mixed directions rather than in the neutral and negative directions.

It also appears that eight of the hypotheses pertaining to the editorial coverage may not be tenable and three of the hypotheses may be tenable. However, no conclusive statement pertaining to their tenability can be made because of \bar{N} . Therefore, further research is warranted.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The Vietnam War was the longest war in which the United States has been involved. During the war, public opinion, especially black public opinion, became a focal point of the media coverage and much public concern. Black public opinion on the Vietnam War also became important because blacks perceived the war to have negative socio-economic and political effects on the black community, which was expressed through black opinion leaders.

Throughout the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War, the mass media communicated public opinion and information on the Vietnam War. Because of their communication and information function, the media may have influenced the feelings and opinions of their audiences regarding the Vietnam War. Thus, it was assumed that general public opinion and black public opinion would have been reflected in the sample white and black daily newspapers respectively. Hence, it is important to look at how the mass media interpreted and

evaluated the war in Vietnam because research has shown that the media, especially the electronic media, covered the war thoroughly. As a result, it was dubbed the "television war." Research has established that the mass media, in general, supported the war in the early time frames of the study as opposed to the later time frames.

When the United States became involved in the Vietnam War in 1964, the majority of the black population, like other segments of the country's population, supported the U.S. war effort. But as the war progressed, black public opinion turned against the Vietnam War. Black opposition was expressed quite frequently by black opinion leaders. The black opinion leaders were influential disseminators of black opinion on the Vietnam War. The function of opinion leaders has been established in the two-step and multi-step flow of information. Blacks perceived the war as a force which exerted negative economic, social, political and attitudinal impacts of the U.S. black community. As a result, many black leaders criticized the war on the basis of these four perceptions. Those leaders who criticized the United States' role in Vietnam included Malcolm X, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., James F. Farmer, Muhammed Ali, Eldridge Cleaver, Stokely Carmichael, Julian Bond, U.S. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, Whitney M. Young, Jr., U.S.

Congressman Augustus F. Hawkins, U.S. Congressman Ronald Dellums, U.S. Congressman John Conyers and U.S. Congressman Robert Nix. One of the criticisms lodged by black opinion leaders was that black soldiers were represented in disproportionate numbers in Vietnam. Several authorities and the mass media offer data which support those assertions.

The background assumptions outlined in Chapter I suggested that the sample black and white daily newspapers accorded their editorial opinions on the Vietnam War different directional treatments. In some instances this was true, but in other cases it was not. These similarities and differences were discussed in Chapter IV.

The study delineates the pattern of editorial opinions on the Vietnam War in the sample black and white daily newspapers during the sample time frames. It also explains the similarities as well as differences in the aforesaid editorial opinions of the sample black and white daily newspapers and examined the interaction between the selected set of factors described in Chapter II and the articulations of editorial opinion toward the Vietnam War during the sample time frames in the sample newspapers. In addition, the study generated certain conclusions regarding the nature and pattern of the editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War in the sample black and white daily newspapers.

In regard to the problem questions outlined in Chapter II, the findings indicate that the American blacks' perceptions of the Vietnam War as a socially unjust event did not influence the editorial opinions of the sample black daily newspapers on the Vietnam War. This appears to be true because none of the sample black daily newspapers' editorials commented on the American blacks' perception of the war. The findings further seem to indicate that the fears, frustrations and alienation of whites as well as blacks toward the Vietnam War were not reflected in the similarities and differences in the editorial opinions toward the war in the sample newspapers. The two sets of sample newspapers editorial coverage did not define specific fears, frustrations and alienation of blacks and whites. Based on the findings, the editorial opinions in the sample black daily newspapers generally did not represent the negative black public opinion toward the Vietnam War. Only two of the twenty-two editorials in the sample black daily newspapers were treated in the negative direction. This finding is in direct contrast with black opinion leaders' expressions which opposed the war.

The findings indicate the editorial opinions in the sample black daily newspapers did not clearly present the Vietnam War as an important issue of public concern to black Americans. It further appears that the findings

show that the editorial opinions of the sample white daily newspapers did not reflect black opinions on the Vietnam War.

The findings also suggest that such factors as the cultural background of American blacks, the economic deprivation of blacks and whites, the living conditions of blacks as well as whites and the changing political opinions of the American people seemed not to effect the nature or the pattern of the editorial opinions on the Vietnam War in the sample newspapers. These factors were not mentioned in the sample newspapers. ' Also, the findings appeared to indicate that the high degree of involvement of blacks in the Vietnam War was not a factor which accounted for differences or similarities in the sample black and white daily newspapers' editorial opinions toward the war in that none of the sample newspapers' editorials mentioned this factor.

The method utilized in the study consisted of qualitative and quantitative content analysis. Eleven descriptive hypotheses were formulated to test the central proposition of the study which is that such factors as the social conditions of blacks and whites, the living conditions of blacks as well as whites and the changing political opinions of the American people would be important in determining the nature as well as pattern of editorial opinions toward the Vietnam War. The editorial

opinions were analyzed under the eight categories of "Our Enemies," "War," "Government Acts," "Politics," "Diplomacy and Foreign Relations," "Economic Activity," "Our Nation" and "Race Relations." Each category within the editorials was evaluated for positive, negative, neutral and mixed directional dimensions.

The findings discussed in Chapter IV suggest that the majority of the sample black and white daily newspapers dealt with "War," "Politics," "Our Enemies" and "Race Relations," whereas the remaining categories had less than 5 per cent of the editorial assignments. The findings seem to indicate that the majority of the editorial opinions in the sample newspapers were treated in the positive, neutral or mixed direction rather than in the negative direction. The findings also appear to indicate that three of the hypotheses may be tenable and eight of the hypotheses may not be tenable.

Surprisingly, the findings seem to show that the sample black daily newspapers were careful not to carry negative editorial opinions about the Vietnam War. This does not correspond with the vocal opposition to the war by black opinion leaders. Thus, the sample black daily newspapers appeared not to reflect the black public opinion on the war. It was expected that the black sample daily newspapers would often bring attention to the negative effects of the Vietnam War on the black

community such as the diversion of federal funds from the urban renewal black community and disproportionate black draft rates. Instead, the sample black daily newspapers seemed to skirt the issues and the consequences of the Vietnam War for the black community. This pattern may have been evident due to the conservatism of the black editors, their lack of awareness of black public opinion on the war or their reservations about carrying editorials criticizing the federal government's policy in Vietnam. Whatever the reasons, it appears that the sample black newspapers failed to communicate the opinions and concerns of the black community and thus failed to perform the communication functions of a community medium.

In that the sample \bar{N} for the study was small, further research is needed to document the effects of editorial opinion on black public opinion in the United States. Future research on the subject should analyze more issues using a larger sample and expanded time frames. Through such an expansion of the study, statistical analysis of the hypotheses can be performed so that the relationship between black public opinion and editorial opinion can be statistically tested.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Berelson, Bernard. Content Analysis in Communication Research. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952.
- Bird, George L., and Merwin, Fredrick, eds. The Press and Society. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.
- Bond, Julian. A Time to Speak, A Time to Act. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.
- Budd, Richard W.; Thorp, Robert K.; and Donohew, Lewis. Content Analysis of Communication. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.
- Cleaver, Eldridge. Soul on Ice. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1968.
- The Encyclopedia America, 1977 ed. S.v. "Domino Theory," by Sergio Barzanti.
- Halstead, Fred. GI's Speak Out Against the War. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970.
- Hennessy, Bernard. Public Opinion. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.
- Holsti, Ole R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- Katz, Elihu, and Lazarsfeld, Paul F. Personal Influence. New York: The Free Press, 1955.
- Katz, William Loren. Eyewitness: The Negro in American History. New York: Pittman Publishing Corp., 14th Printing, 1971.
- Key, V. O., Jr. Public Opinion and American Democracy. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1961.

King, Martin L., Jr. "Beyond Vietnam." In Vietnam and Black America, pp. 79-98. Edited by Clyde Taylor. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1973.

Lasswell, Harold D. "The Structure and Functions of Communication in Society." In Reader in Public Opinion and Communication, pp. 178-89. Edited by Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Merrill, John C. The Elite Press. New York: Pittman Publishing Corporation, 1968.

Miller, William Robert. Martin Luther King. New York: Weybright and Talley, 1968.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 1974 ed. S.v. "Vietnam War."

Oberdorfer, Don. Tet! New York: Doubleday and Company, 1971.

O'Ballance, Edgar. The Wars in Vietnam, 1954-1973. London: Ian Allan, 1975.

Pater, Alan F., and Pater, Jason R., eds. What They Said in 1969: The Yearbook of Spoken Opinion. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Monitor Book Company, Inc., 1970.

Ploski, Howard A., and Kaiser, Ernest, eds. The Negro Almanac. New York: Bellwether Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Powers, Thomas A. The War at Home. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973.

Rivers, William L. The Mass Media: Reporting, Writing, Editing. 2d ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Roper, Burns W. Trends in Public Attitudes toward Television and Other Mass Media, 1959-1974. New York: Television Information Office, 1975.

Sheehan, Neil; Smith, Hedrick; Kenworthy, E. W.; and Butterfield, Fox. The Pentagon Papers. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Strouse, James C. The Mass Media, Public Opinion and Public Policy Analysis. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1975.

Waldrop, Gayle A. Editor and Editorial Writer. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1955.

The World Book Encyclopedia, 1974 ed. S.v. "Vietnam War," by Roger Hilsman.

Periodicals and Journals

Abel, John D., and Wirth, Michael D. "Newspaper vs. TV Credibility for Local News." Journalism Quarterly 54 (Summer 1977):371-75.

Atwood, L. Erwin, and Sanders, Keith R. "Perception of Information Sources and Likelihood of Split Ticket Voting." Journalism Quarterly 52 (Autumn 1975):421-28.

Bailey, George. "Interpretative Reporting of the Vietnam War by Anchormen." Journalism Quarterly 53 (Summer 1976):319-24.

_____. "Television War: Trend in Network Coverage, 1965-1970." Journal of Broadcasting 20 (Spring 1976):147-58.

Brinkman, Del. "Do Editorial Cartoons and Editorials Change Opinions?" Journalism Quarterly 45 (Winter 1968):724-26.

Browne, Robert S. "The Freedom Movement and the War in Vietnam." Freedomways 5 (Fourth Quarter):467-80.

Bush, Chilton R. "A System of Categories for General News Content." Journalism Quarterly 37 (Spring 1960):206-10.

Carter, Richard F., and Greenberg, Bradley S. "Newspapers or Television: Which Do You Believe?" Journalism Quarterly 42 (Winter 1965):29-34.

Click, J. W. "Comparison of Editorial Content of Ebony Magazine, 1967-1974." Journalism Quarterly 52 (Winter 1975):716-20.

Davis, Hal, and Rarick, Galen. "Functions of Editorials and Letters to the Editors." Journalism Quarterly 41 (Winter 1964):108-09.

DiBacco, Thomas A. "The Business Press and Vietnam: Ecstasy or Agony?" Journalism Quarterly 45 (Autumn 1968):426-35.

- Donovan, Hedley. "The War Is Worth Winning." Life, February 25, 1966, pp. 27-32.
- "An Editorial." Look, May 14, 1968, p. 33.
- Eisendrath, Charles R. "The Black Hessians." The Nation, January 29, 1968, pp. 146-48.
- Emery, Edwin. "The Press in the Vietnam Quagmire." Journalism Quarterly 48 (Winter 1971):619-26.
- Erskine, Hazel. "Polls: Is War a Mistake?" Public Opinion Quarterly 34 (Spring 1970):134-50.
- "Escalating Opinion: Vietnam Editorials on Television." Newsweek, March 25, 1968, p. 97.
- Gamson, William A., and Modigliani, Andre. "Knowledge and Foreign Policy Opinions: Some Models for Consideration." Public Opinion Quarterly 30 (Summer 1966):187-99.
- Greenberg, Bradley S. "Media Use and Believability: Some Multiple Correlates." Journalism Quarterly 43 (Winter 1966):655-70.
- Gregg, James E. "Newspaper Editorial Endorsements and California Elections, 1948-1962." Journalism Quarterly 42 (Autumn 1965):532-38.
- Haavelsrud, Magnus. "Learning Resources in the Formation of International Orientations." Communication Review 20 (Fall 1972):229-51.
- Hooper, Michael. "Party and Newspaper Endorsements as Predictors of Voter Choice." Journalism Quarterly 46 (Summer 1969):302-05.
- "How the War in Vietnam Might End." Time, August 9, 1968, pp. 22-23.
- Jacobson, Harvey. "Mass Media Believability: A Study of Receiver Judgments." Journalism Quarterly 46 (Spring 1969):20-28.
- Jones, E. Terrence, and Saunders, Joan. "Persuading an Urban Public: The St. Louis Privacy Campaign." Journalism Quarterly 54 (Winter 1977):669-73.
- Katz, William Loren. "The Afro-American Response to U.S. Imperialism." Freedomways 11 (Third Quarter, 1971):284-91.

- King, Martin L., Jr. "Showdown for Non-Violence." Look, April 16, 1968, pp. 23-25.
- "King Talk." National Review, April 18, 1967, pp. 395-96.
- Kupfer, Marvin. "The Negro View: A Special Anguish." Newsweek, July 10, 1967, p. 34.
- Laing, Robert B., and Stevenson, Robert L. "Public Opinion Trends in the Last Days of the Nixon Administration." Journalism Quarterly 53 (Summer 1976):294-304.
- Lewis, Herbert L. "Foreign Policy on the Newspaper Editorial Page." Journalism Quarterly 26 (March 1949):424-30.
- "Living Room War." U.S. News and World Report, March 4, 1968, pp. 28-29.
- McCombs, Maxwell. "Editorial Endorsements: A Study of Influence." Journalism Quarterly 44 (Autumn 1967):545-48; 561.
- McLean, L. Deckle. "The Black Man and the Draft." Ebony, August 1968, pp. 63-70.
- Myers, David S. "Editorials and Foreign Affairs in the 1964 Presidential Campaigns." Journalism Quarterly 46 (Summer 1969):211-18.
- "Nation's Editors Pick 15 'Superior' Papers." Editor and Publisher, April 12, 1960, p. 12.
- "Negroes Go to War." Economist, April 15, 1967, p. 255.
- "One War: Negro Disillusionment with Vietnam." The Nation, October 14, 1968, p. 357.
- "Only One Color." Newsweek, December 6, 1965, pp. 42-43.
- "The Prince and the Dragon." Time, April 3, 1964, pp. 32-36.
- "Re-Examining the Conduct of the War." Life, January 5, 1968, pp. 4-5.
- "Report from Black America." Newsweek, June 30, 1969, pp. 17-35.

- "Senator Brooke and Dr. King." The Nation, April 10, 1967, pp. 452-53.
- Shaw, Donald L., and Bishop, Michael. "Editorial Function and Societal Stress." Journalism Quarterly 49 (Autumn 1972):582-85.
- "Shifting Opinion on the War." Newsweek, March 25, 1968, p. 84.
- "A Small Step Forward in Saigon." Saturday Evening Post, April 22, 1967, p. 96.
- "The Stakes in South Vietnam." Saturday Evening Post, June 13, 1964, p. 80.
- Stempel, Guido H. III. "Increasing Reliability in Content Analysis." Journalism Quarterly 32 (Fall 1955): 449-55.
- "To L.B.J.: What Is Our Aim in Vietnam?" Life, January 8, 1965, p. 4.
- Verba, Sidney, and Brody, Richard A. "Participation, Policy Preference and the War in Vietnam." Public Opinion Quarterly 34 (Fall 1970):325-32.
- Verba, Sidney; Brody, Richard; Parker, Edwin B.; Nie, Norman N.; Polsby, Nelson W.; Ekman, Paul; and Black, Gordon S. "Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam." American Political Science Review 61 (June 1967):317-33.
- "Vietnam: A First Step." Saturday Evening Post, February 11, 1967, p. 86.
- "Vietnam: The Right War at the Right Time." Time, May 14, 1965, p. 30.
- "War on Poverty: Present Danger." Newsweek, August 8, 1966, pp. 21-22.
- Westley, Bruce H., and Severin, Werner J. "Some Correlates of Media Credibility." Journalism Quarterly 41 (Summer 1964):325-35.
- "What Johnson Faces in Vietnam." Look, January 28, 1964, pp. 19-31.
- Windhauser, John W. "Content Patterns of Editorials in Ohio and Metropolitan Dailies." Journalism Quarterly 50 (Autumn):562-67.

Wright, James D. "Life, Time and the Fortunes of War." Trans-Action, January 1972, pp. 42-52.

Documents and Reports

Farmer, James F. Annual Report to the CORE National Convention. Durham, N.C.: Congress of Racial Equality, July 1, 1965.

Gallup, George. "Public Opinion and the Vietnam War, 1964-1969." The Gallup Opinion Index, Report No. 52, October 1969:1-15.

Kerner Commission. Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

Luedke, William J. '78 Ayer Directory of Publications. Philadelphia, Pa.: Ayer Press, 1978.

Secretary of Defense. Negro in the Armed Forces: A Statistical Fact Book. Washington, D.C.: Office of Secretary of Defense, September 1971.

U.S. Bureau of Census. County and City Data Book, 1977: A Statistical Abstract Supplement. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

U.S. Congress. House. Congressmen Burton, Conyers, Dow, Edwards, Roybal, Hawkins, Helstoski, Kastenmeier, Rosenthal and Ryan speaking on War, Riot, and Priorities. 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1 August 1967. Congressional Record, vol. 113.

U.S. Congress. House. Congressman Robert Nix speaking on the Report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 12 March 1968. Congressional Record, vol. 114.

U.S. Congress. House. Congressman Shirley Chisholm speaking on the Department of Defense Budget. 91st Congress, 1st Session, 26 March 1969. Congressional Record, vol. 115.

U.S. Congress. House. Congressman Ronald Dellums speaking on the Involvement in Indochina. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 24 March 1971. Congressional Record, vol. 117.

Newspapers

Atlanta Constitution, 27 July-9 August 1964; 1 January-15 January 1966; 24 January-8 February 1968; and 17 December-31 December 1970.

Atlanta Daily World, 27 July-9 August 1964; 1 January-15 January 1966; 24 January-8 February 1968; and 17 December-31 December 1970.

Chicago Defender, 27 July-9 August 1964; 1 January-15 January 1966; 24 January-8 February 1968; and 17 December-31 December 1970.

Chicago Tribune, 27 July-9 August 1964; 1 January-15 January 1966; 24 January-8 February 1968; and 17 December-31 December 1970.

The Dallas Times Herald, 3 March 1971, sec. A, p. 17.

San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle, 21 May 1972, sec. A, p. 11.

Washington Post, 29 January 1971, sec. A, p. 4.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293100626989