



clio

AMONG THE MEDIA

Newsletter of the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication



notes
from the head

Time to redouble research efforts

By Pat McNeely
Head
South Carolina

Speak to anyone who teaches history, and you'll hear the same story: Each generation seems to know less and less about the past—whether you're talking about media history or history of any kind.

I was reminded of this increasing problem on my recent trip to San Antonio when I asked at the tourism office about Samuel Maverick.

I was interested in Maverick because he was a native of South Carolina who became a wealthy Nineteenth Century Texas cattle rancher who played a major role in Texas history—and gave us one of our commonly used words.

Because he left his herd unbranded, other ranchers assumed wandering unbranded cattle belonged to Maverick, thus giving rise to the word still used today to mean an unbranded animal or a person who takes an independent stand in a group.

He was one of the two

Debunking myths: An essential undertaking

By W. Joseph Campbell
Clio Editor
American

The September/October 2004 issue of *Columbia Journalism Review* contained a striking reminder about how readily myth and distortion can seep into daily journalism—and, by extension, into journalism history.

In an article by Mariah Blake, the *Review* recalled “the plight of so-called crack babies,” the widely reported 1980s phenomenon that threatened to create a “biological underclass” that would “cripple our schools, fill our jails, and drain our social programs.”

That day never came, the *Review* noted. “Crack babies, it turns out, were a media myth, not a medical reality.”

The article was a telling if unusual attempt to direct attention to a media-driven myth. It also offered lessons for media historians working in a field often muddled by myth and distortion. Debunking myths (or urban legends) is a worthy undertaking, not only to set straight the historical record but to explain and clarify the influence of the news media in American life.

This issue of *Clio* offers an insightful case of myth-debunking. The article by Thom Lieb of Towson University

(see page 3) is an elaboration of his presentation at the AEJMC convention in Toronto in August 2004. Lieb was a presenter at a panel that explored why myth has so often distorted scholarly and popular understanding of important events in media history.

The panel—“Myth and Media History: Accounting for a Distorted Record”—was sponsored by the History Division and co-sponsored by the Critical/Cultural Studies Division.

While the discussion ranged widely, reflecting the clash of perspectives central to the respective divisions, the panelists identified at least a few reasons as to why myths have taken hold in at least some periods of media history.

These reasons include:

- **the enduring effects of sloppy news reporting.** The “crack baby” alarm of the 1980s stands as a striking example. As *Columbia Journalism Review* noted, the scare was “a media myth built on wobbly, outdated science,” specifically a very limited study reported in 1985 in the *New England Journal of Medicine*. (Interestingly, a Nexis search reveals that *Mother Jones* magazine in 1995 and the *National Journal* in 1999 took on and sought to debunk the “crack-baby

See Debunking, page 2

See Notes, page 2

Debunking, from page 1

myth.” However, such efforts at setting the record straight appear to have had scant effect.)

Sloppy reporting in the *Washington Post* gave rise to heroic status of Jessica Lynch. She was a 19-year-old Army supply clerk who, according to the *Post*, had been shot and stabbed but kept fighting until she ran out of ammunition and was taken prisoner early in the Iraq War in 2003.

As it turned out, the *Post*'s account was riddled with error. Lynch had been neither shot nor stabbed, and she probably had been knocked unconscious before having a chance to fight back before her capture. Nonetheless, the erroneous report helped lift her to fame as America's best-known soldier of the Iraq War.

• **a willingness to accept anecdotes at face value—even those that seem too good to be true.** William Randolph Hearst's purported vow to “furnish the war” with Spain is such an anecdote. It's deliciously rich in hubris and arrogance. It has been called Hearst's single-most quoted utterance. But almost certainly the anecdote is mythical. Hearst denied having made the vow, and no physical evidence has been discovered to support the anecdote (Hearst's vow supposedly was sent by telegraph to the artist Frederic Remington, then on assignment in Cuba).

On its face, the Hearstian vow seems altogether too tidy—too perfect to be true. Yet it has proven irresistible. The anecdote is routinely cited in media history texts and even made its way into David Nasaw's *The Chief*, the best biography yet of Hearst.

• **an eagerness to identify powerful media effects.** The Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal are often said to have been revealing examples of the power the news media can wield. After all, television coverage supposedly hastened an end to the Vietnam War and the *Washington Post*'s investigative reports about the Watergate scandal

are often said to have brought down President Richard Nixon.

But both claims are exaggerated. Unrelenting casualties and uncertain policy objectives ultimately ended the U.S. military presence in Vietnam. The *Post*'s reporting may have kept Watergate from fading in 1972. But congressional investigations and the federal courts—and Nixon's own recordings of his incriminating conversations—were crucial in bringing about his resignation in 1974.

Hearst's purported vow to “furnish the war” has been cited as Exhibit A

The urge to identify 'firsts' in media history can give rise to error and distortion

for the dubious notion that the yellow press of New York City fomented the Spanish-American War in 1898. The press assuredly did not have that kind of power, and doesn't now. The war with Spain stemmed from a variety of factors—notably a diplomatic impasse and a humanitarian crisis in Cuba—that were far beyond the ability of the press to much influence, let alone control.

No doubt other factors, in addition to those cited above, help account for the prevalence of myths in media history. The urge to identify “firsts” can also give rise to myth and distortion.

As the panel at Toronto made clear, identifying, confronting, and debunking the myths of media history are objectives both worthy and vital.

■
Campbell is an associate professor at American University's School of Communication. He is the author of two books, including Yellow Journalism: Puncturing the Myths, Defining the Legacies, which was published in 2001. A paperback edition came out in 2003.

Notes, from page 1

largest landowners in West Texas in the 1850s and 1860s, and Maverick County was named for him. One of his grandsons was mayor of San Antonio.

I give all this background to show what a significant role he played in Texas history.

However, when I asked about his home or a museum or other historical site that I might visit to learn more about him, the folks in the tourist office had never heard of him. Even a quick check on their office computers provided no information—even though an even quicker click on Google provided me with a bounty of information after I came home.

Their lack of knowledge about Maverick was a sad moment, but it made me think again about the importance of historians in our society and in the world. I keep remembering George Santayana's oft-quoted admonition:

“Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it.” And more recently historian David McCullough said, “History is a guide to navigation in perilous times. History is who we are and why we are the way we are.” Judging by what I learned—or more accurately didn't learn—about Maverick, the time may be approaching when we'll be doomed to repeat some of our history.

These *are* perilous times indeed, and it is a clear call to us, as historians, to renew and redouble our research and writing efforts and to try to teach today's students to love, revere and remember history the way we do.

I consider it a noble calling.

■

McNeely is the Eleanor M. and R. Frank Mundy Professor at the University of South Carolina School of Journalism and Mass Communications, where she chairs the print and electronic sequence and teaches writing, reporting and history. McNeely is the author of three books. She is head of the AEJMC history division in 2004-05.

The emergence of a myth: When journalists, and activists, got burned

By Thom Lieb
Towson

A few months ago, a *Washington Post* column on the changing outlook on retirement quoted a financial expert as saying that when Baby Boomers hit that phase of their lives, “they will do it with the same zeal and sheer force in numbers with which they flocked to Woodstock, burned their bras and embraced the Beatles and the Stones.”

Thus the myth lives on that young women of the 1960s and 1970s—and feminists in particular—routinely burned their bras in protest, despite the fact that there is no historical record of a feminist ever burning a bra, and despite the public confession of the inadvertent creator of the myth more than a decade ago. What that says about the eagerness of the public and journalists alike to embrace stories that sound right is quite relevant today.

While some critics have labeled the bra-burning myth a media fabrication, it did not spring from the fertile imaginations of a paternalistic cabal. Rather, it arose from efforts of feminists to attract media attention—just not *that* kind.

The origins of the bra-burning myth can be found in the September 7, 1968, feminist protest of the Miss America Pageant in Atlantic City, generally acknowledged as the first major demonstration of the movement. According to a 1970 *New York Times Magazine* article by Susan Brownmiller, the protest was choreographed by New York Radical Women to draw media attention to the movement. The plan, as organizer Robin Morgan wrote in her manifesto, “No More Miss America,” was to “liberate the contest auction block in the guise of “genyooine” deplasticized, breathing women.... We will protest the image of Miss America,

an image that oppresses women in every area in which it purports to represent us.”

The announcement of the demonstration intrigued *New York Post* reporter Lindsay Van Gelder. She visited Morgan and became interested in the movement. Nevertheless, she recalled in a 1990 telephone interview: “I mentioned high in the story that the protesters were planning to burn bras, girdles and other items in a freedom trash can”—an action that, she recalls, the press announcement said would take place. “The headline writer took it a step further,” Van Gelder said, “and called them ‘bra-burners.’”

*This myth reveals that
traps await even
the most careful
researcher*

Van Gelder played up the plans for the burning for two reasons: First, anti-war demonstrators were burning draft cards and flags, so the plan had a cultural resonance. Second, as she told Gaye Tuchman (author of *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*): “I tried to be light and witty so it would get in [the paper]. I was afraid if I reported it straight, it wouldn’t get in at all.”

The story ran in the first edition of the *Post* several days before the protest; it was replaced later in the day with what Van Gelder calls “‘real’ news.”

Despite the intentions of the protesters, there was to be no burning of bras, or anything else. And, in fact, Robin Morgan says there was never even a press announcement, let alone one that described plans to burn bras.

All that existed, Morgan contended in a 1990 interview, was a flier that announced plans to dump garments into a Freedom Trash Can.

Still, a quote from Morgan in a *New York Times* article on the protest—about the only mention of the event in the mainstream media—would appear to support Van Gelder’s story. Morgan was quoted as saying that Atlantic City Mayor Richard S. Jackson had been “worried about our burning things.” Morgan continued: “He said the boardwalk had already been burned out once this year. We told him we wouldn’t do anything dangerous—just a symbolic bra-burning.” Eyewitness accounts and television coverage of the protest indicate that nothing was burned.

Burning or no burning, Van Gelder’s article set off a chain of events in the news media that resonate yet today.

Two days after the protest, *Post* colleague Harriet Van Horne’s piece, “Female Firebrands,” recounted the events: “Highlight of their march was a Freedom Trash Can. With screams of delight they consigned to the flames such shackling, demeaning items as girdles, bras, high-heeled slippers, hair curlers and false eyelashes.” Van Horne conceded that she didn’t attend the protest or talk to the protesters—or even see a picture of them—but nevertheless labeled them “Amazons,” “idiotic,” and “unstroked, uncaressed and emotionally undernourished.”

A few days later, Art Buchwald joined in. It’s hard to tell in retrospect how far his tongue was placed in cheek in writing his column, “Uptight Dissenters Go Too Far in Burning Their Brassieres,” but the syndication of his column likely makes it the most crucial item in spreading the myth.

See Emergence, page 4

Emergence, from page 3

Within just a few days, the myth was appearing as fact in news articles. A *Washington Post* article on the efforts of members of the National Women's Liberation Group to save a historic building identified the women as having "burned undergarments during a demonstration at the Miss America contest in Atlantic City recently."

Van Gelder confessed to her role in creating the myth in a 1992 article in *Ms.* magazine (where, interestingly, Robin Morgan was then working as editor).

Nevertheless, as evidenced by the passage that opened this article, the myth has persisted—and is likely to outlive even the Baby Boomers. So how did it gain such power? What lessons might the myth offer for journalists and journalism historians?

To start with the first question first: The myth became powerful because there was a huge contrast between burning a draft card or a flag to protest a war that many felt was wrong and that was claiming countless lives—and burning a bra because it was "oppressing." Bra burning, therefore, was perceived by the media as a trivial gesture offering evidence that feminists had nothing to complain about.

Opponents of the feminist move-

ment—a category in which Harriet Van Horne seemingly fell—found in the myth a convenient way to ridicule women with whom they disagreed. Labeling a feminist a bra-burner effectively ended the discussion of any important issues the feminists were hoping to place on the media and public agendas.

There were no checks and balances, Van Gelder recalls, because writers and editors were typically insulated from what was happening in the streets, rarely interacting with protesters and other "fringe" characters.

In a 1990 phone interview, Van Gelder referred to a "vicious generation gap in the newsroom," a gap that further increased the odds that material like the bra-burning myth would be run without verification.

Given all that, it was easy for journalists to accept bra-burning as reality because, as Van Gelder noted, the idea of women burning bras and other clothing made sense in light of the stories journalists were already telling about other protesters. Even though only one group had made burnings a regular protest action, that action had occurred frequently enough and for a long enough period to burn itself into the public consciousness.

It was, therefore, easy to believe this story, even when no evidence was available to support it.

For journalists, the lessons of the bra-burning myth should be obvious: Don't rely on second-hand reports from sources who may be motivated by more than a commitment to disseminating the truth.

It would be nice to think that media historians are more cautious than journalists, but this myth reveals that traps await even the most careful researcher. More than two decades passed before it was debunked, and during that time there were many references to it in the news media.

Instead of primary documents—such as the flier that might or might not have existed—those media accounts were virtually all that was written on the topic. A researcher who relied solely on them could not have cracked the myth.

What was required was a look at alternative media (in this case, feminist books and newspapers) and a mind open to the possibility that what hadn't been published (as in a first-person account of bra burnings) might be more important than what had been.



Lieb is a professor in the Department of Mass Communication and Communication Studies at Towson University. His publications include Editing for Clear Communication and Building Basic News Sites, both published by McGraw-Hill.



clio

AMONG THE MEDIA

Editor: *W. Joseph Campbell (American University)*

Layout and design: *Wesley Schauble (American University)*

Webmaster: *Kittrell Rushing (University of Tennessee-Chattanooga)*

Clio Among the Media is published quarterly by the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Submissions to Clio are welcome. Please send them to: W. Joseph Campbell, School of Communication, American University, Washington, DC, 20016-8017. Electronic copy, either disk or e-mail, is preferred. For information, call Campbell at 202/885-2071, or e-mail him at: wjc@american.edu.

Southern Mississippi doctoral student wins two AJHA paper awards

Rebekah Ray, a doctoral student at the University of Southern Mississippi, won two research paper awards at the October 2004 convention of the American Journalism Historians Association. Ray received the Robert Lance and Maurine Beasley awards for her paper, "The Other Carter—Betty Werlein Carter."

The Lance award recognizes the best student paper presented at the convention. The Beasley award recognizes the best paper in women's research.

Carolyn Kitch of Temple University won the outstanding conference paper award for her study, "A Script of Roles and Models': Visual Testimony, Counter-Memory, and Black History in Ebony."

In all, 38 papers were accepted for presentation at the convention in Cleveland, Fred Blevens, the AJHA research chair, reported. That figure represented 56% of the 68 papers submitted (66 of which qualified for judging).

Papers were submitted by faculty and students from 40 universities, Blevens said.

Twenty-one accepted papers were by faculty authors and 17 were written by students.

Students at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill submitted seven papers, five of which were accepted. Students at Southern Mississippi submitted six papers, four of which

were accepted.

Other paper-award winners were:

- David Sloan Award for Outstand-

ing Faculty Paper: W. Joseph Campbell, American University.

- J. William Snorgrass Award for Best Minority Research: Brian Carroll, Berry College.

AJHA's convention next year will be in San Antonio, Texas. Convention dates are October 5-8, 2005.

Ohio State's McKerns dies at 54

Joseph P. McKerns, who taught journalism history for 17 years at Ohio State's School of Communication, died of lung cancer October 23, 2004, at his home near Columbus. He was 54.

McKerns won the Sidney Kobre Award at the annual meeting of the American Journalism Historians Association in Cleveland in October 2004. The award is AJHA's highest honor. The letter nominating McKerns cited his "energy, dedication and intelligence devoted to the unselfish pursuit of truth and knowledge."

McKerns did not attend the AJHA convention in Cleveland. In remarks read for him by his son, Doug, McKerns offered this advice to young researchers:

"Follow your heart. Do the things, work on the things, that mean something to you, that are important to you. If they're important to you and you feel strongly about them, you can make them important to other people.

"And if you can do that, you've done your job as an historian."

McKerns wrote dozens of articles, book chapters and papers on journal-

ists and press issues in the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twentieth centuries. He wrote often about the role that mainstream media played in curbing the power of racial and other minority groups.

He is best known for editing the *Biographical Dictionary of American Journalism*, a standard reference since 1989.

At Ohio State, McKerns directed many dissertations and theses and was active in numerous scholarly groups and their publications. He won awards at Ohio State and elsewhere for his teaching of graduate seminars and undergraduate courses.

McKerns was born August 11, 1950, in Shenandoah, Pa., and reared in Mahanoy City, Pa. He earned an A.B. in American studies and communication arts at the University of Notre Dame in 1972, a master's degree in journalism at Ohio State in 1973 and a doctorate in mass communication at the University of Minnesota in 1979.

He is survived by his mother; his wife of 33 years, Annamae; and three sons.

History Division officers, 2004-05

Head: Patricia McNeely (South Carolina)

Vice Head: Dane Claussen (Point Park)

Secretary/Newsletter editor: W. Joseph Campbell (American)

PF&R Chair: Earnest Perry (Missouri)

Teaching Standards Chair: David Copeland (Elon)

Research Chair: Dane Claussen (Point Park)

Webmaster: Kittrell Rushing (Tennessee-Chattanooga)

Book Award Chair: Patrick Washburn (Ohio)

Covert Award Chair: Karen List (Massachusetts)

Sorting out the important from the merely interesting

By **Dane S. Claussen**
Vice-Head/Research Chair
Point Park

When I was making my second tour as a graduate student, first at Kansas State (M.S.) and then at the University of Georgia (Ph.D.), I had a habit of writing in the margins of my books questions or observations that occurred to me as I was reading.

Starting at Kansas State, it had been nine years since I had been in graduate school, and although I had read any number of books in the meantime, most of them were not on mass communication and I had never needed to brainstorm for theory-related ideas for homework assignments, term papers, or a long-term research agenda as a prospective professor. I wanted to make sure I captured whatever occurred to me in case it never occurred to me again.

Now, nearly 10 years later, I recently dug up a reaction paper of a sort that I wrote about a selection of readings in cultural studies and media history and shared it with a graduate student. He asked me if my opinions had changed since then about any of the authors that I wrote about, and I said that generally they had not—although I had forgotten how critical I was of Harold Innis's writing style before I had read as much bad scholarly writing as I have by now.

I have noticed recently certain patterns in media history research, especially a heavy concentration of conference papers about gender issues (male and female) and race issues in mass communication history and have wondered about what areas and questions are not receiving much (or any) attention from our historians—not that gender and race questions are unimportant, if they tell us something that we didn't already know. (For example, yet another conference paper documenting how racist or sexist yet another publication was at

some points in the past is not helpful; examples would be nearly endless and do not tell us much without demonstrating trends and cause-effect relationships involving staffers, advertisers, readers and/or other actors.)

So it was in the spirit of considering

We don't have a very good understanding of the profit-motive in the history of the news media

the idea of a list of research topics, current trends in mass communication history research, and a question for myself of whether I had been in the academy long enough (i.e. too long) that I was beginning to focus on individual trees and not forestry management that I asked the question recently on the JHISTORY listserv about whether other mass communication historians could put their fingers on unanswered questions and unsolved dilemmas in mass communication history.

Specifically, I posed the question that if mathematicians can tell you that providing the proof for Fermat's Last Theorem is the "holy grail" in their field, what is the equivalent in ours?

I didn't get much response, although I grant that I asked the question around Thanksgiving and we media historians are as focused on minor issues like cranberries rather than major scholarly issues as anyone else.

Wally Eberhard, professor emeritus at the University of Georgia, called my request for ideas "provocative but nearly unanswerable questions related to what historians 'ought' to be doing," and I

don't doubt that a list of unanswered questions in media history, even ones that we could call "major," would be quite long. Eberhard also correctly advised that directing media historians toward particular destinations is like "herding cats," and I can't completely disagree with that either—although I can imagine that at least some of us could be (and even are) more motivated by working on "major issues" in media history over "minor" ones. And I would suggest that while there would be a lot of disagreements and a lot of gray areas, there surely are certain questions that many or most of us could agree on as being of some importance.

Donna L. Halper of Emerson College wrote: "For me, there are certain media myths of broadcast journalism that keep getting re-cycled and it's time we put them to rest. I am fairly certain, for example, that KDKA was NOT the first station on the air, despite Westinghouse's massive publicity machine and its claims. I've seen some rather contorted reasoning about why 8MK (WWJ) or our own pioneering 1XE (later WGI) could not be considered the first station, but I'd love to see this resolved once and for all.

Also, I am also fairly certain that the first commercial was NOT aired on WEAJ in the summer of 1922. In fact, the early history of broadcast journalism is shrouded in misconceptions and myths—I have evidence of newscasts in the early 1920s, but it's difficult to prove which station really did news first, although I have my own theories. I'd love to see a more honest version of our founding years—one not influenced by corporate publicists or by the radio editor of the [*New York Times*], and one that doesn't just concentrate on the great inventors, but rather on how radio affected the lives of people in

See Sorting out, page 7

Sorting out, from page 6

various cities.”

Adam Arenson, a doctoral student in the Yale University history department, offered this idea: “I would suggest that advertising history before the Civil War has been quite underdeveloped; all of the books seem to have a general ‘origins’ chapter that treats colonial newspapers and Roman graffiti in the same breath. The little work I have begun on the subject (the use of stereotyped signatures by the Merriam brothers in advertising the Webster dictionary) suggests that there is a lot more to learn about nationalized markets, fame and reputation, and the evolution from signs to full-fledged ads.”

Martin Kuhn, a doctoral student in journalism and mass communication at the University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill, wrote to pose what he called “a higher order question. Does objectivity matter?”

Kuhn didn’t define “matter,” but allow me to suggest one possible interpretation and research question: when newspapers supposedly bought into the idea of adopting objectivity to broaden their appeal to the masses and/or lessen their offensiveness to certain potential advertisers when contrasted with less objective content, how quickly and to what extent did the public notice and care? In other words, can we compare otherwise similar papers and show relatively larger circulation increases or smaller circulation decreases in the newspaper that adopted objectivity first than in the one that didn’t? One would prefer a control group of a sort to show the impact of adopting objectivity versus not doing so, a perennial problem in historical research.

Allow me to suggest a few others for the list. Mark Feldstein of George Washington University is studying whether patterns in political, economic, and other spheres of American life correspond to the intensity of investigative journalism in certain periods. I don’t know about you, but I, like Feldstein, have never been satisfied with the

explanations given about this topic. Even the explanations for the decline of muckraking in the 1910s would require a “perfect storm” of co-opted or corrupted publishers, bored readers, burned-out journalists, and so forth.

I suggest that we don’t have a very good understanding of the profit-motive in the history of news media. So much journalism history has been about editors who were motivated by politics or religion or an eagerness merely to practice good journalism or any number of other motivations besides making a living (if not a fortune) for a lot of reasons. It conflicts with our saga of professionalization, and it conflicts with the fact that most journalists in U.S. history never made much money, and so on. In any case, we don’t know the extent to which being a printer or publisher or reporter was sooner, or later, or both sooner and later, just a job and a paycheck.

We know quite a bit about the mass media’s eagerness to embrace new technologies (especially new generations of printing presses, the Linotype, the telegraph, photography, new generations of newsprint and other papers, and—to a much lesser extent—the telephone, typewriter, and so forth). And we know quite a bit about the beginnings of newspaper chains and modern strategies of chains from, among other works, Jerry Baldasty’s *E. W. Scripps and the Business of Newspapers*.

But allow me to suggest that we don’t know the extent to which mass media industries in the United States did and did not adopt management, marketing, accounting, and financial practices *from other industries*, in addition to (or instead of) practices that emerged within the mass media industry.

This brings up the question of whether the mass media industries were doing all that they could to maximize revenues and profits, whether individual media (such as newspapers) were doing all that they could to not lose “market share” to other media (such as television).

Here’s another worthy question: Does quality matter? I’ve already stopped counting the number of times that I’ve had to point out to students, and fellow professors, that the *New York Times* was not always the best newspaper in New York City, let alone in the United States.

Until its demise in the mid-1960s, the *New York Herald-Tribune* was acknowledged (even by many *New York Times* staffers) as the city’s the best newspaper. In his book, *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History*, Princeton historian Robert Darnton, a *Times* reporter in 1964-65, noted that fabricated material in the *Times* then was not rare—nearly 40 years before the Jayson Blair scandal! (Similarly, I wonder how many historians incorrectly assume the *Chicago Tribune* always had the largest circulation in Chicago or even know that Joseph Medill didn’t found it.)

Or how about this one?

I would argue that so little research has been done on the history of mass media outside the major metro markets in the United States (especially outside New York, Washington, Boston, and Chicago) or even certain metro areas (before a relatively recent burst—of highly varying quality—of histories and biographies, there was little on the history of journalism even of Los Angeles!), that we probably don’t even know what we don’t know about the histories of mass media in rural areas and in small- to medium-sized cities.

As I showed in a paper some years back, even rural sociologists historically have treated small-town newspapers as an important source of information for their research and but not as important institutions in their communities!



Claussen is associate professor & director of graduate programs, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Point Park University, Pittsburgh. His latest book, Anti-intellectualism in American Life: Magazines and Higher Education, analyzes popular magazines from 1944 to 1996, concluding that coverage of higher education focused on almost every aspect of colleges/universities except education.

AJHA–AEJMC History Division joint spring meeting: A call for papers, panels, participants

You are invited to submit papers and abstracts (250 to 500 words), research in progress and proposals for panels to the AJHA-AEJMC History Division joint spring meeting on Saturday, March 12, 2005, at the New School University in New York, NY.

The conference will run that day from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

The registration fee is \$40.

The sponsors are interested in all areas of journalism and communication history from all time periods and welcome scholars from all academic disciplines and stages of their academic careers.

Abstracts should contain a compelling rationale why the research is of interest to an interdisciplinary community of scholars. (Electronic submissions preferred. Please send three copies of hard-copy submissions).

The program will close with a roundtable discussion about core knowledge in journalism history in which all conference-goers are welcome to participate.

Please send all submissions by January 5, 2005, to:

Elliot King, Program Organizer,
Department of Communication,
Loyola College in Maryland, 4501 N.

Charles St., Baltimore, MD, 21210.
E-mail: <eking@loyola.edu>. Send copies of electronic submissions to <elliott@dbta.com>.

The acceptance notification date is February 4, 2005.

If you are willing to serve on the organizing committee and/or review submissions, please contact Elliot King at <eking@loyola.edu> or 410/356-3943.

The conference hosts are the Missouri School of Journalism at the University of Missouri, and the Media Studies Department at the New School University.

Call for entries: Covert Award in Mass Communication History

The AEJMC History Division announces the 21st annual competition for the Covert Award in Mass Communication History.

The \$500 award will be presented to the author of the best mass communication history article or essay

published in 2004.

Book chapters in edited collections also may be nominated.

The award was endowed by the late Catherine L. Covert, professor of public communications at Syracuse University and former History Division head.

Nominations, including six copies of the article nominated, should be sent by March 1, 2005, to:

Karen K. List, Journalism,
108 Bartlett Hall, University of
Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, 01003.

Nominations sought for AJHA major awards

Nominations are sought for the American Journalism Historians Association's top awards—the Kobre Award, the Book of the Year Award for 2004, and the History Award.

The Kobre Award, the organization's highest honor, recognizes individuals who have built an exemplary record of sustained achievement in journalism history through teaching, research, professional activities, or other contributions to journalism history. Winners need not be members of AJHA. Nominations for the award are solicited annually, but the award is not necessarily given every year. Those making nominations for

the award should present, at a minimum, a cover letter that explains the nominee's contributions to the field as well as a vita or brief biography of the nominee. Nominations are due by May 1, 2005, and should be submitted to Earnest L. Perry Jr., Missouri School of Journalism, 179C Gannett Hall, Columbia MO 65211. His email address is: <perryel@missouri.edu>.

The AJHA book award recognizes the best in journalism history or mass media history published during the 2004 calendar year. The book must have been granted a first-time copyright in 2004. Entrants should submit five copies of their books to the

award coordinator by March 1, 2005. Send materials to David R. Davies, University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5121, Hattiesburg MS 39406-0001. His email address is: <dave.davies@usm.edu>

The AJHA History Award recognizes practicing journalists who, through their work, have made a contribution in some way to journalism history. Nominating letters and supporting materials should be submitted by May 1, 2005, to Earnest Perry at his address, above.

AJHA's awards will be given at its annual convention in San Antonio, Texas, October 5-8, 2005.