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Over the course of writing this thesis, I learned that “life” does not stop while writing, even if that may seem obvious. But at the end of the process, I have a record of the time I spent writing – you are reading it. Many of the other parts that make up the day-to-day are lost to time; unless, of course, those files are stored and maintained for future generations to read and better understand how history takes its course. I am beholden to the many men (and women, though there were fewer of them) whose thoughts, ideas, criticisms, and regular communications composed the sources on which my thesis is built. These journalists were visionaries, and their voices helped democratize science to anyone who could access a copy of the New York Times.
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Writing this thesis has been a truly humbling experience. For nearly everything I learned and read, I was aware that there was more to be read, more to be heard, more to be learned. It has been a fulfilling, grounding process to realize that none of us have all of the answers, but we all have questions.
Author’s Note:

The following thesis became much larger than I intended it to get, but when I think about how the *New York Times* has the ties it does to history, to time, and to many of the most significant players in business and politics in American and international relations, I think it would be mistaken to be surprised. Through this long and sometime strenuous process, I have realized that I have been writing about the intersection of journalism with the military-research-industrial-academic complex. Though it is a large scope, it is still such a small fraction of the world as it was lived. Music, art, politics, dancing, race, gender, class and the intersections of the above all shaped the lived experiences of the people whose lives were touched in some way by these complexes and the scientific developments from the time.

Because I was initially interested in how the *New York Times* covered Stanley Milgram’s 1963 research, my units of inquiry were the *New York Times*, Stanley Milgram, and the National Science Foundation. I conceptualized these groups and individuals as a big institution (the *Times*) and a small team of ethically-questioned researchers (Milgram et al.) acting with financial support from a bigger institution (the NSF). I realized relatively early on that I had to file a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to see the NSF grant applications that I thought might have materials related to Stanley Milgram’s work. I later realized that I would not be able to get the FOIA request processed in time. Meanwhile, I was not finding very much social science-related material in the *New York Times* archives. My work then shifted to the development of science news at the *New York Times* and the Social Science Research Council, a non-profit organization founded in 1923 dedicated to oversight and advancement of social science research. Their archived materials are kept at Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, New York. Within these files, I found two National Science Foundation “Division of Social Science: Grant List” documents from Fiscal Years 1974 and 1975, both of which initially excited me.

As I dug deeper, I discovered additional funding documents in SSRC files that came from the Ford Foundation, so I learned that the Social Science Research Council was one administrative player – a large player – funded in part by the Ford Foundation and the National Science Foundation. Before starting my research, I hypothesized that a lack of coverage may have been attributable to a lack of psychological research funding. However, when I learned that the government *did*
fund psychology research, in large part through the Department of Defense, this argument fell through. Even so, the DoD was entirely absent from the archival materials that I consulted. The process has felt a little bit like I am the Tin Man searching for the Wizard, but instead of locating the man with the levers, I found another bureaucrat, another scientist, another recently-renamed funding agency. The authors whom I have cited have made everything more clear, but I am still left unsettled by the idea of not knowing the full scope of who was in conversation with whom about what.

In my thesis, I aim to explore the development of science news at the *New York Times* with an eye towards how psychological and behavioral material situates in this process. I also aim to contextualize this newsroom’s activity with concurrent Cold War military applications of psychology research, and, to a lesser extent given the materials at hand, corporate applications of psychology research. These conversations, though posed in this thesis as part of an “historical” account, have a very real persistence in today’s socio-political landscape. While I have tracked the development of science news at this one important newspaper, it is essential to note that government, private, and corporate support for science developments rarely (if ever) waned in the years since. I have not spoken much to the ideological debates among scientists, but other authors have, and I urge interested readers to consult the materials I cite and reference in my bibliography. I have also found Google Scholar to be an excellent way to discern overlaps between different fields of work.

After spending a year and a half with these materials, I wish to leave with two lessons about journalism and historical inquiry that this research has convinced me are significant. Firstly, national media has an incredible amount of power to inform public conversation, as does any widespread media. As studied, this work does not involve today’s social media dynamics, but these certainly should be a focus of later historical and other disciplinary modes of inquiry. Secondly, words matter. The way we communicate with one another not only “matters,” but this field of study is and has been, quite literally, worth significant sums of money. Without further ado, let us begin.
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Social Science Research Council Records, Rockefeller Archive Center,

“If the piper's tune is really called by those who pay him (and this is probably more true in political affairs than in other fields), federal appropriations long ago attained the level where informed background was necessary for both government officials, especially members of Congress, and the lay public which elects them. Both officials and the public need to listen to briefings from experts but they should not be captives to these specialists. To become hostages of any group, however benevolent its intentions appear, is to expose oneself to a chance to be misled and exploited, sometimes with dangerous consequences.”

“He who pays the piper calls the tune,” or so the centuries-old folkloric allegory goes. The story originates with the Pied Piper of Hamelin, though Hillier Kriegbaum seems to discuss an otherwise-outfitted kind of piper. Working to untangle the actors in the scene, let us imagine that there is just one government funding agency, and it pays the Piper. Now imagine that the Piper, for simplicity’s sake, is the only news agency that provides information to the public. If we recognize truth in the general premise that currency has the means to coerce, it does not seem out of the realm of possibility that the only news agency that provides information to the public would tell the public what the one government funding agency wants the public to hear. Importantly, nowhere does the story imply that the Piper is the only entity that his financial backer pays.

Stated most plainly, my understanding of Kriegbaum’s words is that if the government chooses to appropriate taxpayer dollars, as it does, members of
Congress and “the lay public” deserve to hear about how their money is spent. For allegory’s sake, let us redefine the Piper as the only Department of Psychology. Reworking the above, it does not seem out of the realm of possibility that the only Department of Psychology would research what the one government funding agency wants the Department to research. What if these are the Two Pipers, and they, along with the one government funding agency, can teach us about financial incentivization?

In 1969, Richard Cohen, the Associate Director of the American Jewish Congress, sent a letter to A.M. Rosenthal, the Managing Editor of the New York Times, commenting that the Times ignored coverage of the annual and highly important American Psychological Association convention, instead covering “a long, interesting, and well-written story” about obscure biology research on beetles.¹ Cohen remarked that this treatment of the APA convention “confirmed” his suspicion “that the Times’ strength in covering ‘hard’ science was matched only by its weakness in covering the behavioral sciences.”² In my thesis, I contend that within these three decades of developing science news at the New York Times, there was a definitive orientation towards the physical, medical, and natural sciences. Furthermore, even when there was a shift towards greater behavioral science coverage in the late 1970s, this coverage did not focus on the military nor industrial applications of psychological knowledge.

² Ibid.
The subject of how science newspaper coverage developed contributes significantly to our understanding of the public understanding of science during the Cold War. Despite the importance of newspaper coverage to the public understanding of science, relatively little is known about the intersection between how science news developed at the *New York Times* and how behavioral sciences like psychology were considered and covered in this post-Atomic bomb, pre-computer time period. How did the editors at the *New York Times* – the people who controlled news production that reached thousands of Americans and citizens around the globe – treat and understand their responsibility to publicize a broad spectrum of scientific topics? What were the concurrent conversations at the American Psychological Association (APA) about how to educate the public about psychological research? What dimensions of the discipline concerned psychologists, but on which newspaper editors and reporters did not focus? What role did the government and government funding agencies play in psychological research compared to that in other scientific disciplines? How were those discrepancies reflected in the *Times*?

To address these questions, this thesis draws upon an important and hereto neglected body of sources, including many internal documents from the New York Times Company in the period leading up to the initiation of the Science Times section in 1978, and documents from the APA about mass media communications. The current thesis is organized chronologically, with a chapter each for the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. After brief discussions of the history of science journalism, the history of government support for psychological research, the government
framework for scientific support, and public interest in science during the early part of the Cold War, I will examine the development of science news at the *New York Times* that culminated in the November 1978 introduction of the Science Times section on Tuesdays and the slow rise in stature of psychology and behavioral science coverage throughout the 1960s and 1970s. I line up these developments with concurrent activities in American Psychological Association, namely their public relations work, support from the Department of Defense, and examples of APA-affiliated Cold War-related research projects in psychological warfare. This examination of the intersections between the APA and the DoD, situated in mid-twentieth-century science journalism at the *New York Times*, sheds important light on how the public was informed and left ignorant about taxpayer-funded science during the midst of the Cold War.

Unlike how some historians of the *New York Times* have depicted the 1978 introduction of the Science Times section, this section did not simply nor coincidentally appear. Susan E. Tifft and Alex S. Jones (1999) wrote a remarkable, 800-page+ history of the *New York Times* and the Sulzberger-Ochs family at the helm of the operation, *The Trust*, compiled in part with sources that I also consulted (mine a fraction of theirs). Their book, as comprehensive as it is, devoted just two pages to the initiation of Science Times, insufficiently characterizing the decades of work that evolved into the special section. They summarized key moments from 1978 that led to the section’s dedication, which I will touch on here and elaborate in later chapters. Their characters in this story were A.M. Rosenthal, then-Executive Editor, Walter E. Mattson, then-President of the New York Times Company, and
Arthur Ochs “Punch” Sulzberger, the Publisher of the *Times* for the duration of the years that my thesis covers.

So Tifft and Jones’ story goes, “early in 1978 Rosenthal suggested to Punch that the *Times* start a science section,” but Mattson “was unenthusiastic and refused to earmark additional money or space to produce it.”¹ Subsequently, “Punch, too, had come to have serious reservations” about the section, but “he had no intention of imposing his judgment on his top editor.” Tifft and Jones then note that “Rosenthal was given a gift in the form of a pressmen’s union strike against the *Times* and other New York papers,” leaving Mattson otherwise encumbered, so Rosenthal, “knowing he had no support from the business side...shuffled his existing allotment of pages and, without adding staff, cobbled up Science Times.”² I have no reason to distrust these specific motivations and actions that occurred on those days; however, a closer look at the two and a half decades before those days preceded Science Times’ commencement.

In the years before 1978, the *New York Times* suffered from the decreasing circulation trend of the early 1970s, wherein “between 1970 and 1975 circulation fell from 908,500 to 828,000.”³ In roughly the same period, two reader-interest surveys, one conducted in 1971 and 1978, provide evidence of growing reader interest in science and science-related topics.⁴ A similar report sent to the editors at the *Times* just after the announcement of the Science Times section also validated these

---

² Ibid.
⁴ Ibid., p. 206.
improving attitudes towards science. The Science Times section was, in part, implemented to alleviate these tumultuous conditions, to coincide with the implementation of new technology to make the workplace more efficient, and to round out the effort to increase suburban and younger readership.\(^7\)

The four-section newspaper, as we know it today, developed during this period. The paper was organized as follows: foreign and national news were devoted to the first section, while the second contained New York metropolitan area news. The third was to be different each weekday, and the fourth contained business and financial news. Tuesdays were the last third section to be decided in 1978 – previous newsroom determinations assigned Sports on Monday; “Living” on Wednesdays, which included dining, cooking, and personal health; “Home” on Thursdays, which centered around “furnishings, design, and gardening”; and lastly (though determined first), “Weekend” on Fridays were “devoted to the arts and entertainment events.”\(^8\)

The modern corollary, in terms of the New York Times Company’s business strategy, which readers might not often consider, could be the Times’ ownership of newspapers in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina.\(^9\) Where possible and relevant, the current thesis will focus on the economic motivations for incorporating the science section into the Times. However, this factor was not abundantly represented in many of the materials at hand.

\(^7\) Ibid.
In 2007, the New York Times Company announced their plans to donate to the New York Public Library their vast archives of over 400 cubic feet that contained over 700,000 pages of documents.° Indeed, the Rare Book Division at the New York Public Library now houses these materials and is where I conducted my research during the summer of 2018. I first consulted the collections explicitly indexed as “Science Times,” and these boxes came from the A.M. (Abraham Michael) Rosenthal records and the Seymour Topping papers. I was drawn to other collections based on who and how the editors and reporters were cross-referenced and copied on communications. These other collections included the Arthur Gelb papers, the Oral History files, the General Files, the Foreign Desk records, the Arthur Hays Sulzberger papers, the Orvil Dryfoos papers, the Clifton Daniel papers, the National Desk records, the Robert E. Garst papers, the Lester Markel papers, and the James Reston papers.

Though many of these boxes and folders were designated broadly as “Science News,” there was no indication as to which collections contained materials about social or behavioral sciences in particular. What follows is my best attempt to reconstruct both the development of the Science Times section and the place that psychology and the behavioral sciences held in those conversations, which, together, account for part of the process that led to the Science Times section in 1978.

---

The New York Times’ history of publishing on scientific topics goes back to the era of its founding in the nineteenth century. An early editorial writer, John Swinton “made sure The Times outdid the competition in science coverage, going so far as to write three to four columns a day on major scientific conferences.” Swinton also wrote a book review in 1860 on Darwin’s On the Origin of Species, back “when the theory of evolution was often attacked and derided, to the extent it was understood at all.” Swinton left the paper in 1869, at which point “science news ‘languished for half a century’” until around 1919, per the Times’ own admission in the New York Times Book of Science. Other early, talented, and dedicated science editors and reporters at the Times have included Carr Van Anda, hired as managing editor in 1904; Alva Johnston, a reporter who earned one of the paper’s first Pulitzer Prizes for “his coverage of the 1922 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science”; and William (Bill) L. Laurence, who was “hired in 1930 as the first newspaper reporter assigned exclusively to cover science.”

In 1919, the forward-thinking Times “was alone in publishing... an accurate story on the implications of the confirmation of Einstein’s theory of relativity.” The newspaper’s dedication to science coverage was given particular weight in November 1978 when it was devoted its own Tuesday section, titled “Science Times.” Following the new section’s popularity, “other newspapers responded with the sincerest form of praise: they started their own regular page or pages of science

---

12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
As this thesis will highlight, the determination to devote this level of space to science news was not a quickly-made decision. Rather, the input from various reporters, editors, readers, and business executives over two decades contributed to this new direction.

Prolific historian of science and medicine John C. Burnham (1987) masterfully analyzed trends in the popularization of science in his book *How Superstition Won and Science Lost: Popularizing Science and Health in the United States*. He noted that science “popularization, in short, involved a generally agreed-on point of view, one that provided a frame of reference within which facts about humankind made sense.” Lay superstition transformed into the popularization of science, a media-driven, bastardized portrayal of science with “elements of sensationalism and disjoined segmentation of information.” Burnham also observed how this pattern tended to converge in studies of health, psychology, and natural sciences. Though the *Times*’ reporters and editors guided the paper to its 1978 science section, the paper’s engaged readers who shared with editors their opinions about the importance of scientific topics to American culture were integral to this process. The archival files not only contain many of the readers’ letters themselves, but also memos and comments among the editors internally responding to the mail and commenting on the response that should be provided to the writer.

---

In the 1970s, newspapers were the venue through which the “average American confine[d] 90% of his reading...[and] 80% of his science information.”\textsuperscript{9} Anthropology professor William Divale’s (1976) analysis of eight newspapers in a two-week span during July 1970 showed that “out of almost 16,000 stories, only 3.3% were devoted to science news.”\textsuperscript{20} In a breakdown of 507 science news articles across 15,403 total articles surveyed, just 144 articles were related to the social sciences, only 18 of which were categorized as “Psychology.”\textsuperscript{21}

Predating this insufficient coverage, however, extensive national funding for social and behavioral sciences flowed through the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Ellen Herman’s (1995) \textit{The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts} is an essential text in this area. I find her work particularly powerful because she uncovered and studied many elements of financial backing that fascinated me since beginning my research, but that I did not find in any of the archival materials I consulted in the Social Science Research Council files at the Rockefeller Archive Center, nor at the American Psychological Association archives. (I do not mean to imply that they are not there – these sites have thousands of files, and I do not claim to have viewed nearly all of them.) My work will focus on avenues of publicity, but what was happening during the decades in question that publicity was supposed to represent, misrepresent, or leave out? I will paraphrase and cite Herman’s work, primarily from

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., pp. 183, 184, 188.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 189.
Chapter Five, “The Career of Cold War Psychology” to illustrate some the bounds of this system.

First and foremost, I would like to make clear that these were no small operations. As Herman explains, “Between 1945 and the mid-1960s, the U.S. military was, by far, the country’s major institutional sponsor of psychological research.”

Briefly, a note on terminology: since World War I, various terminologies have been used to refer to psychological warfare (PSYWAR) and psychological operations (PSYOP). I will refer to this history in more depth in Chapter One. A casebook on these materials from 1976, titled The Art and Science of Psychological Operations: Case Studies of Military Application, also included the terms “international communications,” “political warfare,” and “cultural affairs” within this line of work.

The military’s Cold War sponsorship of psychology research directly followed from the contracts for the same work carried out during WWI and WWII. From 1945 to 1950, the year when the National Science Foundation Act established the Foundation, psychological research contracts were transferred to the purview of the Office of Naval Research (ONR). This research included that on “personnel and training (test design and measurement), group dynamics (conformity, motivation, and leadership studies), human factors engineering (equipment design), and physiological psychology (sensation and perception).”

---

24 Herman, Romance of American Psychology, p. 129.
In the 1950s, these lines of work also included psychological warfare, intelligence classification, and clinical treatment, as well as sensory deprivation and “techniques of ideological conversion” during the Korean War.25

Where did researchers conduct this work? A new class of 136 institutions called Federal Contract Research Centers (or FCRCs), located on university campuses, housed this military-funded research. Herman considers these organizations “the most significant organizational innovation during the Cold War years.”26 Established in 1947, the RAND (Research and Development) Corporation was the first such FCRC. The magnitude of the work that these Centers conduct and their centrality to American policy formation should not be underestimated. Today, FCRCs go by the name “Federally Funded Research and Development Centers” (FFRDCs), and they also conduct research for non-DoD agencies, unlike University Affiliated Research Centers, which remain under DoD supervision.

In this research climate, I believe that the limited coverage of science topics granted an enhanced stature to the topics that did receive attention. If a scarcity of accessible information on psychology research was the norm, an abundance of articles on any particular subject represented an exaggerated proportion of the public’s intelligence on psychology, relative to the work carried out. In sum, a dearth of coverage restricted the general public’s ability to learn about research conducted with support from taxpayer dollars and how it was used.

---

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., p. 135.
The thesis addresses number of different fields and disciplines, including the histories of science communication, Cold War social science, behavioral sciences, psychology, professional associations, public relations, journalism, business, and media studies. Within these intersections, however, I do not refer extensively to political developments at this time. Though related to government work, the bureaucracies involved in this thesis were not patently political.

In addition to the questions posed earlier, this work will also touch on questions that other researchers have considered, like Logan, Fears, and Wilson (1997) and Mazur (1981)’s: “Are news selection processes (e.g., internal newsroom decisions about what science and medical topics to cover and avoid) associated with what citizens believe are important to unimportant public affairs topics?” and Hartz and Chappell (1997)’s “Do these news selection processes (often called agenda setting) result in how public affairs priorities are established by politicians and how public funds are spend (or are withheld) for scientific and biomedical research?" 27

In chronologically tracking the development of the Science Times section and concurrent conversations amongst psychologists at the American Psychological Association, this thesis will discern how discrepancies in the coverage of physical and natural versus social and behavioral sciences emerged and were perpetuated.

As with other disciplines, historians of science believe that the field of “history of science” should not limit itself to one area of interest, but rather that the field benefits from explicitly implementing history of science concerns wherever

---

possible. As historian Ken Alder noted, this kind of integrated conception of science includes ideas like the “shifting policies of [technological] expertise, the design of everyday things, and the cosmologies that have define the scope of an era’s thought and action.” The science reporters and editors at the Times in the 1950s through 1980s also recognized these varied existences of science. The current research project, integrating the areas of interest listed above seeks, in part, to further demonstrate the interconnectedness of scientific endeavors in ways that may have previously elided concern.

The New York Times’ coverage of social science disciplines like psychology was both in line with and at odds with the disciplines’ reality. In comparison to coverage of the physical and medical sciences, the newspaper deemphasized behavioral sciences, and this unequal footing was in line with the fact that the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 did not dictate explicit support for the social sciences. However, this behavioral deemphasis does not consider psychology’s heightened role in twentieth-century military applications of research outside the purview of the National Science Foundation.

Furthermore, there was an obstacle-ridden path through the 1950s and 1960s to get even the physical and natural sciences to a place of stature within the newspaper framework. The quiet intransigence that worked against the science section’s establishment further hindered the presentation of social and behavioral research findings to the public. Through this one highly regarded journalistic

---

institution, there was an offset quality to the public presentation of the social and behavioral research that contrasted with the pace at which the work in behavioral science disciplines was conducted. Here, we can see the way that governmental transparency of funding decisions may be achieved through honest, timely, and vigorous communications between with newspaper decision-makers. Alternatively, this transparency may be blocked in the absence of such communications.

During the period of interest, legacy newspapers – and the society they found themselves a part of – weathered atomic attitudes, the Cold War, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, a media world increasingly oriented towards television, suburbanization, growing government-related bureaucracy, shifting labor and union dynamics, and social upheaval. The following chapters should be considered in light of all of this activity, but not for no reason – editors at the New York Times, and reporters, to a similar but lesser extent, were steeped in this mile-a-minute pace every time they went to their workplace.

Chapter One opens with a description of a detailed memorandum that Walter Sullivan compiled with a “proposed program for daily science coverage” that he sent to his supervising editors. This memo not only provides insight on the sources of New York Times science stories in 1958, but it also sheds light on the way that the reporters in the small department prioritized material in various scientific disciplines. To that end, this document demonstrates the way that coverage of the physical and natural sciences were structurally supported via publication subscriptions and reporters’ assignments in a way that the behavioral sciences like psychology were not.
With this context, the chapter then covers conversations that occurred throughout the 1950s at the American Psychological Association about psychology’s public image. While my newspaper history timeline starts in 1958, the psychology timeline starts earlier in the 1950s, during the Korean War, which lasted from 1950 to 1953. This section of the chapter will frame the discussion around materials from Michael Amrine, a psychology and nuclear-minded public relations advocate who the APA hired as a Public Information Consultant in 1952. His topics of interest included problems regarding the public image of psychology, ideas about methodology for communicating psychology to a wider audience, the contributions of government to psychology and vice versa, and the relationship between psychology and other scientific disciplines. These materials make clear that the field of psychology did not have the deeply established connections to news media that may have eased the dissemination of psychological material.

Chapter Two outlines various formative factors and events that shaped the science section throughout the 1960s. In this decade, social science was increasingly reliant on federal funding, and decreasingly reliant on funding from private foundations like the Ford Foundation. In the 1960s, the science department encountered a brief intersection between the Ford Foundation and the Times; awards and commendations for reporter and editor Walter Sullivan; staffing and organizational concerns, including a reporter’s resignation from the department; and editorial concerns about readers’ understanding science articles. This portion of the chapter concludes with a reader letter sent to A.M. Rosenthal that expressed dismay at the way that the New York Times covered the APA convention in 1969.
Continuing with psychological matters, Chapter Two illuminates the growing relationship between the government and psychologists with applications of social science in the militaristic context of the Cold War. Here, a discussion of the Department of Defense's covert and heavily funded Project Camelot, revealed to the public in 1965, informs the kinds of activity in social science research that, while significant to people living in vast parts of the globe, were not readily communicated to American audiences when newspapers downplayed social science research developments. Given my largely chronological approach, the chapter culminates around the time of the 1968 amendment of the NSF Act of 1950 to include the social sciences in the explicit reach of the federally-funded, public-facing Foundation. Other topics in the chapter include APA policy statements regarding media coverage, and the introduction of a National Information System to ease the dissemination of abstracts from psychological research papers.

Considered together, Chapter Two demonstrates the growing position of science coverage in the New York Times newsroom, and the chapter also helps to make sense of the divide between physical, natural, and medical coverage versus behavioral science coverage. By the end of the decade, the NSF Amendment and Richard Cohen’s letter align to reveal a shift in how editors and reporters considered coverage of the behavioral sciences, gearing towards a more supportive position of behavioral science coverage that emerged in the 1970s.

Chapter Three, covering the 1970s and early 1980s, contains the greatest degree of overlap between New York Times newsroom and APA material. At the end of this decade, A.M. Rosenthal proposed the Science Times section to reporters who
then provided him with their opinions on what the new section should prioritize; many of these reporters recommended greater coverage of behavioral science material in their suggestions. This chapter also spotlights proposed and published psychology news articles to exemplify how the newspaper covered the field. Similarly, following Chapter Two’s editorial concerns about reader understanding, this chapter mentions the repeated editorial concerns about “pop psychology” articles as a potential detractor from the *Times*’ status as a respected news agency. This chapter also introduces the business executives whose blessings were necessary for the Science Times section’s Tuesday space allotment. Despite the importance of these white men in the *Times*’ hierarchy, they were surprisingly absent from archival conversations about how to educate the public on science developments.

Alongside psychology’s increased role in the news media, this chapter very briefly points to the field of industrial psychology. My relative lack of information on industrial psychology should not be interpreted as evidence to the field’s size nor influence, but my materials at hand rarely discussed this branch of psychology. This chapter concludes with a discussion of a 1986 *New York Times* article about schizophrenia that elicited widely varying responses: while a psychiatrist reader criticized the piece, others enjoyed it, and the Senate entered it into the Congressional Record.

The historical relationship between scientific institutions and the press is particularly notable in disciplines like psychology, where limited coverage can have the effect of holding greater emphasis for the public perception of a discipline as a whole. There are two distinct but related concepts in media studies that help to
explain this kind of phenomenon: mediation and mediatization. I will outline the application of “mediation” to my thesis here, and I will discuss “mediatization” in my conclusion. Elonda Clay, a poet, librarian, and religion scholar, defined the concept of “mediated science” as “a particular communication genre devoted to science, including but not limited to academic publications of scientific research [and] mass media and new media coverage of science-related topics.”\(^{29}\) Such a phenomenon “speaks to the changing contexts of cultural productions about science,” a pattern that can be seen in the reporters’ and editors’ opinions towards science at the *Times*.\(^{30}\) Examining the downstream effects of such an understanding and presentation of science enables a comparison between the way that:

...positive presentations of dramatized, commodified, and heroic science frame scientific information as authoritative and legitimating symbolic sources for meaning, while negative presentations... have a persuasive potential that challenge the ethics and limits of science.\(^{31}\)

In the context of the current thesis, the science coverage of the physical, natural, and medical sciences fits relatively smoothly into the “positive presentations” descriptor. Meanwhile, the *New York Times*’ gap-prone psychology coverage does not perfectly fit either presentation. While psychology was arguably not covered enough to be “dramatized, commodified, [nor] heroic,” as the positive presentations suggests, its coverage also did not “challenge the ethics and limits” of behavioral science research applications. More broadly, the introduction of the Science Times section in 1978 tangibly illustrated the shifting cultural attitudes towards science.


\(^{30}\) Ibid., p. 27.

\(^{31}\) Ibid.
Moreover, the *documents* shared amongst the editors, reporters, and readers elucidated intangibly – until now – the process through which such a shift occurred.
Richard Cohen, Associate Director of the American Jewish Congress and noted public relations figure, spotlighted what he saw as the Times’ neglect towards psychology and social science coverage in his 1969 letter to A.M. Rosenthal, second in the chain of command in the Times hierarchy as Managing Editor. Cohen identified an issue that had roots in conversations dating back to 1950. Members and leaders of the American Psychological Association (APA) throughout the 1950s pondered over how to present their findings to the general public.

One vocal advocate for the presentation of psychology in the public sphere was Michael Amrine, a publicist whom the APA hired in 1952, who has more often been cited for his work speaking out regarding his concern about the future of atomic science. Amrine, as eulogized by the New York Times on February 19, 1974 after he died of lymphoma, was “instrumental in bringing public attention to the early battles by scientists of the Manhattan atom-bomb project for civilian, rather than military, control of nuclear energy.”32 In this chapter, I will instead focus on his early work for the APA, in which he identified various categories of issues regarding psychology-public interactions.

With this first section, I explore how the threads of “press” and “government” were present and seemingly inextricable in the science disciplines that were highlighted in Sullivan’s 1958 report. Next, I illustrate how these same “press” and

“government” themes did not play the same roles in conversations about psychology at the American Psychological Association in the 1950s. In discussing how to present their work to the public, the files at hand rarely, if ever, indicated a connection between psychology’s work and that of Defense agencies, despite extensive government support through the Department of Defense. Here, I will provide detailed information about how APA leaders conducted psychological warfare studies in 1950 through 1954 that were included on a Research Analysis Corporation bibliography published in 1965. In discussing the role between psychology and the government, the files at hand demonstrate a yearning for greater support, as though the field was not supported at all. I will conclude with an analysis about how APA discussions about “press” and “government” were qualitatively distinct from their related discussions in the natural sciences in how they were largely shielded from the public eye.

My choice of highlighting the distinction between “press” and “government” is informed by the way that the APA archivists filed their records.33 With this section, I aim to reverse the inquiry to consider the perspectives of individuals and committees at the APA: what did the press look like to them? What did the government’s role in science look like? From this vantage point, the bureaucracy of press that surrounded the physical and medical sciences was almost unrecognizable. I will leave my readers with a question that continues to puzzle me: does Walter Sullivan’s report say more about the newspaper’s view of “science” or does it say

---

33 In searching for “public relations” materials in my research, I often encountered files categorized as “public affairs.” I later realized that this term tended to appear with materials that involved government affairs.
more about the evolved differences with regard to how scientific disciplines wanted
to publicize their work?

Despite these, and other, conversations in psychologist circles, however,
psychologists’ and other behavioral scientists’ voices are muted in the New York
Times’ archival documentation about the development of science news. At this time,
private foundations like the Ford Foundation funded much of the activity in
psychology research, which among other applications, significantly informed Cold
War psychological warfare efforts. Regardless of the APA’s efforts dating from the
early 1950s to expand psychology’s public engagement reach, the New York Times
was not an avenue through which readers could learn about developments in
behavioral science like they could physical and medical sciences.

Part of this unequal focus may be attributed to the science team’s size, at
four reporters who each had distinct interests, backgrounds, and reporting abilities,
which necessarily limited their ability to cover a boundless variety of scientific
disciplines. However, reporters regularly pursued coverage of earth, physical, and
medical science disciplines – areas that were deeply connected to corporate or
government interests. Some of the modes of intersection between the science
disciplines and these funding bodies included direct government funding of the
scientific discipline via organs like the National Science Foundation or the
Department of Defense or educational institutions; professional associations’
lobbying activities; and consumer-oriented pharmaceutical advertising. I argue that
government applications of science and government interests in scientific
endeavors, which varied depending on the scientific discipline, shaped and imposed upon journalistic abilities to cover science.

Walter Sullivan, the manager of the science department at the *Times*, wrote to eight of his supervisors about the state of science news at the newspaper on September 24, 1958. An analysis of Sullivan’s compilation of news sources helps to illustrate the *Times*’ primary contacts and sources for science news at the end of the 1950s. With the physical and natural sciences, thorough lists of sources presuppose strong links between these disciplines and the newspaper, despite the fact that the science department lacked a standalone section of its own, as it later received. Meanwhile, the same report’s list of publications from social science disciplines was much less complete, an indication of organizational barriers to the production of social science coverage. Ultimately, the downstream impact of the science departments’ source choices is that their decisions controlled what the public learned from the newspaper.

**Science Journalism in the Early Twentieth Century**

The late Dorothy Nelkin, a professor, sociologist, and author who wrote influentially on the relationship between science and media, explained in *Selling Science: How the Press Covers Science and Technology* how twentieth and twenty-first century science journalism was borne from the legacy of earlier journalism. “Most” science journalism in the nineteenth century, wrote Nelkin, tended to “[consist] either of directly practical information about new farming techniques, the latest home remedies, or wildly lurid stories,” where science was tooled to
entertain.\textsuperscript{34} By the end of the century, these formulations of news were “influenced by both the dawning awareness of the power of science and technology and the deep ambivalence towards the industrial revolution,” where science “seemed increasingly fascinating but obscure, benevolent but somewhat dangerous.”\textsuperscript{35} This discourse around science, escalated during wartime, also related to “the widening gap in knowledge between the scientific expert and the layman” that Nelkin viewed as “an important development” in science press.\textsuperscript{36}

One important figure in early-twentieth century science journalism was E.W. (Edward Willis) Scripps. Scripps, a twentieth century newspaper publisher-turned-media-magnate from Illinois, earned this legacy due to his role in founding the science news syndicate Science Service in 1921. In 1907, Scripps founded the United Press Association (later the United Press International) as a wire syndicate for the midwestern newspapers that he owned, establishing for himself and his Company a legacy in news dissemination.\textsuperscript{37} Scripps intended Science Service to act as a “liaison agency between the scientific world and the general public” that “would not propagandize for science but would instead market the idea of useful information about science and seek to persuade the press to pay more attention to science.”\textsuperscript{38} In so doing, he identified a niche market for science-focused journalism; as Edwin E.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., p. 80.
Slosson, Science Service’s first executive, noted, “If there had been a spontaneous demand for scientific articles of a high order, Science Service would not have been founded.”

Not all journalists knew how to respond to this new journalistic niche. In response to “antagonism” that science writers felt from other journalists, American science reporters founded the National Association of Science Writers (NASW) in 1934, which had twenty-eight members by 1941, 63 members by 1945, and 413 members by 1960. However, their roles as liaisons between the production of science knowledge and journalistic institutions were called into question by 1941, when “many of the large research laboratories and industrial organizations” involved in science research “themselves [issued] material” directly to press organizations.

While Dorothy Nelkin tied the “widening gap in knowledge between the scientific expert and the layman” to the earlier part of the twentieth century, this gap in knowledge also characterized many of the New York Times’ conversations about science news, in which editors traded their hesitancies with one another. However, the move beyond spot coverage was more challenging, as newspaper editors tended to be reluctant to stake an organizational guarantee that science would be published with the same regularity as other news. Out of 18 major

---

American newspapers listed in Bruce V. Lewenstein’s (1987) popular science analysis, the New York Times was the first to start their science section in 1978.42

**Sputnik Spurs Intrigue**

By the 1950s, a plurality of newspaper editors expressed an interest in scientific topics, as expressed in polling from New York University and the NASW. In a 1951 poll of 50 newspaper editors, 82% expressed interest in “Medicine and Public Health,” nearly matched only by 76% interest in “Atomic Energy”; these levels of interest stand in contrast with just 12% who were interested in “Social Science.”43

The 1958 poll, with nearly five times as many participants at 240 editors, demonstrated some variation, where interest in “Medicine and Public Health” decreased to 56.7%, and “Satellites and Outer Space” captured 80% of the editors’ attention, while interest in “Social Science” dipped to just 2.9%.44 The attention on space exploration at the end of the decade is not surprising, given the International Geophysical Year’s (IGY) beginning on July 1, 1957, the Soviet launch of Sputnik on October 4, 1957, and the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on July 29, 1958. The IGY was an international program in which scientists from 67 countries including the United States and the Soviet Union
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43 Hillier Kriegbaum, *Science and the Mass Media* (New York: New York University Press, 1967), p. 78. This poll, while telling in some aspects, also raises questions for me, given its division of topics. For example, further exploration of the categories in the 1951 survey divides “Atomic Energy” (76%), “Research Generally” (18%), “Military Science” (18%), “Industrial Applications of Science” (16%), and, most curiously, “Physics and Chemistry” (6%). To my understanding, these disciplines contain overlap beyond these forced dichotomies.
44 Ibid.
teamed together “to observe geophysical phenomena and to secure data from all parts of the world” from 1957 to 1958.\textsuperscript{45}

Editors, however, were just one side of the equation: what impact did the news that they oversaw have on their readers? Regarding the diffusion of understanding science news, journalist and author Hillier Kriehbaum (1967) ranked “degrees of transfer of information” to compartmentalize readers’ understanding of science news. These levels ranged from: “1. Pure’ Ignorance” where “nothing gets through,” to “2. Awareness,” which “involves marginal recall,” to “3. Misinformation,” where “a person...garbles several topics with a mass of inaccuracies,” to “4. Comprehension,” which can be “either vague or in-depth,” and lastly, “5. Action,” where the knowledgeable gather “information for the sake of doing something about it.”\textsuperscript{46} Kriehbaum, the Chairman of the NASW’s Science Writers’ Survey Committee at the time of the Sputnik launch, used this framework to preface his discussion of public opinion polling that was conducted around Sputnik.

The University of Michigan’s Survey Research Center conducted comparative polling of readers’ understanding of science before and after the Sputnik launch. Their findings, which Kriehbaum referenced, can help demonstrate how news readers internalized their knowledge of science. In 1957, 54 percent of surveyed readers had “Heard nothing” about the launching of a space satellite, and this “Heard nothing” group decreased to 8 percent of surveyed readers

\textsuperscript{45} “The International Geophysical Year,” National Academy of Science, \url{http://www.nas.edu/history/igy/}.
\textsuperscript{46} Kriehbaum, \textit{Science and the Mass Media}, p. 52.
after Sputnik.\textsuperscript{47} Though this 46% decrease is worthy of note, the group of the most scientifically literate readers only demonstrated a seven percent increase, from 20 percent to 27 percent of readers.\textsuperscript{48} Let us assume that the group of people composing the seven percent of “scientifically literate” in 1958 were not also in the “Heard nothing” group in 1957. As such, this poll, accepting individual differences in readers’ interests, seems to illustrate an extensive variance in how readers conceived of the scientific material with which they were presented.

Though American media provided limited coverage of the International Geophysical Year (IGY) overall, it began with a television announcement from President Eisenhower on its first day. The \textit{New York Times} was one of only a few newspapers to cover the initiation of the program, while “most of the national news magazines either did not cover it at all, or gave it only passive attention in buried articles,” as Ian Kennedy explained in his 2005 Master’s thesis on “The Sputnik Crisis and America’s Response.”\textsuperscript{49} Problems riddled government efforts to publicize the IGY, including issues like “multiple actors with unclear or overlapping roles, poorly articulated goals, ambitious expectations with little money to back them, and a lack of clear management authority,” according to National Science Foundation historian Fae L. Korsmo (2004).\textsuperscript{50} Sputnik, in contrast, suffered no such dearth of coverage. “Any attempt to look at all of the American newspapers’ coverage of

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 53
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} Fae L. Korsmo, “Shaping Up Planet Earth: The International Geophysical Year (1957-1958) and Communicating Science Through Print and Film Media,” \textit{Science Communication} 26, no. 2 (December 2004): pp. 181-182.
Sputnik would take up a while book in itself,” Kennedy noted before delving into
details about how various national and local newspapers covered the Sputnik
launch.\textsuperscript{51} For their part, the \textit{New York Times}’ “extensive coverage of the events” had
a “definite philosophical focus...and an attempt to decipher the implications of
Sputnik for society.”\textsuperscript{52}

While the \textit{New York Times} ostensibly ventured where other news
organizations did not in covering the International Geophysical Year at all, they too
covered Sputnik to a much greater extent. An awareness of this coverage
discrepancy, even with these two seemingly-related scientific programs,\textsuperscript{53} is
important to note because this discrepancy sets a precedent for the way that not all
science events, moreover science disciplines, were treated with the same caliber of
attention or care. Following up on this coverage discrepancy, later sections and
chapters will illustrate how social science coverage was neglected in favor of
physical, medical, and earth science coverage.

In this Master's thesis, Kennedy also connected the coverage of these
scientific events to the American public's attitude towards the events. He wrote,
“The lack of attention by the media was an \textit{indication} of the apathy that most of
the American public felt towards the IGY,” emphasis mine.\textsuperscript{54} However, I argue the
converse; the lack of attention by the media invited the apathy of the American
public. If the public did not know about it, because they were not told about it,

\textsuperscript{51} Kennedy, “The Sputnik Crisis,” p. 132.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., p. 26
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
where were the opportunities to develop a response more robust than apathy?

Regarding the media landscape of the decade, “with each passing year during the 1950s,” as journalism historian Christopher B. Daly (2012) analyzed, “the impact of television became greater, and the consequences spread further across the media landscape,” toppling magazine photojournalism, the newsreel industry, non-music radio programming, and “big-city afternoon newspapers.”

Earlier in the 1950s, widespread and multi-channel coverage of Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy's fearmongering political activities characterized an era of news that prodded contentious debates and attitude development around communism. In relation to my earlier comment about lack of media attention inviting apathy, Robert S. Erikson and Kent L. Tedin consider public apathy in the tenth edition of their widely cited political science text, American Public Opinion: Its Origins and Impact (2019, originally published 1973). The authors wrote that, “Because most political events are remote from people’s everyday lives, people willingly view these events through the interpretation of their leaders.” If this is true, and the public was not informed about remote events like the International Geophysical Year – alternatively worded, the public was left without their leaders’ interpretations – on what basis would they be able to form an opinion about it?

55 Christopher B. Daly, Covering America: A Narrative History of a Nation’s Journalism (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012), p. 312.
Studies in mass communication, a relatively new field in 1950s due to its origins in post-WWII studies of propaganda, allow us to work through the coverage discrepancies that Kennedy mentioned. The direction of Kennedy’s statement exemplifies the concept of agenda-setting theory, a landmark mass communications framework that Max McCombs and Donald Shaw formalized in a 1968 study conducted at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and published in 1972 in *The Public Opinion Quarterly*. This theory, among other communications frameworks, provides a reason to care about how media organizations portrayed a variety of scientific disciplines, like psychology.

Extended further, the current thesis also involves Littlejohn and Foss’s (2011) power relations schema that defines media-source relationships based on whether the media and sources are each “high-” or “low-power.” In the current example, the *New York Times* is a “high-power media,” physical science organizations and their publications are “high-power sources,” and psychological organizations and their publications are “low-power sources.” In the first relationship, where the *Times* and physical sciences align, “a positive, symbiotic relationship will exert great power over the public agenda,” but in the second, as with the *Times* and the APA, “the media organizations will be largely responsible for their own agenda,” under which grounds they “marginalize certain news sources.”

---

58 For an in-depth analysis of the origins of this line of work, see Timothy Glander, *Origins of Mass Communications Research During the American Cold War: Educational Effects and Contemporary Implications* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000).
for baseline categorical purposes, does not provide a space for considering how organizations like the APA might have chosen to leverage their power and resources away from mediums of public education.

While considering the above, it should also be noted that the New York Times was not yet the nationally-syndicated newspaper that it is today. The Times’ successes in science coverage, applauded as they are today, were not a foregone conclusion. Their approach had precedent, thanks to the work of exceptional individuals like E.W. Scripps who founded Science Service, and they continued the pattern of using science to sell their newspapers. Their readers, presumably concentrated in the New York metropolitan area, likely also had diverging comfort levels when it came to science, as did the readers whose polling Hillier Kriegbaum referenced. Perhaps most importantly, the New York Times was esteemed for their non-science coverage. Just like science stories need scientists’ involvement to have anything of substance to say to readers, so do stories about government need sources inside the government to inform reporters about news developments. The Times had government connections, so I estimate that it was less of a stretch for them to have science-government connections. Less natural seems to have been their connections to science in disciplines where the scientific enterprise was less connected to public-facing government support, as in the social and behavioral sciences, like psychology.

---

61 I was not able to access many circulation statistics, so further research may consider this claim more fully with this data.
**New York Times Science and Science at Large in 1958**

The *New York Times*, as an institution, had long existed as a participant in this environment of science representation in journalistic mediums. Their position in the field of science journalism, however, would change with the presence of their reporter Walter Sullivan, who, after years of “[oscillating] between the coverage of world politics and the world of science...definitely shifted to science writing with his comprehensive reporting on the International Geophysical Year” in 1957. Sullivan was a central figure in the push to expand the *New York Times*’ science coverage, as I will narrate in this thesis. Walter Sullivan was born in 1918 in New York City, and he studied English history at Yale University, where he graduated in 1940, and he worked as a copy boy for the *Times* after graduation before his WWII assignment in journalism. Sullivan held various positions during the War, and at its end, he was a lieutenant commander on the U.S.S. Overton. His first science reporting experience also involved the Navy, when he took part in Operation Highjump, an expedition to Antarctica from 1946 to 1947, organized by Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd.

Sullivan figured prominently in the *Times*’ process of expanding its science coverage and the ultimate formalizing of the science coverage into its own section. The process of unifying the *Times*’ dedication to science news, a process which commenced with the introduction of Science Times in 1978, took place roughly over
two decades and encapsulated the modulation and adaptation of an institution – a business – around evolving accepted norms and reformed priorities.

On September 19, 1958, Sullivan circulated a memo to eight different prominent editors, including Thomas Bernstein, then-Assistant Managing Editor under Managing Editors Turner Catledge and E. Clifton Daniel, which detailed a “proposed program for daily science coverage.” This five-page document highlighted the current state of overwork among the four reporters in the science staff, where “science writers have been handicapped by their load of spot news responsibility, short-handedness and lack of coordination” while they were also “swamped with periodicals, handouts, agency copy, phone calls, and a constant procession of scientific meetings – many of them far afield.” With this proposal, Sullivan illuminated for his supervisors the time consuming process of science news reporting.

Sullivan outlined various proposals to rectify the situation. These suggestions included hiring an additional reporter, designating additional filing cabinets for science-related material, and providing office facilities for the four science writers to expand beyond the “cubicle which now bears the inscription of ‘Science’ on the third floor [that is] barely large enough for one desk.” At the end of his letter, Sullivan referenced contemporaneous University of Michigan reader

66 Ibid., p. 1.
67 Ibid., pp. 2-4.
polling that found that “66% of 1,919 people interviewed said they favored an expansion of science coverage in newspapers at the expense of advertising and news of sports, crime and society.”68 Lastly, Sullivan reminded his editors, “Excellence in this field is a notable part of the Times tradition and the challenge of today is to match our performance to the need of the times.”69 In later years, Sullivan was lauded for his abilities reporting science news, but this memo also speaks to his eye for administrative matters and his willingness to advocate for those in his line of work.

Discounting reporters’ own ideas and before downstream responsibilities could be tackled, the science news team was expected to consult a veritable mountain of materials to figure out which newsworthy occurrences they would report. Attached to the proposal, Sullivan provided a six-page “Supplement” titled “Allocation of Periodicals and Primary Areas of Responsibility.” This document divided the science departments’ coverage areas into eleven sections by discipline type, and it listed which reporter(s) were responsible for coverage for each section.70 Occasionally, icons to the left of the publication name designated general notes on the source. The key is reproduced below.

# Should be read by all full-time science writers for background
* Especially fruitful as news sources
@ Generally non-productive of news
% Not presently subscribed to.71

---

68 Ibid., p. 6.
69 Ibid.
71 Ibid., p. 1.
This key, especially with those first two options, begins to hint at the internal discussions regarding agenda setting that occurred among the reporters and editors in the *Times*’ science department. What are the kinds of differentiating factors that would deem a publication to contain essential “background” material as opposed to “fruitful...news sources”? This question is left up for interpretation.

The science department used Section I to prioritize Medicine news-deriving sources. Out of the four person team of science writers at the time, three were assigned to Medicine coverage that was to be “subdivided” between Robert (“Bob”) “Plumb,” Harold “Schmeck,” and the “new man,” in reference to Sullivan’s request for hiring a new (presumed male) science reporter.72 No stone left unturned, the science department amassed a list of 27 weekly, twice-monthly, and monthly journals and publications from which to scour in the search of medical news, five of which were deemed “Especially fruitful as news sources.”73 What kinds of medical news was there to report? Mid-century developments in medicine and health included the consolidation of health-related federal agencies under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953, widespread promotion of the polio vaccine in 1954, and the development of penicillin in 1957.

Corporate interests also influenced the medical field in the 1950s, like in 1954 when fourteen leading tobacco manufacturers banded together to form the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, whose public relations efforts were “aimed in significant part at rebutting the health charges against smoking” as Richard Kluger
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72 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
explained in his landmark 1996 history of the tobacco industry, *Ashes to Ashes: America’s Hundred-Year Cigarette War, the Public Health, and the Unabashed Triumph of Philip Morris*.74 The *Times*’ recurrent emphasis on medical news invites a deeper consideration about the purposes and perspectives embedded in health-related journalism. Hallin and Briggs (2014) outline how, in the creation of medical news, experts are called upon to communicate their knowledge to the public.75 Through this interaction, the expert gets a chance to “extend” their “biomedical authority” via a media outlet.76 Hallin and Briggs use the term “linear-reflectionist perspective” to illustrate the direction of authority that passes from the scientist, through the newspaper (or journals and other media), to the audience.77 Examination of the *New York Times*’ science sourcing materials, in light of the linear-reflectionist perspective, yields an understanding of how news sourcing decisions correspond to, or enable, a perpetuation of biomedical authority.

Especially noteworthy about the list of publications is the direct involvement of medical organizations. Two of these five publications were published by professional organizations that partially composed a “federation of organized medicine,” including the American Medical Association (AMA) and the New York County Medical Society (NYCMS). The NYCMS was founded in 1806 and, today, aims to “represent physicians as they treat patients, advance science, maintain the
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76 Ibid., p. 98.
77 Ibid., pp. 89-90.
standards of the profession, and protect the public health."\(^{78}\) During the post-war period currently in focus for this thesis, NYCMS “worked to advance the private practice of medicine and protect the financial situation for its members [and] was concerned with and opposed the advent of government sponsored health insurance programs.”\(^{79}\) The Society also helped organized the American Medical Association (AMA), which was founded in 1847 and incorporated in 1897.\(^{80}\)

Like the NYCMS, the AMA of the mid-twentieth century had a strong lobbying wing that opposed Medicare and used fear tactics to instill opposition to government involvement in healthcare, likening “all forms of security, compulsory security, even against old age and unemployment” to “a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism,” in the 1939 words of AMA President Dr. Morris Fishbein.\(^{81}\) AMA conservative rallying against Medicare involved mass media with the 1961 Operation Coffee Cup, a radio broadcasting effort for which Ronald Reagan recorded an LP, “Ronald Reagan Speaks Out Against Socialized Medicine,” which was then distributed amongst various states’ AMA-affiliated Women’s Auxiliary committees to advocate that listeners get together and write letters to their Senators and Congressmen in opposition to the King-Anderson Bill, a Medicare forerunner bill.\(^{82}\)

\(^{78}\) According to the New York Medical Society home webpage as of April 2019.

\(^{79}\) Medical Society of the County of New York, “Collection Summary: Medical Society of the County of New York Records, 1806-1989.”

\(^{80}\) Ibid.

\(^{81}\) Quoted in Richard (RJ) Eskow, “‘Operation Coffeecup’: Reagan, the AMA, and the First ‘Viral Marketing’ Campaign...Against Medicare,” HuffPost, December 6, 2017.

These organizing efforts demonstrate the quietly savvy methods that lobbying groups implemented to further the interests of their associated members. Years later in 1964, when Congress would soon vote on Medicare, the AMA, “standing in angry vigil since the early 1940s,” was “anxious for the anti-Medicare votes of tobacco-state lawmakers.”\textsuperscript{83} To this end, the AMA accepted a $10 million dollar grant from the tobacco industry, and subsequently issued statements to the Federal Trade Commission’s division of trade regulations in opposition to “cautionary labelling” of tobacco products.\textsuperscript{84} While Operation Coffee Cup sought to mobilize voters under the guise of their promoting voters’ interests, this approach actively prioritized industry interests over the growing body of evidence that cigarettes harmed patient health.

In addition to anti-Medicare advocacy, the America Medical Association throughout the later nineteenth and early twentieth century “failed to take action against AMA affiliated state and local medical associations that openly practiced racial exclusion in memberships – practices that functionally excluded most African American physicians from membership in the AMA,” and the AMA was “silent in debates over the Civil Rights Act of 1964” and its “‘separate but equal’ provision, which allowed construction of segregated hospital facilities with federal funds.”\textsuperscript{85}

Though the authors of the articles published in these organizations’ journals should not be uniformly judged for the advocacy efforts of the professional organizations,

\textsuperscript{83} Kluger, Ashes to Ashes, p. 286.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
these varied motivating factors should be considered in light of the organizations’ close connections to science journalism’s broadcasting capabilities.

Further indications of corporate interests’ representation in medical news at the Times were indicated in the source list. The report categorized Pfizer Drug Company’s twice-monthly Pfizer Spectrum as “Especially fruitful as news sources,” as was the lobbying organization the American Academy of General Practice’s (AAGP, now the American Academy of Family Physicians) monthly GP Publication of the AAGP. Other publishers and publications on the list included the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research’s Journal of Biophysical and Biochemical Cytology, considered “Generally non-productive of news,” and the British medical journal The Lancet, founded in 1821, to which the science department was “Not presently subscribed” as of 1958. As such, the New York Times science department’s 1958 report illustrates that heavily-funded medical lobbying organizations, including corporate entities, were well-poised to disseminate their content to forward-thinking journalistic entities like the New York Times.

Section II of the science department’s report prioritized the disciplines of physics, engineering, and mathematics, which were also divided between Bob Plumb, Harold Schmeck, and “new man, depending on qualifications of the latter.” For example, out of the 17 publications listed in this section (all of which were “presently subscribed to”), the American Institute of Physics (“AIP” or “the

---

Institute”) and its affiliates published the nine physics-related publications, of which *Physics Today* was marked “Especially fruitful as news sources.”

Like the American Medical Association, the American Institute of Physics, which was founded in 1931 with five founding member societies, was also involved in public relations work and government lobbying. This work extended physicists’ association with the government beyond the existing heavy federal support for physics research. David Kaiser, an historian of science and a physicist, highlighted AIP involvement in government with the debates around the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), which, when passed in 1958, marked the first large-scale federal funding for secondary education. Earlier, in 1955, Nicholas DeWitt, a “Soviet-School Analyst” and “economist” as a *New York Times* profile from 1962 refers to him, wrote the first report on Soviet education in science and engineering fields, *Soviet Professional Manpower: Its Education, Training, and Supply.*

DeWitt worked on this report while at Harvard’s Russian Research Center, which, like the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology at the time, “maintained close ties to the Central Intelligence Agency,” which had “secretly bankrolled” Alexander Korol’s later 1957 report on Soviet education. Korol worked at the aforementioned Center for International Studies at MIT when putting together his report. The CIA connection to this reporting – “intelligence” – raises unanswered questions about the particular role of the

---
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government, though it can conceivably be filed under “Cold War science developments.”

DeWitt’s book, amongst many other findings, included a statistic that the Soviet Union graduated “two to three times” as many students in science and engineering fields, and this statistic was widely publicized. Kaiser specified that “in fact, his ratio began to attract attention even before his first book had been published”; the statistic was first published in a front-page *New York Times* article headlined “Russia Is Overtaking U.S. in Training of Technicians,” for which “the author had interviewed DeWitt” and “‘featured the ‘two to three times finding.’”

Kaiser, reconsidering the data on which DeWitt made his claim, found that the “much-ballyhooed Soviet lead shrank by a factor of ten, down to a mere 24 percent.”

After the Sputnik launch, armed with DeWitt’s and Korol’s reports framed to show American weakness, the proponents of the proposed National Defense Education Act “[u]sed the manpower scare to tie education to national security.”

Enter the American Institute of Physics: Elmer Hutchisson, then-Director of the AIP, “alerted his AIP colleagues” of “an almost unprecedented opportunity to take advantage of the present public questioning concerning the quality of science instruction in our schools.” Further connecting the media to these developments, Kaiser noted that “throughout the protracted NDEA debates, many journalists
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focused narrowly on physics” and that “in the end, the constant media push, coupled with skillful back-room negotiating, paid off,” and the NDEA passed through Congress and was “grudgingly” signed by President Eisenhower in 1959.  

Circling back to Sullivan’s 1958 report, the numerous AIP journals on Sullivan’s report indicate that the organization, and, by extension, the discipline, was well-represented in the science department’s potential source material. 

Sullivan’s report, chronologically speaking, was situated in the midst of the story about the AIP and the NDEA. This timeliness supposes that it was the time immediately surrounding Sullivan’s report when the Kaiser’s termed “constant media push” occurred. This “media push,” considered alongside the CIA’s opaque involvement with the organizations that published the reports, indicates an alignment between the federally-supported science bureaucracy and media channels, like the New York Times. It is this degree of connection to the government that enables a contrast between the coverage of physics and the coverage of behavioral science disciplines like psychology.

The aforementioned examples demonstrate the unique ways that the AMA and the AIP conducted their activities on the government stage. Beyond these efforts, other applications of physicists’ government-supported research abounded for both civil and military purposes, from the AT&T-Bell Telephone Labs’  
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“government-guaranteed telephone monopoly” to nuclear weapon development.\textsuperscript{97} Furthermore, physicists and medical professionals already had been granted the promise of government support via the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 that was explicitly written “to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.”\textsuperscript{98} This list of publications and the written dedication of three reporters to these disciplines’ coverage reflects structural support that existed for physical science news coverage in 1958.

While Bob Plumb and Harold Schmeck were responsible for the medical and physical science coverage in Sections I and II of the report, Walter Sullivan specified his areas of responsibility in Section III, which covered 22 publications of “general science, geophysics, geography, astronomy, and paleontology.”\textsuperscript{99} Many of these publications were noted for their contributions to “background knowledge,” such as \textit{Nature}, \textit{Scientific American}, \textit{Science} (published since 1880 and by the American Association for the Advancement of Science since 1944), and the \textit{Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists} (published since 1945).\textsuperscript{100} The priorities illustrated in this section largely align with Cold War scientific developments, like the International Geophysical Year (IGY) and Sputnik. In light of the relevance of politically oriented science news, the publications emphasized for their contributions as news sources included the National Academy of Science’s monthly \textit{IGY Bulletin}, the U.S.

\textsuperscript{98} National Science Foundation Act of 1950, 81\textsuperscript{st} Congress, May 10, 1950, ch. 171, § 2, 64 Stat. 149.
\textsuperscript{99} Sullivan, “Allocation of Periodicals,” Bernstein papers, NYPL, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid.
Department of Commerce’s weekly *Soviet Bloc IGY Information*, the American Astronomical Society’s *Astronomical Journal*, and Harvard Observatory’s *Sky and Telescope* (Harvard Observatory), though the department was “not presently subscribed” to the latter.

This section of the report, in contrast to the earlier two, primarily contained publications under the jurisdiction of explicitly American and international government-managed science projects – projects through the New York Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Sciences, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the Canada-based Arctic Institute of North America, and the New Zealand Antarctic Society. With these projects, the connection between science and government was no secret; rather, I reckon that those involved took pride in this work, and perhaps it was even an origin point for nationalist fervor.

Walter Sullivan’s written “responsibility to arrange for coverage of such stories,” plus the annotations reflecting the publications’ respected standings, unquestionably reflect that the science department prioritized findings from these disciplines and publications.

Taken together, the first three sections of Sullivan’s report demonstrate that the reporters in the *Times*’ science department were well-versed in areas of science that shared connections to government, either through voter advocacy in medical sciences, government contracts in physical sciences, or government oversight in earth sciences. Beyond immediate political relevance, Sections I, II, and III cover disciplines most likely to have benefitted from the NSF Act of 1950 – the “physical,
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medical, and engineering” sciences. Similarly, the report’s section on “Rocketry” reflects the news fever pitch on aviation that surrounded the Sputnik launch. Richard Witkin was assigned to rocketry coverage, with thirteen curated publications, five of which were noted as “Especially fruitful as news sources,” reflecting the newsiness of that topic.

In contrast to the publications from government-supported disciplines in the first three sections of the report, later sections reflect a lower priority for areas of science that did not receive as much public government support. After much debate amongst governing Senators and representatives and leading scientists who valued government funding of social sciences, the NSF Act of 1950 limited federal funding of social science work by making social science researchers compete for funding under the broad umbrella of “other sciences.” Social science research inched towards securing more federal funding with the NSF’s 1957 Social Science Research Program, intended to support “anthropology, economics, sociology, and history and philosophy of science,” but it was not until 1968 that the NSF Act was amended to include social and behavioral sciences. In addition to Defense spending, mid-twentieth century financial and organizational support for social science research came from the Ford Foundation and the Social Science Research Council.\(^\text{103}\)

Walter Sullivan’s report devoted one reporter each to coverage on Nuclear Energy (John Finney); Health, Education, and Welfare (Bess Furman in Washington); Agronomy (William M. Blair); and Archeology (Sanka Knox), all of

\(^{102}\) National Science Foundation Act of 1950, 81st Congress.
\(^{103}\) I visited the Social Science Research Council archives as part of my research, but due to issues of scope, I have been unable to incorporate many of those materials in this thesis.
which specify “List not yet prepared” with regard to publications that the reporters may have consulted to find that news.\textsuperscript{104} Ornithology coverage was in a similarly tense position; even if John C. Devlin, the designated reporter for ornithology news, wanted to consult one of the five publications curated for that discipline, the department was “not presently subscribed” to any of them. These reporters worked in other, non-science departments at the newspaper.

Structural limitations to Times psychology coverage were visible in Section 10 of the report, “Physchology [sic] and Welfare.” The report assigned reporter Emma Harrison to this area, and it lists three publications: the American Journal of Public Health and the Nations’ Health (published from 1928 to 1970 by the American Public Health Association),\textsuperscript{105} the American Journal of Psychiatry (published by the American Psychiatric Association), and the Psychiatric Bulletin (published by the Medical Arts Publishing Foundation at the public University of Texas).\textsuperscript{106} Even the title of the section – “Physchology” – seems to be a misnomer that combines “physiology” and “psychology,” two disciplines that are distinct from psychiatry – the discipline most obviously present in these sources. The fact that these social and natural science disciplines did not have the assignment of designated science department reporters meant that that coverage was destined to be less wholly covered in the Times’ science offerings. In full, this supplement to Walter Sullivan’s proposal demonstrates, I suggest, the uneven standing of the physical, natural, and

\textsuperscript{104} Sullivan, “Allocation of Periodicals,” Bernstein papers, NYPL, pp 4-5.
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social sciences, as of September 1958. The report also highlights the elevated position of the government and certain professional organizations in news sourcing.

Even though Sullivan provided a detailed plan for the department, however, his suggestions were not followed due to editorial priority disagreements among those to whom Sullivan reported. James Reston, then-Washington Bureau chief, promptly replied a few days later, thanking him for “that excellent memorandum” and relaying, “I think the best thing to do is to let me hold onto your memorandum on the larger dimensions of coverage until [John] Finney,” one of The Times’ first reporters who focused on science, returned from time away from the office. A return to these concerns after Finney’s return is not documented.

This hesitancy to address the science department’s concerns did not deter Walter Sullivan from continuing to seek out more support for his department, however. According to archival documents, a year and a half later, on June 24, 1959, Sullivan compiled and sent out a second memo under London and Moscow bureau chief E. Clifton Daniel’s guidance, this one directly for Managing Editor Turner Catledge, with carbon copies sent to nine others, including science department reporters and top editors like Assistant Managing Editors Theodore and Robert E. Garst. Sullivan again proposed specific structural improvements that he thought
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would improve the science department’s ability to produce high quality content, thus elevating the newspaper’s science coverage.

Walter Sullivan used this memo to outline specific administrative improvements that would improve his department’s work environment. This follow-up memo detailed seven specific proposals to be discussed at a lunch meeting the following week. Firstly, he prioritized “Relocation,” which consisted of housing the four-person science team – Walter Sullivan, Robert “Bob” Plumb, Harold Schmeck, and John Finney – at different desks to remedy the problem of the team being “so isolated from their files and reference materials that these aids to their work [were] virtually useless.” Sullivan also reiterated the request for additional file cabinet storage; requested the hiring of a stenographer to “put through long distance calls— one of our chief sources of news”; suggested the assigning of a “Duty Man” whose responsibility it would be to “handle all material received that day,” which, “at present,” was a “mountain of materials” of “service copy, press releases, and periodicals,” as earlier discussed; proposed space for a “science weekender” page in the Review of the Week; and, lastly, advocated for copy editors to consult more carefully with the science reporters before changing their work.

Sullivan voiced concern over these structural matters at a moment when a definite emphasis had been placed on coverage of the physical and, to a lesser extent, natural sciences – disciplines whose laboratory researchers did not have to convince.
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government agencies about the relevance of their work. As such, a discrepancy existed at the *New York Times* wherein high-ranking editors, acting as gatekeepers of what the newspaper would or would not educate the public about, needed convincing that scientific discoveries deserved a place in the newspaper, even though these sciences were already deemed valuable of a different sort, in that the federal government funded their science research at all.

**Psychology and “Behavioral Sciences” in the Early 1950s**

Science reporters at the *New York Times* in 1958 had a cache of reliable publications from which to source their science news. Prior to the dissemination of Walter Sullivan's report, for one reason or another, the organizations through which these journals and bulletins were published had established connections to the *Times*’ science staff in a way that informed the department of the publication, its publisher, and its publication schedule. Furthermore, the reporters had had enough time with the materials to establish how valuable they found each publication, as categorized by the four-symbol key. The department then had to match up disciplines with at least one reporter.

These connections seem to have been best established in the disciplines covered in Sections I, II, and III of the report – the medical, physical, and earth science disciplines, not the social and behavioral sciences like psychology. Why was this? Why were psychological publications not heartily represented in the *New York Times* science department’s enunciation of their most reliable science sources?
As I will suggest, covert military applications of behavioral science and psychology research during the Korean War acted as a barrier to incentivizing a closer look at this area of research.\textsuperscript{111} Notwithstanding Department of Defense support, I did not find references to the DoD in the archival materials that I consulted. To illustrate the origins of these publicly-unstated intersections between psychological research and psychological public relations, we must look at a variety of materials. Firstly, I will discuss how psychology research’s reliance on private foundations in the early 1950s conceivably could have isolated journalists from psychologist activities. I will then touch on the American Psychological Association’s admitted lack of information about how the public understood psychology in this same time period. I will use these initial discussions to segue into an analysis of public relations consultant Michael Amrine’s documents about the current (1954) and future potential directions for public understanding of psychology. These materials, encompassing the “press” considerations of psychology, will then be contrasted in a later section with the stated observations of the government’s role in psychology at the end of the 1950s.

With regard to research funding, as mentioned earlier, social and behavioral sciences were not explicitly included in the National Science Foundation Act, leaving social scientists outwardly “chastened by dismissals not just from conservative Congressional quarters but from key figures in the national science

establishment,” as Communications professor Jefferson D. Pooley explained in an article on the history of the “behavioral sciences” label.112 The Ford Foundation came into its wealth after Henry Ford’s 1947 death left the organization with assets of over $415 million by 1951, making it “the world’s wealthiest philanthropy by far.”113 A committee chaired by H. Rowan Gaither, who would later go on to be President of the Ford Foundation, determined that “the social sciences should be Ford’s main focus,” though they wanted a new term that did not have the “socialist” connotations of “social science.”114 Pooley cited the Ford Foundation’s choice of the term “behavioral sciences” for their Behavioral Science Program (BSP), which was initiated in 1951, as a leading cause as to why the term gained widespread usage in the twentieth century. Though the BSP ended in 1957, it gave, over the course of its short existence, 373 grants that totaled nearly $43 million.115

As early as 1950, psychologists in the Public Relations Committee at the APA realized that they should formulate an idea of how the public viewed the field of psychology, because they realized that were largely uninformed as to how outsiders viewed their profession and their work. In the first step towards remedying this gap in the discipline’s self-image, the Public Relations Committee of 1950-1952 compiled a report for the “Comment & Communications” ‘section of the American Psychologist, [titled] A Call for Volunteer Research on Psychology’s Public Relations
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The Committee members hearkened for APA-affiliated psychologists to conduct more research devoted to ‘The Public and Psychology,’ similar to public relations research that was published in an April 1948 issue of the American Psychologist centered on this topic.117

The Committee sought “volunteer research from within [its] membership” to address these issues.118 One reason that the Committee thought it best for APA members to conduct this research was that they would “gain not only the substantive informational report, but also spread out amongst ourselves the involvement and unrecorded learnings, which in indirect ways will improve the quality of our thinking on these problems for many years to come.” The foremost questions that this proposed research would address included, “What is the nature of the general public’s (or some specialized public’s) image of psychology, psychologists, and the American Psychological Association?” and “What information and misinformation about psychology and psychological topics is available to the public, and through which media?” Options for media categories that they figured such research could cover included:

a. News stand analysis (covering one copy of every item offered for sale on a typical news stand on a typical day, supplemented by circulation figures)
b. Specialized publications...
c. The ‘psychology’ books in a local public library, supplemented with circulation figures. Or the contents of a drugstore lending library.
d. A typical day of radio and T.V. broadcasting, with auditing assignments distributed among the class

117 Ibid., p. 1.
118 Ibid.
e. The textbooks used in your local high school, or in non-psychology courses in your college
f. Self-improvement books and pamphlets advertised in the pulp magazines.\textsuperscript{109}

The Public Relations Committee also proposed that the content analysis of these materials could focus on:

How frequently is psychology confused with psychiatry or with the occult sciences?
Role portrayal: how is the psychologist portrayed—as a pure scientist, therapist, efficiency expert, etc.?,
Emotional tone: is the item favorable unfavorable, hostile, humorous [sic], ambivalent, over-sold, or what?
Accuracy: does the article portray psychology and psychologists accurately or is it misinformative?\textsuperscript{120}

This thematic diversity and broad range of materials reflect a strong internal assumption that psychology and psychologists had many potential venues through which to be misunderstood. To place all of these events in context with each other, it should be noted that when this Public Relations Committee began operations in 1950, the National Science Foundation also began its activity. Likewise, from 1950 through 1952 the New York Times published nearly 100 articles mentioning the hydrogen bomb, and over 300 such articles appeared in the 1950s as a whole.

Atomic science- and psychology-minded journalist and author Michael Amrine campaigned throughout the 1950s about the labyrinthine status regarding psychology's public identity. In his work for the APA and beyond, he kept public engagement at the front of active conversations in psychologist circles. Amrine had a prolific career in public relations and science writing, beginning when he, at age
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in 1945, was the first staff member of the Federation of Atomic Scientists, later called the Federation of American Scientists, where he “helped to bring about the passage of legislation creating the Atomic Energy Committee,” and, as discussed at the outset of the chapter, called for “civilian, rather than military, control of nuclear energy.” The American Psychological Association hired Amrine as a Public Information Consultant in 1952, and he wrote regularly on public relations issues of concern to psychologists. The Board’s meeting minutes that report Amrine’s hiring “on a consultantship basis” also explain a more extensive conversation about psychology’s public relations role. The minutes also report that:

The Board discussed for more than an hour the intricate and sometimes conflictful topic of public information. The discussion ranged from astral consideration of the ‘morality of public relations’ to concrete and inventive ideas about ways in which psychologists can educate the general public. The Board seems clearly inclined to move toward more active programs of public information but is convinced that our efforts in this area must be guided by a veridical concern for public welfare. We cannot build up false images of psychology nor can we ‘toot our horns’ louder than our accomplishments warrant.
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Within this description, there are various notable turns-of-phrase. Firstly, I wonder about the conclusions drawn from the “astral consideration of the morality of public relations,” but further indication was not made to this end. Similarly striking is the use of the term “veridical” to modify the “concern for public welfare.” The Oxford English Dictionary defines “veridical” as “speaking, telling, or relating the truth” or, when specifically related to psychology, as “coincident with, corresponding to, or representing real events or persons.” Before contemplating the next sentence’s clarifying statement, what informed the Board’s consideration of “public welfare” at all? Let us break down the next sentence by attempting to paraphrase: “We cannot build up false images of psychology”: we cannot lie to the public about what we do; “nor can we ‘toot our horns’ louder than our accomplishments warrant”: we cannot claim successes beyond what our field has achieved. What does this middle ground look like? How can this middle ground “guide” a “veridical concern for public welfare”? The authors do not clarify, but at the very least, this seems to be a rather obfuscated way of explaining the APA’s motives for expanding public engagement efforts.

**Psychology, Press, and Public Relations in Wartime**

The first American Psychological Association Ethics Code was published in this post-War climate in 1953, after the seven-person APA Committee on Ethical Standards for Psychology conducted years of deliberations and revisions. The Committee’s process began with their requesting comments from the 7,500-member
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APA community “describing the specific circumstances in which someone made a
decision that was ethnically critical,” and the Committee then spent years
“reviewing, analyzing, and categorizing” those comments.\textsuperscript{126} In addition to research
explicitly dealing with psychological warfare, as I will soon discuss, the early 1950s
also included post-WWII VA involvement in training veterans as psychologists and
caring for them in large-scale “cooperative studies”; the prevailing-wind orthodoxy
of the behaviorism movement; the introduction of psychopharmacological drugs,
like Ciba Pharmaceutical Products’ Doriden (Glutethimide) sedative as an anti-
anxiety medicine; and Gordon Allport’s 1954 book \textit{The Nature of Prejudice},
considered a hallmark of social psychology.\textsuperscript{127}

In light of this whirlwind of activity in psychological circles, in 1954, Michael
Amrine drafted a report for the Public Relations Committee on \textit{“Long-Range Public
Relations Problems”} to “discuss problems of public relations which psychology may
expect to face for the next few years.”\textsuperscript{128} Amrine divided his report into seven
numbered sections written in all caps: 1. Quacks, 2. The Use of Psychological
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of ‘behaviorism,’” \textit{Psychological Review}, 55, no. 2 (1948): 67–78.; James P. Cattell,
“Psychopharmacological Agents: A Selective Survey,” \textit{American Journal of Psychiatry}, 116, no. 4
at LoC: pp. 1-8.
from the Outside World to Psychology.\textsuperscript{129} I will highlight portions of this report for their contributions to understanding psychology’s public relations standing and the rather marginal role that government or military activities were said to play in this public image status.

Amrine opened his draft specifying, “Some of these problems are not merely public relations problems but are questions of policy for the Board and the whole profession.”\textsuperscript{130} While Amrine highlighted “quacks” as “one of the main troubles” blocking psychology’s “gaining wide acceptance as a legitimate science and profession,” he pointed to the “Ethics Committee,” discussed above, as a “limited answer…to take care of our own members.”\textsuperscript{131} With this section, Amrine recognized that the trust in psychologists on a personal level underscored attitudes towards psychology more broadly. This brief introduction suggests that the Amrine sensed the existence of a precipitous moment wherein it was up to psychologists at the APA to outline their vision for their professional organization.

The central moment when Amrine discussed the government’s role in psychology’s PR was when he expressed the need to disavow psychology from the “black art” of psychological warfare. Amrine explained, “There is something that governments do, never very openly and not very well tied to demonstrable results, which goes by the name of psychological warfare.”\textsuperscript{132} He then further asserted that “[m]ost psychologists, and the head of our government, Mr. Eisenhower, agree that
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this is a misnomer,” and he asked that the terminology “be materially changed...since in government circles nomenclature can sometimes be officially designated and later generations naturally use the new name.”Interestingly, a Google N-Gram for the term “psychological warfare” shows the use of the term increasing throughout the 1940s, peaking in 1954 (the year of Amrine’s draft), and steadily decreasing afterwards, with some oscillations through the 1960s and 1980s. The term is now at its lowest usage since around 1946.

I wish to reckon with this observation for a moment. What did Amrine mean to imply here? He acknowledged the fact of “government” “doing” psychological warfare, stated that this terminology was “agreed” to be a “misnomer,” which Oxford English Dictionary definitions identify as “a wrong name or designation, esp. one which conveys a misleading impression,” and he proposed a terminology change to distance it from psychology. Did Amrine intend to imply that people within the American Psychological Association did not use, know about, or approve of this terminology?

A Research Analysis Corporation report titled RAC Publications List, “maintained primarily for the use of authorized persons in the Military, Government Agencies, and US Government Contractors with established need-to-know,” exemplifies how some American Psychological Association leaders worked in and collaborated with military research centers in the early 1950s during the Korean War. This document included 141 pages of reports, technical memorandums, staff
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papers, and technical papers, twenty-four of which were published before Amrine’s report and have “psychological warfare” in their titles. Within these “psychological warfare” publications, four authors held APA committee leadership positions during the same year as Amrine’s report: Wayne Dennis (on the Board of Directors, President of Division 1, Editor of the Psychological Bulletin, and on the APA Publications Board), John C. Flanagan (Founder of the American Institutes for Research, one of three Members-at-large of the Executive Committee for Division 5 on Evaluation and Measurement, and on the Committee on the Utilization of Manpower), Thomas G. Andrews (APA Representative for the National Council for Mobilization of Education), and Richard P. Youtz (Member-at-large of the Executive Committee for the Division of the Teaching of Psychology, Convention Program Committee member).

I will now describe the authorship of the different studies and detail who worked with whom. Dennis, Flanagan, and Youtz worked together on Dennis’ only publication, titled “Pre-Testing Procedures for Psychological Warfare Printed Materials,” from November 1952. John D. Folley Jr. and Jack Matthews of the American Institute for Research (AIR) also worked on this, as did Lessing A. Kahn and Julius Segal. On Flanagan and Youtz’s second, titled “Pre-Testing Procedures for Psychological Warfare Printed Media—Phase II, Ranking and Other Methods,”
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Flanagan and Youtz assisted Jack W. Birch and David Konigsburg and were credited as being “of the American Institute of Research,” along with five others (Albert S. Kuban, Jack Matthews, Harley Preston, Marion F. Shaycovi, Elmer D. West).\textsuperscript{141} Lessing A. Kahn and Florence K. Nierman of ORO (Operations Research Office), a military research center contracted through Johns Hopkins University, revised this publication.\textsuperscript{142}

For Thomas G. Andrews’ only publication, “An Investigation of Individual Factors Relating to the Effectiveness of Psychological Warfare” from November 1952, he also worked with Lessing A. Kahn, David E. Ambrose, and David J. Carpenter of ORO.\textsuperscript{143} In a separate book of case studies called The Art and Science of Psychological Operations published in 1976, Harley Oliver Preston is listed as a “Senior Staff Member” of the APA and as an Executive Scientist (1947-1960) at AIR and the Director of AIR’s International Division (1961-1964). Preston authored the article “U.S. Vulnerabilities as Portrayed in the East German Television Film, ‘Pilots in Pajamas’” (1968) with James L. Monroe (President of Preston and Associates, Colonel of the U.S. Air Force “on active duty during WWII and Korean War” p xix) and Aldo L. Raffa (a Retired Colonel for the U.S. Air Force).\textsuperscript{144}

All told, these references serve to indicate that APA leaders contributed directly to military research. APA affiliates or their colleagues contributed to 12.5 percent of this report’s list of psychological warfare studies, and, including the three

\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., p. 23.
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
studies that their colleague Lessing A. Kahn also worked on or directed, 25 percent of these studies included APA affiliates or their colleagues. The Far East Command (referred to as FEC) and other military-related agencies conducted the other studies in the report. These affiliations are significant because they directly align work conducted by leaders in the American Psychological Association with research on psychological warfare. I am not aware of what Michael Amrine knew about APA affiliations with this research, but it would be inaccurate to say that the APA leadership was wholly unaware of this work. Furthermore, Harley O. Preston’s citation in the 1976 casebook at least marginally indicates a continuing role of the APA with regard to understanding psychological warfare in the later 1960s.

Returning to Amrine’s report, he refocused his eye towards APA-oriented press and organizational considerations in the section on “Grass Roots Public Relations,” when he postulated that:

Psychologists today would vote overwhelmingly that they would not wish to duplicate the guild spirit of the [American Medical Association]. Very likely psychologists would not want to develop the news consciousness of the American Chemical Society, which runs a news bureau, sponsors radio programs, and is generally out to sell chemistry...We also have the advantage, as disciplines go, that psychology deals with a subject of interest to most human beings. Therefore we do not, at least on the surface, appear to have the need for promoting society’s interest in us. Yet it would seem that a lot of what is described in radio and popular prints as psychology, is not psychology at all. Are we correctly perceived?

This comparison to other disciplines’ professional associations demonstrated self-awareness, a rather strong degree of assurance, and a willingness to speak about the cohesiveness of ideas that a community of psychologists held. The comparison also,
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on a functional level, speaks to the way that professional organizations were seen as a voice for their profession. The latter focus on psychology in popular materials is also reminiscent of the Public Relations Committee memo from 1952 concerned with the fundamental understanding of how the public was presented with psychology.

Michael Amrine later noted his observations about how news has the ability to intersect psychologists and the public and facilitate communication within groups of psychologists. Analyzing coverage of the annual APA Conference, Amrine observed:

> The consensus seems to be that press and radio coverage of the APA annual program is pretty good. We guide reporters to those parts of the program that we consider worthwhile...And then there is an invisible side to coverage of the convention: We have been pretty well able to steer reporters away from persons and subjects which might result in misleading articles out of the convention.  

Amrine seems to reveal some kind of inside joke, indicating that the news media were informed of the kinds of things that were appropriate for them to know – and not more. Amrine did not revisit the suggestive comment but followed with an observation about how future conferences could be better targeted to the news media. Here Amrine also expressed some frustration with coverage of the convention, pointing out that “the convention publicity, as measured by Dr. George Albee over a period of months in 1952, accounts for more mention of psychology in a professional and research orientation than occurs spontaneously in the entire rest of the year.” As though by foresight, this observation about coverage concentration is analogous to Richard Cohen’s future 1969 letter and Executive
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Editor A.M. Rosenthal’s own admissions that there was room to improve behavioral science coverage at the Times. Amrine, while taking issue with this concentration, also reframed this problem as a potential opportunity for change. He identified that:

The continuing problems of psychology, public relationswise [sic], are (1) whether we can improve this annual look at psychology from the point of view of the public, and (2) whether there are other major ways in which we can make a dent on the public consciousness, or to phrase it another way, give a major answer to the questions which the public is constantly asking psychologists.149

These comments cement Michael Amrine’s attempts to engage psychologists and the American Psychological Association into a wider conversation about the intersections of the professional world and secular society. At the time of his writing in 1954, Amrine was not new to these conversations, given his reputation as a vocal activist regarding the links between science and government in the 1940s, when public debate about atomic bombs piqued.150

Concern for public education efforts in psychological matters was not unique to Amrine and the PR committee. In addition to national leaders’ highlighting the relevance of public education of psychology, rank-and-file members of psychological organizations reached out to the Public Information Committee to express their shared interest. For example, early in January 1956, Dean V. Harris, the Information Officer at the Oklahoma State Psychological Association wrote to the Public Information Committee at the APA requesting more information about public education literature. Harris, recently appointed Public Information Officer at his association, specified that he “would like to contribute to the education of the
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public through the medium of newspaper, radio, television, etc.” Harris’ letter indicates both geographically widespread support for public education initiatives as well as a brief summary of the kinds of media channels around at the time on which that information could have been communicated.

Michael Amrine, in his role as a Public Relations Consultant, furthered conversations that people had begun before his hiring. Amrine, who has received more historical attention for his work in nuclear science PR, seems to have had a clear understanding of how the press contributed to the public’s understanding of and opinions towards the world around them. Amrine’s infrequent discussion of the government’s role in psychology’s PR needs potentially reflects an understanding that he thought their PR problems were more appropriately resolved in internal channels.

Three years after writing his draft, Michael Amrine took action towards aligning psychologists with science communications channels. The press room as a fixture of APA meetings had existed for “less than five years” in 1957, and Amrine wanted to formalize the connections between psychologists and professional science writers. In his capacity as a Public Information Consultant, Amrine wrote on May 27, 1957 to inform John Pfeiffer, President of the National Association of Science Writers (NASW), that “Now we are trying to start a speakers bureau and a public information chairman in each state.” As part of this network-building
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151 Letter from Dean V. Harris at Oklahoma State Psychological Association to APA “Public Information Committee or Equivalent,” January 9, 1956, Container 715 (Conference of State Psychological Associations), Folder “Public Information Committee – Correspondence and Reports – 1956,” APA at LoC.
152 Letter from Michael Amrine to John E. Pfeiffer, May 27, 1957, Container 715, APA at LoC.
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proposal, Amrine also asked, “Do you think it would be worthwhile for us to circulate to the membership of the NASW the names of psychologists in the various states who would be good contacts in psychological research stories?”

This question indicates that Amrine understood there to be a lack in communication between the “science writers” organized under the NASW and active research psychologists, and Amrine wrote this letter about a year before the science department’s memo listing their source materials. The fact that connections between science reporters and psychologists were new as of the late 1950s helps explain one mechanism as to why the discipline of psychology held a lower profile in the *Times’* science sourcing strengths.

**Roger W. Russell (1958) on Psychology and Government**

Alongside concerns with how psychology was represented to a media-consuming audience, the American Psychological Association also dealt with issues around how psychology was presented to those involved with the United States government. An 18-page 1958 article that esteemed physiological psychologist and then-Editor of the *American Psychologist* Roger W. Russell wrote in the *American Psychologist* with Amrine’s assistance shows how leaders in public relations positions at the APA considered their role in public access to information during the same year as Walter Sullivan’s memo and supplement that did not emphasize psychology. This report, unlike Amrine’s earlier report that focused on “press,” places a much higher premium on situating psychology within the government-
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science landscape. Russell divided the report into discussions about “Education” and “Science,” the latter of which will be considered here.

The rocky relationship that Russell observed among social scientists and some government officials was not a new phenomenon. Mark Solovey describes in Chapter Two of *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (2013), “Social Science on the Endless (and End-less?) Frontier: The Postwar NSF Debate” that political debates at the end of the 1940s, won by conservative politicians like Ohio Senator Robert Taft, led to the exclusion of the social sciences from the National Science Foundation. The legacy of popular opinion in the wake of these debates appears to have remained constant by the late 1950s, when Russell remarked that “some believe that science will not get very far in this country until events ‘...capture the popular imagination and lead to a quite basic change in popular attitudes.’”

Roger W. Russell had been the Executive Officer of the APA in 1956, at which time he was also the editor of the *American Psychologist*, a position he held through 1959.

This article predated Russell’s decorated career as an international and science-based psychologist who helped develop University of California, Irvine as its vice chancellor for academic affairs, from 1967 to 1972, soon after the campus was established in 1965. Russell identified the distinction that “to some, the term ‘science’ is coincident with the boundaries of the physical sciences; the biological
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and behavioral sciences are considered to be in another category." These distinctions were considered most heartily as they related to issues of federal research funding. Similarly, the Board at the American Psychological Association “directed” the Committee on Public Affairs, a distinct organization from Amrine’s Committee on Public Relations, to “assess the policy issues involved with respect to the nature and form of APA’s participation in the federal legislative process and its implementation.”

In situating psychologists’ activity in relation to government, Russell contextualized their activity with regard to other scientific disciplines. The heading “The Current Scene” opened the report, and the first sentences packed a punch: “Space exploration and other potentialities of science are receiving the kind of attention science did in 1945 and 1946 following the atomic bomb. But with a difference: There is no recent precedent for the present kind of re-examination of American goals and methods.” Russell recognized unity amongst scientists, even as “most present discussions of government support seem to be couched in the terms ‘science, engineering, or mathematics...many natural scientists and mathematicians have the attitude: support should be given to all disciplines.”

Despite acknowledging individual scientists’ support for unity, Russell also noted that “the distinction [between the physical and the biological and behavioral sciences] appears to be particularly pronounced when contributions of the physical
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sciences have been strikingly dramatized."¹⁶⁰ This distinction, observed in the same year as Walter Sullivan’s report about science coverage that prioritized the physical sciences, supposes that media channels like newspapers were one medium that maintained this distinction.

Russell observed “evidence on all sides that human behavior is recognized as a basic factor in many of the important issues with which the nation is currently faced,” noting that various members of the APA and the organization itself “have already been called to advise government agencies on matters which will influence legislation and administration.”¹⁶² This fact of psychologists endowing enough respect to be called upon in an advisory role, however, seems to have contrasted with the reality of their exclusion from public-facing national financial support. Russell explicitly related the persisting structural problems that psychologists faced to psychologists’ relations to government resources:

Psychologists strongly believe that they are seriously hampered by not being able to set up long-term research laboratories. They point out the organizational instability that results from certain financial policies of the Government and the effect of this instability on the kind of research that is done, both in-service and via contract.¹⁶³

Along the lines of Russell’s critique, the language of the National Science Foundation’s founding document did not officially incorporate support for the “social sciences” until 1968, a decade after the current report and eighteen years after the founding of the Foundation. Similarly, by 1959, when the National Science Foundation budget ballooned 250 percent from the 1958 budget to $40 million, the

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 208.
¹⁶² Ibid., p. 200.
¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 208.
social sciences allocation only increased by 50 percent to $600,000.\textsuperscript{164} Regarding the Foundation, Russell optimistically noted that the “APA Board of Directors recently submitted to President Eisenhower nominations for vacancies on the National Science Board” of the NSF; my analysis of the former members of the NSB, however, did not identify any 1960 appointees with backgrounds in psychology.\textsuperscript{165}

Psychologists’ concerns about the public understanding of psychology were closely intertwined with psychologists’ view of their relationship with the government and federal support. As historian Mark Solovey explained, “The social and behavioral scientists rarely enjoyed more than a marginal status within the federal science establishment throughout the first two Cold War decades,” as evidenced by “the distribution of federal funding across the sciences and the numbers of representatives from the different sciences within particular science agencies and science advisory bodies,” which “made the reigning scientific hierarchy perfectly clear.”\textsuperscript{166} The uneven status of federal support for physical, medical, and earth sciences versus that of disciplines like psychology also seems to have played a role in how psychology came to be represented in the eyes of the science department at the New York Times. This status differential, coupled with the fact that the editors at the Times expressed opposition to granting any science a greater place in the newspaper than it had at present, phrased in the future trajectories that the science department faced in the decades to come.


\textsuperscript{166} Solovey, Shaky Foundations, p. 198.
Walter Sullivan’s report on the standing of science coverage at the *Times* in 1958, illustrative of the science department’s source materials, also sheds light on the drastically varying ways that scientific institutions and associations can intersect with journalistic mediums. The journalistic dearth of connections to social sciences like psychology, existing in the military shadows of the more politically-connected areas of science, supposes that governmental involvement in science acted a potential mediator to the science coverage, though the specific mechanism is unclear. While national leaders publicly invested greater taxpayer resources in science, editors at the *Times* did not seem to share this valuation of science nor the politics of science. Even with the science department’s strengths oriented towards physical and natural science coverage, expanded science coverage was not a foregone conclusion, given this editorial skepticism towards explicitly coordinating more science coverage. As we have seen, the process of overcoming the newspaper’s structural limitations on science news was built on a foundation that reflected the uneven character of American science. In the next chapter, we will look at how the science department fared in the 1960s and how the *Times* covered the ongoing, extensive Cold War developments in psychological research.
Chapter 2
“The Manhattan Project of Social Sciences”?

We are in the midst of a revolution whose basis is scientific. The discoveries being made are for all time – they are not advances and retreats, the comings and goings that fill so many of our columns.

– Walter Sullivan, May 27, 1965

Several events that occurred in the science department at the New York Times during the 1960s can be seen as a case study in how individuals disrupt institutionalized momentum in the effort to forge a new path – not for themselves, but for the institution. Then-Sunday editor Lester Markel, in the wake of receiving numerous criticisms for the science editor’s lackluster management, needed persuading that science coverage was worthy of the newspaper’s limited column inches.167 Despite these criticisms, the science department was presented at the start of the 1960s with two projects about science news that reached well beyond their newsroom, both of which illustrate the high esteem with which outside entities viewed the science team. Meanwhile, editorial concerns and staffing problems within the Times organization put limits on how far science coverage at the Times could go.

167 Six memoranda from J. Desmond to Lester Markel, dated as follows: November 29, 1956; February 8, 1957; September 4, 1957; May 27, 1958; December 8, 1959; March 9, 1960, Box 20, Folder 16, New York Times Company records. Lester Markel papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library. [hereafter Markel papers, NYPL]; I do not think it is necessary to name this editor. I believe that his contributions to science journalism do not need to be smeared because of what a few people thought and expressed in private.
Conversations about science news during the 1960s did not often specify which kinds of science would be reported on; the fight seemed to be for “science” overall, regardless of discipline. By the end of the decade, then-Managing Editor A.M. Rosenthal had established himself as a powerful advocate for science’s place in the newspaper. Regarding psychology, the National Science Foundation’s 1968 amendment to incorporate the “social and behavioral sciences” permitted psychologists to feel more hopeful about the potential for expanded media coverage of psychology. These kinds of welcoming attitudes towards social and behavioral science coverage, however, were not yet evident in the Times’ conversations about science. Enter Richard Cohen, whose 1969 letter about the APA convention spotlighted this topic for A.M. Rosenthal, but, overall, the science department’s conversations about social and behavioral science coverage did not pick up steam until the 1970s.

The archival material from this decade did not often refer to behavioral or social science coverage, and when it did, the tone was dismissive. While editors were dubious about behavioral science coverage, however, behavioral scientists planned globally consequential research projects, namely Project Camelot. Project Camelot, which one involved social scientist referred to as the “Manhattan Project for the social sciences,” was a “military-sponsored, social science study of revolution,” as historian Mark Solovey explains it.168 Periodically, I also refer back to evolving constructs at the American Psychological Association that enhanced the

Association’s information dissemination capabilities. Though editorial concerns about science did not emphasize behavioral science research, researchers at the time absolutely conducted psychological research, funded largely by the agencies like the Department of Defense for military applications of behavioral science research.

What does newsworthiness require?

What is Out There? Efforts to Understand the Public Faces of Science and Psychology

News sourcing concerns, extending from Sullivan’s 1958 list, first appeared in the 1960s with regard to a request for the New York Times to analyze the Associated Press (AP) and United Press International (UPI) wire services’ science coverage because significant number of newspapers subscribed to those wires. Science news, like other kinds of news, was communicated to subscribing newspapers via syndicated wires like the Associated Press (AP) and United Press International (UPI) wire services. Wire services, which “send out syndicated news copy to subscribers by wire transmission,” played an important role in news dissemination, especially for smaller newspapers with fewer reporters.\footnote{Merriam Webster, “wire services.”}

The AP and UPI wires were the most highly regarded wires in the 1960s, where AP “was the backbone of journalism—the great reliable conduit of spot news, complete and accurate in its reporting,” while “UPI’s value to an editor was traditionally as a second wire that could...cover an event with an interesting angle, or write a story in a brighter manner,” as Northwestern University Medill School of
Journalism professor Richard A. Schwarzlose (1992) noted in his essay in the anthology *The Future of News: Television, Newspapers, Wire Services, Newsmagazines* that only 5% did not subscribe to either wire, while 25% subscribed to both, 43% to AP only, and 27% to UPI only. These high subscription rates point to the exalted status of the AP and UPI wires in setting the tone for news in newsrooms across the country.

At the *New York Times* science department, reporters consulted the wires but also relied on their own read of the materials they sought out and were sent. However, smaller newspapers with less-well-established science departments necessarily relied to a greater extent on the wire services’ science offerings, which were, according to a letter from Ernest Cutts, Managing Editor at the *Charleston Evening Post*, a cause for concern. In November 1959, the Associated Press Media Editors’ News Enterprise Committee decided to conduct a study on science news for 1960. At Cutts’ request, Managing Editor Turner Catledge authorized Assistant Managing Editor Robert E. Garst to “watch the AP wire for one week—January 18-24—and look over all science news moved in all classes; space, missiles, medicine, health, etc., compare it with UPI performance and, in general, offer some observations, criticisms, and suggestions.”
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Garst found that “the proportion of stories dealing with the substance of science is very small in comparison with those dealing with events involving science incidentally.” Further, he also proposed that “the lack of real science coverage may have a bearing on the indifference of the American people toward the United States-Soviet Russia rivalry in this vital area.”

In prefacing the report with his findings to his boss, Turner Catledge, Garst admitted that the report was “pretty blunt because I found what the wire services call science coverage to be deplorable.” He was not alone in this view. In response to the report, Ernest Cutts, who initially proposed the study, wrote to Garst, “I am glad that it is not a ‘good’ report, for I fully agree with your observations that it is about time the wire services became aware of their short-comings, especially in the field of science.” This determination about the sore state of the wire service’s science material implies that the newspapers that relied on the wires for science stories were prevented from providing “substantive,” “real science coverage” to their readers. That the *Times* was approached to conduct this project attests to the high esteem with which their journalist colleagues viewed their work. Furthermore, recalling that the project was under the purview of the Associated Press Media
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Editors, this project seems to align even more closely with the American Psychological Association’s similar effort described in Chapter One.

With this endeavor, editors in the New York Times science department were involved with a project of consequence for the 95% of daily newspapers that subscribed to one of the wire services. Similarly, the notion that it took until 1960 for 95% of daily newspapers to be able to provide their readers with acceptable science coverage implies that, for most of the nation, newspapers had limited abilities as instruments for mass education in scientific matters.

During the same year that the New York Times analyzed the quality of wire service reports on science news, the American Psychological Association sought to understand and monitor psychology’s public profile. The APA committee in charge of this activity in 1960 was the Committee of Public Information, chaired by Dr. Irwin A. Berg, alongside members Dr. Joseph E. Brewer and Dr. Wallace H. Wulfeck. Curiously, this committee was named the same as the WWI agency also known as CPI, which was the “United States government’s first large scale propaganda agency” that was created under President Woodrow Wilson and officially existed from 1917 to 1919. In a letter to the APA Board of Directors and Council of Representatives updating everyone on the Committee’s activities from

---


the past year, Dr. Berg noted that the Committee had been “primarily concerned” with:

...completing for publication the policy statement on public information; organizing and formulating policy for a television films review sub-committee charged with passing upon television films for accuracy of psychological content; and planning for a study of the public image of psychology in order to base public information activities more soundly.\(^{182}\)

Rather than complete one project and be done, this committee’s activities suggest that they wanted to formalize their manner of understanding of how the public was presented with psychology. Likewise, these actions suggest that the Committee took an active, observing role in validating the way that media represented psychology.

This letter temporally aligns with the *New York Times*’ report on wire services, as both took place in 1960. This temporal alignment indicates that forces in both science journalism and in psychology like-mindedly believed that attention should be devoted specifically towards analyzing how public was informed of their work.

The Ford Foundation wanted to go beyond analyzing existing news, instead reaching out directly to the *New York Times* to certify that science would have a solid foundation in the media. Financially, in Fiscal Year 1961-1962, the Ford Foundation gave over $15.5 million to Science and Engineering programs, a sum that, while significant, was dwarfed by the Foundation’s $35.5 million sum in the same year to various “Overseas Development” programs.\(^{183}\) Near the end of 1962, Thomas E. Cooney, Jr., then a program assistant at the Foundation, communicated with the
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\(^{182}\) Letter from Irwin A. Berg, March 28, 1960, “Committee Activities During 1959-60,” Container 13, APA at LoC.; I have found little historical information about the work of this committee, and I am not certain if this Committee’s activities were related to the WWI committee by the same name.  

New York Times. On November 21, 1962, a “CONFIDENTIAL” proposal for a “hypothetical” program came across Sunday editor Lester Markel’s desk from Cooney.\(^{184}\)

Noting that science magazines “seem to be giving science less attention and shallower treatment than is appropriate to its importance in our culture and national affairs,” the report inquired about the New York Times’ interest in a program in which The Ford Foundation would “offer stipends to writers that would enable them to treat scientific subjects...in ways that would otherwise be too expensive.”\(^{185}\) Lester Markel and his “indispensable deputy” Daniel Schwarz decided against the idea, with Markel telling Cooney that he “thought magazines ought to pay for what they print without a subsidy from the Ford Foundation.”\(^{186}\) Even so, Markel noted that “the fact of the matter is we are not getting any science of conscience in the Magazine,” and asked, “What are we going to do about that? Is it a fact that none of our numerous science writers can perform satisfactorily for the Magazine?”\(^{187}\)

Schwarz replied to these presumptive questions with a list of seven science writers – “some very good men” (no female reporters) – who wrote about science for the Times sometime within the past year.\(^{188}\) Markel, a New York City native who had
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\(^{187}\) Memo from Lester Markel to Daniel Schwarz, November 13, 1962, Markel papers, NYPL.

\(^{188}\) Memo from Daniel Schwarz to Lester Markel, November 14, 1962, Markel papers, NYPL.
held his position as Sunday editor for 32 years since 1923 when he was 29 years old, was three years away from his eventual retirement when he made this decision. These communications show that editors were discerning in the kinds of problem-solving they pursued; though Markel acknowledged the existence of the problem that the Ford Foundation outlined, he decided that the Times was not interested in the attempted involvement of a privately-funded non-profit organization into their science news coverage.

Though editors decided not to implement the proposal, it is curious to think about the potential implications that such involvement could have had on behavioral science coverage, given The Ford Foundation’s earlier role in funding behavioral science research. If these dollars would have enabled the department to achieve some of the goals that the Ford Foundation presented, including the mutually-beneficial goal of “[seeing] whether new writers can be discovered and encouraged to write about science for the educated layman,” what does this dismissal of Ford funding signify? While there are many possible answers to this question, I believe that it is, on some level, an acknowledgement that money has the power to influence.

190 The Ford Foundation, “An Experiment in the Improvement of Science Writing for the Layman,” Markel papers, NYPL, p. 3.
I also want to note that these communications occurred soon before the 114-day newspaper strike that occurred from December 8, 1962 to March 31, 1963. Note of this strike did not appear in the files I consulted, but historians of journalism have written about how the Times’ ability to recover from the strike is a significant part of the newspaper’s history and legacy.
Awards, Accessibility?, and Staffing: Mid-Decade Newsroom Commotion

Soon after Markel’s conversation with the Ford Foundation, a newspaper workers’ strike broke out, enacted over wage negotiations and a protest against newsroom automation of the printing presses. The strike spanned four months from December 8, 1962 to March 31, 1963 and was settled with concessions to both demands, with some automation kept. However, the cost burden of these changes forced the closing of various New York City newspapers and magazines that had previously contributed to the city’s diverse newspaper offerings. The New York Times, benefitting from its history of having a secure financial position, stayed in business, now with fewer immediate competitors. One of their remaining competitors was the New York Daily News, which also had had a solvent financial position before the strike.

Awards as recognition for esteemed work were a more established and accepted form of influence or encouragement. Professional organizations have traditionally intersected with media organizations via awards for their such notable content, and the New York Times was no exception. Months after the strike, on November 21, 1963, Walter Sullivan received a Western Union telegram from E.G. Sherburne, an administrator at the American Association for the Advancement of the Science (AAAS). Sherburne proudly informed Sullivan that he had won the AAAS-Westinghouse Science Writing Awards Contest, for which a public
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announcement would be made in *Science*, the AAAS-published journal, the next month.\(^{192}\)

A flurry of communications surrounded this announcement, the first of which was an official letter sent to now-Managing Editor Turner Catledge. Sherburne applauded, “The quality of the entries in the contest has been increasing consistently over the years, and this year was still higher. Mr. Sullivan is to be congratulated...and you are to be congratulated for having him on your staff.”\(^{193}\) Catledge was away, so Clifton Daniel, Assistant Managing Editor, responded in his place, “One of the great satisfactions in running this newspaper in the past few years has been the growing and improvement of our science news coverage. We are greatly pleased, therefore, to see that others share our sentiments.”\(^{194}\)

The archival records of the high-level commendations that Sullivan received for this award exceeded that of any other achievement. Further congratulations, sent directly to Sullivan, came from the publisher, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, just before the New Year, on December 27, 1963. Sulzberger concisely applauded, “Dear Walter: My hearty congratulations to you on the Westinghouse-American Association for the Advancement of Science award. Keep up the good work! A.H.S.”\(^{195}\) Such personal communication from the Senior Sulzberger, the Publisher’s father, situated at the very top of the newspaper hierarchy, was the highest laureate a *Times* reporter could
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\(^{192}\) Western Union telegram from E.G. Sherburne, Jr. to Walter Sullivan, November 21, 1963, Box 8, Folder 37 (Sullivan, Walter), Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.

\(^{193}\) Letter from E.G. Sherburne, Jr. to Turner Catledge, November 21, 1963, Box 8, Folder 37, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.

\(^{194}\) Letter from Clifton Daniel to E.G. Sherburne, November 22, 1963, Box 8, Folder 37, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.

\(^{195}\) Letter from Arthur Hays Sulzberger to Walter Sullivan, December 27, 1963, Box 8, Folder 37, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.
achieve. In response, Sullivan shared credit with the Times.\textsuperscript{196} The AAAS, founded in 1848, had a long-established reputation as a respectable body of scientists, and this prize allowed the organization to communicate their approval of the Times’ dedication of space towards science reporting, helping entwine science reporting deeper into the fabric of the newspaper.

Even in the face of praise and acknowledgement of Sullivan’s high-quality work, archived communication from December 1963 between Clifton Daniel, then-London and Moscow Bureau Chief, and Theodore Bernstein, then-Assistant Managing Editor, demonstrates that these editors remained concerned about the accessibility of science news.\textsuperscript{197} Referencing an earlier in-person conversation, Daniel noted that Bernstein “raise[d] the question of whether we are right in saying that we should not print anything a general reader cannot understand,” but that under the same logic, Bernstein wondered whether “we would have carried any story about the Einstein theory of relativity.”\textsuperscript{198} Reflecting on their conversation, Daniel emphasized, “We don’t have to worry about the scholar...We do have to worry about the general reader because he can’t understand the general publications. He depends on us to tell him when something of significance has been uncovered by the scholars.”\textsuperscript{199} Beyond the casual gendering of their science news-reading

\textsuperscript{196} Memorandum from Walter Sullivan to Arthur Hays Sulzberger, December 31, 1963, Box 8, Folder 37, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL. “Actually I received two awards, at the ceremony in Cleveland on Friday. One was for me and the other was for the Times. I believe the weight of the credit, as in most such awards, goes to the times, for nourishing and making possible the kind of coverage that we give to science.”


\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., p. 1.

\textsuperscript{199} Ibid., p. 2.
audience, these comments illustrate a sense of responsibility that seems to have undergirded the *Times*’ presentation of science news. Daniel’s conception that the issue was “understanding the general publications” (emphasis mine) also calls to mind questions of accessibility: could the general reader not understand the general publications, or could they not access the general publications as easily as the scholar could?

Alongside this exploration of the role of science reporting, Daniel also recognized a challenge inherent in the task of reporting science news. In closing, he meditated, “I only hope we are not slipping backwards in the matter of science news and too readily accepting the assertion that things are just too complicated for the ordinary reader of the *New York Times* to understand. Certainly we don’t want to make this an excuse for not trying.”

Over the next decade, concerns over readers’ understanding science material periodically reappeared in editorial conversations about science news. This trepidation nearly always involved topics in the physical or natural sciences; the corollary fear, applied to social or behavioral science material when it was brought up in later years, was derisively about avoiding material that could be labelled “pop psychology.” These two categories of worries underscore the way that editors internally distinguished between different types of science coverage.

Other challenges that the growing department encountered involved its staffing. On August 13, 1964, Walter Sullivan sent an incensed letter to an employee at the News Department, expressing his frustration at the reassignment of Liz
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Burpee from the science department to the Sunday department, just months after science department had lost two other staff members.201 Sullivan explained that while “her duties would not differ fundamentally from what she does for” the science department, this move would mean an increase in her pay, indicating that “she is underpaid in her present post.”202 At closing, he remarked, “Perhaps The Times considers Women’s News more important than science, but I do not believe this is true of our readers.”203 This reaction to a reporter’s reassignment, in addition to its casual gendering of audience interest, showcases the Times’ strategy of internally reassigning and promoting within the company, though in this case, the movement came at the detriment of the science team.

The first archivally documented proposal to discuss social science coverage was swiftly dismissed at the end of the same year, moreover. Just before Christmas in 1964, Tom Wicker, a Times reporter stationed in Washington, D.C. who had been a Nieman Fellow at Harvard University in 1957 and wrote the Times’s front-page story on President Kennedy’s assassination in 1963, wrote to Clifton Daniel, then-Managing Editor, to express a desire to talk about “the soft sciences.”204 Daniel emphatically stated that the newspaper did not plan to hire a reporter specifically for the social sciences, saying, “I think I can tell you right away that we will not hire a man for this purpose unless we absolutely have to,” citing budget constraints and
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a wish to use “existing staff to improve our coverage.”

Daniel then tabled this discussion for Wicker’s next meeting to New York.

Though Wicker’s initial reaching out is not documented in the New York Times Company archives that I consulted, this letter indicates that Times staff in both the D.C. and New York offices were presented with conversations and ideas regarding coverage of non-physical and natural sciences early on in the process of building up the science coverage at the Times. Even if these ideas were not procedurally carried into print, this consideration shows that the ideas were in fact floated amongst the editors and reporters.

Meanwhile, Planning Global Ideological Warfare

Esteemed American Psychological Association co-Presidents Dr. Jerome Bruner and Dr. Nicholas Hobbs were cognizant that outsiders looked doubtfully on the behavioral sciences. Dr. Bruner, a decorated cognitive psychologist, and Dr. Hobbs, a psychologist most interested in public service applications of psychology, posed in a memo a few questions for the APA Council of Representatives to consider at a future meeting. The questions included “What should be the role of APA in current attacks on behavioral science research?” and “How can APA help psychologists respond to opportunities for research and service in new federal and state programs, such as those of the office of Education, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, etc.?”

The latter question raised the topic of

\footnote{205} Ibid.
\footnote{206} Memorandum from Jerome Bruner and Nicholas Hobbs to Presidents of Divisions and Presidents of State Psychological Associations, August 2, 1965, Container 13 (Board of Directors, 1946-1986,
psychologists’ involvement in government programs. Months after voicing these questions to the members of the Council, Hobbs reached out individually to members of university Psychology departments across the country to request their service on an APA Board of Public Affairs. Hobbs noted in these letters:

> While it is difficult to define precisely what is meant by the term [‘Public Affairs’], one can cite by way of operational definition our current concerns for such issues as legislation on the child development specialist, Congressional inquiries into the invasion of privacy and the use of drugs, bills before the Congress on care of laboratory animals; proposals for reorganization of several Federal agencies involving psychologists, regulations of the Surgeon General governing use of human subjects in research, psychology in UNESCO, and the projected COSPUP [Committee on Science and Public Policy] study.\(^{207}\)

This non-exhaustive but consequential list of potential roles for a psychologist in government affairs indicates some of the reasons why the public at the time had a personal stake in learning about the field of psychology in the news.

In addition to the government-facing programs noted above, one potential underlying reason for the “attacks on behavioral science research” could have been the recent uncovering of the proposed, secretive Project Camelot. Proposed in 1964 by the Special Operations Research Office at American University and backed by the United States Army, Project Camelot was a large-scale, social science counterinsurgency project aimed largely in Latin America.\(^{208}\) Though the project involved other social sciences, the program most heavily funded psychological research, with Department of Defense psychological research funding increasing
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from $17.2 million in 1961 to $31.1 million in 1964, while non-psychology social science research increased from $0.2 million in 1961 to $5.7 million in 1964.\textsuperscript{209}

The proposed research for Project Camelot would have taken place in many different countries, with “survey research and field studies” in “Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela, Iran, and Thailand,” paired with “comparative historical studies” of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela, Egypt, Iran, Turkey, Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, France, Greece, and Nigeria.”\textsuperscript{210}

Chile, though not a country in the scope of Camelot research, was the country where word of the study became public. When the Chilean “official communist newspaper” El Siglo published the transcript of the proposal on June 12, 1965, with the headline “Yankees study invasion of Chile,” a media backlash began.\textsuperscript{211} The commotion around the study ultimately lead Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to cancel the project less than a month later, on July 8, 1965.\textsuperscript{212} When news of this proposed research became public, “there thus emerged a widespread controversy about the relationship between social science and the national-security state, and especially about the implications of military patronage for the social science enterprise,” as historian Mark Solovey explained in his 2001 article “Project Camelot and the 1960s Epistemological Revolution.”\textsuperscript{213}

\textsuperscript{209} Ibid., p. 180.
\textsuperscript{210} Ibid., p. 181.
\textsuperscript{213} Solovey, “Project Camelot,” p. 184.
While historians recognize that a media frenzy played an important role in the backlash to this application of research, the only explicit mention of Project Camelot in the *New York Times*, as indexed in their online search feature, came from an editorial on August 9, 1965 on page 24, headlined “Burying ‘Project Camelot.’” The critical editorial referred to the program as a “truly extraordinary misjudgment” and charged that “the Pentagon was in process of making one of the worst boners of recent years in Latin-American affairs.” The editorial, however, also absolved the government of wrongdoing, saying that the mistakes were and “[are] fully realized by our Ambassadors,” and that “‘Project Camelot’ will therefore be buried deep as the legendary seat of King Arthur’s court, from which it look its inexplicable name.” It is not immediately clear what the *Times* editorial writers meant by this. Even though Project Camelot was technically cancelled, historian Ellen Herman explained that “virtually the only change” to the Camelot program was when SORO changed its name to “the Center for Research in Social Systems (CRESS)” and “continued, under its new name, to provide the army with detailed information about the Third World.”

The endurance of the program’s imperialistic research objectives makes sense of Dr. Hobbs’ interest, in the current APA letter, to figure out how to manage psychology’s public image. Similarly, COSPUP’s inclusion in Dr. Hobbs’ letter is notable due to the way that the committee intersects with the government – an
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entity into which the *New York Times* and other media organizations were keenly tuned. COSPUP was founded in February 1963 and “was charged with providing basic information for the ‘coordination and long-range planning of the support of science by the executive agencies of the Federal Government,’” and the committee “gave science and technology a voice at the highest policymaking levels of government.”

Even so, the President’s Science Advisory Committee, which existed under some titular capacity from 1951 to 1993, was not represented by someone in the field of Psychology until 1968 when Herbert A. Simon of Carnegie Mellon University joined, and he served for three years until 1971. Excepting four other men on the Committee who had ties to social sciences disciplines, all others who served in this public scientific advisory capacity had a background in the physical or natural sciences.

While the science department at the *New York Times* had to fight for science to have a greater place in the newspaper, physical and social scientists had already benefitted, and continued to benefit, from having a seat at the table with governing officials – and, in the case of psychologists, particularly in a warfare capacity, no less. Laid bare, this discrepancy meant that even if citizens could not easily access information about scientific developments in their regular news offerings, voices
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from those same disciplines spoke to their representatives. That said, psychology’s public-facing problems were three-fold; psychologists’ contributions were not often communicated to readers, and coordinated advocacy within the newsroom for coverage of the discipline was basically non-existent until 1969.

Editors Respond: Mid-Decade Newsroom Commotion

When Walter Sullivan was informed of Liz Burpee’s reassignment out of the science department, he did not want to let the department regress from the inroads they had made over the past few years. Though the second half of the decade continued to challenge the team, Sullivan regularly spoke out in defense of the science at the Times. Furthermore, A.M. Rosenthal began to appear as a supportive voice for the paper’s science coverage.

A kind letter to Walter Sullivan from 1965 showcased the science reporter’s beliefs of why science reporting was so essential. A high school student from Pleasantville sent Sullivan a handwritten letter, dated May 20, 1965, explaining, “I am interested in astronomy and physics, and the Times is the best way I know to keep up with current developments, particularly your articles. Thank you very much.” This letter represents an example of the kind of reader feedbacks that may have edged the newspaper towards the dedication of the science section years later. The reader’s offhand emphasis on “astronomy and physics” also reflects an outside acknowledgement of reporter focus on the physical sciences.

Letter from Charles Scheiner to Walter Sullivan, May 20, 1965, Box 33, Folder 2, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.
Even by mid-decade, however, the science department still struggled for science to have a greater spot in the newspaper, regardless of discipline. On May 27, 1965 Walter Sullivan again expressed his concerns about the status of science coverage at the Times to the then-Executive Editor, Turner Catledge, this time centering his memo on the layout and space allocation to science.\textsuperscript{221} Sullivan reminded Catledge that competitors like the Herald Tribune “devote a full page to science on Sundays, whereas we do not.”\textsuperscript{222} Here, Sullivan tactically employed a competing newspaper as a reason for his supervisor to take his suggestions more seriously.

He explained to Catledge that “the chief problem, then, is to allocate, to science, space commensurate with its importance in our lives,” suggesting that “the ideal solution would be to display science and technology as the first page of a section, as is the case with other departments of comparable importance: sports, business, [and] entertainment.”\textsuperscript{223} This specification demonstrates Sullivan’s awareness of the existing editorial priorities. In closing, Sullivan emphatically pleaded, “We are in the midst of a revolution whose basis is scientific. The discoveries being made are for all time – they are not advances and retreats, the comings and goings that fill so many of our columns.”\textsuperscript{224} Regardless of Sullivan’s strong feelings, editors did not implement his proposal.

\textsuperscript{221} Memorandum from Walter Sullivan to Turner Catledge, May 27, 1965, Box 33, Folder 2, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL, p. 1. Sullivan seems to refer to the Sarasota Herald-Tribune, which Lewenstein (1987) does not reference.
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In 1965, editors finally started to implement some of the science department’s administrative and personnel-related requests. By the fall of 1965, editors began addressing the staffing concerns in a manner that seemed commensurate with the issues that Sullivan presented about the Times’ unsupportive position towards science news. On September 14, 1965, Clifton Daniel forwarded Turner Catledge a memo “for strengthening the expanding science news coverage in the New York Times as worked out yesterday in a meeting of all concerned.” These ideas included moving David Bird of the Sunday department to the science desk “as assistant science editor, a kind of chief-of-staff of the science news department under Walter Sullivan”; moving Jane Brody from Minneapolis to New York for a position “as a medical news reporter” to replace Bob Plumb; offering a job to John Wilford, then-acting Science Editor at Time to replace Richard (Dick) Witkin, who “temporarily changed his specialty” to become the Times’ “chief political reporter in New York City”; and adding a reporter to cover technology for work in the science and business departments.

Other departmental changes involved adapting the responsibilities of people who had already been covering science material. On November 26, 1965, Dr. Howard Rusk, part-time associate editor and author of a Sunday column on medicine and disability issues, was notified, “We intend to place greater emphasis than before on medical news,” and “[we] think it is important that your Sunday column coordinate
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with the work of the science news reporters, and...that there should not be any
duplication or conflict between your work and theirs.”\footnote{Unsigned letter to Howard Rusk, November 26, 1965, Box 33, Folder 2, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.}

This note clearly shows that editors at the Times wanted to emphasize medical news to an even greater extent.

At the end of 1965, James McCabe from the Business department was notified of a reorganization of the eight-person science news team, wherein the people in the department were now “administratively responsible” to the National Desk.\footnote{Memorandum from E.R.F. to James McCabe, December 9, 1965, Box 5, Folder 3, Nat’l Desk records, NYPL. I have not been able to identify whose initial ERF stand for.}

These administrative changes, especially on behalf of people who, as I have discussed, previously denied similar proposals, reflect corporate adaptations that indicate reform in how executives viewed the science department. Just a few months later, however, reporter John Osmundsen’s resignation shook up the department even further.

The numerous changes of the previous year, necessary as they may have been, were not universally recognized as sufficient. Reporter John Osmundsen’s resignation on March 28, 1966 alerted the editorial staff of the persisting need for structural change in the department’s operations. Upon his departure, Osmundsen sent a four-page resignation letter to six of the top editors at the Times, including Turner Catledge, Clifton Daniel, Theodore Bernstein, and Walter Sullivan.\footnote{Memorandum from John Osmundsen to Turner Catledge, Clifton Daniel, Theodore Bernstein, Harrison E. Salisbury, Claude Sitton, and Walter Sullivan, March 28, 1966, Box 33, Folder 2, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.} He wrote that his favorite memory was from February 1962, when a detailed, five-
column story of his was published without much unnecessary editorial oversight.

He reminisced:

I was very proud of the many letters I received from scientists, teachers, high school and college students and from just plain readers...because so many expressed their appreciation for The New York Times as probably the only newspaper in the world that would publish an important science story like that in such detail.\(^{230}\)

Dismayed, he then expressed his view that editorial changes by 1966 “appear to preclude the possibility that the important fields of science and medicine will in the foreseeable future receive the sort of coverage from The Times that they clearly deserve.”\(^{231}\) He also explained his feeling that the four science reporters at the time, who together had “more than 45 years of experience in science reporting...never had the opportunity to exchange views with the persons who make the decisions.”\(^{232}\)

Osmundsen’s opinions speak to problems for the Times’ science department at a time when editorial conversations did not yet seriously consider expanded coverage of non-medical and physical sciences. Consideration of expanding disciplinary coverage arose later in the trajectory of the Times’ science history, which will be covered in Chapter 3. Though he felt unheard prior to his leaving, Osmundsen’s letter of resignation certainly impacted the editors to whom he reported.

Walter Sullivan, who was Osmundsen’s supervisor at the time of his resignation, used this moment as an opportunity to share with the other editors his views on the current status of the science department, some of which overlapped with Osmundsen’s. The very next day after the resignation, Sullivan sent a memo

\(^{230}\) Ibid., p. 1.
\(^{231}\) Ibid., p. 2
\(^{232}\) Ibid., p. 3.
that contained various comments on the resignation and other tentative resignations, as well as proposals for moving forward. In 1966, the science department was published through and subordinate to the National Desk, and Sullivan outlined that the web of editorial input included many individuals: an outside science specialist, the Assistant Science Editor, the National News Editor, the Director of National News, and finally, editors at the National Desk. Sullivan also mentioned “the feeling of the science staff that the new importance of science is not reflected in the paper. Too often science stories of front page importance are buried back near the transportation page,” referencing the example of a story about babies born with the DDT pesticide.

Though not emphasized in the newspaper, the DDT story was extremely significant, in part because of how American government agencies like the United States Department of Agriculture had for decades widely implemented aerial DDT spraying tactics to kill American mosquitos and other insects, and, similarly, to assist global anti-malaria campaigns. This 1966 focus on pesticides followed a few years after Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring (1962), which is cited as calling attention to pressing environmental issues. Important legal environmental precedent was also
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determined in 1966 with the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals *Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference v. Federal Power Commission* decision to overrule the FPC’s attempt to block citizens’ environmental advocacy efforts. Esteemed legal scholar Paul D. Rheingold estimated in 1971 that this case “will likely be regarded as the first of the modern ecology cases.”

Sullivan closed his memo with the suggestion that “the Science Editor [take] part in the News Conference,” a move that would include the science leadership in “administrative matters.” He also recommended that editing duties for science stories primarily be left to those in the department, releasing the current editor from “the crossfire between higher editors and the science writers.” This focus on administrative issues indicates a point of tension that posed a barrier to science coverage regardless of discipline. Archival indication is not made of related subsequent alterations in the administrative processes.

Editorial conversations regarding concerns about science news also occurred between Assistant Managing Editor Theodore Bernstein and his supervisor, Managing Editor Clifton Daniel. On November 25, 1966, Bernstein suggested in a memo for Clifton Daniel that any changes implemented did not go far enough. Providing “some thoughts about where *The Times* stands and where it should go,” Bernstein charted that “The *Times* should present the world of science. In this area we have improved but not quite enough.” He qualified this criticism, noting that
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“in many instances our readers don't have enough basic knowledge to comprehend the scientific developments we offer them,” then proposing that “it may be necessary occasionally to have a sidebar giving elementary background” about topics like integrated circuits, proton accelerators, or computer functions. These comments are reminiscent of those that Clifton Daniel wrote to Bernstein three years earlier about the accessibility of science news stories. This similarity suggests that the editors did not detect a shift in the public’s understanding of physical science or technology in the interim to any notable degree that would have impacted the Times’ science coverage at present.

Henry Lieberman continued Bernstein’s logistical advocacy for science at the Times early the next year. On February 27, 1967, Lieberman, then-titled the “science news coordinator,” tried his hand at appealing to Clifton Daniel with proposals for the Times’ science coverage and department. He again proposed that “the science department be given its own space allotment in direct consultation with the bullpen,” and he also recommended that his title be changed to “science news director, and the science department be upgraded administratively and placed on a level with other departments, like financial, culture, and sports.” The response to these appeals is not documented, and his title remained stagnant for another 1.5 years.
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Later that year, Clifton Daniel reached out to Henry Lieberman with an idea for how the science department could stimulate science coverage using new sources and an investigative approach. By the end of the summer, in this curious reversal where a higher-ranked editor reached out to a lower-ranked editor about science news, Clifton Daniel suggested that the department “launch a number of investigations in various medical fields” as opposed to relying on “handouts, articles in profession publications, and speeches,” as they had in the past. This top-down re-formation of what qualified as “science news” has categorical importance because it extends the definition of “science news” beyond materials that the American Medical Association provided – an organization highlighted in Chapter One for their questionable representation of medicine-related interests. Clifton Daniel’s proposal seems to point towards a greater emphasis on investigative reporting that would move the newspaper’s science coverage towards a position less in-line with the interests of professional associations and the accompanying corporate entities.

Fast forward to 1976, when the New York Times had published a series of five articles on medical incompetence, the first of which appeared on Monday, January 26, 1976. Daniel’s suggestion predates the blowback surrounding this series that entangled the science department and the editorial staff all the way up to the publisher. An archival February 16, 1976 attachment for the Publisher, Arthur Ochs “Punch” Sulzberger, from A.M. Rosenthal, now-Managing Editor, was an “[update] on reader response to the medical series” that illustrated that, of 230 letters received,
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160 were favorable, 30 unfavorable, and 40 mixed, not including “scores of phone called from readers who liked the series.” Furthermore, “of the 30 unfavorable letters, every one was either from a doctor or someone in a ‘related’ field, i.e., pharmaceuticals, medical PR men of some kind; two were from doctors’ wives.”

In sum, this survey points to a discrepancy in how readers responded to the series, an assortment that I visualize as a Venn Diagram of sorts: readers who identified as patients versus those who identified more closely with medical providers.

Alternately phrased, the outcome of the survey suggests that readers’ perception of and response to the series categorically differed depending on the nature of their participation in the medical field. I imagine a thread through time that, working backwards, connects the survey results, the articles published in the series, editors editing the articles, writers writing drafts, and, arguably first, Clifton Daniel’s recommendations in 1967 for more investigative journalism. Seen in context, I argue that the survey’s outcome logically follows from the reporting that Daniel recommended in 1967, under two assumptions. The first assumption is that there was truth to patient grievances. The second assumption is that the critical nature of coverage on medical malpractice is not something that those same professionals would favor. Furthermore, this contrast illustrates the significance of questioning and, ideally, identifying whose interests prestigious media organizations uphold, whether by intentional choice or by consequence in the court
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of public opinion. Editors at the Times continued to value and encourage a greater focus on reporter-led stories as a departure from past practice.

Editors Regroup to Expand the Conversation

By the end of 1967, the topic of science news was broached to a wider community of newspaper editors in the Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The front page of the December edition of the magazine, titled “The Politics of Science,” posed the pull-quoted question, “Why isn’t the press more concerned with the fights and forecasts of scientific research and development?”

Daniel Greenberg, the author of that article, mused that one of the reasons that journalists had not traditionally covered the inner workings of the science world was that “as things stand, the press is having enough difficulty covering the scientific part of science. At last, a good many publications have become persuaded science is of sufficient importance to merit treatment as a separate beat by a trained reporter.”

Greenberg’s criticism of the state of science did not fall on deaf ears at the New York Times.

The response to this article prompted a conversation about the significance of layout to the newspaper's cohesion. Clifton Daniel forwarded this bulletin to A.M. Rosenthal, then-Assistant Managing Editor, with whom its messages deeply resonated. On December 4, 1967 Rosenthal remarked to Daniel, “We...are not terribly clear, it seems to me, about just what our philosophy is or should be in
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science coverage... Do we have a clear approach to science news? He further suggested that “we think about ways of grouping science news stories together and of giving more authority to the science editor in makeup and art suggestions,” citing the idea that other departments “make some of their impact simply by virtue of makeup. Scatter Women’s News or Biz-Fin [Business-Financial] or Culture throughout the paper and they all would lose significance.”

Rosenthal then diverged by suggesting that “we have to think of the possibility of opening our pages to some of the expect scientists and science writers outside The Times,” a practice that he recognized the Times often avoided but that other departments had utilized. This document is the earliest science news-related item on which Rosenthal provided insight, and his forward-thinking approach would later prove crucial to establishing the standalone section. Here, Rosenthal elevated Henry Lieberman’s proposal about unifying the Times’ science coverage, and over the years, Rosenthal continued to leverage his position of editorial power to uplift the science coverage and department.

As the end of the decade approached, calls to heighten the status of the science department had achieved a somewhat mainstream status within the newsroom. Henry Lieberman’s proposal to upgrade the science department was nearly realized, but the National department editor, Gene Roberts, expressed
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opposition and derailed the plan. On December 17, 1968, Lieberman reiterated, “What we need in the Science Department, first of all, is more attention from the top editors of *The Times*. Once this is achieved, we can better define our goals and determine what resources are required to achieve them.” Lieberman concluded that he would understand if the structure of the Science department as subordinate to the National department were maintained.

That same day, Rosenthal contacted Clifton Daniel and James Reston, informing them, “Everybody I spoke to about the suggestion for upgrading the Science Department and Henry Lieberman’s job by giving it an entity of its own, thought it was a good idea—except Gene Roberts,” the new editor of the National section, who “was concerned that this might deprive him of a tool in shaping the National report.” Though Rosenthal disagreed with this stance, he told Roberts “that as far as [he] was concerned, since he had some doubts, we could shelve the whole thing for the time being.” At the end of the memo, he recognized, “I think Henry will probably be rather disappointed. Anything that any of us can do to draw him closer into our discussions and show additional signs of how fully he is appreciated would be helpful.” Here, though national news coverage was ultimately prioritized over science coverage, Rosenthal sought to manage interpersonal dynamics while also legitimizing the science department’s interests.
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Soon after sharing that memo, Rosenthal expressed to his subordinate editors, including Lieberman, that he wanted to be kept in close contact about upcoming news plans. On December 24, 1968, Rosenthal included Lieberman in a widely-circulated memo to fourteen top-tier editors. Here, Rosenthal clarified “the process to be followed in planning for major news displays when advance time is available.” He specified that he “will attend the first planning session of the group,” which for these stories was to “consist of the departmental editor, or his deputy, a representative of the make-up desk, a picture man, and if desired, an artist,” in addition to a representative of the bullpen. These design-focused employees composed part of the team responsible for physically laying out each newspaper. Rosenthal also confirmed that he “would like to be kept informed of the progress of the work – space, preliminary designs, special plans, etc.” This enhanced role seems to be in preparation for his promotion the next year to Associate Managing Editor, in which capacity the science section saw its clearest trajectory towards prominence at the *Times*.

Early in 1969, Bernstein wrote to James Reston, then-Executive Editor, that he found the “science and technology part of today’s National Economic Review...most interesting – perhaps the most interesting,” though he also noted that
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“it had only the most tenuous connection, if any, with the state of the national economy.” Elaborating further, he thought to “consider making...a completely separate science and technology section next year,” potentially with an atypical publishing schedule, like “just before the college kids go on their Christmas vacations so the big corporations can advertise their interviewing plans and get a lot of the kinds while they are in New York.” Bernstein further claimed, “I feel sure that such an independent section would attract enough advertising to be more than self-sustaining.” Bernstein also copied Clifton Daniel and A.M. Rosenthal on this idea. Their responses are not documented, and further actions to begin a science section are not apparent, though the year does usher in a friendlier attitude towards the science department. These communications center Theodore Bernstein and A.M. Rosenthal as key editorial players in promoting a scientific emphasis, though conversations about the content of science coverage itself had begun to be lost within the larger conversation.

Just a few months later, significant commendations boosted morale in the science department regarding their coverage of biological science material. On April 16, 1969, biology Professor Gerald M. Edelman of Rockefeller University wrote to Clifton Daniel, the Managing Editor, to applaud Walter Sullivan’s reporting. On Rockefeller University-watermarked stationery, Professor Edelman lauded:
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Dear Mr. Daniel:
I am writing to you to tell you how impressed my colleagues and I were with the recent article on antibody structure by Mr. Walter Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan expressed our work clearly and at the same time with accuracy and depth, and the diagrams he used were outstanding. This level of reporting and the painstaking care with which this story was prepared are a credit to the reputation which THE NEW YORK TIMES so rightfully deserves.
Sincerely yours,
Gerald M. Edelman, Professor.  

Clifton Daniel was away when this letter was received, so Rosenthal pleasantly responded in his stead, “We are all delighted that you like the work done by Mr. Sullivan. He is a man of whom this newspaper is very proud indeed.” Rosenthal also copied Lieberman and Sullivan on this response.

Two weeks after his letter, the New York Times reported that Professor Edelman was among the 60 new members elected “in recognition of their achievements of research” to the National Academy of Sciences, “a private organization that is federally chartered and advises the government in many fields.” Two years after this interaction, in 1972, Dr. Edelman and Dr. Rodney R. Porter shared the Nobel Prize in Medicine for the antibody research on which Sullivan reported. Sullivan was again honored in June 1969 at Yale University’s Commencement. University President Kingman Brewster presented Sullivan with an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, commenting on his work, “Your reports –
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literate and lucid – have helped promote science to its rightful place on the front page of ‘all the news that’s fit to print.’”

These recognitions of Sullivan’s reporting, hardly the only such examples in the New York Times Company archives, deservedly help to elevate editors’ valuations of science coverage. Meanwhile, the praise for Sullivan’s work may have had, I believe, the unintentional consequence of centering conversations regarding science news at the newspaper on disciplines where Sullivan excelled – disciplines in the natural and physical sciences, not the social and behavioral sciences.

The conversation around social science coverage was reinvigorated later in 1969, two months after the moon landing, thanks to a strongly worded reader letter from Richard Cohen, the Associate Director of the American Jewish Congress. Cohen wrote to Rosenthal, then-Managing Editor, not about anything in his capacity with the American Jewish Congress, but rather as an attendee of the annual American Psychological Association convention in Washington, D.C. For context, in the months between January 1, 1969, and the date of Cohen’s letter, September 3, 1969, the New York Times had published 279 articles that mention the “moon,” and 49 that mention the “moon landing.” “In talking with a number of delegates,” Cohen wrote, “I was disturbed to hear articulated a suspicion I had held privately

---

270 Citation Read by Kingman Brewster, President of Yale University. Commencement – June 9, 1969: WALTER SEAGER SULLIVAN of the Class of 1940 in Yale College, Science Editor of the New York Times,” June 11, 1969, Box 8, Folder 37, Clifton Daniel papers, NYPL.

271 Letter from Richard Cohen to A.M. Rosenthal, September 3, 1969, Box 110, Folder 1, Rosenthal papers, NYPL.

272 These numbers are based on my brief analysis of the New York Times’ online search feature using these terms and the date range listed above.
for some time: that The Times’ strength in covering hard science was matched only by its weakness in covering the behavioral sciences.”

Cohen then contrasted the APA coverage with the same day’s extravagant natural science coverage. He continued with a comical comparative example of science coverage during the ongoing convention, in which “there on page 23,” on Wednesday, September 3, “was a long, interesting, and well-written story complete with three two-column photos describing in fascinating detail how a beetle clobbers its enemies by injecting a noxious chemic spray.” Cohen juxtaposed this level of coverage with that of the APA convention, where “the story...again ignored any of the papers presented or discoveries reported but limited itself to a long story about a group of black student psychologists and followed up the anti-establishment story of the previous day.” He ended his letter with candor but seriousness, concluding that “The Times is unfair to itself it seems to me and its readers by ignoring the study of man in favor of the study of insects.”

With this letter, Cohen asserted the archival material’s most authoritative voice in defense of social science and psychology coverage. Rosenthal promptly responded, “Dear Dick, That is a damn good letter and I’m grateful for it. I am going to talk it over with some of my colleagues.” True to his word, he forwarded the letter to Arthur Gelb, then-Metropolitan Editor, noting, “Here is an interesting letter
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from Dick and I think it has some good points.” These communications indicate that Richard Cohen had a repertoire with both Rosenthal and Gelb, enough to be on a first-name basis, and it was after the interactions surrounding this letter when Rosenthal began to devote greater attention to the Times' coverage of social science.

**Revisiting Psychologists at the End of the Decade**

An evaluation of how comparable news outlets treated behavioral science coverage shows us the kaleidoscopic potential of behavioral science journalism. Moving beyond Managing Editor Clifton Daniel’s 1964 categorical dismissal of “soft science” coverage and the under-the-rug treatment of Project Camelot, social science coverage in mass media gained momentum by the end of the decade. In 1969, the same year as Cohen’s criticism of New York Times coverage of psychology, Time magazine made headway in covering the behavioral sciences. The American Psychological Association’s Media Relations Office issued a statement in February 1969 recognizing Time’s new regular section called “Behavior,” writing, “Time’s editors are convinced that an increasingly sophisticated American reading public is more and more interested in what these scientists can contribute to the solution of the problems of environment and personality.” While the New York Times was the first legacy journalistic newspaper to devote the most space to science topics a decade in the future, Time magazines’ editorial decision suggests that others in the
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field moved more quickly than the *Times* to incorporate behavioral science topics into their offerings.

Yet while *Time* was able to expand their coverage to behavioral science topics, structural barriers in psychology still existed to make the dissemination of psychological material difficult. In 1969, for example, the year following the National Science Foundation’s amendment to include the social sciences into its charter document, the APA received a two-year grant to “develop a plan for a National Information System for Psychology.” This system was funded to achieve:

a) more focused distribution of information; b) decreased lag in the availability of information, c) increased bibliographic control of expanding literature, d) more and better repackaging and synthesis of existing primary and secondary information; and e) information directed toward the needs of psychologists in many diverse specialties, in many employment settings, and with many diverse practical and applied as well as fundamental research concerns.²⁸⁰

That these specific and fundamental structural issues existed within the field demonstrates logistical issues that prevented news organizations like the *New York Times* from seamlessly covering psychology topics as they did other disciplines.

William Schofield, a clinical psychologist, author, and pioneer in the field of Health Psychology and the APA division by the same name, wrote about psychology in everyday life in his 1969 report “The Role of Psychology in Health Services,” which was later published in the *American Psychologist.*²⁸¹ Schofield prepared this manuscript for the APA’s Board of Directors with the assistance of the Board of Directors, 1946-1986, Folder “Meetings - Agenda + notes, 1966-75,” APA at LoC, p. 48.

Professional Affairs. He cited the APA’s recently-revised “statement of American psychology’s professional principles” which state that “Psychology has three major purposes: to increase the body of knowledge in its content area, to communicate this knowledge, and to apply it in a socially useful and responsible manner.”\textsuperscript{282} With this example, the work of psychologists fulfills the first criteria; news coverage, if actualized, would assist with the second; and government inclusion of psychologists and psychological findings in the legislature would achieve the latter.

However, Schofield, confident in psychology’s potential, simplified and overestimated the evolution of outsiders’ opinions on psychology. Schofield continued, “It is no longer a question of fighting for a place at the table. We are accepted there. But our continued presence will demand justification in terms of our day-to-day contribution. If we wish to eat at society’s table, we must be able and willing to till society’s fields.”\textsuperscript{283} This assertion of confidence in the status of the psychologist implies an internal refocusing and reorientation towards loftier goals. There was still distance to cover before the \textit{New York Times}, and presumably other journalistic institutions, fully recognized the behavioral sciences’ contributions enough to willingly and often portray them to the public.

Over the course of the 1960s, leadership changes in the \textit{New York Times} newsroom and recurrent praise from readers about the \textit{Times’} achievements in science news prompted more supportive attitudes regarding science’s place in the newspaper. Meanwhile, archival materials suggest that the newspaper editors

\textsuperscript{282} Ibid.
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persisted in prioritizing non-social science materials, to the expressed dismay of readers like Richard Cohen. It remains unclear the precise role of the American Psychological Association in the militaristic use of psychology that emerged, but it remains unquestionable that there were people in the Association who were involved in those activities. Despite extensive government funding of psychology and other social sciences for Cold War applications, the *New York Times* did not yet view behavioral science material, especially its military applications, with the same encouragement that developed around other scientific disciplines. In this chapter, we have seen that science news at the *New York Times* did not follow a linear trajectory and that behavioral science coverage could not keep pace with that of other scientific disciplines. The next chapter explores the years immediately preceding Science Times’ 1978 dedication and the corresponding increased presence of behavioral science and psychology coverage in those conversation.
Chapter 3
Science Times: Breaking New Ground

Of all the decades covered in this thesis, the 1970s encapsulate the New York Times’ greatest tide-shift in favor of science coverage generally, and, more specifically, behavioral science coverage. Even so, this coverage did not explain to readers the military nor industrial applications of psychology research, nor did it make clear the government support for this work. With A.M. Rosenthal, the highest-ranking news editor at the Times as a powerful advocate in favor of science’s greater position in the paper, the New York Times introduced Science Times as the final weekly section in November 1978. As this chapter details, Rosenthal relied upon feedback from many reporters and editors in the science department to develop and implement this new direction. With it, the Times completed their transition to the four-part newspaper, as we know it today. While historians of the Times have credited the initiation of Science Times to Rosenthal’s 1978 activism in its favor, this chapter will detail the many other opinions that contributed – often with Rosenthal’s solicitation – to the section’s planning.

Co-incidentally, American Psychological Association materials from the 1970s also reflect a greater push towards public engagement and education about positively-framed psychological matters and developments. Following the 1968 amendment to the National Science Foundation Act, leaders in psychological research had an increasingly visible presence in government advisory positions. Historians of psychology note that the 1970s embodied a shift from the 1960s’ behavioral focus to a cognitive and social focus. Though this chapter does not focus
on the ideological developments in the decade, I consider this increasingly public presentation of psychology within the legacy of psychology’s covert military applications, which were not the elements most heartily presented to the public. I argue that this intersection of journalism, government, government-science, and psychology, while informative, shaped the public understanding of psychology in a manner that de-emphasized the militaristic and corporate applications of psychology.

Coverage in the New York Times especially highlighted the social science field in the paper on Tuesday, March 16, 1971, when Bob Reinhold “[listed] the great advances in the social sciences made during the previous four decades.”284 This article, headlined “Social Science Gains Tied To Big Teams of Scholars,” made no reference to the Department of Defense or the military, and it only made tangential reference to federal funding of social science research. It encompassed nearly a full page on page 26, with one two-column photo of Prague-based social and political scientist Dr. Karl Deutsch laughing with American physicist Dr. John Platt, as well as a four-column table with information on “Some Basic Innovations in the Social Sciences,” with material adapted from Dr. Deutsch, Dr. Platt, and Dr. Dieter Senghaas’s 1971 Science article, “Conditions Favoring Major Advances in Social Science.”

These research articles span a wide variety of social science disciplines, and the explicit psychology contributions that are mentioned include B.F. Skinner’s behaviorism (1938-1958) and “culture and personality and comparative child rearing [study of link between culture and personality],” including the work of Swiss child development psychologist Jean Piaget (1940-1960). In analyzing this study, Reinhold noted that the concentration of social science research findings came out of institutions located in six metropolitan areas: New York, Chicago, Cambridge [Massachusetts], Washington, Ann Arbor, and New Haven. These cities also happen to be locations with federally supported research centers and similarly supported educational institutions. Even so, this article dramatically underplays the government’s role in Cold War university settings, a reality that many scholars have since discussed in studies of education, including the anthology *The Fragile Contract: University Science and the Federal Government* (1994), Rebecca S. Lowen’s (1997) *Creating the Cold War University The Transformation of Stanford*, and Andrew Jewett’s (2012) *Science, Democracy, and the American University: From the Civil War to the Cold War*.

Though comprehensive, this presentation of material did not seem to satisfy Rosenthal’s push for increased social science coverage. “Henry [Lieberman]: Please do some thinking about how we can better organize and cover the behavioral sciences,” Rosenthal tersely wrote in a brief memo dated March 21, 1971, “and give me some recommendations.” Dated in March of 1971, this note temporally fits in
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right before the *New York Times*’ series of oral histories, in which Clifton Daniel and Walter Sullivan did not discuss the social and behavioral sciences. This note indicates that even though the social and behavioral sciences were not officially memorialized in the oral histories, these topics were of concern to at least one editor at the *Times* in the early 1970s.

**Continuing Without Hesitation**

The *New York Times*’ science department debuted in the journalism world in a titular 1971 *Editor & Publisher* article, headlined “At *New York Times*, science staff doesn’t work in a routine pattern.” The page 11 article rests on Henry Lieberman’s quotes, who then served as the Science News Coordinator. Lieberman stressed his view that the “science and education departments...try to take into account three separate audiences in writing any story: 1. the general public; 2. the general scientific or educational community; and 3. the specialists in a particular area.”

Rosenthal also featured in the article, and he marked his contribution with a red circle – “’A newspaper builds its reputation on several things it does well,’ he said in an interview, ‘One of them is our science writing.’” Throughout the decade, Rosenthal’s pride in the science department served as a driving force in uplifting the science coverage at the *Times*.
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The *Times’* oral histories, conducted in 1971 and granted their own collection in the archives, briefly document the challenges to regular science coverage. Fittingly, the science department’s oral history was based on a conversation between Clifton Daniel and Walter Sullivan about the then-nine person department. Sullivan, when asked about how much news space is devoted to science in daily and Sunday coverage answered hesitantly, “Well, that’s awfully hard, of course, to say, because there are some days when there are big developments, when it may be that even two full pages....And, of course, there are days, I think they’re rare, when there’s no science at all.”

Later in the interview, Sullivan explained the process of deciding what to report on: “We get, of course, a deluge of press releases from universities, from drug companies, and so forth and so on. The mail...during the height of the season, is – when you pile it up...about three feet high.” Sullivan’s comment demonstrates that universities and private companies sought to have their output publicized as part of science news offerings. This interview demonstrates the variable nature of early 1970s’ science coverage at the *Times*, as well as the chaotic terrain of figuring out which news sources deserved attention, both of which factors align with the material I presented in Chapters One and Two. Sullivan’s comment also calls to mind the news sourcing situation presented in Chapter One at the end of the 1950s, signaling that this facet of news sourcing did not drastically change in the twelve-year interim.
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Daily communications between editors Theodore Bernstein and A.M. Rosenthal over two years from the end of 1971 through 1973 also occasionally referenced science news. Each day, Bernstein sent Rosenthal detailed comments with his opinions of the day’s paper. Two years prior, Bernstein left his position as Assistant Managing Editor, which he had held from 1951 to 1969, to become the editorial director of the book division, before retiring from the *Times* in 1972 at 68 years old. All told, Bernstein’s career at the *Times* started in 1925, and Rosenthal’s in 1945, and as such, these letters illustrate a close, career-spanning professional relationship.

Among comments about font size, column layout, and any number of daily opinions, Bernstein sometimes made note of the science coverage, as on December 29, 1971, when Bernstein wrote to his colleague, “—The science coverage on page 18 can’t help but lift our prestige,” or the next day, when his comments included “—Again I liked the science coverage.” His opinions were not always laudatory, as on January 15, 1972: “—Presumably the opinion of the science dept. was solicited on the Schmeck cancer story, still I am a bit dubious about playing it on Page 1. Is it that much of a breakthrough?”

Sometimes, he even thought that Walter Sullivan erred, as on January 13, 1973: “—I must confess I was unable to understand his front pager about the protein-
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building molecule.” In that comment, he mused about what should be done with science stories that are “important (presumably)” but whose disciplines are incomprehensible for most readers, humbly concluding with “But I don’t know.”

Other times, Bernstein thought the paper did not spotlight science stories enough, as on January 26, 1972: “—Another story that I would like to have seen fronted is Tony Lewis’s ecology piece.” Bernstein, who seems to have been a fan of earth science, also agreed with the placement decisions made on June 8, 1972: “—I’m glad to see we are fronting the Stockholm environmental conference. The stories may not be sensational, but the subject is all-important.” On December 4, 1972, Bernstein offered his thoughts on his perception of a paper with lots of astronomy coverage, noting, “After yesterday’s Apollo take-out, today’s 8.5 columns is just too much. It might well give the impression we are propagandizing for the space program or trying to whip up interest in it.” Even though Abe Rosenthal held one of the highest editorial positions at the Times as its Managing Editor, Theodore Bernstein’s daily memoranda provide insight into the kind of feedback that he received and that shaped his growth.

Much less frequently per my read of the archival materials, Theodore Bernstein commented critically (just one time) about the paper’s social science coverage. On April 30, 1972, he wrote, “On Page 1 the social studies story, though
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quite interesting, is vastly overplayed. Especially since, as the story indicates, there is some dissent in educational circles, so that the new method is more like a revolt than a revolution.\textsuperscript{303} The story he questioned, written by prolific science reporter William K. Stevens, appeared in the paper on the top left corner, adjacent to a large photograph of a helicopter captioned, “NOT FOR RESCUE: Helicopter at besieged city of Anloc, 60 miles north of Saigon, is rushed by wounded South Vietnamese soldiers seeking to leave. Crew of the craft, which had brought in fresh troops, forced many men off.”\textsuperscript{304} Stevens’ article, boldly headlined “The Social Studies: A Revolution Is On,” detailed a new high school pedagogy in social sciences that prioritized the creation of new knowledge over the rote recitation of names and dates of education from previous decades.\textsuperscript{305} Excerpts from the article are below:

History tended to focus on a chronology of political events, accenting such values as democracy, the work ethic, rugged individualism and the pioneer spirit. Its preoccupation was with the American saga and the Western tradition behind it...The new approach is questioning and skeptical. It attempts to get beneath familiar events to fundamental processes and conflicts. It gives greater attention to minority groups and non-Western man, and incorporates whole new dimensions of anthropology, sociology and psychology. And it seeks to put formal studies more closely in tune with the world outside the classroom, sometimes using the community itself as a laboratory...But in breaking out of traditional molds, the practitioners of the New Social Studies have set off fundamental debates over values. There are political conservatives who are adamant that sex, communism and racial conflict should not be examined in the classroom.\textsuperscript{306}
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Though Bernstein personally estimated that the story received too much attention, the story happened upon a phenomenon that scholars of pedagogical practices have since noted with reference to pedagogical reform and development.307

Bernstein’s career and regular communications with Rosenthal also employ concepts about media messaging that G.D. Wiebe (1973) explored in “Mass Media and Man’s Relationship to His Environment,” an article that I found in the American Psychological Association’s Departmental Offices Files for the Scientific Affairs Office. On receiving media communications, Wiebe noted:

Mediated messages are plucked out of the simultaneous multiplicity of the sender’s scene and sent, stripped of their contextual fullness, into other people’s scenes. The receiver cannot argue or contribute or modify or clarify. While mediated communication enriches fantasy and multiplies information, it consigns the receiver to the role of observer. He is excluded from participation in the becoming of things.308

Bernstein, who made his career in news production, now received his news like a layperson, relegated to an after-the-fact communication strategy like Wiebe’s “observer.”

Zimbardo Makes Headlines

One particularly notable strand of interactions that link psychological research and the New York Times begins with in a 1973 feature on schizophrenia

research. With this emphasis, public exposure to the field of psychology centered on extremes of mental health that focused on a particular subgroup of people. The feature in question was a text-heavy, full-column article on schizophrenia, based on Dr. David L. Rosenhan’s 1973 research at Stanford that was published in *Science*. Dr. Rosenhan’s original work, “On Being Sane in Insane Places,” involved eight research participants, the doctor included, enrolling in twelve different psychiatric hospitals and acting as “pseudopatients.” Rosenhan’s experience, and those of the study participants, who were ultimately discharged with diagnoses of “schizophrenia in remission,” led Rosenhan to draw conclusions about patient-damaging consequences that stem from the circumstances of institutionalization.

A few months later, *New York Times Magazine* referenced Rosenhan’s research in an extensive spread on Philip Zimbardo’s now-famous Stanford Prison Experiment. Authored by Zimbardo himself, the *Magazine* devoted a 22-page spread to Zimbardo’s work, thirteen pages of which mostly contained text, while the others were devoted to a series of advertisements for clothing and travel companies. Zimbardo’s reference to Dr. Rosenhan, five paragraphs before the end of the article, was brief and laudatory, reflecting an acceptance of Rosenhan’s respected work. Dr. Rosenhan was again included in a *New York Times* article on the first page of a *Science Times* section from July 14, 1981, headlined “Why Do Some People Turn
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Away from Others in Trouble?” The repeated references to this psychologist and the promotion of his work demonstrate a pattern in the kinds of exposure to psychology that could be found in the *New York Times* in the period at hand.

In addition to his being a prolific researcher whose work sparked interest from the general public and debate amongst the research community, Rosenhan held various memberships and positions in professional organizations. One year after the 1981 *New York Times* article, Rosenhan served as the President of the American Psychological Association’s “Psychology and the Law” Society, an organization that was renamed, as it is currently named, the American Psychology-Law Society. Later in his career, Dr. Rosenhan also served as a Professor at Stanford Law School, indicating that his teachings may have contributed some influence in the lives and careers of those who later took part in the law-making process. The recurrent exposure to Dr. Rosenhan’s work and the fact of the Dr. Rosenhan’s professional connections illustrate a connection between the news about which the public learned about and the work conducted from those connected to professional associations.

Beyond the feature in the *Times*, Zimbardo received lots of other publicity for his research as well. Zimbardo’s experiment involved a simulation of a prison environment built in a Stanford University building basement, and the experiment was cut short following escalations of violence. The experiment also prompted a
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series of ethical debates among social scientists and others, on which Zimbardo commented in 1976:

The ethical point is legitimate insofar as who are you, as an experimenter, to give a person that kind of information about oneself. But my feeling is that that's the most valuable kind of information that you can have - and that certainly a society needs it.  

Ethical controversy notwithstanding, the Zimbardo experiment received a vast amount of news coverage. An internal document on the “Assessment of Dispersion of Information” that Zimbardo compiled for the American Psychological Association’s 1973 Majorca Conference on International Social Psychology indicates a wide variety of news promotion efforts that the study received in the years surrounding its publication. Some of these sources included 175 “phone calls to office regarding details of study”; the aforementioned “popular publication of article in New York Times Magazine”; a “featured story in Life magazine” on October 15, 1971; “newspaper accounts including editorials...in over 100 newspapers”; “publication in Congressional Report of statement about the study and its implications following presentation to House of Representatives Subcommittee on corrections”; as well as numerous speaking engagements and TV coverage, like a “20-minute feature on NBC Chronolog (Nov. 1972) to audience of 3 million.” This multifaceted deluge of news coverage signifies a substantial, long-term effort to use a variety of media channels to educate the public on Zimbardo’s research.
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The Zimbardo study was published just a few years after Bob Reinhold’s *New York Times* review on twentieth-century social science research. Prolific news coverage of the Zimbardo experiment should be considered in light of the media environment that provided audiences with otherwise limited access to social science stories. I would again like to remind the reader about the Cold War applications of psychological research that did not receive widespread publicity. Within that media framework, each instance of psychology or other social science coverage may have had an elevated role in framing the news consumers’ view of the discipline, a phenomenon that centers both quality and quantity of the news offerings. This framing is particularly notable when considering the multitude of research activity that occurred without public awareness.

Organizations like the *New York Times* were not alone in understanding the value of publicity. Local psychological associations like the Virginia Psychological Association (VPA) also considered the importance of public education on psychological matters. Handwritten planning minutes from the VPA’s Publicity Committee on April 23, 1971 arranged:

> We are going to strive for development of radio and/or television spot programs around the state on psychology and its many aspects and specialties and contributions to the public welfare and growth...Again this is in keeping with our need to develop more public spirited, dynamic communication of the knowledge, research efforts, and expertise we have and need not be shy about sharing.  
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This local organization illustrates a microcosm of one kind of publicity that psychologists were after and, in this case, actuated for themselves. These decisions suggest that, entering the 1970s, psychologists directed their attention towards a widening variety of media outlets.

Editors Reappraise Science News

Back in the New York Times newsroom, reporters and editors remained concerned about the science news' status. John Noble Wilford, a science reporter and the Science News Director, involved himself in the evolving science news process on May 14, 1975 when he circulated a six-page memo to his editors about ideas for science coverage and where the team could devote more attention.318 Wilford sent the memo directly to Rosenthal and also distributed it to Assistant Managing Editors Peter Millones and Seymour Topping and National Editor David R. Jones.

Wilford first outlined how the eight-person team contained three “General Assignment” reporters, two “Medicine” specialists, one “Technology” specialist, his assistant (“the Assistant to the science news director”), and himself.319 All but one of these reporters worked in the New York office, and Wilford “recommend[ed] that we restore the two-person science staff at the Washington Bureau” because the “volume of science-related news there is higher than ever,” given that Washington is the city with “the headquarters for many big agencies of science.”320 In addition to
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advocating for more personnel, he reflected on the coverage most often produced and where he saw science coverage headed:

But we have seldom made it a point to let the reader in on the process of science—how it is done; how scientists get their ideas and test them; the motivations and pressures and frustrations and satisfactions of scientists doing their work; the fact that science is not some other-worldly, hocus-pocus pursuit but a living, breathing, dynamic, fascinating part of our culture, often plain and commonsensical, often exquisite in conception and elegant in execution, always an expression of the human desire to know.321

He then described each reporter’s idea for how to go about this work, and their ideas spanned disciplines from physics to biochemistry to genetics to ecology, leading Wilford to conclude, “As you can see, the possibilities are as varied as the science itself...To do these stories right will take space.”322

One example he provided was Jane Brody’s idea to “tell in narrative form” the story of Dr. Wendell Roelofs, an “entomologist at the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva, New York” conducting work to “control...pests without heavy spraying.”323 Brody’s story, “Sex and Chemistry Join Fight on Apple Moth,” appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, May 27, 1975, across the top of page 31, interrupted with a thin text box: “Scientists at Work: This is the first in a series of articles describing the creative process of scientific research.”324 Eight years after Daniel Greenberg’s “Politics of Science” article, the Times implemented the idea into its pages.
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By the mid-1970s, A.M. Rosenthal reminded the science staff that they were not alone in their efforts to report on science news. On December 17, 1975, Rosenthal sent Wilford an eye-catching yellow slip:

Just FYI, a couple of people pointed out to me that the L.A. Times has beefed up its science coverage. Here are some clips I am passing on to you. I am not suggesting that we should have had or did not have these stories, but simply alerting you to another competitor in the field.325

This letter was the first indication of Rosenthal’s direct acknowledgement that the science coverage put the New York Times in a competitive position. Henceforth, Rosenthal used the economic potential of the section to appeal to his colleagues on the Company side of the newspaper.

Around the same time, Rosenthal recalled the social science coverage from 1971 and wrote to Wilford, “I would like to see us do a piece now on what social science research efforts are taking place while, in the opinion of those who are knowledgeable, will have a major impact when viewed from the prospective of history 20 or 30 years hence.”326 In 2019, at the time of this writing, we are now 44 years into the future to which Rosenthal called attention. Though I do not currently know what the updated edition article detailed, Reinhold was rather on the mark about the notable social science disciplines that stood the test of time, at least in the public eye.

I found scant archival material regarding the science section through 1975 and 1976, and little to none that related specifically to social sciences and
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psychology. In 1977, however, editors again considered science coverage in the determinations about what would be the fifth daily section on Tuesdays. As chroniclers of the *Times* like Edwin Diamond have noted, Fashion and Science competed for the Tuesday allotment.\(^{327}\) Hefty advertising potential for the Fashion section earned Fashion Walter Mattson’s support, creating a standoff between Walter Mattson, president of the New York Times Company and Rosenthal, then-Executive Editor, who wanted a Science section.\(^{328}\) Rosenthal also spoke on behalf of other news editors who shared his interest in pushing for science to win that battle.\(^{329}\) It is important to note here that personal technology products and their related advertising did not yet exist as we know it today, because the technological processes that enabled these later devices was still in development, albeit the later stages.

**The American Psychological Association Strategizes Media Relations**

Meanwhile, the APA continued to grapple with how to best introduce the wider public to the field of psychology. The APA established their Public Information Office in 1974. In March 1977, Mona Marie Olean, a Public Information Officer at that office put together a report entitled “Communicating With the Public Via the Media About Psychology.”\(^{330}\) Olean cited various statistics that demonstrated the “increasing popularity of psychology in the media,” including how
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the number of reporters registered in the Convention Press Room at the APA Convention went from 36 in 1974 to 80 in 1975 and 151 in 1976, an almost 24% increase in three years. She also noted a notable increase in reporter requests for convention papers and abstracts from 1,446 requests in 1975 to 4,683 in 1976. Olean further commented, “The increasing popularity of psychology in the media is viewed as a mixed blessing by many members of the APA who object to the misrepresentations, distortions, and the reliance on ‘pop psychology’ by the press.” This use of “pop psychology” mirrors that of the New York Times, indicating that both organizations sought to avoid information that would seemingly dilute the other work that their networks produced.

The report continued, “One of the best ways to stimulate media coverage of a conference, convention, or a one-day meeting is to provide facilities for the press,” examples of which could be as “elaborate as a three-room suite staffed by seven” or “as simple as a small hotel room or desk, located outside the meeting room, staffed by one person.” The report also specified that between 10am and 1pm was the “most successful” time for a press conference because that timing “allows the attending reporters plenty of time to meet late afternoon copy deadlines for evening newspapers and the 6pm local TV and radio newscasts.” This report exemplifies the effort that the APA put forth to guide and influence the public’s exposure to psychology as a field. and these kinds of policy proposals were likely actuated during
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the kinds of press conferences to which reporters from the *New York Times* were invited.

The increased public attention towards psychology, while notable, did not adequately reflect the large scope of work that researchers conducted, nor does the attention imply a uniformity in psychologists’ daily employment. Psychologists’ pay scales indicate one metric of psychologists’ disparate career experiences. The appendix to Olean’s 1977 report noted that “industrial and organizational consulting psychologists tend to have the highest incomes, as a subgroup, [while] psychologists in public service settings and in academia tend to have the lowest,” despite the “large” size of the “latter two groups.”

Proportionally, as of 1977, seven percent of APA members were distributed in the “Engineering, Industrial, and Organizational” subfield of psychology, while “Colleges and Universities” employed 47 percent, nine percent worked in schools, eighteen percent in Hospitals and Clinics, four percent in government agencies, seven percent in Industry and Business, and two percent in “research establishments.” This distribution speaks to the incomplete pretenses that may be established when attempting to succinctly present a diverse discipline, like psychology.

**Making Space: Science’s Gaining a Section**

Rosenthal first posed his ideas about science coverage to the *New York Times*’s business executives at the outset of 1977. On January 11, Rosenthal sent a
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Confidential, six-page memo simply titled “On Tuesdays” to the publisher, Arthur Ochs “Punch” Sulzberger, and Walter E. Mattson. Rosenthal excitedly presented the opportunities for a new science and health section as “the final piece of the mosaic that will result truly in the New York Times – the regular Times, plus a five-day-a-week separate business section, plus the complete range of the special Third Sections.” Rosenthal emphasized this section as “our opportunity to break new journalistic ground,” further noting, “I have a strong hunch indeed that this is what our readership and the journalistic community except of us. Happily...[that] seems to coincide with the interests of the kind of reader we are after.” After delving into potential topics that such a section would cover, Rosenthal summarized the administrative components of his proposal, which included comments on the section’s space, advertising, organization, and timing, before signing off, “Upwards and onwards.”

By initially engaging the executives typically uninvolved in regular communications about science news and advocating for a financially risky proposal, Rosenthal internally elevated the image of science coverage and began a conversation that preceded the dedication of the science section. It should certainly be noted that these efforts consisted of a small part of the work that Rosenthal did in a typical day. I consulted his records related to “science news,” but there are boxes upon boxes at the New York Public Library that contain records of his daily conversations and responsibilities. Similarly, I find it curious that the higher-level

---

339 Ibid.  
340 Ibid.
editors were so uninvolved in setting the agenda for science coverage, especially given the connections that science had to government agencies and funding avenues.

Shortly after Rosenthal’s appeal to Sulzberger and Mattson, editorial conversations about psychology coverage expanded to include ideas for more reporter-initiated stories. On February 7, 1977, James Greenfield, then-Assistant Managing Editor, wrote to Arthur Gelb a detailed memo with the plans for six psychology-related stories that two reporters were to handle. These reporter-motivated stories tangentially related to psychology concerns, like “the psychology of apartments – how much, lights, and furniture arrangement can help people relate to each other more warmly” and “noise-what is the emotional cost of living near an airport or expressway or, for that matter, on Third Avenue?”

This motion to increase coverage of psychology topics was not centered on research that was happening in the field, thus adding dimension to, or complicating, the presentation of psychology to the public. Jonathan L. Freedman wrote the city-living article that seemingly came out of Greenfield’s aforementioned suggestion. Published on Monday, July 25, 1977 on page 15, Freedman ultimately included reference to various disciplines within the social sciences. A few pages after Freedman’s article, readers could find the rest of Walter Sullivan’s article “Scientists
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Fear Heavy Use of Coal May Bring Averse Shift in Climate,” a snippet from which appeared on the front page.\textsuperscript{344}

The front-page prioritizing of environmental science topics and inner inclusion of social science work showcases the Times’ behind-the-scenes focus on science coverage, especially as talks to dedicate a Science section were underway. This kind of coverage may be considered as the “Reporter-Initiated (Feature, Analysis)” articles that composed 5.7\% of the origin of health-related stories in the 1970s, up from just 1.5\% of the health-related stories in the 1960s, per Hallin, Briggs, and Brandt’s survey of health-related articles from the New York Times and Chicago Tribune.\textsuperscript{345}

Rosenthal did not tell the science department about his plans for the science section until the fall of 1977. The archival files do not contain Rosenthal’s appeal to reporters for suggestions, but the archives do contain their responses. To no one’s surprise, the proposal to begin a science section thrilled Hank Lieberman, John Wilford, and Walter Sullivan. Liberman responded to Rosenthal’s proposal with a seven-page commentary.\textsuperscript{346} He included comments on material for the proposed section to cover, its direction and focus, its related costs, and more. At the very end, Lieberman mentioned potential issues, where “one of the most important involves

\begin{footnotesize}
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assuring good daily coverage of science while putting out a separate section” and “harmonizing what we do with what the Sunday Department does.”347 Wilford, too, “applaud[ed] the idea of a science-related section as a logical and valuable extension of The Times’ traditional commitment to science coverage.”348 Sullivan, “to avoid being influenced by John’s response,” drafted his own, but then read Wilford’s and realized that “there is so much duplication...that I am rewriting it to avoid repetition.”349

Amongst other suggestions, Sullivan opined that a medical series could “carry takeouts on where we stand in the fight against some major disease,” providing examples like cancer, arteriosclerosis, epilepsy, and gonorrhea.350 Boyce Rensberger, another science reporter, “suspected that a science section would have substantial appeal to younger readers.”351 Virginia Adams’ response focused on how the new section could prioritize “mental health and related fields,”352 and the National News Desk identified four main areas that the section should cover: “human behavior, health, the world around us, and intellectual affairs.”353 Altogether, Rosenthal collected over 30 pages of advice from reporters and editors about their thoughts for such a section. Despite all of this assistance, the
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introduction of Science Times has often been framed in histories of the Times solely as a product of A.M. Rosenthal’s contributions.

Many of these reporters also included behavioral science topics in their suggestions for the proposed science section. Hank Lieberman, for example, thought that, though “the whole field of behavior, embracing psychology, psychiatry, sociology, and anthropology, is strewn with journalistic booby traps” due to frequent theories and counter-theories, but “this does not mean...that we should ignore behavior. Quite the opposite. Hard-boiled though we have to be... we should pay more attention to the solid findings in the behavioral science and concern ourselves more with the issue and debate element” in those fields.”354 Lieberman identified that the field of “behavior” deserved greater attention and a nuanced toolset that differed from that with which science reporters covered the natural sciences.

About a week later, John Noble Wilford proposed a “behavior (Human Nature)” column to “explore the area of psychology, psychiatry, personal relations, etc.”355 Wilford also noted the challenges of such coverage, continuing that “[w]e must be careful here not to turn this into a forum for ‘pop psychology,’ much of which is faddish and potentially embarrassing for a serious newspaper.”356 As mentioned above, the National News Desk specified four areas of coverage for the science section, one of which was a “human behavior” section that deals with “sexual
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relations...; personal relations going beyond sex, including psychology, psychiatry, and sociology; and child development, where significant changes are taking place in thinking.”

Like Wilford, the National Desk warned that “while the section would be aimed at the lay reader, we cannot lapse into pop psychology or pop science without damaging our reputation.” To avoid this outcome, they emphasized, “We would have to increase our staff, and perhaps in a significant way, to do this job to true Times standards.” Reporters’ and editors’ recurrent usage of the term “behavior” to describe this social science material potentially reflects their familiarity with the terminology associated with the Ford Foundation and related funding associations, as discussed in Chapter 1.

These references to “pop psychology,” where “pop” is short for “popular,” seem to reflect a judgement-laden view of the discipline. The connection between avoiding the “pop science” label and hiring new personnel provokes consideration about how newspapers, driven in part by economic incentives, determine what to publish. As I discussed, primarily in Chapters One and Two, there was no shortage of significant psychological research on which to educate the public. However, if the executives felt hesitant to hire new employees because they did not want to incur new expenses, readers of the Times would not learn about the significant research developments. Likewise, the business side of the newspaper involved a host of employees at the New York Times Company who had been largely uninvolved in
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discussions about scientific content, aside from when Rosenthal wrote to loop the executive business managers into these conversations.

Furthermore, this widespread acknowledgment that a future section consider and improve upon behavioral science coverage reflects that the reporters and editors recognized that behavioral sciences had been lacking. Given the editors’ “gatekeeper” status and the Times’ large readership, proposing behavioral science material began a chain of events that had the potential to influence hundreds of thousands of readers.

At the time, male reporters and editors composed the majority of the science department and the newsroom as a whole. In this environment, the archival materials indicate a subtle but notable influence of gender seeming to underscore interest in psychology coverage beyond what I presented earlier. Virginia Adams, in a seven-page response to A.M. Rosenthal’s inquiry, prefaced her work, “In what follows, I’m going to concentrate on the behavioral sciences, because that’s what I know.” Here, Adams elaborated on a wide variety of potential topics, like “Work and Leisure,” “The Conference Circuit,” and “Controversy,” on all of which Rosenthal annotated his approval.

Later in her list, Adams listed “Research notes,” suggesting that Adams’ focus on behavioral science topics did not place as high an emphasis on research material. The aforementioned statistics also demonstrate how reporter-initiated material featured more prominently than material sourced from researchers. Jane Brody,
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another prolific writer who has worked at the *Times* for decades, also prioritized behavioral topics, beginning her recommendations with “Personal health” and “Behavior columns.”  

Briefly skipping to post-Science Times coverage, about a year later, on August 25, 1980, a staffing summary of the Science Times wrote that of the two women on the eight person team, “the bulk of Dava Sobel’s time has been devoted to behavioral subjects.”  

From the report, it seems that, though writers of both genders proposed behavioral material, female reporters were more likely to actually write it. Less than a month later, Gelb wrote to Rosenthal to request that Sobel be allowed to begin an investigative piece on a mental hospital, a series that began on November 3, 1980 and was published on November 24.  

Rosenthal gathered all of this input and put together a second proposal for Punch Sulzberger, though the archives do not contain this one. At the start of 1978, Sulzberger sent back, “Abe, I am very intrigued with your Tuesday suggestions, but have some serious reservations as to the viability of such a section. I don’t think I can go beyond this right now until I get some feedback from Walter [Mattson] on his business perceptions,” then commenting that Rosenthal should put together a separate budget for this project.  

This response did not deter Rosenthal, who clarified in a later memo, “Punch, I certainly do want everything we do to be economically viable. I hope the Tuesday
section, by itself, can be shown to be economically profitable.” The Newspaper Advertising Bureau validated Rosenthal’s hopeful beliefs when they sent over a research memo titled “Readership and Coverage of Science and Technology in Newspapers.” Researchers based this report on a comprehensive survey of in-home interviews from March 1977 with 3,048 adults whose responses were coded “to obtain new information on the relative levels of interest and importance attached to specific editorial items appearing in daily newspapers during the survey period,” among other goals.

In black ink, Rosenthal underlined the report’s conclusion that “the problems for newspaper editors appears to be a matter of underestimating public interest in science rather than poor judgment about what kinds of science items would appeal to readers.” Rosenthal forwarded the report to Punch, Mattson (then-Executive Vice President), John D. Pomfret (then-Senior Vice President), Donald A. Nizen (then-Vice President), and Fred D. Thompson (then-Vice President), emphasizing, “I think this report speaks for itself as to what circulation and promotion support Science Times merits. We have a winner on our hands and I urge that this be recognized.” Again, Rosenthal here pushed forward his faith in science news, engaging even more people in the conversation.
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The science department continued to prepare for their standalone section. In the spring months, two more reporters sent belated replies to Rosenthal’s initial request for advice. Then, on Tuesday, November 13, 1978, the skyline announced: “Starting Today, Science Times, a New Tuesday Section, in Part C.” However, the scrutiny and feedback certainly did not end with the initiation of Science Times in November 1978. Reporters and editors continued to detail their feedback for their employees, and readers sent in more mail, both congratulatory and critical. The task was no longer to convince the higher-ups of the importance of science, but rather to make certain that capable and productive reporters staffed the department. Furthermore, the challenge was still, as it was before Science Times, that the topics covered continued to be at the cutting edges of science and journalism.

The mounting focus on the potential contributions of behavioral science coverage did not slow after the premiere of Science Times. William Connolly, a member of the National News desk, wrote to Rosenthal on November 26, 1978 about content that the science section should include, advising:

Pay serious attention to articles on human behavior...Not advice to the lovelorn or how to win friends, but informed, sophisticated coverage of what researchers are learning about to the complex and perverse human mind. If a modicum of care is taken to avoid jargon in such stories, to make them accessible to the average intelligent reader, they can hardly avoid being fascinating.

Reporters and editors continued to advocate and implement this approach. During the spring of March 1979, Harold Schmeck, in a motion to be named Science
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department editor, wrote to Arthur Gelb that the replacement for reporter Boyce Rensberger “should be stationed in New York and should cover psychology, psychiatry, behavior, anthropology, archeology, and brain research... Altogether, it could be one of the most exciting beats on the newspaper.”

Rosenthal, having been promoted to Executive Editor, reflected and commented on the behavioral coverage during the summer of that same year. He wrote to Arthur Gelb and Bill Stockton on June 19, 1979 with various comments on the direction of the section, “Also, in our interest in getting behavioral material, let’s make sure that it really has a scientific approach or feel.” This concern with keeping the science section hard-hitting and serious followed the same pattern as earlier years, seemingly demonstrating that attitudes displayed towards the behavioral sciences were resistant to change during the many decades that the Times reported on science. Rosenthal reiterated these beliefs during the summer of 1982 as he reflected on the work that the science section had put out, observing:

> It’s a pretty obvious paradox that the better our coverage gets in any given area, the easier it is to spot what still remains to be done. But it seems to me we are still lacking in two areas – one we have discussed many times: 1) Psychological, psychoanalytical, and other behavior sciences...We simply have to keep pushing in this area.

Arthur Gelb, Philip Boffey, Richard Flaste, John Noble Wilford, and Walter Sullivan received this memo, the tone of which was more strongly reflective of a desire to implement change. This yearning comment, four years after the introduction of the
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Science Times section, indicates that even though editors did not initially prioritize social science coverage, this issue’s perennial relevance enabled future redirections to build on earlier mistakes.

While the New York Times debated how to incorporate behavioral science material into their coverage in the year after Science Times, the American Psychological Association prepared for their 1979 Convention. Within these many planning documents, the meeting minutes for one project contain reference to psychology’s corporate applications. The Task Force to Coordinate the Commemoration of Early Psychology Laboratories in August 1978 discussed plans for a roving historical exhibition. The minutes recorded, “The Task Force suggested that Doug Bray, of Bell Labs, be contacted about possible AT&T sponsorship of such an exhibit.” This note implies a connection between an individual psychologist, Bell Labs, and a corporate entity like AT&T.

A deeper look into Douglas W. Bray explains why he was considered as a helpful resource. Bray, educated in abnormal psychology, was drafted into WWII, “[winding] up in Psychological Research Project (Radar),” which he recalls as a “very impressive program with its emphasis on behavioral evaluations and practice applications” that led him to choose a professional path as an applied psychologist. In an autobiographical essay, Bray referred to the monopolized “Bell System” as one
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of three “major circumstances combined to support a highly rewarding career and a fulfilled life,” writing:

The first of these [circumstances] was the vast arena for human resources research and practice afforded by the Bell System. With one million employees, a well-developed college graduate recruiting system, and an up-from-within system of filling higher level jobs, there was no shortage of research opportunities or participants. There was also a readiness to support research, nurtured perhaps by the fact that communications technology rested on the research of the Bell Telephone Laboratories.376

Bray, from 1971 to 1972, served as the President of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, which was Division 14 of the APA and Organizational Affiliate of the Association for Psychological Science.377 His other professional offices included serving as the chair of the APA” Ethics Committee and President of the Board of Directors of the American Board of Professional Psychology.378 Bray also specified in the autobiographical essay:

During the 1960s, we had many visitors at AT&T seeking to learn about management assessment centers. A few of them later started the process in their own organizations. One of these was William C. Byharn of J.C. Penney in New York. I saw Bill from time to time at professional meetings, particularly since we were both active in the New York State Psychological Association.”379

Bray’s professional and employment affiliations further elucidate the myriad ways that there were connections between the corporate sector and psychological circles – few of which readers could easily learn about in mainstream press.
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Meanwhile, the successful diversification of the science section continued into the 1980s. Rosenthal's high esteem of the science section's diversity is apparent in a 1983 memo he sent to the science department. On May 3, 1983, Rosenthal asserted:

The science staff and the Science Times are a couple apples of our eyes, as I hope you all know. If it weren't for the vast distance of geography that separates the third and fourth floors, I'd be there more often to say so in person. The occasion of this note is to thank you all, reporters and editors and designers for a great Science Times edition this week.\(^\text{380}\)

The issue of Science Times that Rosenthal lauded included front-page articles on the link between sex hormones and heart disease; Lucy, the human ancestor; and a three-column, half-page feature on “Building a Robot: The Crash Course.”\(^\text{381}\) As such, Rosenthal expressed his greatest archivally documented support for Science Times when the section included a multidisciplinary arrangement of articles. This high praise, coming from the highest-ranking news editor at the paper, exemplifies Rosenthal’s belief that the New York Times should represent a diverse cross-section of disciplines.

However, earlier fears about social science coverage devolving into “pop psychology” also did not cease with the introduction of Science Times. On May 22, 1984, foreign correspondent Craig R. Whitney expressed displeasure with a Science Time issue that contained articles spanning a variety of disciplines. The section included front-page stories about an eclipse of the sun, human emotion, and a

\(^{380}\) Memorandum from A.M Rosenthal to Science Staff, May 3, 1983, Box 110, Folder 2, Rosenthal papers, NYPL.

widely-attended American Association of the Advancement of Science meeting, as well as inner-page stories on motion sickness, Galapagos preservation, and “scientists emerging as social activists.”

Whitney wrote to Rosenthal, “In recent months... it seems to me that the section has been skewed a little bit away from the news -- it is beginning to read a bit like a sort of pop-psychology magazine, in fact....I wonder whether we’re pressing hard enough to find out what the breaking news in science is.” Given the other articles’ subjects, this disapproving comment seems to reference Goleman’s article about emotions. Whitney’s comment speaks to the staying power of the “pop psychology” trope.

Reader concerns about psychology material also appear in the mid 1980s. Later in 1984, Science Times published an article by Daniel Goleman about schizophrenia, and it generated substantial commentary. Steven King, M.D., a psychiatrist and student at Columbia’s School of Journalism, wrote to Richard Flaste, Director of Science News, and copied his message to A.M. Rosenthal. Dr. King expressed his frustrations with the way that the Times had dealt with topics in mental health, providing the schizophrenia article as an example. In his view, this article “presented a very skewed view of current research in schizophrenia.” In addition to criticizing the December 11 article, Dr. King asserted that this reporting was part of a pattern in which the Times had:

---

383 Memorandum from Craig R. Whitney to A.M. Rosenthal, May 23, 1984, Box 110, Folder 2, Rosenthal papers.
384 Letter from Steven King, M.D. to Richard Flaste, copied to A.M. Rosenthal, December 18, 1984, Box 109, Folder 27, Rosenthal papers, NYPL.
consistently ignored a massive amount of new and fascinating information about the field while publishing rehashes of old controversies. I am curious as to whether this is due to a lack of awareness or understanding of the importance of this new material or to a belief that it is not newsworthy.  

The beliefs expressed in this letter rather closely resemble Richard Cohen’s comments in his 1969. This similarity indicates that at least two industry insiders’ opinions of the Times’ science coverage remained markedly stable over the 15 year period of time and the implementation of the Science Times section in the interim. This continuity suggests that, despite editors’ concerted efforts to remedy problems that arose, there was still a mismatch of intent and execution between the newspaper and professionally-associated people in the discipline.

Richard Flaste earnestly addressed Dr. King’s forthright critique. In an internal response to the letter, Flaste wrote to Rosenthal:

It all reminds me of what a difficult and nasty beat behavior is. There much be a dozen important fields within this one field - from analysis and neuropsychiatry to the cognitive, social, and behavioral psychologies. Each domain has its influential practitioners who often seem to be largely ignorant and mostly disdainful of what the folks in the other areas of behavior are doing.

This clarification of what he viewed as “behavior” was one of the first such direct explications of this umbrella term in the archival materials. Furthermore, prior to his work with the New York Times, Richard Flaste received a Master’s in Psychology, and he claimed to have witnessed these arguments firsthand, recalling feeling:

dumbstruck by the real hatred the behaviorists held for what they saw as the weak-minded analysts; it’s a hatred that is often reciprocated, of course, despite efforts at detente. The trust is that they all have beautiful and insightful things to say, even if they don’t listen to each other.
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This level of awareness from someone who was importantly positioned within the science news at the Times suggests that the newspaper was positioned to continue in the direction of promoting a wide variety of disciplines.

In contrast to Dr. King’s and Richard Flaste’s comments, other readers reacted positively towards the schizophrenia articles. Rosenthal excitedly wrote to the publisher, Arthur Ochs “Punch” Sulzberger, that “We have been getting scores of these [complimentary] letters. I think the series is a great public service, and is a contender for next year’s laurels. It is being reprinted by mental health organizations.” Rosenthal attached this concise note to a letter of gratitude addressed to Senator Pete Domenici (R) of New Mexico, thanking him for an earlier letter:

Dear Senator Domenici,
Thank you very much indeed for your letter about our series on Schizophrenia. It was terribly good of you to write, and we are grateful to you for including the series into the Congressional Record. We agree with you that the subject of mental health is extraordinarily important. We have heard from people around the country that the series was of some value, and if that is the case, that is reward enough. Thank you again for taking the time and trouble to write.
Sincerely,
A.M. Rosenthal.

This letter demonstrates that not only did readers appreciate the series, but also that the members of the government believed that this work merited recognition. At the time of his writing, Senator Domenici served in the Senate during President Reagan’s fifth and six years. Senator Domenici served alongside Senators Mitch
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McConnell of Kentucky and John Kerry (elected just two years before), Chuck Grassley of Iowa (six years into his tenure), Orrin Hatch of Utah (ten years into his tenure), Patrick Leahy of Vermont (12 year into his tenure), Joe Biden of Delaware (13 years into his tenure), and, from Massachusetts, the late Ted Kennedy (24 years into his tenure). As such, this senatorial recognition came at a time when men who controlled the levers of power were some of the same people who currently hold positions of power.

While there was increased attention devoted to behavioral science and psychology coverage in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the ideas for this coverage did not facilitate a holistic understanding of psychology as a discipline that, among its many positive achievements and applications, also has a legacy of contributing to militaristic and corporate endeavors. By weaving a pre-digital journalistic history through science and government-related spheres of influence and activity, a fuller picture depicting the areas of mid-century awareness and ignorance emerges.

In sum, social science coverage was proposed and swiftly dismissed in the early 1960s, less than a year before non-New York Times news surfaced about Project Camelot, a massive, imperialistic, interventionist Latin American-based social science endeavor, causing a public outcry over military applications of behavioral science research. Historians in this area, including Ellen Herman and Mark Solovey, acknowledge that even in the aftermath of Project Camelot, changes to end the militaristic application of behavioral science were not implemented. The work continued.
A broadening editorial consensus in support of science news developed at the *Times* by the end of the 1960s, potentially influenced in part due to praise from high-level academics. In the years following the 1968 amendment to the National Science Foundation Act to officially incorporate the social sciences in that body of support, A.M. Rosenthal expressed a more welcoming attitude towards behavioral science coverage, in part guided by reader input from people like Richard Cohen, a public relations advocate for the American Jewish Congress. While the 1970s saw, relatively speaking in the context of this thesis, the greatest push towards behavioral science coverage in the newspaper, these conversations also did not touch on the persisting use of Cold War psychological warfare tactics implemented across the globe.

Editorial conversations notwithstanding, by the end of the time period that this thesis covers, the *New York Times* had begun to leverage its institutional weight in favor of increased attention towards science news. In addition to A.M. Rosenthal’s notable contributions and advocacy efforts at the highest levels of *New York Times* editorial decision-making, input from many other reporters and editors made Science Times possible. These journalists, whom I consider public servants in their own rights, include John Noble Wilford, Robert Reinhold, E. Clifton Daniel, Walter Sullivan, Virginia Adams, Jane Brody, Richard Flaste, Theodore Bernstein, Harold Schmeck, William Connolly, James Greenfield, Henry Lieberman, and Boyce Rensberger, among the many other teams of people who were essential for physically laying out and preparing each and every newspaper for publication.
Conclusion
Reflecting from the Digital Age

When readers opened the New York Times on Tuesday, November 14, 1978 and found the Science Times section in the middle of their newspaper, they witnessed firsthand the product of over two decades of advocacy in favor of concretizing the Times’ dedication to science news. Even though Science Times became “news” on this date, reporters and editors had been planning this section for one year, ten months, and fourteen days – if the clock starts when A.M. Rosenthal sent Arthur Ochs “Punch” Sulzberger and Walter Mattson his initial proposal. Even with this preference towards certain disciplines over others, science reporters faced persistent editorial challenges to expanded science coverage. During this pre-personal computer age, consumer advertising for technology to support this news coverage did and could not exist, in part because the technologies enabling these devices, as we know them today, were still in development.

Writing in 2019, I am able to consider my integration of journalism with the military-industrial-academic complex using any number of media frameworks that have been proposed in the last century. One relatively new concept in media studies is the notion of “mediatization,” a term coined in 1999 by Gianpeitro Mazzoleni, an Italian sociologist, and Winfried Schulz, a German sociologist. The authors initially applied the concept to the political sphere, but the following quote will hopefully illustrate the concept’s relevance to science development at the Times as well. The authors discern that “mediatization” dates “at least to the introduction of television,” which is nearly exactly where the current thesis began. They explain:
Mediatization is, in fact, a phenomenon that is common to the political systems of almost all democratic countries, where it has taken different shapes and developed at different speeds... The mass media are not mere passive channels for political communicators and political content. Rather, the media are organizations with their own aims and rules that do not necessarily coincide with, and indeed often clash with, those of political communicators...First, in their news reporting, mass media present only a highly selective sample of newsworthy events from a continuous stream of occurrences...However chosen, the media’s selective sample of events that are reported defines what appears to be the only reality for most citizens and often also for the political elite, particularly in those domains of activity where most people have no direct, personal access to what has happened...In the same way that media select and frame events, the media select which actors will receive attention and frame those actors’ public images. This is one aspect of the mediatization of politics through a media-constructed public sphere. A second aspect consists of the agenda-building and agenda-setting functions of mass media. In addition to conferring status upon actors by giving them attention, the media also assign political relevance and importance to social problems by selecting and emphasizing certain issues and neglecting others.390

The bolding emphasis is mine, and the italics are the authors’. As the coverage of science in mass media developed, as at The New York Times in the 1960s and 1970s, the expansive fields of science underwent a similar relationship through the press. However, I will use the bolded elements of the above paragraph to indicate ways that the process for science in the press has differed from Mazzoleni and Schultz’ application of their argument in the realm of typical politics. I certainly agree that the New York Times was not a passive channel, and their choices of which sciences to publish were certainly highly selective. I also agree that they represented “the only reality” for most citizens. Where I disagree, and disagree strongly in this application towards science, is that I do not believe that the Times’ framing of scientific developments had any bearing on the “political elite,” academic elite, scientific elite,

industrial elite, nor military elite who were involved in carrying out or applying scientific developments day-in, day-out.

Rather, the slow-moving process to stake an organizational claim to science coverage, which the *New York Times* was not the very first to make, but the first legacy publication, points to a rather glaring omission in the way that the public was presented with information about their world. That noted, I agree with the other bolded portions, in that, yes, the media selected physical, earth, and natural scientific actors to receive the bounty of attention. When behavioral and social sciences were added to the mix, the coverage of these disciplines “neglected” to mention the militaristic and imperialistic applications of that work.

The many *New York Times* science reporters included in this thesis, as well as others whose archival materials I did not have space to cite, spoke loudly and persistently for years on end in favor of the *Times’* placing a greater emphasis on scientific developments. Their ability to communicate, like the work of historians and journalists today, necessitated access to and open lines of communication with their intended communicators, sources, and materials. Archival and historical research is necessary for telling these hidden stories, for getting behind the scenes at a source (a newspaper) that is often used merely as a documentary account of the past. As we have seen, however, institutions can have vested interests in maintaining secrecy and limiting, or otherwise managing, methods of communication. The
institutional interest in understanding how we communicate has not gone away; they have merely change their names.\textsuperscript{391}

Bridging scientific, psychological and journalistic inquiries, this thesis provides a fresh look at how news production processes coalesce to shape an audience’s understanding of society around them. Through an examination of decisions made on a day-to-day basis in a newsroom in the middle of Manhattan, we can get a closer look at processes and conversations that resulted, and continues to result, in consequential knowledge dissemination for the paper’s readers. As discussed earlier, the files cited here are a fraction of those housed in the New York Public Library. Future research with these New York Times Company archival documents may shed light on any number of disciplines and industries that have intersected with the \textit{New York Times} in the many years since the paper’s founding, though each archival collection focuses on a slightly different time period. In particular, these archives are particularly rife with input from political actors. This research, by nature, benefits from an interdisciplinary approach that considers “journalism” as a sum of its many moving parts.

Today’s digital communications landscape renders accessible, immediate interpersonal communication in a manner that these editors, engineers, social scientists, and psychologists only imagined (and dedicated their careers towards). It has only been fifty-four (54) years since Hillier Kriehbaum published the quote

used for this thesis’ epigraph. In the interim, Kriehbaum’s prescient reminder to be alert to our own exploitation has become significantly more relevant. With our very recent transformation into a society heavily reliant on technology to communicate, there are new bounds to the kinds of knowledge that can be accessed and shared. In this seemingly uncharted territory, we must be careful and aware of the myriad ways that “information” and “communications” can be weaponized to divide the public and maintain hegemonic concentrations of power.
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