

## ***Collier's* Criticism of the Press During the Norman Hapgood Years, 1902 to 1913**

By Ronald R. Rodgers

*This research examines the criticism of newspapers by one of America's major popular magazines—Collier's Weekly—from 1902 to 1913 under the editorship of Norman Hapgood. This period constitutes the majority of the magazine's daily press criticism of sensationalism and the influence of financial interests. Unlike earlier studies of Collier's, this article looks primarily at the magazine's criticism before and after Will Irwin's now classic 15-part dissection of the newspapers in America, that ran in Collier's over 15 weeks in 1911.*

In February 1906, Norman Hapgood—a longtime critic of the newspaper industry and the renowned editor of one of America's major popular muckraking magazines, *Collier's Weekly*—spoke at Carnegie Hall on “The Newspapers and Public Morals.” In his speech to the Society for Ethical Culture he asked why the press was not being criticized like any other institution. Newspapers, he asserted, certainly had no qualms about taking every “branch of human endeavor” to task for their inadequacies. “And yet if a man, believing on the whole in the usefulness of the press, dares to point out certain quarters in which it needs improvement, he is likely to be charged with ignorance of his subject, with swelled head, or with vindictiveness. The newspapers, to tell the truth, are in the position of the preacher who does all the talking and is seldom talked back to.”<sup>1</sup>

Hapgood spoke from experience. During his years as a report-

Ronald R. Rodgers is an assistant professor in the Department of Journalism, The University of Florida 3053 Weimer Hall Gainesville, FL 32611-8400 (352) 392-8847 rrodgers@jou.ufl.edu

# Strikebusting in St. Petersburg: Nelson Poynter's Postwar Assault on Union Printers

By James F. Tracy

*Labor-management conflict was commonplace in post-World War II America. One less-examined struggle took place within the U.S. newspaper industry. In the late 1940s newspaper publishers waged a campaign to challenge the powerful International Typographical Union (ITU). This included use of anti-labor laws alongside photo-engraving printing technologies to sustain daily publication during strikes. This article examines a strike and legal battle that ensued from 1945 to 1947 between Nelson Poynter and union printers employed at Poynter's St. Petersburg Times and its local counterpart, the Evening Independent. A result of this conflict included Poynter being singled out among newspaper publishers for national recognition "as the boss who broke the strike in St. Petersburg." By using makeshift printing techniques, replacement workers, and the legal expertise of Thurman Arnold, Poynter won a noteworthy decision from the National Labor Relations Board against the ITU that called into question the then fundamental legal framework governing collective bargaining. The decision portended more aggressive anti-labor legislation, including the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act, used by newspaper publishers against their unionized workers in subsequent years.*

## Introduction

Printers' strike against St. Petersburg's daily newspapers in 1945 was a key episode in the struggle between organized composing room workers and newspaper publishers that ensued in the postwar era. In this standoff the publishers of St. Petersburg's two dailies used emergent printing technologies, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and Florida's anti-labor laws to ex

James F. Tracy is an associate professor in the School of Communication and Multimedia Studies at Florida Atlantic University, 777 Glades Road, GCS 238, Boca Raton, FL 33431 (561) 297-6265 [jftracy@fau.edu](mailto:jftracy@fau.edu)

---

The author thanks the reviewers for *American Journalism* for their helpful suggestions. Special thanks to James A. Schnur of the Nelson Poynter Memorial Library and Justin Whitney of the Florida Studies Program, both at University of South Florida, St. Petersburg, for research assistance with this work.

## Haunted by the Babe: Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick's Columns about Babe Ruth

By John Carvalho and Raymond Ankney

*In 1961, Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick announced that Roger Maris's home run record would not be recognized unless he set it in 154 games, as record-holder Babe Ruth did. Frick's announcement sparked criticism and was later rescinded. This article demonstrates that the motive for Frick's actions was not concern for integrity of the game, but loyalty toward Ruth, as reflected both in his ghostwriting for Ruth and his columns in the New York Journal newspaper. Before becoming president of the National League in 1934, Frick was a newspaper sports journalist and one of the first sports broadcasters. His columns are examined both for his depictions of Ruth and for insight into his professional ethic as a sports journalist. The article concludes that Frick ignored the ethical conflicts inherent in his close friendship with Ruth—both in his ghostwriting and in his handling of the home run record.*

### Ford Frick, Babe Ruth, and Roger Maris<sup>1</sup>

On July 17, 1961, Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick announced that, if Roger Maris broke Babe Ruth's single-season home-run record, he would not be credited with the record unless he broke it in 154 games or less. Frick's proclamation stated:

Any player who hit more than sixty home runs during his club's first 154 games would be recognized as having established a new record. However, if the player does not hit more than sixty until after his club has played 154 games, there would have to be some distinc-

John Carvalho is an assistant professor of Journalism at Auburn University  
217 Tichenor Hall  
Auburn University, AL 36849  
(334)-844-4454  
carvajp@auburn.edu

Raymond Ankney is an associate professor of Journalism and Mass Communication at Samford University. University Center Annex, Room 105  
Samford University  
800 Lakeshore Drive  
Birmingham, AL 35229  
(205) 726-2948  
rmankey@samford.edu

**NOTE FROM THE REVIEWERS:** The following article addresses, in part, the content of *American Journalism*. It quotes the journal's editor. To avoid an editorial conflict of interest, three judges working independently reviewed the manuscript and suggested revisions to the authors and editor, with two out of the three concurring that the revised article should be published in AJ.

The authors raise interesting questions. Historians who use online sources must consider the likelihood of decay in uniform resource locators (URLs) and the resulting impact on independent replication and review. However, as historians increasingly analyze events happening in the digital information age, they likely will be forced to rely more and more on online sources—including many that will be difficult, if not impossible, for independent scholars to access.

The judges, including the author of this introductory commentary, hope that publication of this article will begin a discussion of the proper use of online citations by mass media historians and may eventually inform policies governing review and publication.

## Online Citations in History Journals: Current Practice and Views from Journal Editors

By Michael Bugeja, Daniela V. Dimitrova, and Hyehyun Hong

*This study examines use and stability of online citations in Journalism History and American Journalism. Content analysis results show that unlike other journalism and communication journals, online citations remain rare in media history articles. Analysis is supplemented with interviews of the journal editors. Discussion addresses factors accounting for the rarity of online content, predicting more as the Internet becomes the focus of historical research, and analyzes implications of vanishing primary, secondary and “ephemeral” sources.*

### Introduction

For several years, scholars across academic disciplines, including journalism and communication, have been studying the ramifications of use of online cita

Michael Bugeja is a professor and director of the Greenlee School of Journalism and Communication, Iowa State University, 101A Hamilton Hall, Ames, IA 50011. (515) 294-0481, [bugeja@iastate.edu](mailto:bugeja@iastate.edu)

Daniela V. Dimitrova is an assistant professor in the Greenlee School of Journalism and Communication, Iowa State University, 117 Hamilton Hall, Ames, IA 50011. (515) 294-4435, [danielad@iastate.edu](mailto:danielad@iastate.edu)

Hyehyun Hong is a doctoral student in the School of Journalism, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211. (573) 882-8130, [hhzrc@mizzou.edu](mailto:hhzrc@mizzou.edu)