

Ouachita Baptist University

Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita

Honors Theses

Carl Goodson Honors Program

Fall 1970

The Treatment of Orval Faubus by Five Publications during the 1957 Little Rock School Integration Crisis

Bobby Shepherd

Ouachita Baptist University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shepherd, Bobby, "The Treatment of Orval Faubus by Five Publications during the 1957 Little Rock School Integration Crisis" (1970). *Honors Theses*. 559.

https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses/559

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Carl Goodson Honors Program at Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. For more information, please contact mortensona@obu.edu.

THE TREATMENT OF ORVAL FAUBUS BY
FIVE PUBLICATIONS DURING THE
1957 LITTLE ROCK SCHOOL INTEGRATION CRISIS

Bobby Shepherd

Fall Semester, 1970

Ouachita Baptist University
Special Study

The following research paper is the result of many hours of research into the events of September and early October, 1957, the height of the Little Rock School Integration Crisis, as recorded by the nations press.

This paper is concerned, in particular, with the treatment in news reporting and editorial comment which Governor Orval E. Faubus received during this period from five publications, three newspapers and two news magazines. These publications are; The New York Times, The Arkansas Gazette, The Arkansas Democrat, Time and Newsweek magazines.

The objective of this paper is to determine to what extent, if any, Faubus was wrongly or unfairly represented to the readers of these publications.

Before it is possible to describe and analyse the treatment which Orval Faubus received at the hands of the nations press during the Little Rock School Crisis, it is necessary to set the stage and describe briefly the events which were to lead to this confrontation.

The event which probably set in motion the chain of actions which was to ultimately lead to the crisis in Little Rock, was the decision by the United States Supreme Court, in 1954, that separate schools for whites and blacks are by nature unequal. This was the opinion handed down in the historic case of, Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka.¹

Three years passed before this historic decision was to affect the make up of the student body at Little Rock's Central High School. In the fall of 1957 the eyes of the nation, guided by the extensive coverage provided by the nations news media, were focused on the South, as more and more school districts were confronted with the integration question.

In Little Rock a plan submitted by the Little Rock School Board for eventual total integration was accepted by the U. S. District Court. Under the plan, Central High School was to receive black students in 1957, with progressive integration of all the city's schools by 1963. Although few in Little Rock actively supported integration only a small minority, chiefly

¹Brown vs Board of Education of Topeka, (U. S. 295).

the White Citizens Council, actively sought to prevent it.²

On the national scene, the controversial Civil Rights Act was just passed by the Senate. It was a watered down version of the original bill, passed chiefly as the result of a delicate and long sought compromise between Northern liberal Democrats and Southern Democrats, engineered by Lyndon Johnson of Texas. It passed despite an attempted one-man filibuster by the then Democratic Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina.³

In short one of the major issues facing the people of the U.S. in the Fall of 1957 was the controversy over integration and race relations in this country.

The central character of the crisis was Orval Eugene Faubus. A product of the Ozarks, Faubus was a former school teacher and chairman of the State Highway Commission during the administration of Governor Sid McMath.⁴ Faubus was considered, prior to his second election to be essentially a moderate to liberal Democrat who had a fine record as Governor in his first two years.⁵ In his second race, however, Faubus faced Jim Johnson of Crossett, an ultra-conservative and arch segregationist candidate. Faubus was forced to adopt similar methods and sporting

²"Little Rock Sets End of Pupil Bias," New York Times, July 21, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 36.

³"What Orval Hath Wrought," Time, September 23, 1957, p. 12.

⁴"Old South and West meet in Little Rock," New York Times, September 15, 1957, Sec. 11, p. 5.

⁵Ibid.

a like philosophy won a second term. Most observers considered this turn about to be purely political in motive and not an indication of his true beliefs.⁶

The first indication of the impending crisis to appear in the North Eastern press is found in the July 21, 1957 edition of the New York Times. In a small column on a back page the newspaper reported that the Capitol Citizens Council had appealed to the Governor to stop integration, to which Faubus replied, ". . . everyone knows that state laws can't supersede Federal laws."

In order to facilitate the description of the news and editorial slant of the five publications; The New York Times, Time and Newsweek magazines, The Arkansas Gazette and The Arkansas Democrat, during the crisis, I have divided the approximately six weeks of the height of the confrontation into four time periods, I will attempt to describe and explore the news description and editorial attitude of each of these publications.

The first significant time period to be covered by the North Eastern news leader, The New York Times was the period of roughly four days, August 29 through September 2, 1957. In this period an injunction issued by a state court as a result of a private suit supported by Faubus which barred integration was over-ruled by Federal Judge Ronald N. Davies.

⁶"Hillbilly, slightly Sophisticated," Time, September 16, 1957, p. 24.

Faubus commented on the outcome if integration was attempted. The New York Times carried the story in its August 30 edition. A small article on page 21 reported the court appearance of Faubus on behalf of a private suit to delay integration. Faubus warned of violence if integration was attempted. The article pointed out that the Little Rock School Board disagreed with Faubus. On September 1, in an article reporting the defeat of the injunction, it quoted Faubus as saying, "The Federal government is cramming integration down our throats." Regarding actions he might take, he said, "No one has asked me for any help, but when the time comes I will exercise my own judgement in the matter." The Times took no notice of these seeds of crisis in its editorial section, nor did Time or Newsweek magazines report them.

Of the two Little Rock newspapers the Arkansas Gazette was most vocal in commenting on the court struggle and integration order. In a front page editorial of Sunday September 1, the Gazette hardly endorsed integration:

"...few of us are entirely happy over the necessary developments in the wake of changes in the law."⁷

The editorial did, however, urge co-operation and compliance in the matter. The court battle was covered extensively by the Gazette in an objective manner. Governor Faubus is not mentioned in these early editorials, and by the tone of these editorials, it seems that the Gazette foresaw no

⁷Editorial, Arkansas Gazette (Little Rock), "A Time of Testing," September 1, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 1.

trouble.

The Arkansas Democrat also covered these early days quite completely, but refused to take one side or the other in its editorial policy, it merely urged citizens to take no violent action and endorsed the School Boards integration plan.

The second time period of the Crisis brought a landslide of editorial comment to bear upon the Governor. The Call up of the Arkansas National Guard by Faubus on September 2, 1957 was the action which brought more coverage than at any other point of the crisis.

The N. Y. Times reported the Governor's action in a front page story on September 3, 1957. It reported Faubus' claim that the call up was necessary in order to prevent violence. It reported Faubus' television address to the state in which he reported caravans of people en route to Little Rock to demonstrate and a vast increase in the number of knives and guns being sold in the city, necessitating the prevention of integration for the present time. On September 4, a short biographical sketch of Mr. Faubus appeared in the Times, these sketches of the central figures in the crisis, Judge Davies, School Superintendent Virgil Blossom, National Guard Commander Clinger and others were featured throughout the crisis. The sketch briefly described Faubus' history, his record as highway commissioner and his victory over Francis Cherry in the gubernatorial election of 1954. That edition also reported Judge Davies' order that integration proceed immediately,

despite Faubus' stand. The September 5, edition reported the turning away of the nine black students at the door of Central High School, by National Guard troops. Faubus again insisted that his motives were to prevent violence. The Times repeated Faubus' charge that his mansion and office telephones were tapped by Federal agents. He appealed to President Eisenhower for an end to Federal interference. On September 6, the first editorial concerning the events in Little Rock appeared in the Times. The editorial recognized that generations of prejudice couldn't be erased a single court decision. The editorial condemned the manner in which the Negro students were treated at the High School by the crowd. Surprisingly Faubus' name wasn't even mentioned, nor were his actions condemned. In a second editorial on September 7, The Times condemned the reported harassment of reporters in Little Rock, it devoted a single paragraph to a rejection of Faubus' actions, on the grounds of Constitutional and Federal supremacy. It made no mention of possible motives for the Governors actions, nor did it personally attack him.

The Sunday, September 8, edition devoted a full page to quotes from the editors of various newspapers around the nation, and a series of cartoons condemning the call out of the guard. An editorial in the same edition was concerned primarily with segregation and the harassment of Negroes, primarily in the South. It urged support for the Federal government. The editorial mentioned Faubus only in passing. On September 9, the N. Y.

Times reported Faubus' rejection of any settlement, and Little Rock's mayor Woodrow Mann's plea for presidential intervention. It carried a full transcript of Faubus' television interview of the night before. An editorial condemned mob violence at Little Rock but still refused to criticize Faubus for his actions. In an editorial of September 10, the precedents to Faubus' actions were pointed out including the decision of Moyer vs. Peabody, a case from Colorado, decided by the U. S. Supreme Court in the nineteenth century supporting a governor's right to call up the militia in order to prevent insurrection.⁸ On September 11, the Times finally took a firm stand against Faubus' actions. In an editorial it called them, "provocative," and a "defiance of Federal judiciary." It accused Faubus of building up emotions to the breaking point and of giving strength and hope to the extremist minority. The actions of Faubus, an editorial on September 12, reported, had "plunged the Democratic party into divisiveness," and had upset the delicate compromise between Northern and Southern Democrats over the Civil Rights Bill. A September 13, editorial accused Faubus of, "panicing at the thought of a few Negro boys and girls attending a white school."

Both Time and Newsweek magazines gave complete and extensive coverage to the Governor's actions in their September 16 and 23 issues. There was, however, striking differences in the

⁸ Editorial, New York Times, September 10, 1957, Sec. p. 16.

manner in which the events and the Governor himself were presented in each magazine.

Newsweek, in its September 16, edition used a low key approach in covering the events. It gave a complete account of the actions which led to the call up. It gave several possible motives as to why Faubus called out the guard, political motivation, that is an attempt to satisfy segregationist voters, an honest feeling that Federal power was overstepping its boundaries, or his "own" reason; "to prevent violence." The magazines seemed to accept the latter reason as the truth. Newsweek presented a brief but objective biographical outline of the Governor and seemed to neither condone or condemn Faubus' actions.⁹

The Time magazine issue for the same week covered the Little Rock crisis in three pages, the same as did Newsweek, but here all but superficial similarities vanish. Where the Newsweek attitude was objective, and as fair as it seems possible, Time filled its article with a decidedly anti-Faubus slant. It described the Governor as a, "slightly sophisticated hillbilly."¹⁰ Time declared that there was, "no reasonable explanation (for the call-up) except that he hoped to make pol-

⁹"The Great Issue", Newsweek, September 16, 1957 p. 33-36.

¹⁰"Hillbilly, slightly sophisticated," Time

itical capital for himself."¹¹ In another part of the article Faubus was characterized as a, "backwoods politician turned Dapper Dan."¹² Time stated clearly that the blame for the crisis rested entirely upon the Governor's shoulders. Although the magazine described accurately the events surrounding the call-up, it left no doubt that the magazine did not believe Faubus' justifications for his actions, and regarded the Governor as an unscrupulous and desperate politician. This opinion was more graphically illustrated in the magazine's cover story on Faubus of September 23. It depicted Faubus as a rude, ill-mannered and completely self-centered politician of the lowest order. The magazine reported that, "Faubus meant only to further his personal political ambitions."¹³ The article revealed an extensive plan, which, it said, Faubus prepared before the crisis and was carrying out. The plan included the obstruction of orderly integration at Little Rock in order to, "win Eastern Arkansas segregationist voters." The magazine concluded by saying that Faubus was enjoying immensely the results of his plans:

"He was holed up in his executive mansion, protected from intrusion by the National Guard, enjoying congratulatory telegrams, listening to piped music watching kinescopes of himself on television (he likes

¹¹"Pains of History," Time, September 16, 1957, p.24.

¹²Ibid.

¹³"What Orval Hath Wrought," Time, September 16, 1957, p. 12.

that), preparing to reap new publicity benefits."¹⁴

The Arkansas Gazette was the newspaper which was probably the most involved in the School Crisis during this second phase.

In an editorial on September 3, the day after the National Guard was called up, the Gazette stated:

"In taking this action the Governor has publicly aligned himself with the Arkansas White Citizens Council and other extremist groups of the South."¹⁵

That same editorial pointed out that Faubus' action differed from the moderate actions of other "upper South" governors. It also recalled Faubus statement of three years before: "School integration is a local problem."

Throughout the crisis the Gazette reported the news in a most objective and commendable manner, with probably the most extensive coverage of any other newspaper in the nation.

In a front page editorial of September 4, the Gazette said that Faubus' actions had raised the, "most serious constitutional question since the Civil War." The same editorial accused Faubus of revealing too little of his reasons and not backing them up with provable fact. It urged the immediate recall of the Guard. In its news coverage of September 4, the Gazette refuted Faubus' contention of increased weapons sales in the city and the threat of violence.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Editorial, Arkansas Gazette, September 3, 1957

Through out the crisis the gazette carried the editorial opinion of many newspapers across the country. These editorials were evenly divided for and against the Governor's actions, and they presented a cross-section of viewpoints.

In its September 8 and 9, 1957 editions the Gazette resigned itself, editorially, to the fact that neither Faubus nor the U. S. Government would give in. It spoke in terms of the shame which the Governor's actions were bringing to the state. The Gazette gave full blame to Faubus, and concluded that the conflict was between the United States and Faubus not the people of Little Rock. A cartoon appearing in the September 10 edition, depicted a vulture of hate gloating over the Little Rock Crisis.¹⁶

Through letters to the editor the Gazette presented viewpoints from the readers on all sides of the issue. It seemed to give all view points an equal hearing. Typical of ~~the~~ ~~most~~ extreme of the letters, but still unusual in its reasoning, was this letter:

"I am a segregationist, and when the governor called out the guard a week ago I thought he was one too and so did my friends..... he is only trying to delay integration and not maintain segregation He is still the same old Faubus straddling the fence. He is trying to run for a third term and I am against him."¹⁷

¹⁶ Cartoon, Graham, Arkansas Gazette, September 10, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 4.

¹⁷ ~~From the~~ ~~truncated~~ ~~edition~~, Arkansas Gazette, September 12, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 4.

In reporting the editorial comments from newspapers around Arkansas, the Gazette printed this comment from The Southern Standard, in Arkadelphia:

"..... we can be more than thankful that Arkansas had a man with foresight and integrity enough to take initiative to awaken the people to the fact that they are fast losing their sovereign right to govern themselves."¹⁸

The Arkansas Democrat also carried extensive coverage of this phase of the crisis. However, its editorial comments were more selective and tended to waver in predominantly neutral fashion.

The Democrats first editorial after Faubus called out the guard, in the September 5, edition, neither condemned nor condoned his actions. No editorials appeared September 6 and 7. The September 8 edition endorsed law and order, but in a muddled double talk almost completely ignored the School Crisis. The next editorial appeared in the September 11 edition. The editorial seemed to accept prevention of violence as the reason Faubus called out the guard. This was the last editorial concerning the crisis to appear until September 17, 1957.

The third phase of the crisis included Governor Faubus' meeting with President Eisenhower on September 13, 1957 and the events that occurred until the guard was removed by Faubus on

¹⁸ "More Comment on the Little Rock Situation," Arkansas Gazette, from The Southern Standard, September 15, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 11.

on September 20. During this period editorial comment and coverage of the crisis was generally slack as most people apparently thought that the crisis had ended.

The New York Times continued to carry complete coverage of the crisis and of Governor Faubus' meeting with the President at Newport Rhode Island. An editorial appearing on Sunday September 14, insisted that the crisis was over, that Arkansas was, "returning to the union."¹⁹

Although complete coverage continued, the next editorial concerning Little Rock and Faubus did not appear until September 19. In it the Times severely criticized President Eisenhower's lack of leadership during the crisis. The editorial assured the nation that Faubus was sure to be defeated for re-election, but that he stirred up both Northern and Southern extremists.²⁰

On September 21, in the same edition which reported the removal of the guard from Central High School by Faubus, an editorial again accused him of stirring up extremists and of attempting to be a martyr.

Finally on September 22, the newspaper praised the law abiding majority of Little Rock.

The magazines, in general gave less coverage to the events of the week of September 13-20, than to the previous

¹⁹Editorial, "Rendezvous at Newport," New York Times, September 14, 1957, Sec. B, p. 12.

²⁰Editorial, "The Showdown Nears," The New York Times, September 19, 1957, Sep. 1, p. 28.

weeks' activities. Both Time and Newsweek ran feature articles on Orval Faubus, as has already been mentioned.

Time magazine concluded that Faubus was backing down in the face of Federal power.²¹ The magazine continued to give an enormously slanted account and analysis, particularly in its references to Faubus. For example in the September 23, edition the magazine declared that Faubus was responsible for all the violence across the South such as the dynamiting of a Negro home in Nashville, Tennessee. Time continued to describe Governor Faubus as a power hungry politician.

Newsweek, in general, conceded that the worst was over in Little Rock. It concluded that Faubus was retreating in the face of Federal authority.

Although Newsweek gave the Little Rock crisis slightly less coverage than did Time magazine during the period of September 13 through 20, it continued to be more objective in its description and analysis of the events than did Time.

The Arkansas Gazette continued, in this period to give extensive coverage to the crisis and Faubus' meeting with the President. It also continued its editorial attacks on Faubus. On September 15, the Gazette accused Faubus of attempting to, "rule by rumor and secret poll." On September 16, the Gazette compared Faubus' actions with those of North Carolina Governor Hodges, who handled integration without the use of troops

²¹"Retreat from Newport," Time, September 23, 1957, p. 11.

and with no resulting violence.

The Gazette's continued editorial barbs finally earned it a place on a list of those who Governor Faubus said were attempting to, "crucify" him.²²

The Arkansas Democrat continued its policy of editorial silence until September 17, when it said that neither "Faubus nor the President could take any other position without violating their oaths of office," a position which some could construe as an endorsement of the Governor's action. The Democrat again urged observance of the law in its September 21, edition, in its last editorial of the period.

The final period of the Little Rock Crisis includes the mob violence of September 22, the sending in of federal troops by President Eisenhower on September 24, and their presence in Little Rock during the first week of October 1957.

After Governor Faubus had removed the guard from Central High School, the New York Times relegated news from Little Rock to its back pages. This all changed on September 23, 1957, when the Times reported the mob violence of the day before, when Negro students attempted to enter Central High. The Times gave the incident four pages of coverage. In the editorial of that day, Faubus received the blame for the mob attack, it insisted that his actions had created an explosive atmosphere.

²²"Faubus Says He is Hoping for no Unrest," Arkansas Gazette (Little Rock), September 23, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 1.

The day after the mob violence in Little Rock, President Eisenhower insisted upon Governor Faubus' promise that the Black students would attend Central High School and that the law would be honored in Little Rock. Faubus assured Eisenhower that he would not prevent the enforcement of the court orders. This assurance was not good enough for Eisenhower and on September 24, 1957, he signed a document ordering units of the 101st Airborne division into Little Rock to assure peaceful integration at Central.²³

The New York Times reported the entrance of the Federal troops into Little Rock in four pages of pictures and news stories.²⁴ In an editorial it gave Faubus blame for the federal troops call-up and accused him of, "irrationalities."²⁵

On September 25, the Times reported that Black students were admitted to Central High School. It gave editorial support to the President's action in its September 26 edition with little mention of Faubus.

In a September 28 editorial the Times accused Faubus of inciting to riot and of issuing, "inflammatory statements," which were a, "grotesque distortion of facts."²⁶ These comments

²³ "President Sends Troops to Little Rock," New York Times, September 25, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 1.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Editorial, "Troops in Little Rock," New York Times, September 25, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 28.

²⁶ Editorial, "Calm in Little Rock," New York Times, September 28, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 16.

were the result of statements Faubus made accusing troops of bayoneting school girls and innocent bystanders and of Nazi-like conduct.²⁷

The Times made no further editorial comment until October 2, when it accused Faubus of, "interference with the plan to remove troops." On October 3, The Times commented that the, "people of Arkansas could thank Faubus for federal troops He is stubborn and devious.... he pulled the rug from under moderates."

Time magazine continued to report the events of this period but insisted on using a heavy editorial slant in its reporting. Typical of this slant is the statement found in the September 30, edition: "Faubus chose to set himself up as a segregationist hero by manufacturing violence in Little Rock."²⁸

In the October 7, 1957 issue the magazine carried this quote from a Southern Governor who accompanied Faubus to the Texas-Georgia football game the previous week:

"He's really lapping up the glory, there were 33,000 people at the game and every time they cheered a play, he stood up and bowed."²⁹

²⁷"Faubus See's Occupation; Tension at School Eases," New York Times, September 25, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 1, "Text of Address," p. 10.

²⁸"Case No. 3113," Time, September 30, 1957, p. 19

²⁹"Quick Hard and Decisive," Time, October 7, 1957 p. 22

Time also stated that a Faubus aid, James Karam was a primary instigator of violence in Little Rock and typified Faubus' aids as henchmen. A Faubus television address was called a monument to demagoguery, by Time.³⁰

Newsweek gave only minimum coverage of the call-in of federal troops, and continued its practice of objective journalism without excessive editorial content.

The Arkansas Gazette continued its objective news reporting during this final period, but it also kept up a relentless editorial attack upon the Governor. In commenting on the use of Federal troops in Little Rock, the Gazette called Faubus' actions, "reckless, deliberate defiance of the law," and said that he had rallied agitators and rioters.³¹ On September 27, it said that Faubus was using, "demagogues tools," in explaining his actions. In commenting on a Faubus television appearance, the Gazette called it, "an exhibition of crude campaign techniques, a distortion of truth."³² In editorials on October 3, 4 and 10, the Gazette made the comment that Faubus' defiance would make the task of Southern moderates more difficult. It also asserted that, "Faubus changed places with Jim Johnson as hero of the racist element."³⁰

Ibid.

³¹ Editorial, "The High Price of Recklessness," Arkansas Gazette, September 26, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 4.

32

ment.³³ In surveying Faubus' political position the Gazette observed that, "Faubus can't give in without sacrificing temporary political gains."³⁴

Although it continued to report the crisis in Little Rock, the Arkansas Democrat made only one editorial comment between September 23 and 28, when it endorsed, in brief editorial the President's actions. On September 29, the Democrat continued its practice of neither condoning nor condemning Faubus' position by emphasizing the points of agreement with Faubus. Other than this, the Democrat had little to say of this phase of the crisis.

CONCLUSION

In order to decide whether the treatment Orval Faubus received from these five publications, during the Little Rock School Integration Crisis of 1957, was fair or justified, some decision must be reached as to the actual motives involved. How else can an editorial or a news report be judged, unless one forms some opinion as to where the truth lies and what that truth is?

An editorial comment whether it is found under a clear label on the editorial page of the New York Times, or mixed with a news report as in Time magazine, is only the opinion of a group of men who sort out the news as reported by, suppose

³³ Editorial, "Jim and Orv," Arkansas Gazette, September 4, 1957, Sec. 1, p. 4.

³⁴ Editorial, "Mr. Faubus is Where he Was," Arkansas Gazette, September 10, 1957, Sec. 11, p. 4.

posedly objective, journalists. The motives behind the actions must be ascertained by the only means possible, the examination of those actions from every possible angle with a respect for the viewpoints of others and a consideration of ~~the~~ viewpoints, even if they are directly opposed to the editors' own views. After what is believed to be the truth is obtained it must be weighed against ones own beliefs. Only in this way can an editorial comment be an honest one.

Before I can make judgement as to the fairness or objectivity of any of these publications, I must state my opinions regarding the events of September 1957.

From the evidence available to me I must conclude that there was no real threat of violence in Little Rock in the Fall of 1957 as schools opened. This is a conclusion which is easy to make now, thirteen years after the fact. No doubt it was less obvious then, never the less, I feel it is safe to assume that with leadership and the example of the Governor, violence could have been avoided even if the threat originally existed. Accordingly, it is evident to me that the primary and over-riding reason for Governor Faubus' actions was to keep Central High School segregated. political expediency was the primary factor in his reasoning, I feel. This especially evident in light of his subsequent political career. In election after election, the segregationist line was Orval Faubus' primary tool in winning office and before 1970, it had never failed him. I will now state my views as to the treatment which Orval Faubus received at the hands of

these five publications.

The New York Times consistently, throughout the crisis, gave objective and complete coverage to almost every event in those six weeks. I could not detect any editorializing in any of its news stories. Its editorial comments concerning the Governor grew in intensity and in its condemnation as the days went by. Its editorials were usually well founded and backed up by evidence. It was surprising to note that Faubus himself was not editorially attacked until well into the crisis, the editor apparently accepted Faubus' reasoning for his call-up of the guard. As a rule, the Times editor waited for evidence to back up his charges.

This is not the case, however, when we examine the editorial slant of Time magazine. In its first reports of Faubus actions Time resorted immediately to the, I feel, degrading practice of launching personal attacks against the Governor. Time gave the most one-sided accounts of the crisis of any of the publications. It is exceedingly difficult to separate proven fact and the opinion of the magazine from each other, in newstories of the events in Little Rock. The magazine's condemnation of Faubus' actions is apparent in every article on the subject, and it is apparent to such an extent that it detracts from the facts of the story as they were reported.

Newsweek magazine seemed to present a more balanced report of the crisis, instead of stating editorial opinion as definite

fact, it gave several possibilities and the arguments for each and left it up to the reader to decide for himself the merits and demerits of each. Although its reports were well balanced, it is not too difficult to discover that Newsweek was also in definite disagreement with the Governor, however it is obvious, in those cases, what is fact and what is opinion.

The Arkansas Gazette, as one of the two newspapers closest to the crisis, probably presented the most extensive coverage of the events of those six weeks of any newspaper in the nation. Its reports were consistently well balanced and objective. Its editorials were consistently and from the start in direct opposition to Governor Faubus' actions. The Gazette was probably the first newspaper in the nation to accuse Mr. Faubus of basing his actions on purely political motives. The Gazette's editorials seemed to be consistently based on thoughtful reflection of the events of that month. Although the newspaper expressed doubts as to the wisdom of integration, it never the less supported the supremacy of Federal law and judicial authority.

The Arkansas Democrat's editorial policies of this period of crisis were very disappointing indeed. Instead of coming out one way or the other for or against Mr. Faubus, the newspaper remained uncommitted, even to the extent of ignoring the crisis on its editorial page for days at a time. When at last it did support the President's action it did so with reluctance and an obvious lack of enthusiasm. Perhaps by

refraining from editorializing extensively upon the situation, the Democrat sought to avoid the creation of unnecessary tensions. But for what ever the reason, it seems to me that the newspaper had an obligation to the community, to at least comment, to a greater extent, upon the events of that month.

The Democrat, as did the other two newspapers, reported the Little Rock crisis in an objective and impartial manner.

Orval Faubus received completely fair and impartial treatment in the three newspapers covered in this paper. Almost as much objectivity was attained in Newsweek. Only in Time magazine did the fervor of its editors interfere with its objective reporting of the news.

However, on the editorial page Governor Faubus was subjected to the full intensity of these men's opinions, as is only right under our concept of a free press. In fact, it seemed to me, that these editors based their opinions and charges on evidence far more substantial than that upon which the Governor based his actions.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Arkansas Gazette (Little Rock), August, September
October, 1957.

Arkansas Democrat (Little Rock), August, September
October, 1957.

The New York Times, July, August, September, Octo-
ber, 1957.

Time, LXX (September, 16, 23, 30, 1957).

Newsweek, L (September 16, 23, 30, October 7, 1957).