Press censorship — from within

To the Editor:

Once again The Tech has allowed the personal bias of some of its staff to influence its reporting of the news. I refer to your story about the Blood, Sweat and Tears concert, which appeared on Tuesday, Feb. 4, this headline reads: "UA loses $3K on concerts." This is a gross misstatement of the truth. If one were to rely solely on The Tech story for news of the concerts, it would be impossible to know that over 1000 people really enjoyed themselves that night. The entire article is devoted to pointing out the "mismanagement" that caused such a "failure." Well, I was at both concerts, and I can tell you (and the rest of your readers, since you won't) that everyone there had a great time. The Tech sets the number of tickets sold at 1300. That's more than one-quarter of the undergraduate population. One out of four is worth-it as far as I'm concerned.

I refer to the staff's personal bias. It is not so secret to most people at MIT that certain members of The Tech's staff will hunt for reasons to discredit anything that the UA does. I was on The Tech for two years, so I know. But there are also a lot of people here that do not know of your dislike for the UA. You are doing an injustice to all involved. Those who are unfamiliar with you just get a predetermined view of the UA's activities.

While I was working with Hersh, I was aware of a concern among the editors of The Tech that the paper should be of a more professional nature. This is just not the way to go about it. Professionalism does not let their personal biases influence their work in this way, and The Tech will be an amateur newspaper until its editors realize this.

Get with it, will you?

Ken famous '75

Former Night Editor, The Tech
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Today, even after the successes of journalists in exposing the Watergate Affair, there is an inbred threat to the continued freedom of the press. This threat comes not from a menacing White House, nor from the judges holding reporters in contempt for protecting their sources, nor from the Federal Communications Commission, but from within the press corps itself.

Strangely enough, reporters and editors are demonstrating an inability or unwillingness to accept another Watergate-type investigation any time soon. The reporters who lived, breathed, ate, slept, drank, thought, walked and talked almost nothing but Watergate for the better part of a year are physically and mentally drained. The information they were seeking could, and even should, result in the removal of office of a President of the United States. After the inquiry has been removed, the thrill goes out of any chase. Going back to tropic reports has proved to be quite dull for Washington reporters.

The editors who protected their reporters while many were screaming about an unfair press are now having second thoughts. The press is not accustomed to being the subject of frequent, being criticized as the object of other reporters' endeavors. Not a few editors are beginning to wonder whether their press was wrong in not investigating further the Watergate affair in such a comprehensive way.

As a result, these editors are beginning to wonder whether or not Watergate is a lived experience or merely a new scandal. Two recent examples spring to mind:

On December 22, 1974, The New York Times published a story by Pulitzer Prize winning Washington journalist, who shall remain nameless, saying that he was told by a high paid consultant two years ago (by the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, PFIAB) that the CIA was on the verge of getting pictures of some of the President's personal and the President's personal and his family's personal records and that the government did nothing. The consultant said that if one were to rely solely on this story for news of the concerts, it would be impossible to know that over 1000 people really enjoyed themselves that night. The entire article is devoted to pointing out the "mismanagement" that caused such a "failure." Well, I was at both concerts, and I can tell you (and the rest of your readers, since you won't) that everyone there had a great time. The Tech sets the number of tickets sold at 1300. That's more than one-quarter of the undergraduate population. One out of four is worth-it as far as I'm concerned.
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