

Responding to Media Cheap Shots: *Observations on the CAST Experience*

by

Theodore Hutchcroft

Paper No. 16

February 1983

Council for Agricultural Science and Technology

Council For Agricultural Science And Technology (CAST)

Member Societies

American College of Veterinary Toxicologists	Council on Soil Testing and Plant Analysis
American Dairy Science Association	Crop Science Society of America
American Forage and Grassland Council	Institute of Food Technologists
American Meat Science Association	North Central Weed Control Conference
American Meteorological Society	Northeastern Weed Science Society
American Phytopathological Society	Plant Growth Regulator Society of America
American Society for Horticultural Science	Poultry Science Association
American Society of Agricultural Engineers	Rural Sociological Society
American Society of Agronomy	Society of Nematologists
American Society of Animal Science	Soil Science Society of America
Aquatic Plant Management Society	Southern Weed Science Society
Association of Official Seed Analysts	Weed Science Society of America
Western Society of Weed Science	

Papers

Publications in the *Papers* Series are speeches and other expository statements other than official letters, usually written by one person, that are of such character and length as to justify numbering them as CAST documents. Authors of individual papers are responsible for the content.

Through representatives on the CAST Board of Directors, the member societies are responsible for the policies and procedures followed by the headquarters office in developing, processing, and disseminating the papers, and, depending on the nature of the paper, the society representatives nominate qualified persons from their respective disciplines for participation in the preparation. Aside from these involvements, the member societies have no responsibility for the content of any paper.

Authors of CAST papers, other than persons in the headquarters office, serve as scientists and not as representatives of their employers. They receive no honoraria but are reimbursed upon request for travel expenses associated with the preparation and presentation. Their time is contributed by their employers. Costs of publishing and distributing the papers are borne by CAST.

CAST encourages the reproduction of its publications in their entirety for independent distribution, but it has no responsibility for the use that may be made of them. CAST does not endorse either products or services; thus, a reproduction of a publication made in such a way as to imply an endorsement would be considered inappropriate.

Responding to Media Cheap Shots: *Observations on the CAST Experience*

by

Theodore Hutchcroft

The respected science editor, Robert A. Day,¹ has written:

There are four things that make this world go round: love, energy, materials, and information. We see about us a critical shortage of the first commodity, a near-critical shortage of the second, increasing shortage of the third, but an absolute glut of the fourth.

We in science, of necessity, must contribute to the glut.

The "media cheap shot" is a form of misinformation which adds to that deluge. The term is so new you will not find it in your dictionary. The more I looked, the more I appreciated the frustration of Justice Potter Stewart² as the Supreme Court was deciding a motion picture pornography case. He acknowledged the futility of trying to define "hard-core pornography," then concluded, "But I know it when I see it...."

Most of us react the same way to a media cheap shot — we can't exactly define it, but we know one when we see it.

My research was not in vain, however, for the 1980 *Dictionary of Popular Slang* says "cheap shot" is a sports phrase meaning "an easy attack on a weakened opponent."³

This is inadequate for a discussion of cheap shots in the news media. Here are some suggestions for identifying a media cheap shot.

Basically, it is a form of misinformation that is disseminated to gain an advantage for the source. The subject usually is not aware the cheap shot has been fired. The cheap shot discredits the opponent, often including a charge or an accusation. The message may appear to be based on a reliable source; it may even be a quotation from the opponent. A cheap shot does not make extensive use of the truth. Often the impact of the message is by innuendo rather than as a direct charge.

Building the source's own reputation by communicating an intended disfavor is basic to the concept of a media cheap shot. It often contains an element of surprise, either in the message or in the timing of the announcement. The ploy is to catch the opponent off guard and so unable to make a proper response.

Cheap shots can appear in any media format —

newspapers, magazines, speeches, films, radio and television broadcasts, newsletters, and so forth. The source may be an individual speaking personally, or for his organization. The effect is the same whether the cheap shot is published as a quotation or as a reporter's account of an event.

Cheap shots often have entertainment value, thus titillate readers, viewers and listeners. Sources know this, as do reporters and editors. The element of conflict in a cheap shot appeals to the media gatekeepers.

There is an element of hit-and-run about a media cheap shot. However, perpetrators frequently return to the scene and repeat their offenses.

The cheap shot can come from anywhere. A friendly competitor may take a cheap shot to gain an advantage when his competition appears vulnerable. Most are made by persons or institutions seeking to gain attention for their cause. Many cheap shots are made by activists who have little or nothing to lose by making wild statements, and stand to gain in the eyes of their constituents. These are often the folks who yell the loudest.

The public's interest in the sensational, rather than the quality of the message of the cheap shot, often gains the source attention. Reporters often are too busy, uninterested, or both, to check the facts, so these sources receive the all-important "media access."

Irresponsible activists are by no means the only sources of cheap shots. They can and do come from politicians, writers, scientists, businessmen, farmers, secretaries — literally every walk of life.

The media cheap shot is usually a short item — a one-liner, or a relatively brief article or program. A longer presentation may include a cluster of individual cheap shots. This becomes, to my way of thinking, a "hatchet job," which is an expanded version of the cheap shot. The *Random House Dictionary* defines hatchet job as "a maliciously destructive critique or act" and a hatchet man as "a writer or speaker who specializes in defamatory acts" or "a person whose job is to execute unpleasant tasks for a superior, as criticizing or dismissing."⁴

The cheap shot and the hatchet job are related terms, being at opposite ends of the continuum. If a cheap shot is an elbow in the ribs, a hatchet job is a punch below the belt.

Some examples may help to put these concepts into perspective.

The first is the March *Fact Sheet* by the Farm Animal Care Trust.⁵ This one-page document titled "Facts on CAST" purports to describe CAST and calls attention

Presented as a talk at the summer seminar of the Agricultural Relations Council. Vail, Colorado, July 14, 1982. Hutchcroft is the Vice President of the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology.

to the recent publication, "Scientific Aspects of the Welfare of Food Animals," which does not seem to be favorably viewed by the trust. The CAST report is referred to as "a defense of intensive husbandry," while CAST itself is erroneously represented as "a consortium of professional associations and organizations representing crop and livestock producers and the food industry."

More to the point, the sheet seeks to discredit CAST by lifting quotations from a speech by a former CAST President.⁶ They are out of context and supplemented by subtle remarks such as, "Apparently CAST is having problems," and "Evidently Baker is worried." Interestingly, the quotations are from a talk devoted to "some of the past, present, and future challenges for CAST in communicating and relating to truth."

This cheap shot was not in the mass media, but probably was distributed to a mailing list developed by the trust's staff. CAST got its copy secondhand, which illustrates the element of surprise. FACT, Inc. is a new organization trying to establish itself. What better way to attract attention of the media and funding sources than by appearing to uncover inadequacies in a recognized and reputable scientific body? And, what better way to do the job than by using the words of the victim?

CAST's response to this cheap shot has been to make no public reply. There is no reason to extend CAST's credibility to this new crusade. However, the members of the task force which prepared the animal welfare report were alerted to this situation.

The second example is a portion of a statement made by Reed Irvine of Accuracy in Media at the recent annual meeting of the stockholders of CBS, Inc.⁷ As reported in the *AIM Report*, Irvine said:

Just yesterday a journalist who was in my office said that any journalist stationed in the Soviet Union for any lengthy period of time that came away without feeling and expressing strong revulsion for the communist totalitarian system must be suspected of having been recruited. Mr. Cronkite was in Moscow in 1946-48. I would very much like to know, if Mr. Cronkite were here, if he could cite any articles, speeches or broadcasts which he has made in recent years in which he has clearly enunciated his revulsion for the communist system.

This is a classic media cheap shot: the attack is intentional; it attempts to discredit an individual not present at the time; it has entertainment value because it accuses a celebrity; it is presented in such a way as to be almost impossible to rebut; it has an element of fact; and it appears to be based on information from a reliable source. It looks like a hit-and-run attack, with no response anticipated.

An individual probably reacts to a media cheap shot in one of three ways. If the cheap shot agrees with our biases, we may say, "Right on!" or "Way to go!" or a similar encouragement. Should the cheap shot go against our biases, we may react more violently, maybe

getting very upset and asking, "What can we do to get retribution?" But most times we will not know or care, so will pay little attention except for the entertainment value involved. It is not likely we will remember the incident, though if we do we may accept it as at least a partial truth.

Fortunately, the First Amendment of the Constitution provides protection for free speech and a free press. Unfortunately, it also allows lying, unfairness and vilification, though it does not approve of them.⁸

Each of us taking part in this seminar is associated with agriculture, which is a major science-based industry. We market the results of scientific research to producers, to processors, and to consumers. We are involved daily in communicating science-based information. This puts us in a critical position, for science is high on the public agenda in the 1980s.

Yet there are some who oppose this free flow of information. They resort to misinformation, to using the media cheap shot. Five prominent agricultural scientists found this out in a series of events that began just ten years ago. The April 1972 issue of the *American Birds* magazine of the National Audubon Society included this message in its foreword:⁹

We are well aware that segments of the pesticide industry and certain paid "scientist-spokesmen" are citing Christmas Bird Count totals (and other data in American Birds) as proving that the bird life of North America is thriving, and that many species are actually increasing despite widespread and condemned use of DDT and other non-degradable hydrocarbon pesticides.

This, quite obviously, is false and misleading, a distortion of facts for the most self-serving of reasons.

.....

Any time you hear a "scientist" say the opposite, you are in the presence of someone who is being paid to lie, or is parroting something he knows little about.

A *New York Times* reporter read this and asked the Audubon Society for the names of the scientists. The resulting story was headlined,¹⁰

"Pesticide Spokesmen Accused of 'Lying' on Higher Bird Count."

The story identified the article's author and quoted him as specifying the "lying scientists" to be Dr. Robert H. White-Stevens of Rutgers University; Dr. Thomas H. Jukes of the University of California; Dr. Norman E. Borlaug, Nobel Prize winner; Dr. J. Gordon Edwards of San Jose State College; and Dr. Donald A. Spencer, who formerly was with the National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

White-Stevens, Jukes and Edwards sued for libel. They easily won the case in the U.S. District Court on the basis that it is the "right of scientists to make honest evaluation of evidence and to present their findings without being defamed in the process."¹¹

That decision was appealed and overturned. The new decision said in part:¹²

Our holding today does not in any way condone the mischievous and unwarranted assault on the good name of the appellees, who appear from their writings to have entered the lists in favor of DDT in good faith and for humanitarian motives that ought to be beyond reproach.

Nevertheless, we believe that the interest of a public figure in the purity of his reputation cannot be allowed to obstruct the vital pulse of ideas and intelligence on which an informed and self-governing people depend. It is unfortunate that the exercise of liberties so precious as freedom of speech and of the press may sometimes do harm that the state is powerless to recompense: but this is the price that must be paid for the blessing of a democratic way of life.

Those of us in agricultural public relations must have mixed emotions about this decision. But upon reflection we must concur. Whether we represent a company, a university, the government or an association, it is vital that we have the opportunity to contribute to the free and open flow of information.

For better or worse, a cheap shot is a form of free speech. What appears to be a cheap shot to one may be to someone else a gem of literate, factual communication. Freedom of speech and of the press are cornerstones of our democracy; they are just as important to the successful operation of our scientific system.

One of the current evidences of freedom of the press is an expanded interest in investigative reporting. Do not confuse investigative reporting with a cheap shot or even a hatchet job. The terms are not synonymous.

In each situation, carefully evaluate the alleged media cheap shot. Is the item really a cheap shot, or is it a statement of fact that is embarrassing to us, our company or our cause? In other words, have we been caught in a compromising position? This may be a golden opportunity to set our house in order. Look for positive hidden messages in the cheap shot that may help to alleviate potential problems.

CAST was incorporated in 1972 by food and agricultural scientists to improve the quality of public policy development, notably at the national level. Scientists working through CAST are taking more responsibility for assembling research information on food and agricultural subjects of current national concern for use in the public policy process. One of CAST's first publications was "Informing the Nonagricultural Public About Agricultural Science" by Dr. Charles A. Black, now the Executive Vice President.¹³ CAST has invested considerable resources over the past decade to improve the quality of science information communicated in the news media.

As CAST has become widely recognized, it has had to walk through a thorny path of attacks from nonscientific groups and some of the news media. In fairness and accuracy, however, it must be noted that most of

the news media and the scientific community have welcomed CAST's service. Most news coverage has been factually sound, thus helping to extend CAST's effectiveness. Many reporters have encouraged the work scientists have undertaken through CAST. An editorial in the January 1982 *Progressive Farmer* is an example.¹⁴

One of the first attacks against CAST was a *Des Moines Sunday Register* story on August 18, 1974, headlined "Firms Pay Pesticide Report Cost."¹⁵ The story was about a CAST task force report on the zero-tolerance concept, though the writer said it was about pesticides. The focus of the story was on CAST's private funding, accusing the scientists of conflict of interest. No direct charges were made; the accusation was by intimation.

CAST had provided the writer with information for the article; the Executive Vice President quickly responded to the errors and the selective use of that information.¹⁶ Copies of the CAST reply were sent to the paper's editor and to the chief of the Washington Bureau, as well as to the CAST directorate.

CAST was not alone in reacting. An agricultural consultant sent a personal message to one of the paper's editors. These events seem to have prompted the lead editorial in the following Sunday's paper, "Farm Science Establishment."¹⁷ This repeated the scientific conflict of interest issue, but in greater detail. It had been prepared without contacting CAST for information.

This time, CAST responded to the editorial writer with letters containing detailed explanations.¹⁸ Supplementing these was a letter to the editor, voluntarily submitted by an official of a large agribusiness firm, which was published by the newspaper three weeks after the original story.¹⁹ The others were not published.

The lesson to be drawn from this case history is that an exchange of letters with a news medium is not necessarily an effective or efficient method of communicating with the general public. Walker Lundy of the Tallahassee *Democrat* recently put it this way: "Too often, it's like arguing with the umpire."²⁰

There are benefits to such an exchange, even though the news medium makes no retractions or corrections. (In this situation, similar types of stories and editorials about CAST have continued to appear in the *Des Moines Register* from time to time.) Among the benefits: (1) Everyone concerned with CAST is sensitive to avoid any possible conflicts of interest between funding and the scientific output. (2) The exchange of articles and correspondence lead to better informed internal publics.

This is not the place to present a case history of the article about CAST in the January 1979 *BioScience* magazine of the American Institute of Biological Sciences.²¹ It is a long, complex story that deserves more attention than can be given to it in this presentation. The *BioScience* article and some others that

developed from it early in 1979 may more aptly be called hatchet jobs than cheap shots.

It is useful to note, though, that since the article was published by a science-related organization — some of whose member societies are a part of the CAST consortium — the CAST Executive Committee prepared an extensive review of 24 of the key statements it contained.²² This was distributed to organizations associated with CAST so their leaders would be fully informed of the allegations and the facts regarding them. To a significant degree, this neutralized the negative thrust of the article.

CAST has an informal procedure for responding to media cheap shots. Most are handled on an individual basis. The Board of Directors and others concerned with food and agricultural science have developed an early warning system to alert the Headquarters Office staff of offending items.

Once identified, the cheap shot must be analyzed and evaluated. Who or what is the source? Is it a result of deliberate misinformation or only of inadequate information? Is it an error of editorial judgment or is the source a continual sniper?

Has this cheap shot come at what educators call a “teachable moment”? Is this the time and/or the issue on which to respond? No response should be made without the prospect of a positive effect.

Focusing your response is important, too. What is the audience for the response: the writer? the editor? the publisher? a government agency? the Congress? the residents of a community? an industry? the news media? any or all of the above?

The response must serve a legitimate organizational goal. In addition, who may be the other beneficiaries of this response: an individual? general public? scientific community? an industry?

What is the best channel for the response: a letter to the editor? a personal telephone call or visit? an advertisement? a publication? a television and/or radio appearance? or some combination of these and others?

Carefully select the person or persons to make the response. Try to avoid personality conflicts between the source of the cheap shot and the responder. Involve the elected officials and other leaders of your group so the response can be factual and not tied to paid staff (unless that is the organization’s method of operation). The responder must have expertise in the topic, and be acceptable as a representative of the group for whom he/she speaks, such as scientists, residents, employees, members, and so forth. The responders need not have been involved in the original cheap shot, for this is a matter of issues and facts, not personalities.

Respond as promptly as possible following the publication of the cheap shot. Hopefully, there may be a printed correction or a letter to the editor. However, it is recognized that reader retention is not very good, so readers may not remember the original incident. A timely response tells the source that you are taking the

matter very seriously. It may help to educate him/her if this is a teachable moment.

Keep your response within your area of expertise. Just as politicians can look silly trying to call plays in a football game, so scientists and businessmen lose credibility when speaking about topics outside of their experience.

Be cautious in fighting the battles of others, just though they may be. Most of us have enough fence-mending to do at home without straying into neighboring pastures.

Distribution of the response is an important consideration, too. Reference has been made to the primary target audiences; be sure they each receive a copy, along with some explanation. When the cheap shot appears in the public media, send copies to those newspapers subscribing to the news wire or the syndicate. They deserve a copy of your corrections so they are aware of the level of credibility of the services they are buying. And, they may even publish your reply.

The news media representatives are a double-faceted audience. First, they are a channel for reaching the general public, as well as selected publics, with information of value. That is their news flow role. Second, they are gatekeepers for that news, so are important as opinion leaders and agenda setters. We have a responsibility to keep them well informed, even when we do not have an announcement to be released.

Try to turn a negative cheap shot into a plus. You are taking the offensive by “setting the situation right.” Send copies of the response to your organization’s members, clients, customers, voters, suppliers, colleagues, and other audiences. They need to know you are speaking out! The misinformation is not going unanswered, and you are a leader in the cause. In this age of public apathy and single-issue politics, you may be surprised by the new friends to be made.

What will be the effect on the various audiences if the cheap shot goes unanswered? If it will be quickly forgotten, you have a clue to go on to other matters. But many times a response is demanded, if only to correct the public record. Scientists need to be alert to misinformation, for once a statement is published it takes on a form of legitimacy completely unfounded by the facts. We have a responsibility to keep the public’s supply of information as accurate as possible.

The “Washington Merry-Go-Round” column by Jack Anderson for May 13-14, 1977, was a cheap shot at the agronomic sciences and chemical fertilizers.²³ Anderson claimed fertilizers polluted soils and streams, and wasted precious oil and gas resources. This was his introduction for touting a brand-name microbiological soil additive.

There were factual errors which CAST was urged to call to Anderson’s attention. The Executive Vice President sent Anderson a letter on May 19 saying “additional information and perspective on this subject” was being prepared by two scientists recommended by the

Soil Science Society of America, one member of the CAST consortium.²⁴ Dr. Paul D. Christensen of Utah State University sent a five-page response on June 3, and ten days later Dr. Joel Giddens of the University of Georgia sent off a two-page response.²⁵

Copies of the three letters were sent to the 600-plus newspapers carrying the Anderson column. Neither Anderson's office nor the King Features Syndicate would provide CAST with such a mailing list. However, it was possible to get a copy that had been prepared from clippings. CAST then received clippings from about 20 papers that had printed the Christensen-Giddens responses.

CAST took advantage of this cheap shot to reinforce its position as a recognized voice for food and agricultural science. An eight-page fold-out brochure was published, "When Jack Anderson Errs....CAST Speaks Out!" This reprinted the erroneous column plus the three CAST-initiated letters.²⁶ It was sent to member organizations, and used in a membership solicitation in the fertilizer and agricultural chemicals industries.

CAST pioneered a procedure for reviewing the scientific content of television programs as another means of combating media cheap shots. A feature of this process has been promptly disseminating the evaluations to the news media.

CAST has been alerted to upcoming programs suspected of having a considerable amount of misinformation relating to food and agricultural science. This notification usually has come only a few days in advance. Often the only information available is from the promotion department's news release. Once the scope of the topic is determined and a decision made to form a task force, contact is made with the appropriate scientific societies to ask for their nominations of scientists to be on the task force. Those persons are contacted by telephone to enlist their participation and give them instructions. Each task force member watches the program at his home or office (or motel if traveling). The scientists then discuss the scientific content by a telephone conference call. Depending on the program length, the size of the task force, the program's scientific quality, and the complexity of the issue, this discussion might take up to 1½ hours. The task force chairman or the CAST Executive Vice President makes notes, then summarizes the comments into a news release. This draft is checked by telephone the next morning with the task force members, then called to New York City or Washington where it is reproduced and distributed to the appropriate news outlets.

Usually CAST also publishes a more detailed statement of the review in its report series. These documents are disseminated to member institutions, to the news media, and to other opinion leaders and decision-makers.

The scientists taking part in these and other CAST task forces volunteer their services. They receive no honorarium, though CAST does reimburse them for

any out-of-pocket expenses involved in carrying out this assignment.

There was a reference a few moments ago to an editor's saying that trying to talk to a newspaper was like arguing with the umpire. There is even greater difficulty in communicating with the television industry. A typical television response received by CAST is, "We appreciate having the information you enclosed about Agent Orange, but the program you refer to...was a syndicated program and not produced by NBC...."²⁷

Yet those of us who attempt to follow developments in communication are confronted by public claims of just the opposite position. The networks and the individual stations say that they and they alone are responsible for the programs they air!

Conditions in our society are ripe for the media cheap shot. The general public comprehends little of the glut of information to which it is exposed. Our elected representatives may understand only a little more. Leader and layman alike are looking for ways to decode and evaluate the news flow. Unfortunately, too, news is becoming an entertainment commodity. Many stories on the evening television news are selected because of their amusement and diversionary appeals rather than for their significance or utility.

CAST and other organizations involved in public affairs education are "fair game" for the media cheap shot, or at least so it seems. The Executive Vice President of CAST wrote about this recently in a memo to the Board of Directors.²⁸ He said in part:

CAST probably is attacked by one nonscience advocacy group or another (and occasionally by several) in connection with most of its publications. Such attacks, uninformed and inappropriate though they may be, nonetheless have the intended effect on all too many persons. Included in the affected group are some scientists. Most scientists are remote from public affairs and the political process, and many do not fully appreciate the difference between the way things are done in scientific circles and in the political process.

.....

The important thing to appreciate is the great gulf that exists between the cloistered environment in which scientists search for truth by means of the experimental method and the rough and tumble environment to which science is subjected as CAST endeavors to make sound scientific information available for understanding and decision-making on food and agricultural issues of national importance. Among many who contend for influence in the public arena, scientific accuracy is of only secondary concern, and the ethics of science are an unknown quantity. The objective of many in the public arena is to achieve their goals by whatever means may be at hand.

William E. Burrows, a former newspaper reporter now training science journalists, notes that journalists

are more interested in the *what* of a situation and its *effects*, while scientists prefer to ponder the *why* and to look for *causes*. He believes readers are disillusioned with science because they perceive it to have failed in solving our social ills. In fact, the public feels science may be contributing to the problem!²⁹

In a recent book on science and the news media, June Goodfield urges a special effort by both scientists and journalists. To her, the fundamental point is that "the very notion of being a professional implies an acceptance of moral responsibilities for the consequences of one's work which affect both the other members of the profession and society at large."³⁰

Those of us in agricultural communications must be committed to improving the quality of science reporting. Agribusiness functions to market the results of research. Professionally and personally, we are involved in science transfer, from the laboratories to the fields and the dinner tables of the world.

So, take warning. Just as this spring and summer have been great seasons for mosquitoes, so our society is passing through an era that is favorable to the media cheap shot. And like mosquitoes, it's doubtful the cheap shot can be eradicated. But we can work for

effective control of this misinformation.

Be vigilant in combating the media cheap shot. Public relations practitioners have a commitment to accurate communication. At the same time, we must be wary of being distracted by every cheap shot that comes our way. Be selective in developing your responses. It is easy to spend too much time on these activities. Like swatting mosquitoes, they can drain our resources from the really important issues. Take a careful look at each situation, then determine the short and long-term impacts it may have. Is it just an irritation that will pass in a couple of days, or does it have the possibility of becoming a part of the body of accepted knowledge because nobody cared enough to set the record straight?

We must demonstrate our commitment to the American system. One way to make it work better is to combat the media cheap shot. Walter Cronkite spoke to this point recently, saying, "If we vote for democracy, then we have to defend at every quarter its very foundation, the free and independent flow of public information. That remains democracy's only fail-safe system against both the dangers of its own excesses and the approach of tyranny."³¹

References:

1. Robert A. Day, *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper* (Philadelphia: ISI Press, 1979), p. iii.
2. *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, 378 U.S. 184 (1964).
3. Anita May Pearl, *Dictionary of Popular Slang* (Middle Village: Jonathan David Publishers, 1980), p. 24.
4. *Random House College Dictionary* (New York: Random House, 1973), p. 605.
5. Farm Animal Care Trust, Inc., *Fact Sheet*, No. 4, March 22, 1982.
6. Frank H. Baker, "CAST and the Big T: Truth," Council for Agricultural Science and Technology Paper No. 7, November 19, 1979.
7. "CBS Stalls," *AIM Reporter*, Vol. XI, No. 11, June 1, 1982, p. 1.
8. E.G. Blinn, "The First Amendment: A Personal Statement." A talk for the Iowa State University Summer Lecture Series, July 1, 1982.
9. "Foreword," *American Birds*, April 1972, p. 135.
10. "Pesticide Spokesmen Accused of 'Lying' on Higher Bird Count," *New York Times*, August 14, 1972, p. 33.
11. *Edwards v. National Audubon Society*, 423 F. Supp. 516 (1976). Another case of scientists' right to speak out on public issues is described in "Nutrition Quackery: Upholding the Right to Criticize," by John Harvey Young and Robert S. Still in *Food Technology*, Vol. 35, No. 12, December 1981. It tells about a suit brought against Dr. Frederick J. Stare and Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan.
12. *Edwards v. National Audubon Society*, 596 F. 2d 113 (1977).
13. Charles A. Black, "Informing the Nonagricultural Public About Agricultural Science," Council for Agricultural Science and Technology Special Publication No. 2, December 1972.
14. "CAST — Agriculture's Voice of Reason," *Progressive Farmer*, January 1982.
15. George Anthan, "Firms Pay Pesticide Report Cost," *Des Moines Sunday Register*, August 18, 1974.
16. Letter by Charles A. Black to George Anthan, August 19, 1974.
17. "Farm Science Establishment," *Des Moines Sunday Register*, August 25, 1974.
18. Letters by Charles A. Black to Lauren Soth, August 28, 1974 and September 3, 1974; letters by Lauren Soth to Charles A. Black, August 30, 1974 and September 16, 1974.
19. Earl R. Sorenson, "Defends Financing of Pesticide Report," *Des Moines Sunday Register*, September 8, 1974.
20. Walker Lundy, "Six Reasons Readers Mistrust the Press — and What to Do About It," *Des Moines Register*, April 15, 1982. Reprinted from *The Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*.
21. Robin Marantz Henig, "Agriculture's Strange Bedfellows: CAST-Industry Tie Raises Credibility Concern," *BioScience*, January 1979, pp. 9-12, 59.
22. "Review of 'Agriculture's Strange Bedfellows: CAST-Industry Tie Raises Credibility Concern,' an article by Robin Marantz Henig published in the January 1979 issue of *BioScience*," comments prepared in March 1979 by the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology Executive Committee.
23. Jack Anderson, "Petrochemical Fertilizers Pollute," *Journal and Courier*, Lafayette, Indiana, May 13, 1977.
24. Letter by Charles A. Black to Jack Anderson, May 19, 1977.
25. Letter by Paul D. Christensen to Jack Anderson, June 3, 1977, and letter by Joel Giddens to Jack Anderson, June 13, 1977.
26. "When Jack Anderson Errs....CAST Speaks Out!" Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, August 1977.
27. Letter by Robert O'Neil to Paul W. Santelmann, October 20, 1981.
28. Memo by Charles A. Black, "Nonmembership of Individuals in CAST," to the Board of Directors and State Representatives, May 24, 1982.
29. William E. Burrows, "Science Meets the Press," *Current*, No. 223, June 1980. Reviewed in *ACE Quarterly*, Vol. 65, No. 2, April-June 1982, pp. 26-28.
30. June Goodfield, *Reflections on Science and the Media* (Washington: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1981). Reviewed in *Science*, September 4, 1981, pp. 1108-1109.
31. Walter Cronkite, "The Rebirth of Trust," *Channels*, Vol. 2, No. 2, June/July 1982, pp. 54-56. Adapted from a speech to the National Association of Broadcasters, Dallas, Texas, April 7, 1982.