The Green Press: Mass Media and the U.S. Environmental Movement 1945-1975

Ambrogino Giusti

Faculty Advisor: Linda Nash

Faculty Reviewer: Robert Stacey

Senior Honors History Thesis

Completed: March 8th, 2007

In a 1947 letter to the editor of the *New York Times* entitled "The Smoke Nuisance," New York City resident F. W. Nitardy wrote:

> May I express my appreciation to you for including with the list of tasks awaiting the Mayor as item 4, "Initiate a real anti-smoke program to clear the air and abate the soot nuisance." Smoke, soot, and fly ash are quite unnecessary. It would seem, however, that most of our citizens are not fully aware of the huge economic loss inflicted on them and our city by this nuisance.[1]

In a 1964 letter to the editor of the *New York Times* entitled "To Fight Air Pollution," New York City resident Mildred L. De Vries wrote:

> Congratulations for once again bringing the subject of air pollution to the attention of your readers…To my mind, there is no greater immediate problem facing all big city dwellers…From the details you furnish, Mayor Wagner should be ashamed of himself for his poor handling of this all-important health menace.[2]

These two letters should be of some interest to historians of U.S. environmentalism. In both cases, the writers not only express their concern for an environmental issue but also thank the *Times* for expressing *its* concern as well. More interesting still are the contrasts between them. Whereas the 1947 letter complains that many people are not aware of the problem, the 1964 letter recognizes that the *Times* had repeatedly brought the issue to the public's attention. Also, the 1947 letter characterizes air pollutants as unnecessary nuisances, just as the *Times* had talked of abating a soot nuisance; the 1964 letter describes the problem as a health menace, just as the *Times* had talked of "unhealthful" air. What these letters suggest is that the media played an important role in shaping the environmental movement, both by informing people of environmental problems and by influencing the way people thought about environmental issues.

Most historians of U.S. environmentalism have at least taken note of the media's importance. However, nearly all historical works on environmentalism mention the media only briefly and without much elaboration of their claims or evidence to support them. This lack of sufficient detail and supporting evidence leaves plenty of room for progress in this area of

[1] *NYT*, Dec. 23, 1947, p. 22; in response to *NYT*, Dec. 13, 1947, p. 14
[2] *NYT*, Aug. 4, 1964, p. 28; in response to *NYT*, Jul. 29, 1964, p. 32

research. This paper aims to enrich our understanding of the history of environmentalism by examining in depth the media's coverage of environmental issues.[3]

Specifically, this paper is concerned with the rise of "modern environmentalism" in postwar American society. Modern environmentalism differed from earlier environmental movements in having the support of a broad cross-section of American citizens and advocating strong action to abate anthropogenic environmental threats to human health at all levels of government—local, state, national, and international. Historians typically argue that the modern environmental movement emerged in the 1960s.[4] This paper thus focuses on the period between 1945 and 1975 in order to examine how media coverage changed in the 1960s and early 1970s compared to the preceding postwar decades.

Of the different types of anthropogenic environmental threats to human health with which modern environmentalism was concerned, it was air pollution and water pollution that largely defined the movement in its crucial early years. This paper focuses solely on air pollution, which was by far the more serious of the two concerns. Specifically, this paper focuses on air pollution in the three largest cities in the United States at the time: Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. All three had serious and somewhat different air pollution problems by the postwar period.[5]

---

[3] The best attempt to study the media's role in the history of U.S. environmentalism is Mark Neuzil, *Mass Media and Environmental Conflict: America's Green Crusades* (Thousand Oaks: 1996); for general histories that give little attention to the media, see Hal K. Rothman, *The Greening of a Nation?: Environmentalism in the United States since 1945* (Fort Worth: 1998); Philip Shabecoff, *A Fierce Green Fire: The American Environmental Movement* (Washington DC: 2003); Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement* (Washington DC: 2005); Kirkpatrick Sale, *The Green Revolution: The American Environmental Movement, 1962-1992* (New York: 1993); Samuel P. Hays, *Explorations in Environmental History: Essays* (Pittsburgh: 1998); Samuel P. Hays, *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985* (New York: 1989); Samuel P. Hays, *A History of Environmental Politics since 1945* (Pittsburgh: 2000); Richard N. L. Andrews, *Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves: A History of American Environmental Policy* (New Haven: 2006); for general histories that give no attention to the media, see Victor B. Scheffer, *The Shaping of Environmentalism in America* (Seattle: 1991); Benjamin Kline, *First Along the River: A Brief History of the U.S. Environmental Movement* (San Francisco: 2000); Riley E. Dunlap and Angela G. Mertig, eds., *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970-1990* (Philadelphia, 1992)

[4] Adam Rome, "Give Earth a Chance: The Environmental Movement and the Sixties," *Journal of American History* 90, no. 2 (2003); Scott H. Dewey, *Don't Breathe the Air: Air Pollution and U.S. Environmental Politics, 1945-1970* (College Station: 2000), 4.

[5] For the importance of air pollution to the modern environmental movement, see Dewey, 3-5.

This paper also focuses only on mainstream media—specifically the three major mass-circulation newspapers in each city: the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Chicago Tribune*, and the *New York Times*. Residents in each city consumed information from other types of media as well. Yet these three newspapers in particular were certainly among the most influential forms of media in their respective cities (particularly before the spread television), due to the large size of their audiences and their general claims to objectivity. Many people relied on them for information and opinions about things that affected everyday life, such as air pollution.

A common explanation for why a strong environmental movement emerged in the postwar period is simply that new environmental problems gave rise to new environmental concerns. Yet air pollution was not a new problem in American society during the postwar years; it had been a serious issue of concern during the Progressive era as well. Throughout the Progressive decades, from the 1890s through the 1910s, financially secure upper- and middle-class urbanites detested the smoke that enshrouded American cities. Moreover, they took action against smoke in the form of modest reforms to the existing industrial order—modest, not strong, because they still profited immensely from the industries producing the smoke. Meanwhile, the vast numbers of urban poor were largely marginalized by the movement. Hence, the Progressive era environmental movement to abate air pollution did not attract the support of a broad cross-section of American society. Anti-smoke efforts were also initiated exclusively at the local level. While national regulations were enacted in the same period to conserve natural resources and pristine wilderness, no strong national regulations were developed for air or water pollution, nor were any called for by reformers. This was because Progressive-era reformers viewed pollution only as a local issue. Without an understanding of the problem as national in scope and transboundary in character, there was little agitation for strong national regulations.[6]

[6] David Stradling, *Smokestacks and Progressives: Environmentalists, Engineers, and Air Quality in America, 1881-1951* (Baltimore: 1999), 1-5.

Samuel P. Hays offers a different explanation for why a popular movement for national pollution control did not emerge until after World War II. He argues that the unprecedented affluence of the postwar years encouraged most Americans to reject the old argument—popular during the Progressive era—that pollution was the price of economic progress. Many people were now secure enough economically to demand a healthy city environment as part of their quality of life. Moreover, the New Deal had sufficiently broadened the scope of federal power to pave the way for its intervention in new aspects of American society, such as pollution control. Yet this explanation makes clear only why the modern environmental movement was a postwar phenomenon, not why it became a force in the 1960s. Adam Rome has addressed this point by arguing that the revitalization of liberalism, the growing discontent of middle-class women, and the explosion of student radicalism and countercultural protest in the 1960s each contributed in key ways to the emergence of modern environmentalism. Together, the work of Hays and Rome offer a strong answer to the question of why modern environmentalism was a postwar movement that coalesced in the 1960s. This paper supplements their explanations by adding media coverage of environmental issues as a new and important piece to the puzzle.[7]

The media's coverage of environmental issues was not the only impetus behind the rise of modern environmentalism. Moreover, the movement and the discourse were intertwined; the movement's evolution affected the media's coverage of issues just as much as the media's coverage of issues affected the movement's evolution. Yet an understanding of how the media reported on and, more importantly, how it framed environmental issues—through the stories it reported, the aspects of those stories it focused on, the language it used, the opinions it expressed (directly and indirectly)—helps us understand why modern environmentalism arose when and how it did. There was a limit to how much city residents could learn from direct experience with air pollution, and it was not inevitable that their everyday experiences would result in the

[7] Hays, "Beauty," 13-39; Rome, 1-3

development of a modern environmental consciousness. Without an understanding of how the media helped people think like modern environmentalists through its coverage of environmental issues, our perspective on the rise of modern environmentalism in the 1960s remains incomplete.

There were four noteworthy trends in newspaper coverage of air pollution between 1945 and 1975 which aided in the formation of a modern environmental consciousness among readers.

First, there was a consistent message in articles and editorials that city residents should be concerned with and informed about the problem, as well as interested in and supportive of efforts to solve it. This helps explain why modern environmentalism evolved as a popular movement—why, for example, as many as twenty million Americans from a diverse range of backgrounds turned out to celebrate the first Earth Day on April 22, 1970. By prodding readers to take action on air pollution control in their cities, newspapers increased the likelihood that city residents would take a greater interest in environmental issues in general.[8]

Second, articles reported, and editorials argued, that air pollution was a ubiquitous problem existing in almost every large city throughout the nation and around the world. This helps explain the push for national environmental legislation and international environmental agreements in the postwar period. As newspapers presented local air pollution as part of a broader problem, readers came to think of its causes as deep and structural. City residents were thus more willing to push for extensive and comprehensive governmental solutions.

Third, newspapers framed air pollution as a transboundary problem that could easily spread from one locality to another. This also helps explain why the modern environmental movement not only pushed for local action but also demanded national regulations. By raising consciousness among readers of the fact that air pollution originating in surrounding areas contaminated the air they breathed, and by emphasizing that local regulations alone would be

[8] Rothman, 121-5.

largely ineffective for this reason, newspapers helped galvanize support among city residents for action at multiple levels of government in order to solve their own local pollution problems.

Fourth, the issue of air pollution was framed as a crisis—a public health disaster, immense in scale, growing worse, and requiring quick, effective action to prevent. Unlike the other three trends which were present throughout the period between 1945 and 1975, the discourse of crisis came mostly in the early 1960s and grew stronger over time. This helps to explain why the modern environmental movement really only emerged in the 1960s. The sudden sense that air pollution threatened the very survival of human life in cities across the country pushed city residents to get involved in local anti-pollution campaigns and demand strong national regulations so as to avoid a major environmental catastrophe in their own city.

In addition to these common trends, individual newspapers had unique and important messages specifically targeting residents of the major cities in which they were based. The *Los Angeles Times* reminded readers of Los Angeles' past without smog, adding fuel to an emerging environmental critique of economic progress as an unqualified good. There was also a notion that Los Angeles' smog regulations set a good example for other cities to follow, giving rise to a new sense of civic pride in having effective environmental regulations. The *Chicago Tribune* reminded its readers that Chicago was the first city in the nation to enact anti-smoke regulations, again contributing to a sense of civic pride in having tough environmental regulations, but also a sense of civic shame in no longer having effective environmental regulations. Moreover, it consistently emphasized that industry was not the only source of air pollution, contributing to the emerging notion that individuals needed to take greater personal responsibility for their contribution to environmental problems. The *New York Times* reminded readers that New York had fallen far behind other cities in air pollution control, and criticized the city government for not adequately funding air pollution control programs, both of which fostered a sense of civic shame in not having effective environmental regulations.

Los Angeles

Modern, complex air pollution—as opposed to the older, simpler smoke nuisance of the Progressive Era—was first recognized and confronted in the city of Los Angeles. It was for this reason that Los Angles received the most adverse publicity—and acquired the much-detested designation as "smog capital" of the world. It was deeply ironic, moreover, that Los Angeles became famous for its chronic air pollution. During the latter half of the 1800s, the city was famous for its clear and healthful atmosphere—indeed, it was called the "sunshine capital" of the world. The city had a history of air pollution before the 1940s due to its location. Situated within a ring of mountain ranges with little wind, conditions were perfect for creating atmospheric inversions (when a mass of cool air slides under a mass of warm air) which trapped pollutants entering the atmosphere close to the earth. Pollution of the air by particulate matter from industrial processes was not new, though it was worse by the 1940s due to wartime expansion. What was new by the 1940s was smog (mixed smoke and fog), caused by photochemical reactions on the nitrogen dioxide and hydrocarbons emitted by a growing fleet of automobiles.[9]

The *Los Angeles Times* made banishing smog a pet issue in the late 1940s. Dorothy Chandler, wife of *Times* publisher Norman Chandler, was appalled by the vile atmosphere one day driving back into the region from cleaner areas to the east and marched into her husband's office demanding, "Something has to be done!" (Incidentally, this was not the only instance in which Dorothy exerted influence over the *Times*. By the mid-1950s Dorothy, rather than her husband, had become the most important power at the *Times*.) Norman in turn created a new full-time smog editor to coordinate a publicity campaign against air pollution. The *Times* credited

[9] Dewey, 37-9; *LAT*, Dec. 16, 1954, p. A1; *LAT*, Jan. 31, 1967, p. 1; *LAT*, Jan. 6, 1972, p. C10

itself in various articles as initiating the fight for clean air in Los Angeles; other newspapers, such as the *New York Times* and *Chicago Tribune*, also acknowledged its early leadership.[10]

By 1945, severe smog afflicted Los Angeles every summer, inspiring public protests. In November of 1944, the city council had adopted an ordinance creating a bureau of air pollution control. The summer of 1946 witnessed the most severe smog yet seen in the area, repeatedly stinging residents' eyes and noses, while Los Angeles' smog problem drew nationwide media attention for the first time. Sustained public outcry resulted and local officials joined concerned citizens in pushing for the creation of a countywide program to control pollution sources in the many autonomous jurisdictions of the greater metropolitan area. In 1947, the county board of supervisors created a new county air pollution control district, absorbing the city program.[11]

The *Times* became a key participant in control effort when, on its own initiative, it paid the most well known smoke-control expert in the country to study the local situation and subsequently published his report. During this early period, the *Times* also began requesting specific complaints against sources of smoke and fumes from residents. This resulted in a flood of complaints, which the *Times* turned over to the air pollution control district to investigate. The *Times* also reminded readers that the city had not always had a serious smog problem, that there was a time when "Los Angeles enjoyed and deserved its reputation as the sunshine capital." This was significant, in part, because Los Angeles was experiencing tremendous demographic growth at this time and many new residents probably had little knowledge of the city's history.[12]

In the early 1940s, the *Times* tried to galvanize public support for smog control through opinionated articles and editorials. A 1947 editorial, for example, argued that "it is imperative

---

[10] Robert Gottlieb and Irene Wolt, *Thinking Big: The Story of the Los Angeles Times, its Publishers, and their Influence on Southern California* (New York: 1977), 241-7; Dewey, 87; *LAT*, Nov. 22, 1947, p. A4; *LAT*, May 4, 1950, p. 1; *LAT*, Nov. 9, 1955, p. A5; *CT*, Nov. 23, 1947, p. 27; *NYT*, Nov. 3, 1946, p. 102

[11] Dewey, 41-5, 84; *LAT*, Apr. 23, 1946, p. A1; *LAT*, Aug. 21, 1946, p.2; *LAT*, Oct. 15, 1947, p. 3; *LAT*, Nov. 22, 1947, p. A4; *LAT*, Feb. 3, 1948, p. A1; *LAT*, Nov. 11, 1947, p. A1

[12] Dewey, 39; *LAT*, Dec. 9, 1946, p. 1; *LAT*, Jan. 19, 1947, p. 1; *LAT*, Mar. 21, 1947, p. 5; *LAT*, Oct. 21, 1946, p. A1; *LAT*, Oct. 19, 1946, p. A1

the citizens of the entire county support the smog control program." A 1946 article on efforts to reduce air pollution ends with the statement, "The job can be done. But it costs money. Are the people willing to pay the price?" Another in 1949 stated clearly that the "complete co-operation [of] a thoroughly informed public will hasten the success of the fight on smog." Not only did the *Times* advocate public support for smog control, it often reported that in fact the indignation of city residents was growing more voluble every time smog enshrouded the city.[13]

Another aspect of the *Times*' coverage of air pollution in these early years was a focus on its transboundary dimension. Surrounded by heavily industrialized cities such as Vernon, South Gate, Torrance, and El Segundo—none having anti-smog ordinances—a large amount of the pollutants in Los Angeles' air originated outside the city limits. Many articles printed before the creation of the air pollution control district mentioned this fact. For example, one from 1946 claimed, "It must be remembered that the city bureau has jurisdiction only within the city…this makes [city officials] helpless to do anything about a neighboring city which may belch out smoke and fumes." Another in 1946 quoted a city official saying, "We have obtained wonderful co-operation from plants in the city limits. But look out yonder. What can we do about that?"[14]

As Los Angeles entered the 1950s, the air pollution control district made notable progress in many areas. Large, stationary industrial sources of pollution (e.g. iron and steel mills) were controlled as far as available technology allowed. The heavy particulate emissions (e.g. smoke and soot) common in eastern and midwestern cities were almost completely eliminated in Los Angeles during this time through strict enforcement of a ban on visible emissions. There was also an ambitious and effective program to control sulfur dioxide (a throat and lung irritant) from

[13] *LAT*, Nov. 22, 1947, p. A4; *LAT*, Nov. 4, 1946, p. A1; *LAT*, Oct. 8 1949, p. 6; *LAT*, Sep. 26, 1946, p. A4
[14] *LAT*, Sep. 26, 1946, p. A4; *LAT*, Oct. 16, 1946, p. A1; *LAT*, Jul. 20, 1946, p. A4; *LAT*, Oct. 15, 1946, p. 1; *LAT* Oct. 19, 1946, p. A1

local oil refineries. However, success in controlling particulate emissions did not put an end to *smog*, the principal cause of which was the unregulated, invisible emissions of automobiles.[15]

Because of its accomplishments, Los Angeles was becoming the national and world leader in air pollution control. The *Times* made this known to its readers. Articles reported that "Los Angeles has the strictest set of standards in the United States" and "Los Angeles is the pioneer in smog control…never before has an industrial area [this] size undertaken the control of various gases, fumes, and dusts." Indeed, since the formation of the air pollution control district, Los Angeles had the best-funded control program in the nation. It was even reported that Los Angeles was used by the federal government as a leading example of a city which had organized to combat smog when the federal government held its first national conference on air pollution.[16]

Beginning in the early-1950s, there was a growing awareness in the *Times*' coverage of air pollution that smog was not unique to Los Angeles. A 1953 article summarized this nicely when it begins simply, "Smog no longer is a local problem." Another article on the first National Smog Abatement Week, declared that the whole nation had to be made conscious of the war on smog in cities across the country. A third described air pollution control efforts in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Cincinnati. In this way, the *Times* reminded residents that, despite their city's new reputation as smog capital of the world, the problem was not limited to Los Angeles.[17]

By 1954, a serious smog siege gripped the region and citizens angrily asked why the problem had not been solved. County supervisors and the new mayor of Los Angeles, who had been elected largely on the issue of smog, blamed the director of the air pollution control district, resulting in his demotion. Nonetheless, the air pollution control district continued to make relatively substantial gains in controlling one pollution source after another, narrowing in on the

---

[15] Dewey, 45-6; *LAT*, Sep. 3, 1949, p. 2; *LAT*, Apr. 10, 1952, p. A1; *LAT*, Oct. 17, 1953, p. A1; *LAT*, Jul. 16, 1953, p. A3

[16] Dewey, 44-5; *LAT* Dec. 16, 1950, p. A1; *LAT*, Feb. 17, 1949, p. 2; *LAT*, Oct. 8, 1949, p. 6; *LAT*, Mar. 23, 1949, p. A8; *LAT*, Apr. 26, 1950, p. A1

[17] *LAT*, Sep. 29, 1953, p. 1; *LAT*, Oct. 8, 1949, p. 6; *LAT*, Dec. 3, 1954, p. 1

main source of smog—auto emissions. Compared to Los Angeles, most other cities were making only feeble attempts at air pollution abatement. In 1955, impelled by the terrible smog sieges of the early 1950s, the county created the world's first air pollution alert system.[18]

The *Times* continued to appeal for more public concern and support in the early and mid-1950s. A 1950 editorial claimed that the 2,000,000 residents of Los Angeles had a responsibility to study and understand the problem. Moreover, reported another article, citizens needed to realize that it was everybody's responsibility to help solve the air pollution problem, not the job of one person or one department. Perhaps to avoid sounding hypocritical, the author of one editorial declared, "I personally will stand in line to pay my share if it will give me good clean air to breathe and a blue sky over my head." While this message usually targeted local residents, it occasionally applied to a larger audience. An article on air pollution education in schools quoted the county smog director as saying, "Individual citizens in all parts of the country will be instrumental in determining the success of air pollution control."[19]

The *Times* also continued to remind readers that smog was not unique to Los Angeles, and in the mid-1950s this message was more international in scope. Two articles in particular attest to this. One began by declaring, "Smog is a worldwide problem," and reported that 400 experts at the National Air Pollution Symposium believed that "smog is now a serious problem in cities in the United States, England, Africa, and South America." Another appearing a year later quoted a county smog control officer saying, "More than 100 American cities now are spending tax-payers' money to fight air pollution, many additional cities have smog problems…and filthy air has spread to cities in Europe, Africa, South America, Australia, and no doubt Asia." Thus, he added that while Los Angeles' air pollution was one of the most widely publicized of any city in the world its problem was far from unique.[20]

---

[18] Dewey, 50-3; *LAT*, Jan. 7, 1955, p. 24; *LAT*, Nov. 9, 1955, p. A5
[19] *LAT*, Sep. 5, 1950, p. A4, *LAT*, Nov. 16, 1953, p. A4; *LAT*, Jan. 24, 1956, p. 29; *LAT*, Dec. 30, 1954, p. 4
[20] *LAT*, Apr. 19, 1955, p. A1; *LAT*, May 14, 1956, p. A1

By the late 1950s, the air pollution control district had banned all backyard garbage incinerators (of which there had been some 400,000), just as it had previously quelled the burning of rubbish in all 54 public dumps. Residents had long relied on incineration as a cheap means of solid waste disposal, though their inefficient incinerators belched large amounts of particulates. Reductions in smog were limited, however, and the city continued to suffer terrible smog sieges. The county agency still concentrated on industrial pollution sources, however, requiring all power plants to burn natural gas instead of oil during the summer. Only by 1959 was there a growing sense that auto exhaust was the "real culprit" behind smog.[21]

The *Times*' framing of the smog situation as part of a national and international problem persisted into the late 1950s. An article covering the 1958 Washington Conference on Air Pollution argued it accomplished some good by calling attention to what it called a "national" problem. Two years later, articles on air pollution continued to report that "air pollution is a growing national problem." Rather than portraying smog control efforts as simply solutions to the city's local problem, articles claimed that the "solution of the smog problem in American cities seemed a step nearer today" as a result of new innovations in smog control. Articles also began reporting on air pollution in other countries, sometimes with provocative headlines such as "Russian Smog Gets So Bad It Overshadows Ideology."[22]

Not only did the *Times* report that cities throughout the country and around the world struggled with air pollution, but also that Los Angeles was a model of air pollution control for these cities. A 1958 article declared, "Los Angeles' action in smog matters brought results—or at least the promise of results—on a national level." Another informed readers that their city's world leadership in the fight against smog and air pollution was acknowledged and praised by a group of visiting European air pollution experts. A third proclaimed, "Los Angeles leads the way

[21] Dewey, 46, 53-4; *LAT*, Feb. 22, 1950, p. A4; *LAT*, Sep. 5, 1950, p. A4; *LAT*, Oct. 28, 1956, p. A4; *LAT*, Oct. 10, 1957, p. 1; *LAT*, Jan. 22, 1958, p. 12; *LAT*, Jul. 25, 1957, p. B1; *LAT*, Oct. 29, 1958, p. B1; *LAT*, Jul. 1, 1959, p. 28; *LAT*, Dec. 2, 1959, p. B4

[22] *LAT*, Nov. 21, 1958, p. B4; *LAT*, Dec. 8, 1960, p. 2; *LAT*, Feb. 27, 1960, p. 4; *LAT*, Apr. 20, 1960g, p. 2

in controlling smog. If you placed other cities, such as Chicago, with their smog controls in the Los Angeles Basin, they would be asphyxiated within a year." Establishing a notion that Los Angeles was doing the best job it could given its circumstances was a common way in which the newspaper turned its smog situation from a source of civic shame into a source of civic pride.[23]

Between 1945 and 1960, there were many articles that framed the smog problem in Los Angeles as a crisis. An editorial in 1947 claimed, "It would be fatal to let the smog campaign bog down." The idea that smog constituted a threat to public health was repeated in articles with headlines such as "Air Pollution Can Kill, Medic Group Claims" and "Smog Can Become Killer." Although these articles often referred only to the elderly and people with respiratory ills, the attention-grabbing death imagery prominent in the headlines would have contributed to fears among all readers. Other articles reported that the smog problem had become an "emergency" and warned residents, "Don't underestimate the dangers of smog. It is known that we came perilously close to a major disaster." Even more alarming were articles in 1954 and 1957 which claimed respectively that "America's great cities may be doomed because they are choking themselves to death" and "our large cities might soon become uninhabitable." These two articles added a national dimension and sense of urgency to the still relatively mild discourse of crisis.[24]

Los Angeles' air pollution problems persisted into the early 1960s. A study done in 1960 concluded that breathing the city's air was equivalent to smoking 7 cigarettes a day, while a survey in 1961 found the city's air had one of the highest lead concentrations in the nation. Furthermore, the hated smog persisted. Yet in the early 1960s, the *Times* reported that experts had pinpointed auto exhaust as the main cause of smog, and that steps were finally being taken to

[23] *LAT*, Jan. 22, 1958, p. 12; *LAT*, Jul. 20, 1954, p. A1; *LAT*, May 14, 1956, p. A1
[24] *LAT*, Nov. 22, 1947, p. A4; *LAT*, Jan. 21, 1955, p. A1; *LAT*, Dec. 28, 1958, p. WS1; *LAT*, Mar. 16, 1959, p. B1; *LAT*, Nov. 16, 1953, p. A4; *LAT*, Jan. 13, 1955, p. A1; *LAT*, Sep. 24, 1954, p. 17, *LAT*, Mar. 27, 1957, p. B1

curb it. The city council ordered smog-cutting breather pipes installed on all municipal cars and trucks, and requested that the governor of California make this a statewide regulation.[25]

Despite the growing recognition that automobiles had gone unregulated for far too long, the *Times* still fostered a sense of civic pride in the city's effective regulation of industries and other stationary sources of emissions. "Los Angles County has the most stringent and most strictly enforced air pollution controls in the world," a 1962 article claimed, "and it is these controls that have brought improvement." A 1963 editorial argued that Los Angeles County had proved an effective air pollution control and research program could be initiated and supported locally, though it also claimed the federal government had an important supporting role to play.[26]

Air pollution coverage by the *Times* in the early 1960s still emphasized that the problem was not unique to Los Angeles. An article in 1961 quoted national authorities as saying "we're fast disproving the idea prevalent in other parts of the country that Los Angeles alone deserves to be called smog country." The *Times* even began a new series of articles in 1963 on the spread of air pollution because, as the common preamble explains, "Smog, long considered peculiar to Los Angeles, now is a statewide and national problem."[27]

Yet the *Times* did more than simply point out to readers that others who once chided Los Angeles for its smog were no longer so smug. It also expressed its concern for the "health of the nation" and wondered how it might be protected. A common answer in editorials was that the federal government needed to take more action, and there were signs that it was beginning to do so. Indeed, a 1963 editorialist wrote, "It may only be because smog is increasing in the District of Columbia, but Congress finally seems to be seriously concerned about the national problem of

[25] *LAT*, Apr. 28, 1960, p. B1; *LAT*, Jun. 6, 1961, p. 2; *LAT*, May 27, 1963, p. A1; *LAT*, Jan. 14, 1960, p. B3
[26] *LAT*, Apr. 15, 1962, p. G1; *LAT*, Sep. 11, 1963, p. A4
[27] *LAT*, Dec. 5, 1961, p. B1; *LAT*, May 27, 1963, p. A1

air pollution." These editorials complimented articles on the pervasiveness of air pollution by focusing readers' attention on the logical solution—national controls and regulations.[28]

Despite this focus on national developments, the *Times* did not neglect the international dimensions of the problem in this period. Articles continued to be written on smog problems in cities around the world, including such distant places as Osaka and Rome. An article in 1963 reported that "the world is watching Los Angeles," not so much because the city had effective regulations, but because "we are considered experimental animals frequently being exposed to fumigation by relatively unknown objectionable gases." The implication was that these other cities would soon have to deal with the same objectionable gases.[29]

In these very same articles focusing attention on the pervasiveness of air pollution was a sense that the problem knew no bounds. "The smog problem is international," another 1963 article declared, "it may be generated locally in Buenos Aires or Rome—or it may spill into Mexico from San Diego or into Canada from Detroit." Indeed, smog regularly crossed not only international borders, but also state, county, and city limits. One article included a map of California showing how the smog in Los Angeles was part of a massive blanket covering most of the state and all its major cities. Another article in the *Times* reported that California's air pollutants were also spilling over into Arizona's air.[30]

Not many articles in the early 1960s portrayed the problem of smog as a crisis, though a few did. One in 1961 argued that "the link between air pollution and the future of the nation's metropolitan centers is inescapable," meaning smog could limit the ability of cities to prosper, if not survive. Other articles claimed the problem was growing worse, and would likely continue to do so. A 1961 article, for instance, reminded readers that any attempt to control auto emissions had to consider that an increase in the number of cars would eventually offset the gains made

[28] *LAT*, Sep. 11, 1963, p. A4; *LAT*, Dec. 9, 1962, p. TW18; *LAT*, Aug. 27, 1962, p. 26; *LAT*, May 15, 1962, p. E8
[29] *LAT*, Aug 27, 1962, p. B7; *LAT*, May 7, 1963, p. A1; *LAT*, May 28, 1963, p. A1
[30] *LAT*, May 26, 1963, p. H1; *LAT*, Nov. 22, 1952, p. A1; *LAT*, Apr. 15, 1954, p. 1

through regulations. Another claimed that pollution would always grow apace with population. This was a dire message for Los Angeles which was still experiencing tremendous demographic expansion. As the *Times*' science editor warned in a 1963 editorial, "time is not on our side."[31]

Just as the *Times* had warned, the years of the mid-1960s were marked by a worsening of the problem as total atmospheric oxidant levels increased due to the ever-increasing number of people and automobiles. By 1965, the city was still experiencing some of the worst smog attacks in its history. Meanwhile, the county air pollution control district enjoyed overall public support and respect for its untiring efforts, and new anti-smog groups emerged to work with the agency rather than against it. There was also a continuing shift of primary attention and resentment away from local stationary sources of pollution and toward automobiles and their manufacturers.[32]

From the mid-1960s to the late 1970s, the *Times* continued to remind residents of Los Angeles' idyllic past without smog. For example, a 1963 article about the city's air pollution problems began by describing how "30 years ago the basin bathed in the clear air and sunshine that made the city famous," and how drastic changes had come in less than a decade. Articles in 1968 and 1970 described the city as a "paradise lost," referring to the stark contrast between the clean skies of the past and the mentally depressing "garbage dump in suspension" of the present. A 1972 article similarly reminisced how Los Angeles had been a tourist city famed for its clear and sunny days, yet by 1944 "an ugly haze people were just beginning to call smog had ruined the fair days of prewar memory." For people living under this ugly haze everyday, the notion that their city once had clean skies was a powerful reminder of the cost of economic progress.[33]

In the mid-1960s, the *Times* also reminded readers that Los Angeles was not the only city longing for the clean and clear skies of the past. Articles reported that New York, St. Louis, Washington DC, and Philadelphia all had air pollution as bad as or worse than Los Angeles,

---

[31] *LAT*, Jan. 8, 1961, p. I1; *LAT*, Jan. 8, 1961, p. I1; *LAT*, May 27, 1963, p. A1; *LAT*, Jun. 2, 1963, p. I1
[32] Dewey, 97; *LAT*, Nov. 5, 1965, p. A5
[33] *LAT*, May 27, 1963, p. A1; *LAT*, Jul. 25, 1968, p. A6; *LAT*, Jun. 17, 1970, p. D2; *LAT*, Jan. 6, 1972, p. A1

though Los Angeles' smog still seemed to receive the most adverse publicity. Another article in 1965 quoted health officials who claimed that pollution is plaguing every large city in the world, not just those in the United States. It was also reported that three other cities—Casablanca, Santiago, and Cape Town—shared the "honor" of having the worst locations in the world for air pollution. Besides these three cities, articles also reported on air pollution in Athens, Moscow, and Eilat (Los Angeles' sister city in Israel). The article on Athens reported that "Athens, like many cities of the world, will be deserted unless the problem of smog is faced courageously."[34]

This idea that cities around the world might soon become uninhabitable was part of a much stronger discourse of crisis in the *Times'* coverage of the mid-1960s. Another article in 1966 quoted a scientist saying, "The whole world will eventually suffocate in its own airborne wastes if something drastic is not done." Focusing specifically on Los Angeles, one articles claimed, "Our air could become altogether un-breathable." A 1966 editorial reported that experts at the National Conference of Air Pollution had agreed that smog threatened the very survival of American cities. The editorial then remarked that "failure to act now to lessen air pollution only assures the problem will become worse and the inevitable remedies will be far more drastic."[35] Thus, while the *Times* had long portrayed air pollution as a serious threat to public health, there was a trend in the mid-1960s to portray it as a far more threatening and more pressing problem than once thought, and this had consequences for the way residents thought about the issue.

In keeping with this growing sense of urgency, articles throughout the early and mid-1960s also advocated more action by residents in the campaign against smog. A 1962 editorial with the headline "Join The Fight Against Poison In Your City's Air" commented that "there is still time to reverse the accelerating pace at which we are polluting the air, but only if all of us accept the job as part of our responsibility." A 1963 article reiterated the same basic message

[34] *LAT*, Dec. 10, 1966, p. 3; *LAT*, Feb. 19, 1964, p. 2; *LAT*, Jul. 26, 1964, p. E26; *LAT*, Sep. 1, 1965, p. B15; *LAT*, Mar. 3, 1966, p. A1; *LAT*, Aug. 14, 1964, p. B4; *LAT*, Jul. 22, 1966, p. 3; *LAT*, Dec, 16, 1966, p. B4
[35] *LAT*, Jun. 22, 1966, p. 3; *LAT*, Apr. 11, 1966, p. A4; *LAT*, Mar. 3, 1966, p. A1; *LAT*, Jun. 21, 1966, p. A1, *LAT*, Dec. 27, 1966, p. A4

when it claimed, "Each of us who drives is a litterbug." Since automobiles were now widely acknowledged to be the principal culprit behind smog, residents' individual choices mattered greatly to attempts at smog abatement. This explains why another 1963 article suggested, "We must recognize that our pattern of living and thinking must change drastically."[36]

In the late 1960s, the level of public concern and anger over air pollution skyrocketed following the arrival of the 1967 smog season. Los Angeles residents suffered their worst smog in 11 years, with dangerously high concentrations of ozone. The smog persisted into October, at the same time the debate over the Dingell Amendment to the federal Air Quality Act of 1967 was occurring. The Dingell Amendment tried to delete California's special permission to set emissions standards stricter than federal regulations. California won its right to set stricter standards, due in part to the protests of Los Angeles residents. Meanwhile, by 1968 statistics indicated that smog in Los Angeles was not getting any better, but also not getting much worse.[37]

The *Times*' coverage of air pollution in this period still inspired a sense of civic pride in Los Angeles' (and, more frequently, California's) war against smog. A 1965 article quoted a federal official who claimed, "Los Angeles leads every other major city in battling air pollution, making it the bright spot of the nation in smog control." Another in 1966 reported that all urban areas had followed Los Angeles in developing air pollution problems, though not all had followed it in establishing effective controls and enforcement agencies. A third in 1967 claimed the control of pollutants from industries had made Los Angeles the cleanest metropolis in the nation in terms of sulfur dioxide emissions. The same article described how California led the way in setting strict emissions standards and managing inter-city and inter-county air pollution.[38]

This was not the only article in the late 1960s to mention the transboundary aspect of air pollution. Another argued that, indeed, the cities of southern California had no other choice than

[36] *LAT*, Dec. 9, 1962, p. TW18; *LAT*, May 26, 1963, p. H1; *LAT*, Jun. 2, 1963, p. I1
[37] Dewey, 105-6; *LAT*, Dec. 6, 1967, p. B4; *LAT*, Jul. 25, 1968, p. 1
[38] *LAT*, Sep. 1, 1965, p. B15; *LAT*, Jun 21, 1966, p. A1; *LAT*, Jan. 31, 1967, p. 1

to cooperate in order to solve their mutual air pollution problem. An editorial about what it called Spaceship Earth commented that "pollution respects no municipal, county, state, or international boundaries," and that "there is no ordinance Pasadena could pass to prevent the smog generated in Los Angeles from pouring into its jurisdictional territory." Finally, an article covering the new Air Quality Act of 1967 argued that it marked a timely and appropriate entry of federal power into a problem that respected no state boundaries.[39]

It was a timely intervention not only because air pollution crossed city limits, the *Times* reminded readers, but also because the problem truly was national in scope. As one article put it, "Nearly every large American city has a vehicular air pollution problem of major proportions." Interestingly, there was a sharp increase in the coverage of air pollution and its control in cities located in other parts of the world during the late-1960s. Articles reported on Tokyo and Yokkaichi in Japan, Santiago, Sao Paulo, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, and Mexico City in Latin America, Moscow and Leningrad in Russia, and Budapest, Prague, Belgrade, and Warsaw in Eastern Europe. These articles stressed that air pollution was a worldwide phenomenon, not limited to cities in wealthy, capitalist, or western countries. It was this very idea, becoming more widely accepted at this time, which led the United Nations to hold its first major international conference on environmental issues at Stockholm in 1972.[40]

The discourse of crisis continued into the late 1960s. This was not reserved solely for Los Angeles' smog problem. "Almost every large city in America lives on the brink of a health disaster," a 1967 article declared. This article also claimed that the nation as a whole had to reduce pollution or "we will commit suicide by drowning in the feces of our own industrial prosperity." An editorial from the same year claimed an extreme solution was needed because smog was an extreme problem. A third article reported, however, that it seemed as if "no really

[39] *LAT*, Jul. 11, 1966, p. A6; *LAT*, Jan. 31, 1967, p. 1; *LAT*, Dec. 1, 1966, p. SG1
[40] *LAT*, Jul. 25, 1968, p. A6; *LAT*, Mar. 14, 1968, p. A1; *LAT*, Mar. 16, 1969, p. F1; *LAT*, Feb. 6, 1967, p. 16; *LAT*, Jun. 6, 1968, p. G6; *LAT*, Nov. 23, 1968, p. 7; *LAT*, Mar. 7, 1969, p. 19; *LAT*, Dec. 28, 1969, p. I3; *LAT*, Oct. 12, 1967, p. SF1

effective measures will be taken against smog until people start dropping like flies and children have to wear gas masks to school." Such powerful imagery was new in the late 1960s, and parents concerned with the health and well-being of their children likely took note.[41]

In terms of air pollution, 1970 was the worst year yet for Los Angeles. On two-thirds of the days in that year, Los Angeles carried several times the allowable level of pollutants set by state and federal regulations. City schools also began banning physical activity on smoggy days. Ironically, there was no smog on April 22 of that year, when the city celebrated Earth Day. The county air pollution control district lost most of its public support in the early 1970s, as citizens questioned why the agency had failed to eliminate smog. Indeed, smog had not been banished by 1975. (The air over Los Angeles has never been restored to the level purity it had in 1940.) Yet the city and county of Los Angeles, and the state of California, had accomplished by 1975 far more in air pollution control than any other similar jurisdictions in the nation or world.[42]

The *Times* continued inspire civic pride by reminding its readers of this fact. An article in 1970 quoted a county official claiming, "No county or city in the world has smog control regulations related to factories as strict as Los Angeles County's." A 1972 article defended the air pollution control district's efforts on the grounds that it was recognized internationally as the leading agency of its kind, and it had in fact done a remarkable job in making Los Angeles the cleanest city in the world in terms of particulate matter. Another article reported that "engineers and scientists come from all over the world to see what Southern California has learned to do."[43]

A few articles and editorials still called for more public interest in the campaign against smog. One editorial by the president of a local group called Coalition for Clean Air argued, "We must recognize that each of us is not doing all he could to achieve cleaner air; only an aroused

---

[41] *LAT*, Apr. 6, 1967, p. A6; *LAT*, Oct. 31, 1967, p. A6; *LAT*, Oct. 31, 1967, p. SF1
[42] Dewey, 82, 110; *LAT*, Jan. 9, 1972, p. W7; *LAT*, Mar. 18, 1970, p. E1; *LAT*, Sep. 23, 1970, p. 7A; *LAT*, Apr. 23, 1970, p. A1; *LAT*, Apr. 26, 1970, p. F5; *LAT*, Jan. 9, 1972, p. W10; *LAT*, Jan. 24, 1973, p. C7; *LAT*, Nov. 10, 1970, p. SF1
[43] *LAT*, Nov. 10, 1970, p. SF1; *LAT*, Jan. 9, 1972, p. W10; *LAT*, Jan. 6, 1972, p. C8

citizenry can expect meaningful results." Another editorial claimed with regards to the public that complacency, not ignorance, was the biggest barrier to smog control. Yet other articles reported there was already substantial public support for smog control. One cited a study showing that many residents were so concerned about smog they would give up their autos if rapid transit were available. The *Times* naturally took some pride in the growth of civic activism over the years, since it had largely initiated the postwar drive for such public engagement.[44]

The transboundary dimension of air pollution continued to be the focus of many articles. One described how smog from Los Angeles moved inland to distant counties in California, then continued eastward from city to city and state to state. Another reported how an "advancing line" of air pollution was sweeping into previously untouched rural areas. A third described a new theory of "moving air pollution belts" between major industrial cities. Yet another reported that aerial samples showed pollutants could cover 100-plus miles a day. An equal number of articles and editorials argued that, since smog does not respect boundaries, environmental protection should be a prime concern at every level of government. A 1973 editorial stated simply, "Air pollution is a regional problem, not a local one. It is time to deal with it on a regional basis."[45]

Relatedly, the *Times* continued to focus on air pollution around the world. One article in 1972 reported that the effluents of a "global industrial revolution" were corrupting earth's entire atmosphere and that air pollution had become almost universal in a single generation. A special report in the *Times* entitled "World's New Plague: Polluted Air For All" described air pollution and its control in Thailand, Chile, Japan, England, Paris, Rome, France, Germany, Italy, India, Russia, Vietnam, Argentina, Brazil, the Netherlands, and the United States. Not only did other cities have smog, the *Times* reported, Los Angeles could no longer claim the dubious distinction

[44] *LAT*, Oct. 2, 1972, p. B7; *LAT*, Jan. 6, 1972, p. C8; *LAT*, Nov. 20, 1970, p. SF6
[45] *LAT*, Jan. 9, 1972, p. W7; *LAT*, Oct. 19, 1971, p. B3; *LAT*, Aug. 10, 1972, p. 3; *LAT*, Feb. 9, 1975, p. 3; *LAT*, Mar. 29, 1973, p. 8D; *LAT*, Nov. 17, 1970, p. C6; *LAT*, Jun. 23, 1971, p. SG6; *LAT*, Apr. 29, 1971, p. D9; *LAT*, May, 10, 1973, p. C6

"smog capital of the world" since nine other cities had worse smog. Another article with the headline "Other Cities Face Smog Crisis Worse Than L.A." made a similar claim.[46]

Finally, as the headline of the last article shows, the framing of the air pollution situation as a crisis continued into the early 1970s. Other articles explicitly used the word crisis. For example, one commented that "what we have here in California is a case of air pollution so serious that it is a continuing crisis." Other articles used figurative speech to convey the same general idea. For instance, another called the air pollution situation "a long, slow Pearl Harbor." Many of these articles called for drastic, prompt, and enduring measures to get rid of the problem, arguing that "we can't let up, we have no other options." Hence, there was a stronger sense that the battle against smog would be a long and difficult one. As another article from 1973 put it, "There's still work to be done, and always will be."[47]

In summary, the *Los Angeles Times* was very active in the campaign for clean air in Los Angeles; and it reminded readers of the city's pre-WWII past without a serious smog problem. The *Times* fostered a sense of pride in the city's accomplishments beginning in the early 1950s, at first focusing attention on its strict regulation of industrial polluters, then on the entire state's efforts to reduce auto emissions. Articles and editorials encouraged citizens to get active in the campaign, gradually focusing more on personal responsibility for individual auto emissions. The *Times* had a sustained focus on air pollution developments in other cities in the U.S., and by the mid-1950s and especially the late 1960s around the world. By contrast, the transboundary aspect of air pollution received much less focus after the late 1940s (when neighboring cities polluted Los Angeles' air with impunity) until the early 1970s. Finally, the notion that the air pollution problem had become a crisis was prominent in articles throughout the entire period, though it was much stronger and had more of an international focus beginning in the mid-1960s.

---

[46] *LAT*, Jan. 6, 1972, p. C8; *LAT*, Jan. 6, 1972, p. A1; *LAT*, Nov. 9, 1973, p. C1; *LAT*, Dec. 7, 1970, p. A28
[47] *LAT*, Nov. 6, 1970, p. D12; *LAT*, Jul. 12, 1970, p. N31C; *LAT*, Jan. 9, 1972, p. W7; *LAT*, Jun. 23, 1971, p. SG6; *LAT*, Mar. 29, 1973, p. 8D

Chicago

Like Los Angeles, Chicago did not have as long a history of serious air pollution problems as other cities, such as Pittsburgh and St. Louis. This was because, unlike Los Angles, Chicago's location on a flat plain near Lake Michigan gave it good ventilation—as well as the title Windy City. Nevertheless, the city developed smoke problems during the latter half of the 1800s, due to the sheer volume of industrial and domestic emissions. Not only was Chicago rapidly industrializing, its factories, railroads, steamboats, and households were all fueled by soft, smoky coal. By 1880, the city had a nearly continuous pall covering the whole horizon. As a result, Chicago enacted the nation's first anti-smoke ordinance in 1881 declaring dense smoke a public nuisance, while a 1907 ordinance created a department of smoke inspection. However, due to underfunding, poor enforcement, and other flaws, these ordinances did not eliminate the city's growing problem. Population growth and further industrialization meant that Chicago was burning more coal than ever by 1945, and its air pollution problem had grown accordingly.[48]

By 1947, palls of smog regularly covered portions of Chicago. This persistent nuisance served as the impetus for an 18-month campaign for smoke abatement, beginning in 1947 and culminating in 1948 with the creation of a city ordinance establishing new regulations and a new air pollution control bureau. By October of 1949, Mayor Kennelly had officially launched Chicago into the fight against air pollution by proclaiming the city's first Cleaner Air Week.[49]

In this early period, the *Tribune* was very supportive of air pollution control. A 1949 article pointed out that the city's staff of smoke observers at the time was only half as large as it was in 1909. A 1950 article claimed the city "appears to hold her smoke abatement staff in low esteem" when measured against smaller cities. In proportion to its size and population, Chicago spent far less on anti-smoke endeavors and had the smallest and least well-paid staff compared to

[48] Stradling, 190; Dewey, 23-5; *CT*, Oct. 20, 1949, p. 25; *CT*, Jan. 14, 1952, p. A3; *CT*, Jan. 16, 1952, p. 14; *CT*, Oct. 20, 1963, p. A1; *CT*, Feb. 14, 1966, p. 9

[49] *CT*, Sep. 8, 1947, p. 15; *CT*, Jul. 11, 1948, p. S1; *CT*, Oct. 16, 1949, p. 26

St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Columbus at the time. In 1950, an article appeared claiming the city's policing efforts had failed and that "Chicago may soon be the dirtiest city in America" solely because the city's administration was sleeping on the job.[50]

The *Tribune's* early articles also consistently reminded readers that industry was not the only contributor to air pollution. This was a regular message in its "How to Keep Well" series on various health issues. A 1949 article in this series reported, "Smoke, bellowing from factories, is not entirely to blame, as every home has a furnace to add to air pollution." It was also a central message of the "Grime Girl" series in which a reporter toured the city in a white coat to see how dirty it got—"much of the city's air pollution problem can be blamed on citizens," she wrote.[51]

A few articles in this period also informed readers that air pollution was a ubiquitous problem transcending city limits. The author of a 1950 article on control efforts in Pittsburgh expressed the view that, like Pittsburgh, "Chicago is an island of anti-smoke effort" surrounded by a region of heavy industry "wherein smoke making knows no law." A 1951 article reported that smogs were killing hundreds of Americans in dirty cities each year, while an article in the "How to Keep Well" series claimed smog was a growing problem in many parts of the country.[52]

Though the *Tribune* did not claim Chicago's air pollution problem was unique, it did foster a sense that the city's control efforts were exceptional—at least in the past. Articles printed in 1952 reminded readers that "Chicago led the nation in its fight against the smoke evil more than 70 years ago," referring to its 1881 ordinance. Yet, they claimed, Chicago long ago forfeited its leadership in the crusade for health and cleanliness; by that time it tolerated blacker smoke than many other U.S. cities. Hence, a 1955 editorial about Los Angeles' smog problem cautioned

[50] *CT*, Oct. 20, 1949, p. 25; *CT*, May 22, 1950, p. 14; *CT*, Oct. 31, 1950, p. 20
[51] *CT*, Jun. 9, 1949, p. 22; *CT*, Mar. 13, 1950, p. 14; *CT*, Mar. 14, 1952, p. 12; *CT*, Mar. 17, 1952, p. B9
[52] *CT*, May 12, 1950, p. 13; *CT*, Feb. 2, 1951, p. 15; *CT*, May 8, 1952, p. 16

Chicago residents against gloating over the California city's plight since there was no denying that Chicago had its own serious smoke and dust problem.[53]

How had Chicago fallen behind other cities? On the one hand, it was simply the result of Chicago at the time having a greater concentration of industry than any other comparable space on earth, as well as being the world's number one user of bituminous or "soft" coal (which releases more particulate matter and has more of the sulfur dioxide that makes smoke acidic than anthracite or "hard" coal). On the other hand, the *Tribune* pointed out, it was "the plain truth" that Chicago was doing less than any other large city to stop air pollution—its efforts were "feeble, spasmodic, and unproductive." A 1955 editorial went so far as to call for the abolition of the city's department of air pollution control if it could not show better results.[54]

This line of criticism continued into 1956. One article from this year claimed that despite a reduction in average monthly dustfall from 1926 to 1955, Chicago still lagged behind other major cities and its "delinquency is evidenced by an overspreading mass of smoke and haze." It noted that even Los Angeles, though notorious for its smog, actually had cleaner air in terms of particulate emissions. Moreover, it claimed, this was because the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District had a staff of 166 and a budget of $1,248,038—compared to Chicago's department of air pollution control with a staff of 35 and a budget of $300,000. A second 1956 article claimed, "What would impress citizens of Chicago most…would be evidence that the mayor and city council earnestly mean to make the most of anti-smoke ordinances." A third opined that in order to be a greater city Chicago must be a cleaner city.[55]

During its sustained criticism of Chicago's control efforts, the *Tribune* did not elide the fact that air pollutants originating outside the city limits contributed to the city's problem. A 1956 article informed its readers that the city's department was urging the formation of an air

[53] *CT*, Jan. 14, 1952, p. A3; *CT*, Jan. 16, 1952, p. 14; *CT*, Oct. 5, 1955, p. 20
[54] Dewey, 18; *CT*, May 17, 1955, p. 20; *CT*, Apr. 25, 1955, p. 22; *CT*, Apr. 22, 1955, p. B9; *CT*, Apr. 29, 1955, p. 16
[55] *CT*, Sep. 6, 1956, p. 10; *CT*, Dec. 19, 1956, p. 16; *CT*, Jun. 15, 1956, p. 6

pollution control board for the entire Chicago metropolitan area. An editorial from the same year commented, "There is merit in the proposal…which could logically be widened into an interstate body with jurisdiction over northwest Indiana." A third 1956 article explicitly declared it was utterly futile to try to purify Chicago's air by action confined to the city limits. This notion that local regulations were completely inadequate hinted at the need for strong federal regulations.[56]

Subsequently, the department of air pollution control steadily increased its enforcement of anti-smoke regulations throughout 1956 and into 1957. Moreover, the city had drafted a tougher air pollution ordinance—ten times as voluminous as the existing law—by May of 1957, and presented it to the mayor in January of 1958. A 1957 editorial felt the new ordinance was timely since Chicago was clearly lagging behind other cities. It cautioned, however, that "the problem is not going to be solved with an ordinance alone"—it must also be enforced. The proposed ordinance spent almost a year in city council before being unanimously approved in December of 1958. During this time, a sense of urgency developed after the city suffered through the first eye-itching smog in its history. Once the ordinance became law, the *Tribune* once again expressed cautious optimism, claiming that "passing an improved ordinance is an indispensable step toward cleaner air, but it is a first step not a last one."[57]

Over the next few years, the *Tribune* continued to focus attention on the transboundary dimension of air pollution. The author of a 1958 article covering the first national conference on air pollution opined that since air currents do not respect political borders, coping with air pollution could be neither a city nor even a state function. A 1959 article quoted an official as saying that "unless controls are extended over a wider area, everyone is going to suffer."

---

[56] *CT*, Feb. 28, 1956, p. 3; *CT*, Mar. 3, 1956, p. 10; *CT*, Sep. 7, 1956, p. 6

[57] *CT*, Dec. 24, 1956, p. 9; *CT*, Mar. 3, 1956, p. 10; *CT*, May 10, 1957, p. C11; *CT*, Oct. 21, 1957, p. A6; *CT*, Jan. 17, 1958, p. 15; *CT*, Oct. 26, 1957, p. 16; *CT*, Nov. 20, 1958, p. W9; *CT*, Dec. 6, 1958, p. 7; *CT*, Dec. 23, 1958, p. A1; *CT*, Jul. 24, 1958, p. 7; *CT*, CT, Dec. 30, 1958, p. 10

Incidentally, by March of 1961 the Chicago city council approved a resolution asking the Illinois state legislature to create a metropolitan agency for this very purpose.[58]

One impetus for this attention on the transboundary quality of air pollution was the city's wind. It was long known that strong winds blowing across Chicago from Lake Michigan tended to purge much of the city's auto fumes before they could form smog. By 1962, articles in the *Tribune* began reporting that "the same winds which Chicagoans think clean their air actually carry great amounts of pollution." These ill winds came primarily from the south, bringing pollutants from the industrialized Calumet region of Indiana. The Calumet region had one of the nation's worst air pollution problems at the time and—as the *Tribune* noted—the entire metropolitan area suffered since dirty air did not respect city limits. Moreover, it claimed, the myth of purifying winds "has done more than anything to impede an attack on air pollution."[59]

Another part of the problem was nearby suburbs. In 1962 and 1963, a number of articles in the *Tribune* complained that suburbs had little or no air pollution enforcement, and Chicago was powerless to enforce its own strict ordinance further than one mile beyond its city limits. The logical implication, as many articles pointed out, was that Chicago could not have clean air until suburbs established laws of their own, or submitted to a countywide, statewide, or nationwide control program. There is evidence that the city and state began seeking these solutions. In August of 1962, Evanston created an ordinance after Chicago charged the suburb with polluting its air. By September of 1963, Mayor Daley was offering suburbs the use of Chicago's facilities to aid them in establishing air pollution control departments. And by October of 1963, the *Tribune* reported that the Illinois sate legislature was "preparing to surround Chicago with cleaner air" via a statewide control act.[60]

---

[58] *CT*, Nov. 22, 1958, p. 14; *CT*, Jun. 3, 1959, p. B10; *CT*, Mar. 31, 1961, p. 5
[59] *CT*, Feb. 28, 1962, p. A7; *CT*, May, 21, 1962, p. A10; *CT*, Oct. 4, 1962, p. N1; *CT*, Oct. 11, 1962, p. 51
[60] *CT*, Aug. 16, 1962, p. S3; *CT*, Sep. 28, 1962, p. A4; *CT*, Oct. 7, 1962, p. N1; *CT*, Oct. 11, 1962, p. W1; *CT*, Dec. 12, 1962, p. B17; *CT*, Jan. 29, 1963, p. A5; *CT*, Aug. 12, 1962, p. L1; *CT*, Sep. 18, 1963, p. A8; *CT*, Oct. 22, 1963, p. A1

During the early 1960s, the *Tribune* continued to remind its readers that smog was a ubiquitous problem in the United States. It did so through articles on scientific reports claming that "the smog problem typical of Los Angeles is beginning to develop in other American cities," articles reprinting speeches by President Kennedy calling for action to eliminate smog from American cities, and articles in its "How to Keep Well" series which claimed air pollution was no longer limited to a few notorious smog belts, but a problem in almost any city of any size. These articles gave readers all the more reason to support nationwide pollution regulations.[61]

A final theme running through the *Tribune's* articles in the late 1950s and early 1960s was the need for residents to get involved in the city's campaign. Two opinionated articles in 1958, for example, ended on this very note. One article declared that "individual citizens must voluntarily do what they can to limit and reduce air pollution," the other that "air contamination calls for the intelligent cooperation of individuals both in their daily routine and in their support for adequate government action." By 1964, articles regularly quoted city officials making such statements as "only thru an increase in public awareness and cooperation can the city clean its air" and "the public has been educated, ignorance [of anti-smoke regulations] no longer is an excuse." These followed the usual claim that industry was not the sole source of air pollution.[62]

By 1963, the *Tribune* felt confident enough to print an article declaring Chicago to have a record unsurpassed in the nation for taking action against air pollution. Most of its remedial measures had been taken quite recently. The city had adopted a new comprehensive ordinance in 1959 to control additional kinds of pollutants and increase the air pollution control department's budget and staff. In 1964, the city's efforts received a huge boost when it was awarded a federal grant of $1,179,000 giving Chicago the largest budget for air pollution control in the nation. In that same year, it won the National Cleaner Air Week Award. In 1965, the department installed a

[61] *CT*, May 22, 1962, p. 14; *CT*, Dec. 11, 1962, p. 14; CT, Sep. 17, 1962, p. 24
[62] *CT*, Dec. 30, 1958, p. 10; *CT*, Nov. 22, 1958, p. 14; *CT*, Oct. 7, 1962, p. N1; *CT*, Jan. 1964, p. A8; *CT*, Dec. 17, 1964, p. S1

new detection system to systematically measure sulfur dioxide levels for the first time. The *Tribune* obviously felt such developments were important enough to report to its readers.[63]

Despite this positive account of Chicago's progress, however, the *Tribune* sent a parallel message that the problem was nevertheless still growing. Articles in 1964 reported that Chicago had the worst level of sulfur dioxide of any large city in the nation. A flurry of articles in 1965 and 1966 made such claims as "air pollution has not had the public and scientific attention it should have had," the task of cleansing the air "will never be accomplished since urbanization always stays one jump ahead," and though progress has been made "there is still a long way to go and many difficulties to overcome." In May of 1966, the *Tribune* claimed there was little improvement in the quality of Chicago's air, even with the increase in anti-pollution efforts.[64]

By 1966, a number of Chicago's suburbs also began increasing their air pollution control efforts. Residents of Cicero—the most polluted community in the west suburban area—organized a citizens' committee that presented a petition to town officials for more regulation. A long-awaited air pollution ordinance for another suburb called Gary was presented to its city council. And a third suburb, Hammond, passed its own strong air pollution ordinance, despite an attempt by the suburb's chamber of commerce to weaken its provisions. The *Tribune* covered all these events in great detail, which was consistent with its earlier concern that pollutants originating in various suburban areas were contaminating Chicago's air. Hence, just by reporting on the local concern with inter-city air pollution, the *Tribune* contributed to the development of a consciousness among readers of the transboundary dimension of environmental issues.[65]

This coverage continued throughout the mid-1960s. In 1967, the *Tribune* reported that the city council of Des Plaines had unanimously voted to draft its first control ordinance. Gary's city

---

[63] *CT*, Oct. 20, 1963, p. A1; *CT*, Apr. 11, 1965, p. 128; *CT*, Aug. 29, 1965, p. S1
[64] *CT*, Jan. 5, 1964, p. S3; *CT*, Sep. 10, 1964, p. WA4; *CT*, Jun. 7, 1965, p. 24, *CT*, Jul. 11, 1965, p. N7; *CT*, Feb. 14, 1966, p. 9; *CT*, May 20, 1966, p. A10
[65] *CT*, May 5, 1966, p. J1; *CT*, Jul. 21, 1966, p. G3; *CT*, Dec. 1, 1966, p. 14; *CT*, Feb. 19, 1967, p. A1; *CT*, Jun. 23, 1966, p. 1; *CT*, Jul. 10, 1966, p. 3; *CT*, Jul. 28, 1966, p. 1; *CT*, Sep. 18, 1966, p. A3, *CT*, Nov. 20, 1966, p. O3; *CT*, Dec. 25, 1966, p. A3

council passed its new ordinance in 1967, which was similar to ones already passed in Whiting and East Chicago. Between 1968 and 1970, Evanston, Batavia, and Aurora had all increased their control efforts as well. Even before then, Cook County officials had voted unanimously to extend its control ordinance to 126 suburbs in 1967. The *Tribune's* interest in these events is easy to ascertain—less pollution emanating from suburbs meant less pollution absorbed by Chicago. As one 1967 article put it, "We cannot continue to think in terms of arbitrary boundaries…if we are to cope with such area-wide problems as air pollution.[66]

The *Tribune's* coverage of air pollution in the mid-1960s was also consistent with its earlier concern that citizens needed to be more active. There was some evidence for growing public involvement. A 1965 article contained a comment by an air pollution inspector that "the public is becoming more and more conscious of air pollution control," as reflected in the increasing number of violations people reported. Nonetheless, two articles in 1966 were critical of the public's attitude. One claimed Chicagoans seemed simply unaware of the polluted state of their air; the other claimed, "We know how to cure smog, it's not difficult or expensive, the problem is getting the people in the community to support a cleanup program."[67]

This criticism was even more explicit by 1967. In an article about trash fires, the author quoted an official as saying, "Industry knows how and why it must abate its share of pollution…the public somehow has to be educated." Another article claimed that Chicago would only have clear skies after the public was jolted out of its apathy and willing to accept its part of the financial burden of control. A third claimed it was time for people to become angry at what is happening to their air, implying that concern was still lacking. Through such criticism, the tried to foster a more active citizens' movement for cleaner air. Why? As the *Tribune* itself explained

[66] *CT*, Feb. 23, 1967, p. F8; *CT*, Apr. 5, 1967, p. B11; *CT*, May 9, 1968, p. N1; *CT*, Sep. 1, 1968, p. W3; *CT*, Dec. 4, 1969, p. W1; *CT*, Jan. 18, 1970, p. W3; *CT*, Oct. 4, 1967, p. 10; *CT*, Sep. 27, 1967, p. B1
[67] *CT*, Jan. 28, 1965, p. N1; *CT*, Feb. 13, 1966, p. 3; *CT*, Sep. 27, 1966, p. 8

in the common preamble to its series of articles on air pollution, "This is yet another instance of our continuing attempts to inform the public on subjects of great concern to society."[68]

A new aspect of the *Tribune's* coverage in the mid-1960s was its characterization of air pollution as a growing crisis. It is evident in one article's claims that the "lungs of city dwellers…are grimy with substances that can be lethal," and that "killer smogs have taken lives in London and New York." It can also be found in a 1966 article's claim that the federal government had committed the nation to a war on air pollution since the atmosphere in many cities would soon become "too toxic to permit human life." Another article in 1966 carried the crisis discourse even further in telling readers, "There is no possibility of withdrawal from this contest, no chance of negotiating with the nebulous gray enemy."[69] This portrayal of the city as locked in a fight for survival against air pollution by the *Tribune* gave readers a sense that urgent action by government was not just desirable, it was now absolutely necessary.

In 1968, the *Tribune* reported that Chicago was the second most polluted city in the nation. A few articles began to run alarming headlines such as "Report Shows A Killer Smog Possible Here," while others created powerful imagery with statements such as "Chicago looks [from a helicopter] as tho it is being smothered under a blue-gray fog." Articles in the late 1960s also quoted federal officials as saying, for example, "In every region of the country air pollution is serious…but what is truly frightening is that the problem is relentlessly growing worse." Many of these articles argued, or at least implied in not-so-subtle ways, that action had to be taken immediately if the problem was to be solved. Many also reached the conclusion that only the federal government could rescue U.S. cities from air pollution.[70]

By the late 1960s, Chicago still suffered through days of heavy smog due to thermal inversions which kept pollutants from dispersing over a wider area. During these smog sieges,

---

[68] *CT*, Jun. 15, 1967, p. 1; *CT*, Feb. 25, 1967, p. E9; *CT*, Oct. 23, 1967, p. A17; *CT*, Feb. 28, 1967, p. 12
[69] *CT*, Feb. 13, 1966, p. 3; *CT*, Sep. 29, 1966, p. D6; *CT*, Sep. 26, 1966, p. 4
[70] *CT*, Feb. 15, 1968, p. 1; *CT*, Oct. 30, 1968, p. 16; *CT*, Oct. 23, 1967, p. A17; *CT*, Feb. 15, 1968, p. 1; *CT*, Oct. 24, 1967, p. 6; *CT*, Mar. 28, 1968, p. 22; *CT*, Dec. 15, 1966, p. 6

sulfur dioxide levels often rose to potentially dangerous levels. Stronger clinical evidence also emerged around this time that sulfur dioxide caused acute respiratory illness, especially in elderly people. Concern over sulfur dioxide was one of the factors leading to the development of a set of stringent amendments to the city's air pollution code, approved by the city council in June of 1968. Although the amendments mandated a gradual reduction in the sulfur content of coal, in June of 1969 the city council postponed this requirement for a year. This resulted in a public outcry. Most of the *Tribune's* articles covering this event were fairly dispassionate. One article, however, reported that while the decision benefited a few people economically, it condemned thousands of people to further discomfort and danger.[71]

In November of 1969, Chicago experienced what the *Tribune* would later refer to as the November smog crisis. Between the 6th and 11th of that month, a blanket of smog trapped by a thermal inversion shrouded the city, with pollutants attaining such high levels that it was reported in the *Tribune* on the 8th as a "life-threatening situation." (The same article also pointed out that "business and industry are not alone to blame…each of us who burns coal contributed our bit.") Not long after the pollution episode, the *Tribune* ran articles questioning why "too little had been done too late" by city officials and the state of Illinois asked the same question.[72]

Other articles in 1969 also portrayed the problem of air pollution as a crisis. One on the city's balloon-suspended measurement equipment reported pollutants were reaching dangerous levels. An article in the "How to Keep Well" series began, "The air over our metropolitan areas is getting worse by the year." Most striking of all, however, was an article with the headline, "Is Man His Own Doomsday Machine?" This seven-page report on "the earth dweller's alarming

[71] *CT*, Sep. 9, 1967, p. A8; *CT*, Oct. 20, 1968, p. 16; *CT*, Jul. 21, 1968, p. A2; *CT*, May 25, 1968, p. C11; *CT*, Jun. 20, 1968, p. 4; *CT*, Jul. 21, 1968, p. A2; *CT*, Jun. 24, 1969, p. B8; *CT*, Jun. 30, 1969, p. B20; *CT*, Jul. 10, 1969, p. NB2

[72] *CT*, Nov. 8, 1969, p. S10; *CT*, Nov. 17, 1969, p. 30

tendency to make his planet uninhabitable" contained a picture of a smoggy Chicago day with the caption, "Too many fine days like this and we're all dead."[73]

Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s, the *Tribune* regularly reminded readers that the problem of air pollution was ubiquitous. Some articles focused on the national level, with statements such as "Chicagoans who thought air pollution was only a problem of cities like Los Angeles and New York were shaken last November" and "3 out of 5 Americans now breath dangerously polluted air…the list of polluted cities grows." Coverage of other countries also increased. The *Tribune* ran articles on air pollution in, for example, the Soviet Union, South America, and Mexico. A sense of solidarity in the face of a national and international problem was captured nicely by one article's claim that "it won't make any difference whether you are a socialist, democrat, republican, communist, or member of the Greek Junta if we run out of air."[74]

By 1970, Chicago was still second only to New York in sulfur dioxide levels, though the largest single air pollution factor in the city was carbon monoxide from automobiles. Also in 1970, the state of Illinois sought to revoke Chicago's permit to operate its own air pollution control department. State officials were forced to reevaluate the city's exemption from state control by the November Crisis (which resulted in 100 deaths) and a growing perception that the city's department was inefficient. This perception was due in part to the *Tribune's* efforts to get the department's director to release the names of 13 anonymous payrollers supposedly working as inspectors but suspected of being patronage workers. The inquiry resulted in the director being fired. In an effort to convince the state not to revoke its permit, the city passed even more stringent regulations on the sulfur content of coal and increased penalties for violations.[75]

---

[73] *CT*, Sep. 4, 1969, p. 18; *CT*, Feb. 15, 1969, p. W12; *CT*, Mar. 30, 1969, p. H18
[74] *CT*, Feb. 5, 1970, p. S1; *CT*, Aug. 31, 1967, p. C19; *CT*, Jul 21, 1968, p. A14; *CT*, Dec. 28, 1969, p. C15; *CT*, Apr. 4, 1970, p. 6; *CT*, Nov. 26, 1971, p. A10
[75] *CT*, Aug. 4, 1970, p. A7; *CT*, Apr. 26, 1970, p. N5; *CT*, Apr. 11, 1970, p. NA23; *CT*, Apr. 17, 1970, p. 20; *CT*, Apr. 20, 1970, p. 17; *CT*, Jan. 13, 1970, p. 5; *CT*, Jan. 10, 1971; p. SA6; *CT*, Jan. 12, 1970, p. 22; *CT*, Jan. 13, 1970, p. 13; *CT*, May 20, 1970, p. 20; *CT*, Apr. 30, 1970, p. B4; *CT*, Jun. 28, 1970, p. A7

In the early 1970s, the *Tribune's* message that citizens needed to be more active in the campaign against smog was more explicit then ever. In a straightforward appeal, one article stated, "We urge the citizens of Illinois, Indiana, and every other state to quit sending flyweight budgets and officials into the ring against air pollution." The *Tribune's* reasoning was simple: "the final solution to pollution is what the public is willing to do." Hence, articles quoted experts as saying, in the case of the need for more public transportation, that the biggest obstacle was people's desire for cars as a symbol of independence or social status, and with respect to the need for a ban on leaf-burning, that "people are going to have to recognize there must be an abridgment of personal freedom if we are going to live the way we do."[76]

Fortunately, the *Tribune* noted, there was evidence of growing public activism, such as Chicagoans volunteering to serve as smoke watchers for the city. Moreover, articles on environmentalism in general emphasized that curbing pollution "is a goal that has increasing support from an ever-widening spectrum of Americans." The *Tribune* clearly approved. By both reporting there as a need for more public activism and lauding the public activism which took place, the *Tribune* may well have prompted more than a few city residents to take a greater interest in Chicago's air pollution problem and environmental issues in general.[77]

The notion that air pollution was a transboundary problem also carried over from the late 1960s, when the *Tribune* had referred to air pollution as "the sewer of the sky…as broad as the sky itself and crossing city, county, and state lines." One 1970 article warned, "Every time Chicago has a southeast wind, the city will have a pollution problem" thanks to the heavily industrialized suburbs of Gary and South Chicago. The persistent problem of suburb air pollution explains why the *Tribune* took a rather positive view of the state's decision to revoke the city's

[76] *CT*, Aug. 24, 1970, p. 15; *CT*, Apr. 18, 1971, p. A1; *CT*, Mar. 11, 1971, p. S1; *CT*, Nov. 15, 1970, P. SCL6
[77] *CT*, Mar. 11, 1970, p. A3; *CT*, Feb. 1, 1970, p. A1

permit to have its own department without state control. As the author of one article pointed out, stronger state control meant better regulation of air pollution sources outside the city limits.[78]

The notion that air pollution was a growing crisis continued as well. Quotes in articles by government officials suggested this. Nixon was quoted as saying, "New York, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles might soon become unfit to live in if they do not curb the growing menace." In response to cuts in federal aid, the city's commissioner of environmental control was quoted as declaring, "I don't think they recognize that we have serious problems here." Yet quotes were not the only way this message was conveyed. Statements by the writers themselves were often more original. The *Tribune's* environmental editor remarked, "Death by air pollution doesn't strike like a bullet…it is slow like poison, striking the weakest people first: babies, infants, asthmatics, the aged, and the poor." Another writer claimed, "Air pollution is our new airborne disease and people are the germs…the move to the suburbs has only widened the area of contamination." This discourse of crisis likely strengthened demands among residents for urgent governmental action to halt the spread of the "disease" threatening human life in their city.[79]

Periods of intense smog—or, as the *Tribune* often called them, "air pollution menaces"—marked both the beginning and the end of the year 1971. The city suffered through four consecutive days of smog with hazardous levels of sulfur dioxide in January. By December, the city was again besieged by the "menace" for two consecutive days. This time, the *Tribune* reported that Chicago was experiencing its worst air pollution since monitoring began in 1966. Southerly winds eventually saved the city by pushing the stagnant air out over Lake Michigan.[80]

During the same year, the *Tribune's* usual plea for more public outcry over air pollution was replaced with a greater emphasis on the ways in which citizen concern already existed, not only in Chicago but also across the country. An article reporting on the EPA's first use of its

[78] *CT*, May 30, 1967, p. D1; *CT*, Feb. 5, 1970, p. S1; *CT*, Sep. 17, 1970, p. W1
[79] *CT*, Jan. 3, 1970, p. A12; *CT*, Oct. 27, 1970, p. 3; *CT*, Jan. 10, 1971, p. p. SA6; *CT*, Sep. 20, 1972, p. 20
[80] *CT*, Jan. 2, 1971, p. A1; *CT*, Jan. 1, 1971, p. 2; *CT*, Dec. 4, 1971, p. 7; *CT*, Dec. 5, 1971, p. A20

emergency powers under the Clean Air Act to force Birmingham to shut down its industries during a smog siege focused on how residents—though hurt financially—directed their animosity at the polluters rather than the EPA. Another reported on a calendar produced by the local environmental group, Campaign Against Pollution, which Chicagoans could use to keep a day-by-day record of all the violations they found (which the group then collected at the end of the year). The *Tribune* not only took note of the trend, but also pointed out that, "A public vitally concerned about pollution will no longer accept promises in lieu of performance."[81]

One aspect of this "performance" the *Tribune* strongly emphasized in the early 1970s was cooperation among different levels of government. The *Tribune* lost patience with the long-standing feud between the city and state, claiming that "officials at all levels keep telling us cooperation is necessary…here is an opportunity for them to act on their own advice," and warning that if the feud continued both sides would lose and the cause of clean air would suffer. Other articles reported on actual instances in which city and state officials worked together and approved of federal regulations. One article described how the job of chasing down city polluters was in fact shared by a myriad of departments at the city, county, state, and federal level.[82] By demanding greater governmental cooperation, and explaining why existing cooperation was useful, the *Tribune* helped develop demand for such cooperation among city residents.

By 1972, the *Tribune* was reporting that Chicago's air was the cleanest it had been since 1964, due to massive decreases in sulfur dioxide levels; hence, the city would easily meet the 1975 deadline for compliance with federal standards set by the Clean Air Act. It did not make the deadline. In July of 1973, officials discovered the low sulfur dioxide figures were erroneous, and

[81] *CT*, Nov. 28, 1971, p. A3; *CT*, Mar. 28, 1971, p. A3; *CT*, Jan. 5, 1972, p. 16
[82] *CT*, Jul. 18, 1972, p. 14; *CT*, Sep. 7, 1972, p. W2; *CT*, Dec. 13, 1973, p. W1

the city had made far less progress than previously believed. Chicago continued to struggle with air pollution problems such as dangerously high ozone levels throughout 1974.[83]

In the early 1970s, the *Tribune* consistently attributed the huge gains in sulfur dioxide control to city regulations. For instance, one 1972 article claimed "the gain is traced directly to rigid antipollution measures forcing polluters to switch to cleaner fuels," while another claimed the low levels of sulfur dioxide in a recent dirty air attack indicated the city's sulfur controls were becoming effective. In February of 1973, the *Tribune's* environmental editor argued yet again that the low readings of sulfurous gases "marked a turning point in Chicago air pollution history because it shows that the city's ban on burning high-sulfur fuel is working." In this way, the *Tribune* tried to salvage a certain amount of civic pride in Chicago's anti-pollution efforts. More importantly, it sent a message to readers that governmental regulations, though they had not eliminated the problem, were the source of what limited progress was being made. This certainly helped contribute to a consciousness among residents that federal regulations would be instrumental for whatever progress could be made at the national level as well.[84]

During the mid-1970s, the *Tribune* continued to praise public engagement with the issue. An article in February of 1973 on Chicago's cleaner air claimed that "behind it all was a hard core of citizens who fought City Hall and big industry for the right to cleaner air." The same message continued into 1975, with one article claiming that wide public support for pollution control contributed to reductions of pollution levels. The same article then demanded that "Americans—and Chicagoans in particular—should take air pollution seriously." The *Tribune* thus further inculcated readers with the idea that their ongoing support for air pollution control would be just as essential as governmental regulations in the quest for cleaner air.[85]

---

[83] *CT*, Jan. 8, 1972, p. B10; *CT*, Aug. 23, 1972, p. 2; *CT*, Jun. 1, 1975, p. 42; *CT*, May 31, 1973, p. A2; *CT*, Jul. 22, 1974, p. 3; *CT*, Aug. 9, 1974, p. 3; *CT*, Aug. 10, 1974, p. N3; *CT*, Aug. 16, 1974, p. B15; *CT*, Aug. 20, 1974, p. 3
[84] *CT*, Jan. 9, 1972, p. 14; *CT*, Jan. 27, 1972, p. W1; *CT*, Feb. 8, 1973, p. S2
[85] *CT*, Feb. 18, 1973, p. 45; *CT*, Feb. 24, 1975, p. 3; *CT*, Feb. 25, 1975, p. A2

Finally, perhaps due to the city's failure to meet the Clean Air Act's deadline, articles in 1975 continued to embrace a strong discourse of crisis. One argued that "in view of air pollution's deadly long-term impact on human health, further progress is imperative." Another claimed that "mankind seems bent on its own destruction…cities are being smothered to death…[and] fresh air has become a scarce commodity." These were powerful claims, and readers who took note of them likely continued to demand greater efforts, from fellow citizens and government alike, to fight air pollution. But it was not all doom and gloom. The last article on air pollution in 1975 had this to say: "Some hoped and others feared environmental concern would be just a passing fad. But not so. The stakes are so high and we are sufficiently aware of them that the struggle for an environment favorable to human life will never be abandoned."[86]

In summary, the *Chicago Tribune* was supportive of air pollution control throughout the period between 1945 and 1975. In the late 1940s, it reminded citizens that Chicago was the first city to legislate against air pollution, but by then had fallen behind other cities. In this early period, it also deplored city officials' lack of resolve, and later helped expose corruption within the anti-pollution agency. The *Tribune* (considered to be a relatively conservative newspaper) consistently claimed industry was not the only source of air pollution, and called on citizens to accept more responsibility for their contribution to the problem. There was also a sustained focus on the transboundary dimension of air pollution, due to the persistent problem of high emissions in surrounding industrialized suburbs in both Illinois and Indiana. By the early 1970s, the *Tribune* supported action at all levels of government to handle the problem. By contrast, there was less focus on air pollution in other cities, though there was a growth in coverage of cities around the world in the late 1960s. Finally, the *Tribune* only began framing the issue of air pollution as a crisis in the mid-1960s, and this framing grew stronger over the years due to the persistence of intense air pollution episodes and a failure to meet federal air quality standards.

---

[86] *CT*, Feb. 25, 1975, p. A2; *CT*, Aug 23, 1975, p. B10; *CT*, Dec. 19, 1975, p. A2

New York

Unlike Chicago and the other heavily industrialized cities of the midwest, New York did not suffer from clouds of heavy smoke during the 1800s. This was chiefly because New York had relatively little heavy industry and relied on harder, cleaner-burning anthracite coal for its energy needs. Moreover, New York's breezy location on coastal islands gave it good ventilation. By World War II, however, New York was developing a serious air pollution problem. The first half of the 1900s had brought more factories and industrial development to the area, much of it right across the Hudson River in New Jersey. Better extraction techniques and transportation methods also allowed the city to import increasing amounts of cheaper, smokier bituminous coal. By 1945, soft coal had largely displaced the use of hard coal in New York. Coal burning was not the only source of New York's new air pollution problem, as a growing number of automobiles and garbage incinerators contributed their share of pollutants to the city's atmosphere as well.[87]

By 1947, public frustration with New York's pollution was deepening. In response, the Health Department—just one of the five agencies responsible for smoke control at the time—announced it would launch a campaign against smoke. Attempts to introduce legislation into the city council to control air pollution, however, were repeatedly frustrated until October of 1948 when the "Killer Smog" event in Donora Pennsylvania finally prodded the city council into taking action. The vice president of the city council, Joseph Sharkey, introduced two bills into the city council that year to set up new regulations and establish an independent department of air pollution control. After a long debate, the city council finally passed the two bills into law in 1952. Meanwhile, eye-smarting, throat-itching smog regularly blanketed the city by 1952.[88]

---

[87] Stradling, 1, 10, 22-3, 32; Dewey, 113, 158; *NYT*, Jan. 16, 1952, p. 23; *NYT*, Sep. 14, 1955, p. 37; *NYT*, Sep. 15, 1958, p. 23

[88] Dewey, 114-6; *NYT*, Jan. 18, 1947, p. C14; *NYT*, Jan. 9, 1947, p. 25; *NYT*, Jan. 11, 1947, p. 15; *NYT*, Jan. 31, 1947, p. 25; *NYT*, Aug. 23, 1947, p. 15; *NYT*, Jun. 3, 1948, p. 27; *NYT*, Jun. 9, 1948, p. 25; *NYT*, Jun. 14, 1948, p. 25; *NYT*, Nov. 6, 1948, p. 7; *NYT*, Jan. 5, 1949, p. 24; *NYT*, Dec. 5, 1951, p. 37; *NYT*, Jun. 24, 1952, p. 28; *NYT*, Nov. 18, 1952, p. 33; *NYT*, Sep. 12, 1952, p. 23; *NYT*, Nov. 22, 1953, p. E2

Throughout these early years, the *Times* consistently supported greater smoke control, and expressed its concern that New York had fallen far behind other cities in its control efforts. A 1948 article reported that scores of cities now had smoke control programs, while New York was making only "painfully slow progress" in developing its own program. The *Times* was fond of contrasting the unimpressive efforts of New York with the "monumental" achievements of major cities such as Los Angeles and Pittsburgh. Other articles in 1948 claimed it was "an undisputed fact air pollution control in New York has been unsatisfactory" and a better job needed to be done. By 1950, the message had not changed, with one editorial claiming to be dissatisfied with the whole progress of air pollution control in New York.[89]

A large part of this critique centered on the issue of funding. The *Times* repeatedly pointed out that New York's expenditures on air pollution control were "not appropriate to the size of the city, the magnitude of the problem, or the economic benefits that could be received." Various articles called the city's expenditures "pathetically" or "laughably" or "pitifully" small. In 1948, it warned that the newly proposed bill establishing an independent department would have to be backed up with sufficient funding. The *Times* then chastised the city council for not following this recommendation, and regularly cited the department's complaints about lack of funds. Interestingly, the *Times* often emphasized that, since smog harmed the city economically, funding for smoke control should be considered an "investment" producing economic returns.[90]

The *Times* also sought to stimulate greater public awareness of air pollution in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the goal being a vibrant grass-roots movement. Already by 1947, the *Times* ran articles with the message that stopping smoke would be impossible without the full support of all citizens. The reason for this, one article claimed, was that "lethargy among citizens leads to lethargy among officials." As a self-described interested observer, the *Times* regularly

---

[89] Dewey, 139; *NYT*, Jun. 15, 1948, p. 26; *NYT*, Jun. 8, 1948, p. 24; *NYT*, Dec. 3, 1948, p. 27; *NYT*, Oct. 23, 1948, p. 14; *NYT*, Jan. 19, 1950, p. 26

[90] *NYT*, May 13, 1947, p. 27; *NYT*, Jun. 8, 1948, p. 24; *NYT*, Nov. 8, 1948, p. 20; *NYT*, Sep. 21, 1949, p. 30; *NYT*, May 9, 1953, p. 32; *NYT*, Jul. 8, 1953, p. 29; *NYT*, Sep. 1949, p. 30; *NYT*, Nov. 24, 1953, p. 28

noted and welcomed increased public interest in smoke. Yet that was not enough. As one editorial put it, rather than "unorganized and hence ineffective indignation" the city desperately needed a "continuous and vociferous citizens' movement." Such a movement, combined with indignant public opinion, could "keep municipal government on its toes in the smoke fight."[91]

Aside from articles comparing New York's control efforts to those of Los Angeles and Pittsburgh, coverage of air pollution problems in other cities focused mainly on Donora, Pennsylvania. The small industrial town's "Killer Smog," which resulted in the death of about twenty people, made the front page in 1948 and was a focus of many subsequent articles. Some of these also quoted experts who claimed, for example, that many other cities in the country had the setting for similar disasters and that air pollution was a major national health problem.[92]

In the early 1950s, the number of articles on the transboundary aspect of New York's air pollution increased sharply. The problem was that many heavily industrialized counties across the Hudson River in New Jersey had little or no regulations in place. Articles in the *Times* emphasized that "pollution of New York's air by New Jersey smoke is no theory," and quoted experts who thought it essential that smog control be attempted on a regional rather than political subdivision basis. Moreover, the wind blew both ways across the Hudson, as one 1954 editorial emphasized, meaning air pollution was certainly an appropriate issue for inter-state cooperation. New York took the initiative by proposing to expand the functions of the Interstate Sanitation Commission to include air pollution control. The Commission, whose members were New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, had focused only on water pollution since its founding in 1932.[93]

In 1954, the U.S. Environmental Health Center ranked New York 5th highest among 22 cities with regard to the particulate matter in its air. In order to remedy this situation, the city

---

[91] *NYT*, Feb. 23, 1947, p. R3; *NYT*, Jun. 4, 1948, p. 22; *NYT*, Jun. 8, 1948, p. 24; *NYT*, Sep. 14, 1948, p. 28; *NYT*, Nov. 17, 1950, p. 26; *NYT*, Jan 17, 1951, p. 22; *NYT*, May 9, 1951, p. 32
[92] *NYT*, Nov. 7, 1948, p. E11; *NYT*, Nov. 20, 1948, p. 23; *NYT*, Oct. 14, 1949, p. 29
[93] *NYT*, Sep. 19, 1951; p. 33; *NYT*, Apr. 17, 1951, p. 31; *NYT*, Oct. 1951, p. 22; *NYT*, May 3, 1954, p. 24; *NYT*, Dec. 6, 1951, p. 32; *NYT*, Jan. 23, 1952, p. 21; *NYT*, Apr. 5, 1952, p. 17; *NYT*, Mar. 12, 1954, p. 12

enacted regulations to limit the hours of operation for the city's more than 10,000 incinerators. In 1955, the Department of Air Pollution Control began block-by-block drives to catch violators of the new incinerator rules. The *Times* approved of this crackdown. As soot-fall decreased, the city began tackling sources of invisible gaseous pollutants including buses, cars, and power plants. New York State entered the drive in 1957 when it created an air pollution control board with the power to regulate New York City. By 1958, the department reported that progress was clearly being made. Yet smog attacks in 1958 were still serious enough to force airports to shut down.[94]

In the mid-1950s, the *Times* began pointing out that air pollution was a problem in more than just a few well-publicized cases such as Donora and Los Angeles. A 1954 article reported that air pollution was high on the list of health problems now needing federal-state-local cooperative solutions because air pollution was becoming a "chronic problem for virtually every large city in the country." Another article about the third National Air Pollution Symposium began by stating simply, "Smog is becoming a nationwide and international problem." Other articles quoted experts in the field who hoped for a truly international response to the problem.[95]

At the same time the *Times* was broadening its focus on air pollution in other cities, it also continued to remind readers of how far New York had fallen behind these other cities in air pollution control efforts. One article noted that "New York was 50 years late in awakening to the perils of noxious gas." Moreover, many articles between 1955 and 1958 suggested that New York still had a long way to go in its fight against air pollution; as one editorial put it, "Reducing air pollution in cities is a battle on many fronts, gradually won by small victories."[96]

A central part of the *Times'* its general critique of New York's poor performance with regards to air pollution was its claim that the city's appropriations for control efforts were simply

---

[94] *NYT*, Feb. 20, 1954, p. 29; *NYT*, Apr. 13, 1954, p. 33; *NYT*, Mar. 28, 1955, p. 15; *NYT*, May 8, 1955, p. 51; *NYT*, Feb 17, 1955, p. 26; *NYT*, Oct. 25, 1955, p. 35; *NYT*, Jan. 21, 1954, p. 44; *NYT*, Mar. 11, 1955, p. 17; *NYT*, Nov. 14, 1955, p. 29; *NYT*, Jun. 8, 1957, p. 40; *NYT*, Aug. 20 1957, p. 29; *NYT*, Oct. 13, 1958, p. 31; *NYT*, Oct. 13, 1958, p. 28; *NYT*, Oct. 10, 1958, p. 33; *NYT*, Mar. 20, 1957, p. 28; *NYT*, Jun. 9, 1958, p. 25, *NYT*, Jun. 1958, p. 58

[95] *NYT*, Dec. 8, 1954, p. 37; *NYT*, Apr. 19, 1955, p. 21, *NYT*, Mar. 3, 1955, p. 29

[96] *NYT*, Mar. 6, 1953, p. 25; *NYT*, Nov. 20, 1955, p. 134; *NYT*, May 5, 1955, p. 35; *NYT*, May 31, 1958, p. 14

inadequate. One editorial claimed that an anti-smoke program had never been adequately financed in New York. Staffing was also an issue, since the *Times* reported that the department "strives manfully with an inadequate staff" and "wants to do more but doesn't have enough inspectors." In some ways, the message in the mid- and late 1950s was the same as in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Comparisons were still drawn between New York and Los Angeles—by 1960, one article reported, Los Angeles had a budget of $3,640,000 and a staff of 458 compared to New York's $674,380 budget and staff of 111. Additionally, articles still framed the issue as one of economics—an investment to profitably reduce the costs smog inflicted upon the city.[97]

In other ways, the message had changed. It was now common for articles to claim that, without an adequate budget, New York might find itself "in the position London found itself in 1952 and Los Angeles finds itself today"—in other words, constantly harassed by smog. Articles were more willing to draw a "lesson" from air pollution episodes, claiming for example that "recent smogs over New York were evidence of the necessity for vastly enlarging the budget, personnel, and facilities." Finally, articles noted that the public was becoming increasingly aware of the low budget (likely due to the *Times*' efforts to publicize it). Editorials now claimed the public would blame city officials for not providing enough funds if the situation worsened.[98]

Indeed, the department of air pollution control increasingly called on residents to be more active in the campaign against smog. In 1956, the *Times* reported that the department was launching a citywide educational campaign to increase public interest. By 1958, the department was urging citizens to report any air pollution they noticed to the department, precisely because its staff was inadequate to police the entire city by itself. The *Times* supported this endeavor, providing instructions on how to file reports and providing contact information. In 1959, a *Times*

---

[97] *NYT*, Apr. 2, 1953, p. 26; *NYT*, Feb. 10, 1954, p. 31; *NYT*, Jan 23, 1955, p. 57; *NYT*, Feb. 18, 1956, p. 18; *NYT*, Oct. 22, 1956, p. 31; *NYT*, Oct. 24, 1956, p. 35; *NYT*, May 31, 1957, p. 20; *NYT*, Jul 27, 1957, p. 10; *NYT*, Jan. 26, 1957, p. 17; *NYT* May 23, 1960, p. 28

[98] *NYT*, Nov. 30, 1953, p. B2; *NYT*, Nov. 9, 1956, p. 33; *NYT*, Feb. 3, 1956, p. 25; *NYT*, Nov. 7, 1959, p. 22; *NYT*, Jan 29, 1960, p. 24

article even claimed that the "ideal woman" was the woman who complained about air pollution, and attributed enforcement gains to a rise in the number of complaints reported by women.[99]

Meanwhile, efforts at inter-state cooperation in the mid- and late 1950s increased after Congress allowed New York State, New Jersey, and Connecticut to broaden the powers of the Interstate Sanitation Commission to study air pollution. Its studies, initiated in 1957, confirmed that "ill winds" blew both ways across the Hudson. The *Times* provided detailed coverage of these developments, with editorials expressing the view that, instead of bickering over who was responsible for polluting whose air, the studies showed it was time for regulations covering the entire New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. By 1959, such regulations were working their way through both state legislatures, and the area's main air pollution control agencies had agreed to cooperate more closely, which the *Times* called a "constructive step forward."[100]

As the 1950s drew to a close, The *Times* reported that the department was making good progress in enforcement due to citizen complaints and despite an ongoing shortage of inspectors. Moreover, residents breathed significantly cleaner air in 1958 than in 1957, though smaze episodes (mixed smoke and haze) were still common. By the early 1960s, soot levels were constantly decreasing—which the *Times* credited to controls the city had set up over various types of burning—while auto exhaust in 1961 was greater than at any time since measurements began in 1955, and continued to rise sharply into the mid-1960s. The department continued to increase enforcement efforts, serving record numbers of violations. Meanwhile, the state had adopted an air quality control system that established new standards for the city to meet.[101]

---

[99] *NYT*, Apr. 30, 1959, p. 30; *NYT*, Oct. 19, 1958, p. 67; *NYT*, May, 4, 1959, p. 28; *NYT*, Dec. 17, 1959, p. 20; *NYT* Jul. 8, 1959, p. 28; *NYT*, Oct. 13, 1959, p. 41; *NYT*, Nov. 12, 1959, p. 31

[100] *NYT*, Dec. 19, 1956, p. 49; *NYT*, Aug. 7, 1956, p. 16; *NYT*, Oct. 10, 1957, p. 35; *NYT*, Jan. 30, 1958, p. 25; *NYT*, Feb 25, 1959, p. 33; *NYT*, Jun. 29, 1959, p. 28

[101] *NYT*, Feb. 2, 1959, p. 17; *NYT* Feb, 2, 1959, p. 18; *NYT*, May 11, 1959, p. 29; *NYT*, Apr. 20, 1959, p. 16; *NYT*, Jul. 31, 1959, p. 43; *NYT*, Feb. 8, 1960, p. 13; *NYT*, May 9, 1960, p. 53; *NYT*, Feb 20, 1961, p. 49; *NYT*, Feb. 6, 1961, p. 25; *NYT*, Feb. 26, 1962, p. 29; *NYT*, Nov. 30, 1962, p. 35; *NYT*, Jul. 27, 1964, p. 33; *NYT*, Aug. 16, 1964, p. 45; *NYT*, Oct. 31, 1964, p. 31

Only in the early 1960s did the *Times* really begin framing the issue of air pollution as a crisis (though it had done so for a brief time and to a limited extent after the Donora incident in 1948). The *Times* now claimed the city should acknowledge that "the shadow of danger from increasing air pollution is looming ever larger." A 1964 editorial was quite explicit with its claim that "New York City faces a critical situation every day because of the prevalence of sulfur dioxide in the air." This new sense of urgency stemmed in part from the fact that, as another article pointed out, "evidence of the disastrous effects of city air pollution continues to grow almost daily." The obvious solution reached by leading experts, according to the *Times*, was that something effective had to be done about the situation without delay. Editorials added that only a large-scale attack could meet such a large-scale problem, and that the "survival of the human race" depended on finding the solutions to urgent problems like air pollution.[102]

Articles continued to focus on air pollution in other cities. For example, one article began, "Smog, which until recently was associated with Los Angeles, has been spreading across the face of the land," and reported that "unless something is done, experts say, most major cities in the U.S. will be afflicted by heavy smogs within the next ten to fifteen years." Another reported that airborne carcinogens (e.g. benzpyrene) were now universally present in the air of U.S. cities. This was the bad news; the good news was that most cities were reportedly more conscious of the need for air pollution control than ever before. Moreover, articles in the 1960s began talking about a "national drive" against air pollution since so many cities struggled against it. As one 1963 article put it, "Air pollution is a local problem that is also a national one."[103]

A related justification for a national drive against air pollution was that it crossed political boundaries. The *Times* had reported on the "evil winds" blowing pollution back and forth across

---

[102] *NYT*, Nov. 21, 1953, p. 12; *NYT*, Jun. 9, 1959, p. 36; *NYT*, Dec. 17, 1959, p. 20; *NYT*, Jan. 24, 1960, p. 76; *NYT*, Jul. 3, 1961, p. 17; *NYT*, Apr. 2, 1961, p. A4; *NYT*, Nov. 13, 1963, p. 43; *NYT*, Nov. 14, 1963, p. 32; *NYT*, May 20, 1964, p. 42; *NYT*, Apr. 2, 1964, p. 35

[103] *NYT*, Jan. 18, 1959, p. SM32, *NYT*, Dec. 19, 1959, p. 26; *NYT*, Apr. 28, 1960, p. 27; *NYT*, Oct. 16, 1960, p. A8; *NYT*, Oct. 15, 1961, p. 64; *NYT*, Dec. 28, 1963, p. 22

the Hudson since the early 1950s, and it continued to do so into the early 1960s. However, beginning in the 1960s articles took a broader perspective. The problem was not just with New Jersey, but that New York was located "at the end of a 3,000-mile-long sewer stretching from the California coast." This obviously highlighted for readers the need for nationwide controls.[104]

A final aspect of air pollution coverage in the early 1960s was the continuing call for citizen participation. Editorials were more direct then ever in calling on readers to "do a little worrying" and make their complaints known to city officials and members of Congress. Articles also reported on examples of citizen engagement. For example, one article reported on a local neighborhood's efforts to establish a voluntary smoke watch reporting to the city's department, and suggested the community pointed the way to a kind of community-city cooperation that could be emulated "profitably" elsewhere in New York. By 1962, the *Times* reported the public's former careless attitude is being replaced by a more intelligent understanding of the issue.[105]

During the mid-1960s, New York made steady, if undramatic, progress toward cleaner air. Of 12 principal air pollutants, 9 decreased between 1963 and 1964, while 3 (sulfur dioxide, ammonia, and sodium chloride) increased. Although the city's department hailed this apparent stabilization of air pollution levels, the *Times* reminded readers that these levels were still higher than those in other major cities. There were other signs of progress. The department received a federal grant of $188,000 to expand its operations, and the city council passed a tough new air pollution control bill in 1966. However, during Thanksgiving weekend of that year, New York suffered through the heaviest smog in its history. Not only did 10% of the city's residents suffer some ill effects (e.g. smarting eyes and breathing difficulties) the smog caused 168 deaths.[106]

---

[104] *NYT*, Feb. 19, 1964, p. 41; *NYT*, Jan. 16, 1961, p. 29; *NYT*, Dec. 12, 1960, p. 58; *NYT*, Mar. 21, 1961, p. 29; *NYT*, Oct. 23, 1962, p. 33

[105] *NYT*, Jan. 5, 1960, p. 16; *NYT*, Jun. 28, 1960, p. 30; *NYT*, May 14, 1962, p. 31; *NYT*, Jul. 25, 1962, p. 35; *NYT*, Mar. 4, 1964, p. 39

[106] *NYT*, Jan. 10, 1965, p. 81; *NYT*, May, 22, 1965, p. 14; *NYT*, Jun. 14, 1965, p. 35; *NYT*, Apr. 15, 1966, p. 33; *NYT*, Dec. 7, 1966, p. 33; *NYT*, Dec. 10, 1966, p. 31; *NYT*, Nov. 27, 1966, p. E7; *NYT*, Oct. 27, 1967, p. 56

The notion that air pollution in New York constituted a crisis grew stronger in the mid-1960s. By 1965, it was well known that New York had higher levels of smoke, fumes, dust, and sulfur dioxide than any other major city in the country. The *Times* claimed that "even a layman can craw one basic conclusion: the air we breathe is killing us." Editorials also began using the word "crisis" at this time; for example, a 1965 editorial declared, "Pollution has ceased to be just a nuisance. It has become a crisis. Action is needed—now." Both articles and editorials alike described air pollution as a grave threat to health, claiming that "on the purity of air depends the conservation of human life itself," and that "inaction is tantamount to community murder." Moreover, there was a sense that not only was federal action going to be necessary, but also that "since the problem is severe and steadily worsening any delay would be a mistake."[107]

The *Times* continued to give the issue a sense of crisis in 1966. In this year, articles claimed that until effective measures were taken to cleanse New York's polluted air, the city would constantly live under the "threat of disaster." Others quoted experts saying that "the city will experience a disaster of substantial proportions unless something is done." An article on the new air pollution bill then working its way through the city council claimed, "If passed, it may mean New Yorkers won't choke to death on the air around us." There was a noticeable sense of urgency in articles reporting, for example, that "the nation's air pollution problems continue to grow faster than all efforts to cope with them." One of the last articles on air pollution in 1966 warned that "unless the nation came to grips quickly with the problem of air pollution, people would have to live indoors like moles, use gas masks, or put protective domes over cities." Powerful imagery such as this likely raised the level of environmental concern among readers.[108]

As the last two quotes show, the discourse crisis was not reserved solely for New York—the entire nation was facing an air pollution crisis. Thus, articles in the mid-1960s claimed "the

---

[107] *NYT*, May 20, 1964, p. 35; *NYT*, Dec. 5, 1965, p. F1; *NYT*, Apr. 5, 1965, p. 30; *NYT*, Dec. 1965, p. 28; *NYT*, Feb. 19, 1965, p. 34; *NYT*, Dec. 27, 1965, p. 24; *NYT*, Jun. 23, 1965, p. 40; *NYT*, Jul. 5, 1965, p. 6

[108] *NYT*, Dec. 27, 1966, p. 38; *NYT*, Apr. 13, 1966, p. 40; *NYT*, Apr. 11, 1966, p. 52; *NYT*, Mar. 26, 1966, p. 28; *NYT*, Feb 5, 1966, p. 28; *NYT*, Jun. 8, 1966, p. 18; *NYT*, Dec. 13, 1966, p. 24

time has long since passed when people could make fun of Los Angeles…every sizeable city in the nation is a likely candidate for the title, Smog Town, U.S.A." Moreover, the crisis was not portrayed as being limited to U.S. cities. Indeed editorials claimed the problem had international implications, and a 1966 article reported that experts at the first International Clean Air Congress concluded the polluted air in the world's cities had to be cleaned up immediately.[109]

The *Times* continued to accuse officials of starving the campaign against air pollution of necessary funds. (By 1966, New York's per capita expenditure was only half of what the federal government considered to be necessary for a minimum program.) In the 1960s, some of these accusations were tinged by the discourse of crisis. One editorial opined, "Somehow the money must be found. New York cannot live under a death cloud forever." Alongside articles focusing on the economic gains to be had from greater "investment" in air pollution control, more articles now framed the issue of budget cuts as "economy at the expense of health."[110]

Budget cuts also reflected public indifference to clean air, according to the department of air pollution control. Hence, the *Times* continued to call on citizens to take greater interest in air pollution and to support the department's efforts. Besides encouraging residents to report violations and providing them with the number to call, articles also focused attention on the volunteers serving as free inspectors for the understaffed department. "Mrs. Bickford [a volunteer] wants citizens to know that public demands will bring action," one article reported. In this way, the *Times* hoped to increase citizen activism in the city's environmental movement.[111]

In the late 1960s, New York attempted—but largely failed—to bring its public and private garbage incinerators under control. Under a law passed in 1966, all apartment house incinerators had to be upgraded to reduce smoke output by 1968. The law was repealed in 1967

---

[109] *NYT*, Dec. 27, 1965, p. 24; *NYT*, Jul 4, 1965, p. X17; *NYT*, May 15, 1966, p. E10; *NYT*, Oct. 8, 1966, p. 3
[110] *NYT*, Oct. 15, 1966, p. 28; *NYT*, Apr. 13, 1966, p. 40; *NYT*, Jul 29, 1964, p. 32; *NYT*, Aug, 31, 1965, p. 40; *NYT*, May 20, 1964, p. 35; *NYT*, Dec. 29, 1965, p. 28
[111] *NYT*, May 20, 1964, p. 35; *NYT*, May 25, 1963, p. 13; *NYT*, Oct. 18, 1966, p. 47; *NYT*, Jan 13, 1967, p. 46; *NYT*, Jan. 16, 1967, p. 20; *NYT*, Jan. 17, 1967, p. 25

due to its confusing language and the opposition by private incinerator owners on the grounds that upgrading was too expensive. A new policy allowing owners to shut down incinerators in return for free garbage collection failed when the Sanitation Department quickly became overwhelmed. By 1970, nearly all of the city's 135,000 oil burners and 15,000 garbage incinerators were still operating with impunity in violation of city ordinances. Moreover, New York's air was still the most polluted in the nation.[112]

The evolving discourse of crisis grew even more dire in the late 1960s. One reason for this was the Thanksgiving smog episode of 1966. Articles began quoting experts who claimed, for example, "Almost every day New York City approaches the smog danger levels that brought on a three-day emergency last November." There was also a prominent notion that the city might become uninhabitable in ten years if action was not taken. Meteorologists quoted in the *Times* argued that the self-cleaning capabilities of the atmosphere over New York were being overwhelmed, and that if it were not for the windiness of its location "air quality would be intolerable—unfit for human habitation." Thus, according to one editorial, "cleaning up New York's befouled atmosphere is not just a matter of civic pride; it is a question of survival."[113]

Intertwined with this grim prediction of "aerial catastrophe" was another message that governmental action could save New York and other cities from untimely demise. A 1967 editorial claimed "the menace…won't be finally eliminated unless there is a massive, sustained effort at all levels of government." At one level, this applied to city government. Indeed, there were plenty of articles both praising the mayor for "demonstrating his resolve to get the poison out of New York's air," and criticizing the fact that one delay had followed another in the city's fight against air pollution. At another level, this message applied to the federal government, with

---

[112] Dewey, 133-4; NYT, May 7, 1967, p. 57; *NYT*, May 24, 1967, p. 43; *NYT*, Jun. 2, 1967, p. 42; *NYT*, Dec. 8, 1967, p. 36; *NYT*, Jul. 18, 1967, p. 16; *NYT*, Jul. 21, 1967, p. 15; *NYT*, Aug. 25, 1967, p. 24; *NYT*, Jul. 7, 1967, P. *NYT* F41; NYT, Nov. 11, 1968, p. 27; *NYT*, Dec. 20, 1968, p. 42; *NYT*, Mar. 12, 1968, p. 55; *NYT*, Jun. 12, 1969, p. 54; *NYT*, Jul. 6, 1969, p. 38

[113] *NYT*, Jan. 9, 1967, p. 32; *NYT*, May 10, 1967, p. 33; *NYT*, Jan 14, 1967, p. 17; *NYT*, Aug. 5, 1967, p. 22

some articles claiming that "the plumes of visible and invisible filth in the air around us demand Congressional action if the cities of America are not to be put off-limits to people."[114]

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the issue of transboundary pollution from New Jersey also took center stage. New estimates by the U.S. Public Health Service in 1968 claimed that New Jersey contributed 43% of the smoke, soot, and dust in New York's air, with other surrounding cities contributing lesser amounts as well. In the early 1970s, it was well known that New York received much of New Jersey's hydrocarbons (the key ingredients of smog), while sulfur dioxide and ozone poured in from the southwest. The conclusion that editorials in the *Times* drew from these reports was that "as long as the west wind blows, New Yorkers are going to suffer from the lax enforcement in northern New Jersey."[115]

From this first conclusion, moreover, came a second conclusion—that efforts to combat dirty air required interstate action. As one editorial put it, "A regional mechanism for dealing with air pollution is urgently needed—and is lacking." When progress was made toward such a regional mechanism in 1967, editorials proclaimed, "New Jersey's signature on the Mid-Atlantic State Air Pollution Control Compact is by far the most encouraging recent development in the frustrating battle against this menace." However, it was not only editorials focusing attention on this issue; numerous articles appeared throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s informing readers of the latest developments in regional cooperation.[116]

Coverage in the late 1960s also saw an explosion in the number of articles about smog problems and solutions in other cities and countries throughout the world. These included articles on Tokyo, Madrid, Rome, Athens, Montreal, Kenya, Mexico, and Sweden. Articles not focusing

---

[114] *NYT*, Jan. 18, 1967, p. 34; *NYT*, Aug 5, 1967, p. 22; *NYT*, May 4, 1967, p. 38; *NYT*, Nov, 12, 1968, p. 45; *NYT*, May 14, 1969, p. 49; *NYT*, Aug 17, 1967, p. 35

[115] *NYT*, Feb. 3, 1968, p. 28; *NYT*, Apr. 17, 1973g, p. 88; *NYT*, Oct. 13, 1975, p. 57; *NYT*, Jun. 23, 1965, p. 40; *NYT*, Oct. 15, 1966, p. 28

[116] *NYT*, Jul. 5, 1965, p. 6; *NYT*, Jan. 22, 1967, p. 65; *NYT*, Feb. 3, 1968, p. 28; *NYT*, Feb. 7, 1967, p. 38; *NYT*, Jul. 5, 1967, p. 40; *NYT*, May, 10, 1966, p. 44; *NYT*, Feb. 4, 1967, p. 54; *NYT*, May 14, 1967, p. 110; *NYT*, Jan 17, 1967, p. 26; *NYT*, Jan. 12, 1967, p. 25; *NYT*, Aug. 17, 1969, p. 61; *NYT*, Jun. 3, 1973, p. 77; *NYT*, Jan. 29, 1968, p. 23; *NYT*, May, 25, 1969, p. 80; *NYT* Aug. 21, 1971, p. 30

specifically on these places nonetheless included comments such as "last week not only New York but such distant cities as Sydney and Tokyo gasped under smog blankets," and "practically every industrialized nation [is] becoming rapidly pollution-conscious." Articles still focused on the United States too. One claimed that air contamination had started to spread from U.S. cities into previously untouched rural regions. Another reported that sulfur oxides often exceeded safe levels in virtually every major U.S. city and many smaller ones as well.[117]

In the early 1970s, New York continued the struggle to bring its pollution problem under control. One aspect of the problem was sulfur dioxide; by 1970, average concentrations of this harmful gas were almost three times the federal criterion for safe levels. In response to federal instigation, the city prohibited the burning of fuel containing more than 0.3% sulfur. While some reductions in sulfur dioxide levels occurred, high soot levels persisted as a result of the failure to regulate apartment-house incinerators and oil burners due to the stubborn resistance of landlords. This was a problem because the city was expected to meet federal standards established by the Clean Air Act by 1975. Ultimately, the EPA granted the state of New York a two-year extension, thus buying New York City—by then still the most polluted city in America—more time.[118]

In the early 1970s, the *Times* ran fewer articles concerning the public's role in the campaign, and different articles sent different types of messages. One article reported that the city's new air pollution code empowered individuals to prosecute violators, then claimed "it recognizes the principle of citizen self-help: every man a sky-watcher, and those with heavily smoking stacks beware." A second reported that the main danger was not so much air pollution levels but unnecessary alarmism among residents. A third reporting on a new and costly traffic

---

[117] *NYT*, Feb. 16, 1969, p. 62; *NYT*, Feb. 6, 1967, p. 30; *NYT*, Feb. 20, 1969, p. 49; *NYT*, Jul. 21, 1970, p. 15; *NYT*, Jun. 6, 1969, p. 5; *NYT*, Jan. 3, 1967, p. 11; *NYT*, Jun. 15, 1970, p. 15; *NYT*, Jun. 28, 1970, p. 20; *NYT*, Sep. 21, 1970, p. 20; *NYT*, Apr. 8, 1965, p. 78; *NYT*, Sep. 28, 1969, p. 98; *NYT*, Feb. 12, 1970, p. 2; *NYT*, Aug. 2, 1970, p. 113; *NYT*, Apr. 23, 1967, p. 133; *NYT*, May 24, 1970, p. 37; *NYT*, Mar. 23, 1967, p. 23; *NYT*, Feb. 7, 1967, p. 38

[118] *NYT*, Apr. 30, 1970, p. 29; *NYT*, Jan 7, 1971, p. 69; *NYT*, Feb. 22, 1970, p. 61; *NYT*, May 27, 1970, p. 47; *NYT*, Nov. 14, 1970, p. 43; *NYT*, Nov. 22, 1970, p. 65; *NYT*, Jul. 14, 1971, p. 70; *NYT*, Sep. 20, 1971, p. 51; *NYT*, Dec. 11, 1971, p. 35; *NYT*, Jun. 4, 1972, p. 23; *NYT*, Apr. 19, 1973, p. 86

control program to reduce auto exhaust commented that New Yorkers would just have to learn to live with it, and "with the air perceptibly less poisonous, they might even come to enjoy it."[119]

One message that did not change much by the early 1970s was the call for more funding. Some articles continued to emphasize that such an increase was a good investment because the cost of air-pollution control was still considerably less than the cost of air pollution itself. Others reported that the city's anti-pollution agency was requesting more funds "because of a need to avert crises." Articles also continued to focus attention on the need for more inspectors—by 1971 there were 300, though according to one article 500 were needed to enforce the new air pollution code. In 1975, a study by Columbia University confirmed that the city's environmental agency had long been operating with shortages of personnel, equipment, and funding.[120]

Articles on air pollution and its control in other cities around the world continued to appear in the early 1970s. The *Times* ran articles on Sydney, Tokyo, Moscow, and Mexico City, in addition to U.S. cities such as Philadelphia, San Francisco, and San Diego. It also became more common for articles to report on air pollution throughout the East Coast, so that New York's smog episodes were situated within a regional context. A few articles, with headlines such as "Man And His Environment: Some Basic Facts About A Growing National Problem," situated New York's pollution problems within a national context as well.[121]

Finally, the notion that New York had an air pollution crisis also persisted. Alarming scientific studies on pollutants in the city's atmosphere streamed into the *Times*. For example, levels of nitrogen oxides were reported to be above the danger point, while carbon monoxide in the city's air was called "an astonishing threat to the health of vast numbers of persons." One article cited a report by Ralph Nader estimating that air pollution—primarily sulfur dioxide—

---

[119] *NYT*, Jul 29, 1970, p. 3; *NYT*, Nov. 26, 1970, p. 30; *NYT*, Dec. 19, 1970, p. 56; *NYT*, Aug, 7, 1971, p. 29; *NYT*, Jul. 4, 1973, p. 14

[120] *NYT*, Jun 24, 1969, p. 45; *NYT*, Oct. 30, 1968, p. 53; *NYT*, Jul. 18, 1971, p. 47; *NYT*, Jun. 14, 1975, p. 31

[121] *NYT*, Apr. 25, 1971, p. 7; *NYT*, Jan. 9, 1972, p. 7; *NYT*, Jul 14, 1974, p. 22; *NYT*, Aug. 18, 1972, p. 9; *NYT*, Oct. 9, 1972, p. 6; *NYT*, Apr. 4, 1971, p. 22; *NYT*, Feb. 27, 1972, p. N50; *NYT*, Feb. 6, 1972, p. 62; *NYT*, Feb. 26, 1970, p. 29; *NYT*, Nov. 19, 1971, p. 89; *NYT*, Aug. 3, 1975, p. 37; *NYT* Apr. 20, 1970, p. 33

killed from 1,000 to 2,000 people per year in New York City. A few articles explicitly used the word crisis to describe these alarming trends. For example, a 1970 article claimed that smog was "a pollution problem already fast approaching the crisis point." One article even had the somewhat humorous headline "You'll Be All Right, If You Just Stop Breathing."[122]

Moreover, the *Times* contained a good deal of criticism for the city's control efforts. In an article with the headline "Crisis Charged In Air Pollution Here," it was reported that the enforcement of air pollution control law was in a "state of collapse." A 1974 editorial claimed, "At a time of growing threat to health from rising carbon monoxide levels throughout the city, procrastination…is inexcusable;" another wrote, "Neither the Governor nor the Mayor appears to appreciate the vital importance of cleaner air to the health of the city;" a third commented, "New Yorkers ought to be alarmed about persisting pollution that threatens the very life of the city.[123]

In summary, the *New York Times* was very supportive of efforts to control air pollution, and concerned that New York had fallen far behind other cities. Throughout the period, the *Times* demanded more funding for control efforts, the justification being economic in nature until the mid-1960s when it focused more on public health. Since the late 1940s, the *Times* sought to foster a grass-roots movement, and the message became particularly sharp in the early 1960s before fading somewhat in the early 1970s. Coverage of air pollution in other cities began in the late 1940s focusing mainly on Donora. By the mid-1950s, the *Times* broadened its focus to other U.S. cities. In the late 1960s the focus broadened even wider to air pollution developments in other countries. The issue of transboundary air pollution received an equal amount of coverage, beginning in the early 1950s with interstate relations between New York and New Jersey and continuing throughout the period. Finally, a consistent framing of the air pollution problem as a crisis really only first appeared in the early 1960s, and grew stronger in the mid- and late 1960s.

---

[122] *NYT*, Aug. 3, 1970, p. 34; *NYT*, Aug 29, 1974, p. 30; *NYT*, Jun, 29, 1970, p. 59; *NYT*, Feb. 26, 1970, p. 29; *NYT*, Jul. 18, 1971, p. E6

[123] *NYT*, Mar. 4, 1970, p. 24; *NYT*, Jun. 27, 1974, p.44; *NYT*, May 6, 1974, p. 34; *NYT*, Oct. 30, 1970, p. 40

Conclusion

This paper has aimed to further our understanding of the media's role in the history of U.S. environmentalism. Specifically it has asked how mass media's coverage of environmental issues can help explain why modern environmentalism arose when it did (in the postwar era and particularly in the 1960s), and how it did (as a popular movement for strong action by multiple levels of government). Newspaper coverage of air pollution in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York from 1945 to 1975 exhibited four broad trends which help answer these questions.

In all three cities, the major newspaper promoted public participation in the campaign against local air pollution. The *New York Times* was the most vocal in its support for an active grass-roots movement to pressure city officials into giving greater attention to pollution control, though this faded by the 1970s. The *Chicago Tribune* also promoted public activism, but more in the form of personal responsibility for individual contributions to the problem. Interestingly, the *Los Angeles Times'* early push for the kind of grass-roots activism advocated by the *New York Times* gradually gave way to a greater emphasis on the kind of personal responsibility advocated by the *Chicago Tribune*, due in part to a greater recognition of auto exhaust as the main source of smog. This advocacy on the part of the newspapers helps explain why the modern environmental movement attracted the support of a broad cross-section of American society, since city residents that were prodded by the media into taking action on local environmental issues were more likely to become environmentally conscious and active in general.

All three newspapers reported on air pollution in cities throughout the nation and around the world, thus framing local air pollution as part of a larger, more ubiquitous problem. The *Los Angeles Times* was the most consistent in emphasizing that smog existed in other American cities, and it began focusing on cities in other countries the earliest as well, though this certainly increased in the mid-1960s. The *New York Times* began by focusing almost exclusively on a few air pollution crises in other cities (mainly Donora), gradually extending its focus to air pollution

in other American cities and, finally, to other cities around the world by the mid-1960s. Like the *New York Times*, the *Chicago Tribune* had less consistent coverage of air pollution in other cities than the *Los Angeles Times*, and its focus on cities in other countries only came in the late-1960s. This focus on air pollution in other cities helps explain why environmentalists pushed for national regulations since its framing as a widespread problem entailed comprehensive solutions.

All three newspapers emphasized how air pollutants generated in some localities polluted the air of others, thus giving readers a sense that air pollution was a transboundary problem. The *Chicago Tribune* had a sustained focus on the issue of transboundary air pollution, due largely to the fact that Chicago imported great amounts of pollutants from heavily industrialized suburbs in both Illinois and Indiana. The *New York Times* also had a continuous focus on the transboundary nature of air pollution, due to the winds blowing pollutants from New Jersey to New York and vice versa. The *Los Angeles Times*, however, focused less on this issue since it did not have an inter-state problem and its suburbs came under countywide air pollution controls fairly early. This framing of the problem as inherently transboundary implied a need for action at multiple levels of government since purely local controls would not be effective solutions to the problem.

In all three cases, the newspaper framed the problem as an immense crisis and a growing threat to both public health and the future habitability of cities. The *New York Times* framed the issue as a crisis following the Donora air pollution episode, but only did so on a consistent basis beginning in the early-1960s. The *Chicago Tribune's* crisis discourse began somewhat later in the mid-1960s, but like the *New York Times* its discourse grew more dire and more urgent thereafter. The *Los Angeles Times*, by contrast, had a fairly prominent crisis discourse during the entire period, though it certainly grew much stronger and had more of an international focus beginning in the mid-1960s. The fact that the framing of the issue as a crisis became most pronounced in the 1960s helps explain the explosion of environmental concern and activism in the 1960s, since the new sense of urgency would have generated a strong push for immediate

action to avert catastrophe. For the same reason, the fact that the discourse came earliest in the *Los Angeles Times* helps explain why Los Angeles led the world in air pollution control efforts.

Aside from these four overarching trends, each newspaper expressed unique messages for city residents. In the case of the *Los Angeles Times*, these were reminding readers of their city's past without smog and fostering a sense of civic pride in strict environmental regulations. In the case of the *New York Times*, these were reminding readers of how little their city government spent on anti-pollution programs and fostering a sense of civic shame in their city's slow progress in air pollution control relative to other cities (such as Los Angeles). In the case of the *Chicago Tribune*, these included reminding readers of their city's reputation for developing the first anti-smoke laws and defending local industries from excessive blame for the problem. All of these contributed in different ways to increasing environmental consciousness among readers.

Finally, it is worth noting that all three newspapers were highly supportive of strong, concerted measures to control air pollution. Even the *Chicago Tribune*, generally considered to be a more conservative publication than the *Los Angeles Times* and the *New York Times*, found the status quo unacceptable in this respect. This suggests that local press support was a key factor in the development of the many local urban environmental movements which coalesced into the modern national environmental movement. At the very least, it suggests newspapers pressured city officials into responding more readily to residents' complaints about pollution problems.

Of course, newspaper coverage of environmental issues was not the only impetus behind the rise of modern environmentalism. The modern environmental movement was itself an amalgamation of different movements—a complex coalition of different groups each having their own motivations and goals. In short, there was simply never a single cause driving the movement as a whole. Thus, this paper has attempted to supplement, not supplant, other explanations for why modern environmentalism evolved the way it did. Indeed, an understanding of newspaper coverage of air pollution makes it easier to explain modern environmentalism. The

local press may have been only one of many factors contributing to this historical phenomenon, but it was an important one. The findings in this paper suggest that the media in general has played a greater role in the history of environmentalism than historians currently acknowledge.

Furthermore, this paper's findings point to five areas for future historical research. First, historians could look for concrete instances in which the media's framing of an environmental issue influenced individual or public perceptions (regrettably absent in this paper). Second, historians could examine the newspapers of other major cities to see if the same broad trends in their coverage of air pollution were present. Third, they might also examine media coverage of other environmental issues, especially water pollution. Fourth, they might look at other types of media to see how their coverage of environmental issues was different from mass-circulation newspapers. Finally, historians could examine newspaper coverage of air and water pollution in the Progressive era to see how it might have been differently from the postwar era. Such research would help us better ascertain the media's role in the history of U.S. environmentalism.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Los Angeles Times, Mar. 19, 1946 to Feb. 9, 1975 (about 250 articles) through ProQuest

Chicago Tribune, Mar. 8, 1947 to Dec. 19, 1975 (about 500 articles) through ProQuest

New York Times, Nov. 3, 1946 to Dec. 14, 1975 (about 750 articles) through ProQuest

Secondary Sources:

Andrews, Richard N. L. *Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves: A History of American Environmental Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Dewey, Scott H. *Don't Breathe the Air: Air Pollution and U.S. Environmental Politics, 1945-1970*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000.

Dunlap, Riley E. and Angela G. Mertig, eds. *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970-1990*. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis Press, 1992.

Gottlieb, Robert. *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington DC: Island Press, 2005.

Gottlieb, Robert and Irene Wolt. *Thinking Big: The Story of the Los Angeles Times, its Publishers, and their Influence on Southern California*. New York: Putnam Press, 1977.

Hays, Samuel P. *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Hays, Samuel P. *Explorations in Environmental History: Essays*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998.

Hays, Samuel P. *A History of Environmental Politics since 1945*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000.

Kline, Benjamin. *First Along the River: A Brief History of the U.S. Environmental Movement*. San Francisco: Acada Books, 2000.

Neuzil, Mark. *Mass Media and Environmental Conflict: America's Green Crusades*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1996.

Rome, Adam, "Give Earth a Chance: The Environmental Movement and the Sixties." *Journal of American History* 90, no. 2 (2003).

Rothman, Hal K. *The Greening of a Nation?: Environmentalism in the United States since 1945*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1998.

Sale, Kirkpatrick. *The Green Revolution: The American Environmental Movement, 1962-1992*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.

Scheffer, Victor B. *The Shaping of Environmentalism in America*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991.

Shabecoff, Philip. *A Fierce Green Fire: The American Environmental Movement*. Washington DC: Island Press, 2003.

Stradling, David. *Smokestacks and Progressives: Environmentalists, Engineers, and Air Quality in America, 1881-1951*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.