TELEVISION QUARTERLY

VOLUME IV NUMBER 1 WINTER 1965

THE JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF TELEVISION ARTS AND SCIENCES

Published by The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences with the cooperation of the Television and Radio Department, Newhouse Communications Center, Syracuse University.

Proteus and All That

As every (Athenian) schoolboy knows, Proteus was the mythological chap who, in order to avoid the task of prophecy, assumed a variety of forms.

Like Proteus, the NBC TELEVISION NETWORK is known for its diversity, but we do make predictions on occasion.

We confidently predict that NBC will continue to lead the broadcasting field in diversified, quality programming. We further predict NBC will continue to dominate the increasingly important world of *color* broadcasting.

A glance at some of NBC's recent offerings reveals how safe these predictions really are:

Widely hailed specials like "THE LOUVRE" and "VIETNAM: IT'S A MAD WAR"; entertainment standouts like "BONANZA" and "WALT DISNEY"; news coverage unmatched by any other network; the World Series, and football's most important Bowl games; plus a first-rank assortment of musical, religious, educational and children's shows.

This, we submit, is a high-protean diet. And in the months ahead, television audiences will enjoy more of the same (meaning more of the *different*) on NBC.

NBC TELEVISION

Look to NBC for the best combination of entertainment, news and sports.

TELEVISION QUARTERLY

is published quarterly by The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in cooperation with the Syracuse University Television and Radio Department.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: Television and Radio Department, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. All advertising copy and editorial matter should be sent to that address.

BUSINESS OFFICE: Advertising placement and other business arrangements should be made with the New York office of The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, 54 West 40th St., New York 18, New York.

Members of The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences receive TELEVISION QUARTERLY as part of membership services. Inquiry regarding membership should be directed to the New York office of The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

The subscription rates for non-members, libraries and others is $5.00 a year and $1.50 a copy in the United States and Canada; $5.50 a year and $1.65 a copy in all other countries, postage paid. Subscription orders should be sent to TELEVISION QUARTERLY, The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, 54 West 40th St., New York 18, N. Y.

The opinions expressed herein are solely those of the contributing authors and do not necessarily represent those of The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, the members of the Editorial Board of Television Quarterly or the Syracuse University Television and Radio Department.

Second Class postage paid at Syracuse, New York. Re-entered at Geneva, N. Y.

Printed by
W. F. HUMPHREY PRESS, INC.,
Geneva, New York

TELEVISION QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF TELEVISION ARTS AND SCIENCES

Published by The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in cooperation with the Television and Radio Department, Newhouse Communications Center, Syracuse University

...it is time for a penetrating, provocative and continuing examination of television as an art, a science, an industry, and a social force... This journal has only one aim—to take a serious look at television.

—from the
Statement of Editorial Policy
Television Quarterly
Vol. I, No. 1, February, 1962

TELEVISION QUARTERLY

WINTER 1965 VOL. IV NO. 1

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

DEPARTMENTS

TV INTERNATIONAL

The medium's world-wide expansion is characterized by both hopeful accomplishment and minor misadventure. Among the more significant cooperative efforts in international communication has been the development of Eurovision, a full-scale TV network operating among European nations on this side of the Iron Curtain. Here, WILSON P. DIZARD, Special Assistant to the Deputy Director of USIA, traces the origin and present status of Eurovision and its emerging Communist counterpart, Intervision.

While both Communist and non-Communist nations seek added strength in numbers, a few rugged individualists persist in attempting to develop broadcasting systems in their own way. A prime example in this tradition has been North Sea-TV, one of the more sophisticated of several electronic "pirate ships" operating of late in international waters. FRANK IEZZI describes those events leading up to the recent dramatic "capture" of the TV Ship by Dutch authorities, and speculates upon the outcome of North Sea-TV's struggle for legal recognition.

And while all forms of legal, extra-legal and illegal international TV development are eagerly sought, some authorities wonder what price progress. For ETHEL STRAINCHAMPS, the realization of a truly world-wide TV system will only herald the triumph of "Mediaese"—that peculiar kind of human speech which may ultimately bring us all to communication by monosyllabic grunt.

EUROPE'S TV NETWORKS

WILSON P. DIZARD

By 1970 regional and intercontinental TV network links will be available to a billion or more viewers in over 40 countries throughout the globe. The prospect of simultaneous sight-and-sound transmissions on such an unprecedented scale has political, economic and cultural implications for all countries, and for American world leadership in particular. What we say about ourselves on these new links, and what is said about us by others, will influence the world's image of America. A closer look at two major regional networks, Eurovision and Intervision (serving Western and Eastern Europe respectively) may help us formulate clearer attitudes towards international networks.

Intervision and Eurovision have their origins in the International Broadcasting Union (IBU), a pre-war attempt to encourage inter-

WILSON P. DIZARD has traveled abroad extensively as a foreign service officer in the United States Information Agency. A graduate of Fordham College, Mr. Dizard worked as a writer for Time, Inc. before joining the State Department in 1951. During the 1962–63 academic year he was a Research Fellow at M.I.T.'s Center for International Studies. Author of *The Strategy of Truth* and several magazine and newspaper articles, Mr. Dizard is currently preparing a book on international television.

national cooperation in the radio field. At a 1946 conference in Brussels, it was replaced by a new group, *Organization Internationale de Radiodiffusion* (OIR), whose membership included most European countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Since television was a future aspiration for most countries at the time, OIR devoted its efforts primarily to radio activities. By 1948, however, the new organization was considering a proposal by Marcel Bezençon of Radio Lausanne for a "program clearing house" to facilitate exchanges of television productions between national networks throughout the continent.

This and similar plans were delayed, however, until the larger issue of East-West tensions within the OIR could be resolved. It had become increasingly apparent that the Soviet Union and its satellites intended to use the organization primarily for propaganda activities. The British Broadcasting Corporation (which was not a member of OIR) took the initiative in proposing the formation of a new West European radio-television organization. The result was the formation of the European Broadcasting Union in February, 1950 with 21 regular and associate members. EBU took over the OIR's administrative offices in Geneva and its technical center in Brussels. OIR, now completely under Communist domination, was moved to Prague,[1] where it quickly became an all-out Communist transmission belt, coordinating radio and television exchanges between "socialist" countries.

Freed of Communist harassment, the new European Broadcasting Union moved quickly to set up a coordinating mechanism for handling a range of problems, including technical research, legal questions and program exchange. In this latter field, television was beginning to dominate the broadcasting scene by 1950. The Bezençon plan for a "program clearing house" was revived, with the provision that the EBU assume over-all responsibility for European-wide exchanges of both live and filmed programs. In his proposal, M. Bezençon argued that only a central organization such as the EBU could deal with the problem effectively. Such exchanges, he said, would benefit larger countries that were interested in distributing programs for prestige reasons, and also smaller countries which would need foreign programs since they could not bear the cost of locally-produced programs.

In May, 1951 the EBU administrative council authorized a study leading to the establishment of an experimental program exchange system. Meanwhile, earlier Franco-British successes in bilateral

exchanges, coupled with the rapid development of television plans in other European countries, gave added impetus to the idea of a European-wide network. The event which brought the network closer to reality than any other was the coronation of Britain's Queen Elizabeth II in June of 1953. While legal and technical experts wrangled over the difficulties involved in international TV transmissions, the French, Dutch, Danish and German television systems began negotiating with the BBC for sound-and-picture coverage of the coronation ceremonies. A dozen television transmitters on the continent relayed the event to millions of European viewers. This was the impetus for Eurovision.

Eurovision is a massive test case of the opportunities, and the limitations, involved in developing regional and intercontinental networks. It is doubtful that any area of the world will come close to European accomplishments in this field for a long time. Europe has the advantages of a relatively small geographical area, high technical competence, cultural compatibility and, above all, a strong impulse toward regional unity at many levels. Eurovision was nurtured in the dynamics of post-war European regional cooperation and, in turn, it has contributed to this movement.[2]

Eurovision's ground rules are basically simple ones. The most important operating principle is that EBU is a clearing house for providing programs that its member-organizations want. The organization's success is rooted in the fact that it has never required its member stations to accept a program; its neutrality in this matter is its continuing strength. The result has been that EBU presides over what is undoubtedly the most elaborate program-planning operation in the mass communications field. It involves a complex schedule of relay arrangements in many cases involving only two countries and in others as many as two dozen. The great majority of interchanges involve a half dozen countries or less. Only rarely is the full Eurovision network used for a simultaneous program transmission. In most cases, EBU's role is that of a routine middleman. In large-scale exchanges, however, it becomes more involved in program planning. Thus EBU's programming committee began planning for the coverage of the 1966 world football championship, to be held in Great Britain, a full two years before the event.

The other guiding principle of Eurovision operations is that each of its member-organizations provides the technical equipment and financial costs of Eurovision programs originated from its services. There has been pressure in recent years to have these costs shared

by organizations receiving the programs. This proposal has been defeated, most recently in an EBU program committee meeting in Lausanne in April, 1964.

The end result of this organizational activity is to permit millions of viewers in various countries to watch programs that take them beyond the physical and psychological confines of their own cities and country. The range of Eurovision programming they see is a varied one. There is no doubt, however, about which type of program is most popular. It is sports, and particularly soccer. The partisanship that Americans demonstrate towards their favorite teams in baseball and football pales before the frenzied interest that most of the rest of the world shows in soccer. The Olympic Games aside, the one truly "world's championship" sporting event is the contest for an award most Americans have never heard of—the cup symbolic of victory in the World Soccer Championships. Whatever noble thoughts its organizers might have had about Eurovision as a regional cultural force, the fact is that the new network was given its initial boost when it broadcast the 1954 world soccer contest. Here was something that all its viewers, actual and potential, could understand, without any significant interference from political, linguistic or other barriers.

Sports has dominated the Eurovision programming pattern from the beginning. During the network's first six years, sports accounted for more than half of all its transmissions. Since 1960 this ratio has dropped to a fairly consistent pattern of between 40 and 50 per cent of total transmission time. Aside from the always-popular soccer games, the Eurovision sports schedule includes such varied events as Wimbledon tennis, boxing, wrestling, sportscar racing and track and field events. Huge audiences watched the Olympic winter games at Cortina, Italy in 1960, and at Innsbruck in 1964. Not to be outdone by these international events, Eurovision has organized its own regional contest, a Eurovision swimming competition.

Sports gave Eurovision its initial impetus as a mass regional medium and it has been a major factor in sustaining this large audience. In recent years, the trend in Eurovision's programming pattern has been away from sports and towards more diversified types of programs. Sports accounted for 70 per cent of the network's programs in 1956; its share of the program pie dropped to under 50 per cent by 1960. The most significant factor in this change has been the increasing emphasis on news coverage. In 1964 over half the network's transmissions involved either live coverage of major

news events or the network's daily transmission of more routine news happenings.

Simultaneous coverage of major European events has been an important Eurovision function since its experimental success with the British coronation in 1953. The network has since built a well-deserved reputation for the imaginative coverage it has given to regional news events. Its cameras have given viewers a unique, incomparable view of the men and events which have brought Western Europe closer to regional unity in the past 20 or so years than at any time in modern history. It has done this without ever resorting to consciously-directed propaganda programming advocating European union. The network's approach has been the more effective one of reporting, without editorializing, the sights and sounds of post-war Europe. The only guideline for Eurovision news coverage from the very beginning has been the event's newsworthiness, as determined by each individual member. With this standard, Eurovision has covered the deaths of popes, the marriages of kings, NATO military exercises, the formation and progress of the Common Market, the United Nations' disarmament meetings in Geneva, the funeral of Toscanini, and such natural disasters as mine rescues, floods and avalanches.

The network's imaginative approach to much of its news coverage has strengthened its popularity. Thus, when the International Geophysical Year opened in 1957, Eurovision by-passed the idea of having scientists give dull talks about international cooperation. Instead, it placed its cameras high up on Switzerland's Jungfrau and deep below the Mediterranean to dramatize to its viewers the IGY's scope and purpose. In 1962 Eurovision cooperated with U. S. authorities in bringing to Europeans the first trans-Atlantic television transmissions relayed by the Telstar satellite. During the following year, European stations originated 101 programs to the United States and received 40.[8]

More spectacular was the Soviet Union's achievement in August, 1962 which provided, through the Eurovision network, live transmissions from an orbiting manned-space capsule.

Although Eurovision's ground rules for the coverage of news events emphasize newsworthiness, there are numerous political factors involved in what is shown—and what is not shown—via Eurovision. Each country can agree to, or veto, a request by its Eurovision colleagues for coverage of a particular event within its borders. Although most of the network's members have a good

record of cooperation, there is a natural tendency to emphasize events which show their country in a favorable light. In a few cases, this moves from tendency to conscious policy. The largest originator of Eurovision news coverage is the French state network. If there are political parties in opposition to General DeGaulle which hold political rallies or are involved in other newsworthy events, Eurovision's audience will have to learn about them from other sources. The emphasis in French television's news output to the regional network is heavily weighted on coverage of General DeGaulle's activities.[4] General DeGaulle and his provocative views do not, however, go unchallenged on Eurovision. When the French government vetoed the admission of Great Britain into the Common Market in 1962, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was able to bring a forceful presentation of the British case before a large Eurovision audience in rebuttal.

American politics and its leaders have become more familiar to Europeans through Eurovision. The enormous European popularity enjoyed by Dwight Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy was enhanced by live network coverage of their Presidential visits to the continent. Television played an important role in strengthening the Kennedy image in Europe during his first Presidential trip there in 1961, shortly after his inauguration.

The abrupt end of the President's life had an enormous emotional impact on Europeans, and again television played a central role. In the days following his assassination, Eurovision covered events in Washington through the most extensive news transmissions in its history. Over one hundred million people witnessed the President's funeral through satellite-relay transmissions sent by Eurovision to all its own member-networks and to the East European Intervision network. Additionally, Eurovision arranged ten other multilateral transmissions from the United States and two full-scale sequential news transmissions during those somber days.

Complementing this live coverage of such major news events is Eurovision's day-to-day activities in covering the normal flow of news. Almost from the network's inception, Eurovision officials had talked of plans for systematic daily exchanges of news between member stations. Without such an exchange, individual national networks rely on shipments of newsfilm which are delayed both by the time it takes to process the film and to ship it. The need was for a system to relay news events, live or on film, through Eurovision facilities on a scheduled daily basis, in time for local nightly news

programs. The Eurovision system, which has been in full operation since 1962, is an imaginative precursor of the day when there will be world-wide facilities for exchanging television news coverage.

Behind these transmissions is a complex technical and programming plan. The focal point of the programming operations is in the office of the Eurovision news coordinator in Geneva. During the day, he draws up a news transmission schedule after consulting with news editors of Eurovision stations. The editors tell him what news material they are prepared to feed into the network and what material they are prepared to take "off the line." Once a firm schedule for news is set up, the news coordinator clears his schedule through Eurovision's general program coordinator at EBU headquarters in Geneva and with the staff of the EBU Technical Center, Brussels. At 5:00 P.M. the Technical Center sets into motion the complex transmitting pattern which feeds a visual news exchange over thousands of miles of Eurovision relay lines from Helsinki to Rome. Stations feed material into the line according to the day's pre-arranged schedule. Others pick up material, broadcasting it live in some cases but in most instances taping it for use on news shows later in the evening.

Eurovision's daily news exchanges have overcome the early hesitations that many of the network's member-stations had about this project. In 1963, 28 national television systems made 7,027 pick-ups of Eurovision news transmissions. These pick-ups involved 1,246 originations from 19 national networks, or an average of about four a day.[5]

Over 90 per cent of Eurovision transmissions involve either news or sports. It is probable that this pattern will also hold for any other regional or intercontinental television network arrangements in other areas of the world. The reasons are obvious. Both news and sports are, for the most part, readily understandable; the picture tells the story. A network can, if it wants to, add its own commentary. The Eurovision stations have over the years developed a split-second system for adding local language commentaries to foreign news and sports shows through the use of simultaneous translators or by supplying its own commentators at the scene of the event. However, language is a major barrier outside the news and sports fields.

Eurovision has attempted to solve this problem by relying heavily on "spectaculars" in its network entertainment shows. A typical Eurovision entertainment program is an open-air performance of *Aida* from Italy, complete with horses, camels and a cast of hundreds.

The network's variety shows generally feature well-known international stars. Ballet and ballroom dancing are popular items on the Eurovision schedule. Although the network seldom transmits plays in their original versions, it has its own intermittent drama series, known as "The Largest Theater in the World." The title is not entirely an exercise in hyperbole. An estimated audience of 50 million persons saw the play *Heart to Heart,* by British author Terence Rattigan. The Rattigan play and others in the series are commissioned by Eurovision to be shown in several language versions by the network's member-stations as nearly simultaneously as possible. (In practice, this has turned out to cover a period of about one week.) Eurovision's dramatic series, together with its other entertainment shows, will always represent a small portion of the network's total schedule. They have, however, established themselves as a permanent part of the European television scene.

Eurovision's success in regional transmissions led the Communist nations to attempt a similar venture within their own borders. The result was Intervision, which is—technically at least—Eurovision's opposite number in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The technical achievements of Intervision are, in fact, considerable. It is geographically the most widespread single land network, stretching from East Berlin to the Urals, with the prospect of being extended to Vladivostok on the Pacific Ocean within a few years. This latter achievement would involve a linear distance of over 9,000 miles. Intervision does not, however, service as many individual stations or as large an audience as its Western European counterpart.

The most important distinction between Intervision and Eurovision is, of course, their purposes. Intervision is intended primarily to be a transmission belt for the propaganda of the Soviet Union and its European allies. It is international television in the service of Marxism-Leninism.

Intervision was founded in February, 1960 by the State television organizations of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany and Poland. A year later the Soviet Union joined the system, followed by Bulgaria and Rumania.[6] Organizationally, Intervision is an activity of OIRT, the Communist radio-television organization which free world nations deserted in 1950 to form the European Broadcasting Union. Since that time, OIRT has provided a clearing house for radio and television activities of Communist bloc countries as well as those with leftist or neutralist leanings.[7]

Intervision's organizational set-up is a frank imitation of the one

adopted by Eurovision. It includes an Intervision Council, a program coordination center and a technical coordination center, all in Prague.[8] Since early in 1964, all of the network's active members have been linked directly by cable and microwave connections. This linkage was, however, slow in developing. The first links between "socialist" countries took place in 1960 when Moscow and Warsaw were connected. The Soviet Union, however, seemed more interested in securing links with Eurovision than with smaller countries in the Communist bloc. A roundabout link with West Europe was achieved in 1961 through a relay between Leningrad and Helsinki. Later a more direct route from Warsaw to East Berlin was completed.

Intervision programming efforts are considerably smaller in both scope and imagination than those of its Eurovision counterpart. There is a fairly active interchange of sports programs, but the mainstay of the programming schedule involves events which the Communist leadership considers politically important. This includes coverage of May Day parades, national day-of-liberation celebrations, ribbon-cutting ceremonies involving socialist achievements, and the like. Whatever its political strengths, Marxism-Leninism does not make good television. Added to this is the significant fact that ties between countries in the "socialist commonwealth" are no longer as tightly bound either by the dominance of the Soviet Union or their own need for mutual cooperation.

This has had its effect in stunting Intervision's influence. It is a trend that is difficult to identify clearly. There is little doubt about the trend, however. Its most important indicator is the relatively small number of programs exchanged on the network. A 1963 Polish summary of Intervision's activities claimed that about "500 to 600 items" would be exchanged in that year. This compares with the Eurovision total of over 3,000 for the same period. More significantly, the Polish report declares that in one three-month period, Polish television would take only 36 programs of the 111 offered by the network. This is a low level of socialist unity which, in an earlier and more repressive Stalinist era, would not have been permitted.[9] There are some indications that other East European networks have cut back use of Intervision facilities. In 1961 Czech TV devoted five per cent of its programming to Intervision; the following year this had dropped to four per cent.

The strongest trend in Iron Curtain television seems to be the desire of East European countries to step up their contacts with

West European television. There are, in fact, strong indications that the prospect for such contacts have always been a strong consideration in Intervision's growth. The Soviet Union took the lead in exploiting the possibility of live television contact with the West. Circumstances permitted it to couple this significant achievement with another one. On April 14, 1961 the first live relay took place between Moscow and London via Helsinki; the event it recorded was the tumultuous Moscow reception accorded Major Yuri Gagarin, the first Soviet astronaut. The program was re-transmitted by the BBC to other Eurovision stations throughout the continent. It was a stunning technical and political achievement for the Russians, and they proceeded to follow it up with other relay programs. A few weeks later, Europeans saw a spectacular May Day parade in Red Square. In August a special transmission was made between Moscow and Rome at the time of Italian Premier Amintore Fanfani's visit to the Soviet Union.

Since that time an intermittent series of exchanges between the two television networks has taken place. Premier Khrushchev took advantage of the link to put his ideas directly to the vast Eurovision audience; in one such program in April, 1964, the former Soviet leader set out his side of his dispute with the Chinese Communists in a speech that was carried by 16 national networks on both sides of the Iron Curtain.[10]

There are only minor technical difficulties involved in connecting the two networks. An Intervision program can move through East German TV studios to Eurovision's regional network center in a matter of seconds. For several years after the first 1961 exchanges, the two networks operated on a pragmatic basis, sharing program expenses on an agreed-upon scale. At its 19th General Assembly, in September, 1963, OIRT proposed that more permanent arrangements for greater cooperation between the two networks be developed. The hitch to any such arrangements is liable to be a political one. Eurovision members have already indicated that they will insist on a formula of more-or-less equal reciprocity in any formal agreement on exchanges, together with guarantees against blatant propaganda exploitation of any exchanges. EBU's membership is aware of the Communists' policy of parading their achievements to the outside world while keeping a tight rein on information coming into their own countries.

Eurovision was involved in a ludicrous incident in 1964 which underscored this point. The occasion was the television relay of a

soccer game from Great Britain to, among other countries, the Soviet Union. The British national team played an all-star team which included Ferenc Puskas, a world-famous Hungarian player who had defected to the West after the Budapest uprising in 1956. His defection had never been reported in the Soviet press. He was, therefore, officially a "non-person" as far as Soviet television was concerned. Although he played a brilliant game—all of which was recorded on the visual part of the transmission—his name was never once mentioned by the Soviet commentator describing the event.

Despite these irritations, there seems little doubt that cooperation between Eurovision and Intervision will be stepped up in the coming years. Televisions exchanges have a unique and promising role to play in encouraging more "bridge-building" contacts between Eastern Europe and the West. This will, however, depend in large part on the willingness of Communist governments to permit a higher level of uncensored information exchanges in television and the other media than they have in the past.

There is no doubt that Europe, both East and West, has a long lead in regional network television. Geography, politics and financial considerations are each formidable obstacles to the development of similar networks in other parts of the world. Despite these barriers, however, regional and intercontinental links will become a reality in every corner of the globe within the next decade. It is not too early for the American government and the commercial television industry to develop policies and programs to meet this dramatic development in the medium's growth.

NOTES

1. In July, 1959 OIR's organizational name was changed to International Radio and Television Organization. For descriptions of the post-war development in this field, see "Origin and First Steps of the EBU Programme Committee," *EBU Review*, 85B, May, 1964; also *Twelve Years of Communist Broadcasting, 1948–49*, Simon Costikyan, Office of Research and Analysis, U. S. Information Agency, Washington, D. C.

2. European national networks had three standards which had to be made compatible for international operations—the British 405-line system, the French 819-line system, and 625 lines for the rest of Europe.
3. Not all of these, however, were Eurovision network programs. A large percentage of the programs sent to the United States are bilateral relays intended to service the American commercial networks' news operations.
4. During 1963, RTF provided Eurovision with 134 originations of all kinds. This was twice the number of originations of any other single member of the network. Although this record is undoubtedly due in large part to RTF's coverage of French domestic events, it is also explained by the importance of Paris as an international news center. See *EBU Review,* No. 85, Part B., May, 1964, p. 25.
5. A detailed statistical summary can be found in the *EBU Review, supra,* p. 25. The discrepancy between the number of networks who originate and those who pick up Eurovision news transmissions can be explained by the fact that American, Canadian and Eastern European networks generally do not contribute news items to the daily Eurovision exchange but are occasional users of its services. The exchanges are described in "The Eurovision News Transmission," by J. W. Rengelink, in the same issue of *EBU Review.*
6. Given the exigencies of politics within the Communist bloc, Albania has not become a member of Intervision. Yugoslavia has been an active member of Eurovision for a number of years; in 1964 the Yugoslavs announced that they were building a relay tower in Northern Servia which would connect them directly with Intervision.
7. OIRT members include Albania, Bulgaria, Communist China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Finland, East Germany, Hungary, Iraq, North Korea, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and North Viet Nam.
8. For an Intervision official's description of the organization, see "Intervision," by Alés Suchy, in *World Radio TV Handbook,* 18th edition, 1964 (O. Lund Johansen, ed.), Hellerup, Denmark, p. 26.
9. The report on Intervision appeared in the Polish weekly, *Polityka,* March 23, 1963. An English translation can be found in *East Europe,* March, 1964.
10. *New York Times,* April 13, 1964.

EXPORTING TV KNOW-HOW —A CASE HISTORY

Within weeks, the Saudi Arabian Television Network, developed with the consultation and assistance of American TV specialists, will make its initial telecast. *Television Quarterly* invited HAROLD ANDERSON, Vice President, NBC International, and Manager of Special Projects, to provide a personal account of his findings and experiences in the course of this unique enterprise.

NBC International is involved in the largest single TV project ever undertaken by an American firm—introducing television into Saudi Arabia. The initial negotiations were carried out between George A. Graham Jr., Vice President in Charge of NBC Enterprises, of which NBC International is a division, and Jamil Ali Hijilan, the Saudi Arabian Minister of Education. The government of Saudi Arabia under the Regency of His Royal Highness, King Faisal, has planned for a 13-station network to minister to the educational and informational requirements of the nation.

The Saudi Arabians are a very hospitable people and entertain within the boundaries of their homes, but the tenets of the Moslem religion do not endorse public entertainment; because of this there are no cinemas in Saudi Arabia. Sports, the basic form of public entertainment, is sanctioned because of its health-giving aspect. The Saudi Arabians are great soccer players and this, along with some cricket and a budding interest in softball, constitutes the major spectator activity in the country. As the Saudi Arabian network progresses, entertainment programming is expected to develop since watching television is an in-the-home activity. However, the entertainment aspect of television will never be its primary *raison d'être* in Saudi Arabia.

I have recently returned from Saudi Arabia where the first two stations in the network are under way. The station at Jedda is completely constructed and is in the process of receiving broadcasting equipment. The other station, at Riyadh, has just completed construction and will begin receiving equipment. Both buildings stand where there was formerly nothing but sand. Jedda is the Red Sea port city of Saudi Arabia where all the principal commercial and banking activities of the country take place. The city has an international flavor, is the seat of all the foreign diplomatic missions, and is traditionally believed to be the location of the tomb of Eve, wife of Adam.

Riyadh is the capital of Saudi Arabia and the principal city of the Nedj territory, ancestral home of the ruling House of Saud. Abdul-Azziz ibn Saud, founder of the Saudi Arabian dynasty, united the country out of previously existing sheikdoms, emirates, and sultanates in 1926.

The Ulema, ruling religious faction of Saudi Arabia, is also located in Riyadh. This body of teachers and scholars does not rule the country in its own right but its accord is definitely necessary to the king. The Regency of Prince Faisal which became final in March of 1964 was supported by this group, and Faisal was then proclaimed King of Saudi Arabia on November 2, 1964. The oil revenue of the country in the past accrued for the most part to the personal fortune of the House of Saud. There was an enormous disparity between the lavish living standards of the king and the numerous royal princes and that of the average Saudi Arabian citizen. In spite of this, Saudi Arabia has always had one of the world's lowest crime rates. King Faisal, who is called the "Enlightened One," has placed the major portion of the oil revenue to work improving the country in such areas as road building, television, sewage improvement, and agriculture.

The establishment of a television network is one of the many factors in King Faisal's over-all plan to make Saudi Arabia a prime contender in the world market. Along with oil, the major industry of the country, heavy industry and agriculture are two fields which Saudi Arabia hopes to build into revenue producers. Agriculture was once the major occupation of Saudi Arabians and there are plans to turn what is now desert into productive soil with the help of irrigation and water purification. There has been some talk of bringing two atomic reactors into Jedda to convert sea water to fresh water. Television, in its educational role, goes hand in hand with these expansion plans.

The target date for the initial broadcast of the Saudi Arabian network is April 1, 1965, when the country observes its great yearly national religious holiday, the Haj. This holiday is of corresponding magnitude to our Christmas and it is the ambition of every Moslem—Saudi Arabian and otherwise—to make a pilgrimage to the holy cities of Mecca and Medina during the Haj. Mecca is the seat of all Islamic belief; and Medina, the second most holy city, is the burying place of Muhammad, Islam's greatest prophet. It is fitting that initial television in Saudi Arabia will be able to communicate the great April pilgrimages to Mecca and Medina to the entire Moslem world.

One of the most intriguing situations I encountered exists because of the sacrosanct nature of the cities of Mecca and Medina. Future television stations in the network are planned for both these cities, but a tactical problem exists because only Moslems are allowed to approach the holy cities any closer than 12 miles. It is planned to build relay stations in the hills outside the 12-mile limit for each city. These stations will be operated by non-Moslems while Saudi Arabian personnel are being trained to run them. When the Saudis complete their training they will move the relay stations into the cities and establish studios there.

The initial trip to Saudi Arabia was made by Joseph M. Klein, President of NBC International. Later, I joined other NBC Enterprises staff members on a trip to survey and select sites for the initial two stations at Jedda and Riyadh. During this trip we held discussions with top Saudi Arabian government officials to determine their desires for educational and informational television. Among the topics considered were programming philosophies and policies. At the same time the capability for future stations was established. In line with their greatly accelerated modernization program in every field, the officials expressed a desire for studios for live production, videotape facilities, and mobile vans with tape facilities; in other words, complete studio complements.

Interestingly enough, there is a fairly large English-speaking population in Jedda, where a two-language broadcasting system is being created. Arabic will be spoken on TV, and English on an accompanying radio station. For those speaking only English, the TV sound can be turned down and the radio turned up. Since it appears that all programming will have to be translated into Arabic, two methods are proposed for documentaries, travel, and sports programs. One is to supply Arabic voice-over tracks for these types of programming, and the other is to supply lip-synchronized dubbing. If dubbing is used, a major stumbling block exists because of the difference in the Arabian and English rate of speaking. The beautiful Arabic language is more formal and uses more words to convey meaning than English. In the dubbing process the Arabic volubility must be condensed to match the English lip movements. This problem has been encountered before with such languages as Japanese, and will be overcome as American television know-how continues to expand throughout the world.

The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
54 West 40th Street, New York 18, New York

Please enter my subscription for one year (four issues) to *Television Quarterly,* the Journal of The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

Name _____
(Please Print)

Address _____

City _____ Zone_____ State_____

Subscription Rates $5.00 per year in the U. S. and Canada.
$5.50 per year in all other countries.

Make checks payable to: *Television Quarterly*

TV PIRACY ON THE HIGH SEAS

FRANK IEZZI

A quiet but dramatic development has recently taken place off the coast of Holland which threatens, or promises, to have world-wide implications for television broadcasters and audiences. In September of 1964, six dedicated and persistent people, aided by a handful of technicians, began operating a television station of highly doubtful legality.[1] Should the practice they initiated survive the courts, it might encourage similar "pirate TV broadcasters" or "free-lance TV entrepreneurs," as they would prefer to be called, to set up shop off the coastlines of other nations anywhere in the world.

Before describing this bold broadcasting venture it is necessary, in order to lend perspective, to sketch-in some detail about the

FRANK IEZZI is Director of Broadcasting and Associate Professor of Speech and Drama at Hofstra University. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin in 1954, and in 1959 was recipient of a Fund for Adult Education Mass Media Leadership Training Award. Dr. Iezzi has made five study tours of European broadcasting systems and has written several articles on TV abroad. His "Television Drama in Europe" appeared in the August, 1962 issue of *Television Quarterly*.

Dutch broadcasting scene before the advent of these six intruders who collectively comprise the Reclame Exploitatie Maatschappij (REM) station. Up until the arrival of REM, the Dutch broadcasting system of the Netherlands was unique in structure and method of financing. Regarding structure, Netherlands broadcasting was not privately operated, publicly operated, nor governmentally operated. The system provided for direct participation by the major cultural, religious and political associations in supplying all national and local broadcasts over the state-owned transmitters and relay facilities.

As a result, radio and television broadcasting in Holland was monopolized by five such organizations which were, in descending order of size, the Catholic Broadcasting System, the Workers Association of Radio Amateurs, The Protestant System, the General Broadcasting System (consisting of non-sectarian and non-political members), and the Liberal Protestant System. Thus, millions of radio listeners and TV viewers were able to receive broadcasts which reflected their particular opinions and beliefs and which reflected the political structure and religious foundation of the Netherlands.

Regarding finances, Netherlands broadcasting was one of the few remaining systems in Europe not at least partially commercial. Revenue to support both radio and television came from annual license fees of $3.31 for radio receivers and $10 for TV receivers.

Progressing slowly until 1958, Dutch TV has made impressive strides. The entire country is covered by the TV signals of two channels. The TV audience numbered 500,000 in 1959; 1,000,000 in 1961; and 1,600,000 in 1964. The five cultural, religious and political organizations cited above shared cooperatively the program time available on the two non-commercial channels. The government collected approximately a $10 license fee annually on each of the 1.6 million Dutch TV sets—thus making $16,000,000 per year available to the five participating organizations on a prorated basis according to the size of their membership (as determined by the number of subscriptions each received for TV guides).

That was the situation before the advent of the "pirate TV station," known as North Sea-TV, established by the REM organization. Essentially, North Sea-TV consists of a time-selling and packaging agency located on land in Amsterdam and a transmitting facility which had been erected on an artificial "island" six miles off the Dutch shore. In addition to the purchasing of such filmed programs as *Ben Casey, Rin Tin Tin,* and *The Invisible*

Man, mainly from England and the United States, the selling of the time and the production of spot commercials and announcements, the land-side offices assembled the 16mm film reels that had comprised the programs that were broadcast. These film reels, complete with interspersed commercials, were then transported by helicopter or hydrofoil boat to the seaside offices seven days in advance of air-time.

The seaside installation (now silenced) consists of a concrete artificial "island" located six miles off the coast of Holland and thereby three miles outside of Dutch territorial waters. Essentially, this "island" looks like a Texas Tower atop of which is located a transmitting tower. The concrete building is 40 feet above sea level, perched on legs that go 66 feet below the water to a sandbank. The purpose of this structure (built by Cor Verolme, the Rotterdam shipbuilder who is the main backer of North Sea-TV) is primarily to support the 360-foot transmitter tower, but it also houses transmission and telecine equipment and provides living quarters for the seven TV engineers and equal number of island maintenance engineers. During operation, the crew remained on board for two weeks and then rested on land for one week. Technical talk among the basically Belgian engineering crew aboard the island was conducted in English, and social conversation in Flemish or Dutch. Mail, newspapers and fresh food were delivered easily, although helicopter and hydrofoil ship deliveries proved more difficult in heavy seas. The concrete island contains snug dormitory accommodations for the crew, a kitchen, a dining room, a tiny control room and a tinier studio for titles and ID's. The equipment is from RCA. During its broadcast life the station's directional signal covered 80 miles.

North Sea-TV's programs were broadcast every evening from 6:30 to 8:00 and again from 10:00 to 11:30. The programs were in English, since they were obtained from England and the United States, and had Dutch sub-titles. This provided a fortuitous fringe-benefit for the language-conscious Dutch viewer since it afforded him the welcome opportunity to improve his English. Apart from the formidable tasks of buying appropriate program materials, selling air time, scheduling, producing commercial inserts, transporting film reels and transmitting from a remote off-shore installation (these obstacles were more considerable since none of the members of REM had any experience in running a TV station), the greatest obstacle to the success of the venture was yet to come.

In late 1964, the Dutch government began negotiating a Bill which would enable Dutch authorities to occupy the artificial island and to force North Sea-TV to desist from broadcasting. The proposed Bill is based upon a 1958 United Nations Convention which defines the limits of continental shelves over which coastal states hold sovereignty. The government asserted that this dictum should include artificial structures erected on the continental shelf.

Joseph Brandel, the dynamic director of REM and the North Sea-TV project who reports only to shipbuilder Verolme, indicated that he was willing to concede that Dutch criminal law ought to apply aboard the "island," but stressed that the island was owned by a foreign power (as yet unidentified) and that, accordingly, Dutch broadcasting laws did not apply. Mr. Brandel predicted that this unidentified nation, should the proposed Bill pass and be enforced, would take the Dutch government to the International Court, which is located, ironically, in the Hague, only 50 miles away from the North Sea-TV island. Brandel pointed out that Lloyds of London had insured REM for nine million guilders ($2,500,000) against the possibility that the government of the Netherlands would succeed in its efforts to put North Sea-TV out of business.

The Dutch government notwithstanding, how was the North Sea-TV project greeted by other segments of the Dutch nation? From all indications, the Dutch viewing public was enthusiastically receptive. The special North Sea-TV television aerial had been springing up on the rooftops all over the Netherlands, and audience measurement made just before the government intervened indicated that more than 250,000 homes were already watching with some degree of regularity. Despite the estimate (cited earlier) that 1,600,000 homes had been watching the government-sanctioned TV programs before the advent of North Sea-TV, proponents of this new free-lance TV station indicated that this figure comprised only 51% of Dutch families. This is quite low when we consider that Holland is one of the most home-loving nations of the world. They further argued that although these people watched the TV set they were bored by the programs being presented, which were almost entirely of an educational or religious nature with entertainment barely a consideration.

Dutch advertising agencies and sponsors welcomed the impressive new marketing medium offered by North Sea-TV. And film and television unions welcomed the opportunity for extra work. REM's operation brought in $260,000 in advertising revenue in its first

month, and it looked forward with confidence to operating in the black by the end of its first year.

But North Sea-TV never completed a year of actual operation. On December 11, 1964, the Second Chamber (Senate) passed by a large majority the necessary "order in Council" to enable the Dutch government to close down by force the pirate TV station. Since the First Chamber (House) had approved such legislation by a vote of 114 to 19 some three months before, the stage was set. On December 17, 1964, Premier Victor G. M. Marijnem revealed to the Dutch Senate that North Sea-TV had assigned ownership of the TV island installation to a Panamanian concern and its promotional activities to a British concern. At 8:00 A.M. on the morning of December 18, 1964, a 300-ton Dutch Royal Navy vessel anchored 200 yards from the TV island. Three Air Force helicopters hovered over the island, dropped flares to light the area, and swiftly lowered four policemen onto the platform. Simultaneously, a small boat from the 300-ton vessel brought Amsterdam assistant prosecutor J. F. Hartsuiker to the tower, where he personally supervised the legal confiscation of transmitters on the island, thereby closing down the pirate TV station and the pirate radio station which had also been housed and operated on the small man-made island.[2]

The stations' main backer, Cor Verolme, anticipating the dramatic "invasion," had ordered his ten men aboard not to resist the police, but not to assist them either lest the $2.5 million in Lloyds of London insurance be jeopardized. With the commercial resourcefulness which had characterized the North Sea-TV radio pirate broadcasting operation from the very outset, the ten-man crew proceeded to photograph and to film the entire "Keystone Kop" invasion, perhaps for promotional or legal evidence use sometime in the future.

Shortly after the invasion it was revealed that advertising revenue from three and one-half months of operation at the reduced introductory rate had been three million guilders ($834,000). Reuters reported from London that the station is owned by Eric Bent, owner of a British printing concern, who intends to protest the invasion to the Dutch government but adds that he does not "wish to make any sort of international incident of the situation." Cor Verolme, particularly incensed that Dutch police took such drastic action outside of Dutch territorial waters, has already set into motion the

legal machinery to take the Dutch government to the International Court.

The transmitter is silent, but the basic questions of international control over broadcasting which North Sea-TV's operation has raised remain to be answered. Should North Sea-TV survive the inevitable legal encounter in the International Court, how long will it be before a number of similar "pirate" TV stations appear just outside the territorial waters of other nations, perhaps including the United States?

NOTES

1. According to Radio Regulations Treaty (International) signed in Geneva in 1959 and adopted, Special Rules Relating to Broadcasting, 3 Section 1, "The establishment and use of broadcasting stations (sound broadcasting and TV broadcasting stations) on board ship, aircraft or any other floating or airborne objects outside national territories is prohibited in accordance with International Treaty." See A.J.P. Tammes's article, "Freedom of the High Seas: Legitimacy of a Television Island," *European Broadcasting Union Review*, Part B, General and Legal, No. 86B, July, 1965, pp. 38–40.
2. Britain has been plagued for months by pirate radio stations on ships anchored off the coast in international waters. Recently two vessels, the *Caroline* and the *Atlanta*, merged their commercial broadcasting operations and now claim a listening audience of 39 million Britons. They are reportedly backed by British, Irish and Swiss funds and owned by a concern registered in the Principality of Lichtenstein. On December 23, 1964, Radio London, a pirate radio station operating off the British coast, started broadcasting, bringing the number of such operations off Britain to five. It operates from a former United States minesweeper anchored on the Thames Estuary in Southern England with a range of 250 miles and reaching ten million British homes.

MEDIAESE- THE INTERNATIONAL DIALECT

ETHEL STRAINCHAMPS

The almost universal prediction of speech experts who assayed the impact of radio and the talking movies on our culture in the early history of those media was that they would homogenize the English language. But, even with the added influence of television, which is generally admitted to be a more powerful medium, the prediction has proved to be inaccurate.

The persisting diversity of English dialects, both British and American, is most conspicuously displayed in both countries at election time. The delegates from all states at the national party conventions in America are permitted to speak at least a few words. Almost every variety of the letter *a*, for example, can still be heard—from the almost-broad one in "New Hampshire pahsses" to the almost-long one in "Georgia paisses." As principal candidates we

A free-lance writer and regular contributor to the arts and review section of the Sunday *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, ETHEL STRAINCHAMPS has had articles on language published in *Harper's, Saturday Review, TV Guide*, and other magazines. Her background includes experience on Springfield, Missouri, newspapers and KTTS radio and television. Miss Strainchamps has collaborated on a book on American usage to be published by Scott, Foresman; and is a consulting editor on a dictionary being prepared by that firm.

have had, in the past few years, speakers of all the traditional American dialects, from John F. Kennedy (who spoke pure Northeastern) to Lyndon B. Johnson, who speaks Southern Midland. Nor has the British candidate, from Macmillan to Wilson, made any obvious concessions to voters out of his own region or class who might find his accents unfamiliar.

Yet the nonconformist speech habits of a national political leader do not seem to do him any damage with the voters, not even with those in areas where such peculiarities must strike listeners as annoyingly exotic. This would seem to indicate that the performers in radio, television, and films who do constantly strive to eradicate their own native "accents" are wasting their time and effort.

The brand of English spoken in the public information and entertainment media, by Britons and Americans, has been called Mid-Atlantic by certain linguists, and the term has been picked up by British critics. For example, John Coleman, film and TV critic of the *New Statesman*, recently noted that the American actor George C. Scott had played a British Intelligence officer in a certain film "with a Mid-Atlantic accent and enviable aplomb." That term does not, however, indicate the narrow scope of this special dialect, and, since that narrowness is its most remarkable feature, a more accurate name for it would be *Mediaese*.

As the language not of a geographical group or a social class but of a profession, *Mediaese* is the first dialect to have become standard for all the speakers of any language without its first having been accepted as the normal speech of a dominant social elite. Unlike the standard English of any former era, *Mediaese* makes no claim to such established linguistic virtues as elegance, precision, correctness, or adherence to precedent. It aims at one thing only: the widest possible acceptability to the largest number of its hearers. Its speakers, all of whom compete for the loyalty of the same vast audience, do not hope that their diction will be admired but that it will not be noticed. The "Beautiful Diction" awards that used to be won regularly by the late George Arliss would be hastily rejected by his successors, even if there were any culture promoters left who were so "square" as to offer such awards in the first place.

As was inevitable, the dialect that evolved from the effort to be the most acceptable to largest numbers of English-speaking people most closely resembles middle-class Midland American. This was already the language spoken by more people than any other natural English dialect. According to dialect experts, Midland (which was

formerly called General American) is the native dialect of all the people of the United States except those born along the Atlantic seaboard or in the Southeast, plus a few in such "speech pockets" as the Ozarks. The artificial *Mediaese* differs from the natural Midland only in minor details such as the pronunciation of *th* in *with* (hard in *Mediaese*) and of the *u* sound in such words as *news* (long, as in *few* in *Mediaese*). Of course *Mediaese* also observes the upper-class (Class III) rules of grammar, including the one requiring the objective case of pronouns in compound objects, which is not usually observed by candidates. And it also has somewhat rounder vowels than the true Middlewestern Midland, such as that spoken by Presidents Eisenhower and Truman.

Now usually described as "accentless," *Mediaese* is the dialect used by such stand-up dialect comedians as Myron Cohen in their remarks to audiences between dialect monologues, and by such international stars as Audrey Hepburn and Peter Sellers when they appear *in propria persona*. If this dialect now seems accentless to almost everybody, it is because it has become familiar to almost every listener as the "real" language of radio, TV, and the films—of actors not playing roles, of announcers announcing, newscasters casting, and commentators commenting. Before it had become thus established, it did not sound accentless to speakers of Northeastern and Southern. New Yorkers have described it as "drawling" and "flat"; Southerners as "rapid" and "sophisticated." Its accentlessness, that is, was relative.

Mediaese is not the first English dialect to have become acceptable as international professional speech. Before it, there was "stage diction," but this was based on a class dialect (U-British). In its modified American version it was marked by the broad *a* and the silent *r* in words in which they did not appear in the majority American dialect. Stage diction was used in the first of the higher-brow American sound films (the Barrymores and the Lunts were among its American practitioners), and it was the dialect used by the pioneer radio announcers.

As soon as radio became really popular, however, the network offices began to be swamped with complaints about the "la-di-da pronunciations of some of their hirelings," as H. L. Mencken put it, and speech experts were hired to set up standards. Both Dr. Frank H. Vizetelly at CBS and Dr. James F. Bender at NBC settled on "General American," as Midland was then called, as the best dialect for announcers to use, and the precedent they set in the

thirties has been followed ever since. The British Broadcasting Corporation started with announcers who spoke Received Standard, or Oxford (sometimes called haw-haw) British; but this also brought complaints from listeners, mainly in Northern England, Ireland, and Scotland. Announcers were soon required to modify their diction. The most popular BBC performers now speak a form of *Mediaese* that is only slightly different from the American form. The language of the BBC performers in the show on the Kennedy assassination done by the cast of "That Was the Week That Was" (re-telecast in America) struck most listeners here as unremarkable and certainly inoffensive.

What has happened is that performers in the public media on both sides of the ocean have arrived at a common synthetic dialect that is acceptable to the international audience without having any appreciable effect on the daily speech habits of the members of that audience. Dialect researchers have, in fact, found that urbanization and commercialization have had a greater effect on eradicating dialect boundaries, and that these affect vocabulary more than pronunciation—which has always actually varied more than vocabulary and grammar, from dialect to dialect.

The media dialect has perhaps come to be regarded as a medium for speakers who are themselves media for someone else's ideas—the dramatist's, the newswriter's, the sponsor's—and it may be for this reason that politicians instinctively shun it. Mastery of it may, in fact, work against a politician, even in a national election, particularly when it is combined, as in the case of Richard M. Nixon, with a general smoothness of style. John F. Kennedy spoke raw Bostonese in the TV debates with Nixon, but surveys showed that the general audience thought he sounded "more sincere."

Of the candidates in our most recent election, then-Senator Goldwater and Vice President Humphrey spoke Midland American, the nearest natural relative of *Mediaese*. But their use of the first-person nominative pronoun in compound objects is not the only way in which they deviated from the polished norm. They both also lacked the rounder vowels, and, in impromptu remarks, the smooth syntax that is characteristic of Teleprompter *Mediaese*. Perhaps both may thank such imperfections for keeping their sincerity intact.

THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF TELEVISION ARTS AND SCIENCES

A NON-PROFIT ASSOCIATION DEDICATED TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF TELEVISION

SAFETY IN NUMBERS

Sailing too near the wind is adventurous navigation, but discovery and pride in performance are worth every peril. In his article examining the various media of public communication, JOHN F. DILLE, JR. recognizes the need for more daring on the part of broadcasters. Only by bold and voluntary participation in the exchange of controversial ideas and opinions can station management contribute to the intellectual strength of American democracy. Dille urges program planners to relinquish the safety of status-quo thinking and explore uncharted areas of public service.

SYLVIA Moss suggests another kind of daring: the courage to scrutinize our social conventions and commonly-held norms of conduct. In contemporary television comedy she discerns the clash between Ingroup and Outgroup, between "the normal" and "the different." The result can be satire that reveals ourselves to ourselves depending upon the degree of psychological safety the viewer is willing to risk.

DEMOCRACY AND MEDIA INTERACTION

JOHN F. DILLE, JR.

We have heard persuasive arguments that newspapers, having become either fat and complacent in secondary and smaller markets, or beset by cost problems in metropolitan markets, are clearly on the decline and the way out. And there are persuasive arguments that broadcasting has all of the future of mass media in its palms. Neither of these conclusions is necessarily true. Is it not possible that both will continue to be significant elements, that they will complement and catalyze each other, and that both will prosper through better service to the American people? And cannot each of these basic media, if willing and perceptive, exert an influence on its own future?

Newspapers may face a somewhat less exciting prospect because their fight is to hold their position and at the same time inch forward through better performance. The more exciting prospect is for

JOHN F. DILLE, JR. is President of the *Communicana Group*, which operates several Indiana television and radio stations and two daily newspapers. Mr. Dille, who holds a master's degree in communications from the University of Chicago, is the past Chairman of the ABC-TV Affiliates' Board of Governors. He is active in the NAB, serving as Vice-Chairman of the Television Board of Directors and Chairman of the NAB's Editorializing Committee.

broadcasting, which is *potentially* on the threshold of a role so dynamic its magnitude is hard to assess. But I say potentially. Broadcasting can realize this role only by casting off some of its shackles and inhibitions. Some of these are imposed by self-aggrandizing ownerships or management, some by failure of broadcasters to stand up to the regulators, and some by inertia.

To overcome this inertia let us draw some helpful ideas and interpretations from history. Radio's genesis came about before many of us were born, and in the youth of the rest of us. Television was born only yesterday it seems, and now it has two children of questionable birth—CATV and its stepbrother, pay-TV. The genesis of newspapers, on the other hand, lies far back in our yesteryears. Newspapers by long tradition have a tremendous advantage in being unfettered by regulation. But newspapers maintain this advantage through the special character of their genesis—which led to the protection they enjoy under the First Amendment.

The early newspapers were simple slivers of today's fat editions; they were literally nothing more than a sheet of paper designed to carry a man's ideas beyond the range of his voice. *Ideas—arguments—information!* If another man thought, "Why, that stupid oaf—he doesn't know what he's talking about!" *he* could put out his own sheet of paper. The great early dialogues of the American democratic society were first expressed by word of mouth—on the street corners, in the homes, the taverns and the village assemblies. But these ideas soon were extended throughout other areas of the colonies and young nation by the only method then available—print.

In time the costs of distributing these ideas in print outran the ability of the people to pay for them at the copy price. Cost pressures were such that advertising ultimately became the means of support. But advertising was simply dropped in—incidentally, somewhere in the paper where it would not interfere with the ideas or information being conveyed. So there was no basic change in character.

By the time radio came along, the initial springboard for appeal to the public had to be different. Radio had to utilize the greatest advantage of its unique medium, and the emphasis had to be on song and story. Argumentative ideas were ancillary.

Out of these differences in genesis have been perpetuated characteristics which broadcasters ought to re-examine today. In the case of the newspaper, the creative spark was struck by a man—or men—

who cared basically about only one thing: the persuasion of others to a point of view. Sometimes he was a deeply reflective individual, sometimes a patriotic but wild-eyed rebel, sometimes a poetic philosopher, sometimes even an anarchist—but always he was a catalyst in the thinking processes of the audience he reached. In a sense, that spiritual core and dedication continues to exist in the newspaper structure of today. Yes, I know, today's editor (to whom the charge and chalice has been handed down over the generations) has been called more cynical, less of a crusader, less pure. Yet though it is sometimes latent and not immediately discernible, in many editors the same dedicated spirit is still very much alive.

Compare the management and the departmental structure of newspapers and broadcasting operations. On any daily newspaper of reasonable size or consequence, there sits in the top council an editor or managing editor who is completely independent of, unrelated to, and usually quite disinterested in the revenue-producing elements of the business. And for the most part he is dedicated to staying away from revenue problems. It is a point of pride almost to the extent of zealotry. This man's responsibility and mission is solely and totally dedicated to the quality and quantity of *non-advertising* material to be presented to the readers in each day's edition.

I am aware that there are broadcasting operations which can justifiably claim some parallel to this activity in their own organizations. But in the broad terms of broadcasting across this land, can we say that this is typically true? It seems to me that there must be in top broadcasting management an executive responsible for what might be called "non-revenue-oriented thinking." This is too much a part-time job in too much of broadcasting. And all too often it doesn't really come from the heart or out of the pride of creation which many newspapermen *do* have—but rather from a minimal defensive effort against potential FCC criticism.

It should not be thought lofty, or beyond the ken of broadcasting, to think in terms of the ongoing dialogue which is necessary to the functioning of the free American society. The framers of the First Amendment had in mind debate, a great continuing debate, with the people hearing all sides and getting all the facts. This aspiration can be reduced to working broadcasting terms, for in terms of persuasive power no other media can match broadcasting. The *willingness* to do so with pride in performance is the only effective means to shake off the regulatory shackles and stop further government encroachment. The result of refusal to accept this responsibility is

regulation and guidelines prepared by persons not basically as knowledgeable about broadcasting as broadcasters themselves are, or ought to be.

Let me now try to come to grips with a more tangible approach to performance—the kind of performance which would be called in newspaper terms "editorial content." I am pleading to broaden the understanding of editorial content beyond simply expression of opinion. Of course it can be related to public service programming, but I'd prefer a more exciting label because this is an area of adventurous prospects in programming. Perhaps it might be called "action and adventure" programming because it should produce *action* in the community and because it is certainly an *adventure* for the general manager.

Suppose, for example, that broadcasters programmed a critical discussion of the textbooks being used in the public schools, debating whether the books used are up-to-date, whether they meet requirements for today's pre-college training entrance, or whether they reflect any philosophical overtones alien to our nation's best interests. Or imagine a TV or radio campaign to persuade high school youth that scholarship should be honored to the same degree as athletic prowess. Perhaps the magazine racks in drug stores, cigar stores and other outlets for periodicals are displaying salacious material; perhaps a particular area has an appalling rate of teenage automobile accidents. All of these suggestions could well provide the source of "action and adventure" in public service programming.

And we shouldn't exclude the liveliest subject of them all—politics. Now is the time for all of us in the broadcasting profession to start planning and preparing. Depending on our specific areas, it is at least a year to local elections, two years to congressional, and four years to the next general election. We have a priceless advantage over newspapers in public acceptance. Any newspaper is almost sure to be already labeled as partisan by its readers; many people have preconceived judgments as to its opinions. But broadcasters start fresh and their believability quotient is impressively high. It will stay high in direct proportion to the sense of responsibility and fair play we exhibit in our content supervision.

I am not unaware of the limitations in producing such "action and adventure" public service programming, especially in secondary and smaller markets. But it can be done. Admittedly there are problems of allocating the time, implementing the staff, and finding the money to do a good job. But within our individual means, and even

stretching those means, broadcasters simply must move forward. It is imperative that stations, particularly those whose profit margin makes it easier, plow back some revenues into their own future health. Many of the newspapers which survived the competitive attrition in their ranks in the last quarter of a century did so because they performed this mission better than the ones that fell by the wayside.

Actually, in broadcasting activities today, there is nothing reprehensible about monitoring newspapers for good ideas. Broadcasters should be able to sense it when a newspaper gets a good subject going in its news columns, its feature articles or its editorials. Frequently we can work with the same or a similar topic and explore different facets of it—or even develop material in opposition to the newspaper's subject matter. This, of course, may involve editorializing and controversy. If it does, so much the better. And I don't think a staff the size of a newspaper's is necessary to do it. By judicious selection of the material to be treated, a great deal can be handled internally. Further, we can find authoritative and helpful individuals or organizations to lend a hand in preparing and/or delivering the material. The obvious caveat is that we must have faith in their judgment, and back it with our own. I believe it likely that new sources of help will develop, whether from existing organizations, new ones, or perhaps from our own cooperative efforts.

It is my strong conviction that newspapers and broadcasting can complement and stimulate each other—and that both can prosper in the doing. Nothing is more provoking than a good argument between two convinced and well-informed antagonists. The sequence of action-reaction is likely to produce a much more effective and audience-commanding product than a single action alone. I am sure, too, that this builds *new* audiences for both media.

Of course, actions such as this would expose broadcasters to the possibility of complaints, and would bring into play that cryptic FCC policy known as the Fairness Doctrine. But it's time we stopped worrying about complaints if we believe our actions are just. If in the development of such "action and adventure" programming we get into editorializing or controversy and come face to face with the Fairness Doctrine, so much the better. Perhaps this exposure of the weaknesses of the Fairness Doctrine will result in its revision or abolition. For example, in my thinking about newspaper-broadcasting interaction, at least one section of the Commission's specifically expressed position simply does not make

sense. In the *Fairness Doctrine Primer,* this statement appears:

> It is the Commission's view that the requirement of fairness, as set forth in the editorializing report, applies to a broadcasting licensee irrespective of the position which may be taken by other media on the issue involved; and the licensee's own performance in this respect, in and of itself, must demonstrate compliance with the Fairness Doctrine.

This, to me, is a hamstringing view for the Commission to take. It seems to me implicit, and in some instances explicit, in FCC philosophy that all Americans—or as many as possible—be exposed to differing opinions on controversial subjects, and that opposing expressions be made available in approximately equal quantity. In the long run, it simply does not make sense to isolate and measure the performance of broadcast licensees without regard to the activities of all other media.

At one NAB meeting I had an exchange with the Commission during which I posed a hypothetical problem dealing with a newspaper in a given market which takes a position on a controversial subject. Station A then takes an opposing position. And station B takes a stand on the same subject opposite Station A and therefore compatible with the newspaper. A knowledgeable spokesman for a group in the community, having read the Fairness Doctrine, approaches Station A for equal opportunity. Station A denies the request on the grounds that adequate service has been given the community on the first point of view. The reasoning, of course, is that the community has already heard the first point of view expounded twice, and that to grant further time on Station A would make for three expressions of the position originally advanced by the newspaper and only one for the opposing position taken by Station A. Now, naturally, I realize that under Fairness Doctrine ideals both Stations A and B would express divergent points of view, but such a situation still gives a very strong balance of power to the newspaper.

Several Commissioners expressed sympathy with confused broadcasters in their responses, but sympathy doesn't necessarily equate with what I think is right. Commission consensus was that hypothesis is indeed difficult to deal with and that a specific case would be needed—but I don't know how gutsy someone is going to have to be to get the definitive answer. Commissioner Lee did say that in such a case he probably would give consideration to the fact of exposure in other media. But that isn't the way the *Fairness Doctrine Primer* reads.

It is my feeling that broadcasters should be permitted to act according to their own discretion in terms of fairness despite the language in the paragraph cited above. Indeed the Commission itself, in other passages, practically encourages this. I quote again from the *Fairness Doctrine Primer*:

> In passing on any complaint in this area, the Commission's role is not to substitute its judgment for that of the licensee as to any of the programming decisions, but rather to determine whether the licensee can be said to have acted reasonably and in good faith. There is thus room for considerably more discretion on the part of the licensee under the Fairness Doctrine than under the "equal opportunities" requirement.

If there is confusion, I say it should be straightened out—by broadcasters. The Commission is too overwhelmed already with problems of various kinds, and besides broadcasters are better equipped to find solutions in this area. Broadcasters must pledge themselves to form their own value judgments on what is "fair"—and not depend on governmental interpretation.

Newspapers and broadcasting are not natural enemies but natural, though competitive, friends. Both can project the free interchange of ideas, information and opinion that is the cornerstone on which our free society rests. Both can serve the public interest. But one is free, the other still fettered.

THE NEW COMEDY

SYLVIA MOSS

In this season's crop of network comedies, a distinct new variety has arisen which, it appears to me, deserves the more specific label of the Comedy of Ingroup-Outgroup. The sudden emergence of this genre cannot be ignored, since it presents a challenge to the more traditional situation comedies and since success in one formula usually begets more of the same pattern.

At present there are six network comedies which, although there are subdivisions within the category, all obey the Ingroup-Outgroup rules. These programs are *Bewitched, The Munsters, The Addams Family, My Living Doll, The Beverly Hillbillies* and *My Favorite Martian.* Each of these programs depends for comedy on the clash

A graduate of the University of Toronto, SYLVIA MOSS served for three years with the Canadian office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. In 1962–63, Miss Moss was a Program Organizer in the Department of School Broadcasts and Youth Programming of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. She is presently a Graduate Assistant in the Television-Radio Department of Syracuse University.

of social conventions. Each represents norms, values, customs, or conduct that are unacceptable or unintelligible to modern North American society. In each of them there is a collision of absolutes: into our "normal world" is introduced a person or group operating on a totally different rationale. This small, alien culture is "Ingroup"; for them, modern society is "Outgroup." The intrusive interaction of the two generates comedy.

On one level, the collision is like that of the man who walks into a plate-glass window, and the comic spring is from the same source. The man does not know the plate-glass window is there; but we, the viewers, do. We want to see his confident approach, his fall, his puzzlement, his recognition of what has happened, and his realization of lost dignity. We know the story, but we want to see it again. In such a comic situation both Ingroup and Outgroup are bounced off the invisible barrier that stands between them. By parody or satire the collision can result in sparks which illuminate our own society.

One of the rules of the Comedy of Ingroup-Outgroup is that each side must rigidly adhere to its own code. As long as the differences remain obvious, the loyalties absolute and the sincerity of belief genuine, the comedy is sustained. If the codes change, we feel cheated. We do not wish to see Jethro Clampett turn into a literate society boy. If his attitude alters toward his own culture, so does ours, and we are no longer amused. Rhoda the Robot is being steadily programmed to meet human situations on a human level, but if she were to ultimately *become* a human being, she would destroy not only her world but ours as well. The devisive factors must always remain clearly defined. Ingroup and Outgroup may react to one another, but they must never influence one another. In *The Munsters* the one constant character who can never be funny is the niece, Marylin, who is at home in both the In and Out worlds, and consequently is never in conflict with either.

In these six programs there is representation from the social unit of the family (as in *The Munsters, The Addams Family,* and *The Beverly Hillbillies*); and the individual, as in *My Favorite Martian, Bewitched,* and *My Living Doll.* The first major exposition of the clash of Ingroup and Outgroup cultures occurred in *Beverly Hillbillies* (family), followed the next season by *My Favorite Martian* (individual). From these two highly successful pioneers have sprung this season, more or less fully armed, the other four.

Why suddenly from two Ingroup-Outgroup comedies do we

now have six? What is the appeal of this kind of comedy that makes it so successful? The one constant we would expect to find is audience identification. Yet it isn't there. If viewers have an emotional reaction it is one of superiority. We watch the zany situations arise, but if we identify at all it is with the accepted norms of our own society. We don't feel sympathy when Ingroup is crushed or bruised by our world, as we might when an idiot like Gomer Pyle gets into trouble with his Sergeant. There is no attempt to pit little man against big machine, or small culture against Giant Culture. If anything, Ingroup frequently defeats Outgroup. Ingroup people can cope with themselves *and* the challenges, however incomprehensible, of external culture. As viewers we can afford to feel secure—and superior—because all this is happening in a world which could never be real. And, besides, it is not *we* who are threatened. As long as Ingroup does not affect Outgroup, comedy remains dominant. But if the basis for relationship changes, one or the other becomes a source of potential aggression—and the ready smile hardens into a bared fang of defense.

Again, the situations that arise from the clash of cultures twist our perspective by defiance of known laws. In one of the Marx Brothers films, Harpo, with a knife in his back, is pressed against a hotel corridor wall by his two brothers as footsteps are heard approaching. All *three* heads turn in silent admiration as a beautiful blonde walks by. And here we have part of the reason for success. We see a normal reaction (one good for a mild and conventional laugh, anyway) in an abnormal situation. A dead man is reacting as if he were alive. The shock of the unexpected within the framework of a recognized comedy setting creates laughter—secure laughter. Presumably this incident couldn't be comic in a morgue, and without the presence of the Marx Brothers. But we *know* it is the Marx Brothers, and we aren't afraid of the defiance of a natural law. We can afford to laugh. Since we do not adjust ourselves to the Ingroup perspective, we are prepared for confrontations with the unexpected. We bring our own expectations and values to the situation, but we bring also the comforting knowledge that we are watching unreality.

It is interesting to note here that in an age which covets the moon, there is a plethora of science fiction melodrama but little science fiction comedy. Until recently we have responded seriously to literary excursions into outer space. We continue to venerate and perpetuate at an adult level the fantasies of Jules Verne. Now

at last we are producing two programs that laugh at advanced technology, space research, and outer worlds. Perhaps this is the only way we can cope with the uncertainties, even terrors, of these subjects. We have control of these worlds. Our laughter is not harshly touched by reality. Robots and Martians move in a world we know, which we can regulate. There is a clash of mores but not a clash of power. It is we, not they, who have absolute authority.

Fear seems common to these six programs. Theoretically, we are supposed to be afraid of automatons, creatures from outer space, witches, monsters and madmen; and we are even apprehensive of healthy, happy, uninhibited rustics. They rock our boat. But put them in a controllable enclosed area and we find them laughable. Let them remain in fantasy; but don't let them or the implications of their possible existence impinge on our reality. May all automatons remain subject to man, all Martians be affable uncles, all witches be beautiful and their kin be lovable, and all country cousins be socially acceptable buffoons! This makes it easier for us to cope with them.

Three of the new shows are in the mock-horror tradition: *Bewitched, The Munsters* and *The Addams Family*. In films, highly antisocial fear-provoking acts have been carried into the realm of comedy with great success: Chaplin with his amiable murderer, M. Verdoux; Hitchcock with his television spoofing and films such as *The Trouble With Harry*. But perhaps the first full exploitation of mock-horror films came from Hammer Studios, where a modest gold-mine was discovered by turning werewolves, vampires, ghouls, and mad scientists into funny-guys. For refinement of horror we turn to human drama. If we want our spine chilled, we go to an Ingmar Bergman film; if we want our digestion restored, we can have a good laugh watching Vincent Price or Boris Karloff. Television adopted some of this comic technique into its new programs, proving that even monsters are just folks.

The Ingroup-Outgroup genre, at its best, could be trenchant satire. But it looks as though we don't want to have our own world illuminated. We just want to have a good, safe chuckle.

TV AND EDUCATION

While harried TV entrepreneurs dodge volleys from all quarters, and while intellectuals speculate upon the medium's dire effects upon our civilization, a quiet change of attitude in television criticism has been evolving. Such change is being generated not in the rarefied debates over the social and cultural consequences of the mass media, but in the atmosphere of the future—those classrooms of America wherein teachers have decided that the educational process cannot be separated from the extra-classroom experience of the youth of this nation. For better or worse, commercial television is a major aspect of that experience.

In Cleveland, Ohio, in November of last year, an attempt was made to weld the experiences derived from formal education and informal exposure to television into a meaningful whole. There, at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, the Committee on Commercial Broadcasting combined interests with the Television Information Office to conduct a Television Festival. The project included three phases: the showing of award-winning commercial programs of value to the classroom teacher; a general session open to all NCTE members devoted to discussion of ways and means by which teachers might use television-as-it-exists to point the way toward what it might become; and, following the general session, a panel discussion among professional TV critics and educators who voiced hopes and possibilities regarding TV's role within the educational process.

Some of the proceedings of the latter phases deserve reporting in this journal, for, in the words of NCTE Committee Chairman Patrick Hazard (who generously assisted in the preparation of the material printed below), "understanding is what we were after, and some of what we thought and said may interest the professionals who give the medium its meaning."

Inquiry at the general meeting was led by three men whose commitment to the potential educational force of commercial television is well known. Albert R. Hibbs reviewed some of the challenges of TV science education for young people; Ned Hoopes considered various positive values which the secondary-school English teacher may find in a number of current programs; and Richard Siemanowski offered suggestions as to how teachers and local stations might collaborate in the encouragement of future TV writers. Abridgments of their remarks follow.

ALBERT HIBBS is senior staff scientist at the California Institute of Technology Jet Propulsion Laboratory and chief of the Arms Control Study Group. A leading scientist who has been working on the national space effort, he is the host of *Exploring*, NBC-TV's educational program for children. Dr. Hibbs has completed a television series, *Science in the News*, and has appeared in many other TV productions. He received his Ph.D. in physics at California Institute of Technology.

NED HOOPES received his Ph.D. from Northwestern University and has taught at his alma mater, at Hofstra University, and in the Harvard and Yale summer programs. He is currently on the faculty of Hunter College High School and Hunter College. Former moderator of *The Reading Room*, a children's program, Mr. Hoopes was featured on *CBS Reports*' "The Influential American" and served as guest editor for a recent Book Week issue of *Scholastic Teacher*. His completed anthology, *Search for Perspective*, is scheduled for publication by Holt, Rinehart in March.

Executive Producer in the Public Affairs Department of CBS News, RICHARD SIEMANOWSKI holds an M.A. degree from the University of Chicago. Before entering television, he worked in the newspaper field as a police reporter, drama and film critic, and assistant editor. Mr. Siemanowski has produced such prominent television series as *Chronicle*, *Portrait*, and *Lamp unto My Feet*. His single productions include *The Presidency: A Splendid Misery*, *Americans: A Portrait in Verses*, and the award-winning *The Hidden Revolution*.

"EXPLORING" THE CHILD'S WORLD

ALBERT R. HIBBS

Some years ago I was under the misapprehension that the best service a scientist could perform in working with educators was to instruct the classroom teacher in the field of science. This, which might be called a primitive approach, was based on the notion that the typical information about science as given to elementary students was full of mistakes and misunderstandings which, in the interests of both science and education, ought to be corrected.

I experienced no difficulty in gaining acceptance of this primitive approach. The teachers to whom I lectured were quite eager to learn, and even took notes. The approach came to grief, however, because of two different obstacles—the nature of teachers and the reality of children.

These obstacles first arose during a discussion period following a lecture I had given at a teacher's institute. One teacher reported that a student of hers had asked where the moon came from, and she found herself unable to answer properly. She asked me to provide her with the right answer, which she could pass along to her third grade pupil. On the surface it was an easy question, and I responded promptly, saying, "Nobody knows how the moon was initially formed." But even as I said the words, I realized the inadequacy of this answer. If I wished to be a purist, I would have to give the same answer to the majority of all scientific questions because very few scientific phenomena in the universe are understood with absolute certainty.

As a result of this interchange, I began further speculation; and it soon became clear to me that the most important scientific lesson which an elementary grade student can learn is the scientific method itself, an organized method for learning about the world. Certainly this is far and away more important than the learning of scientific facts.

Instead of cataloguing the current theories of planetary origin, surely it is better to work out with the student some means whereby he himself can evolve a sensible answer to that question—sensible, that is, on his own level, regardless of whether or not that answer coincided with currently-acceptable scientific theories.

This, it seems to me, is vital. In applying the scientific method in this manner to answer unanswerable questions in grade school, it is important to set aside any concern for obtaining so-called right answers. The quality of an answer must instead be judged on the basis of the technique used to obtain it. Has the student used whatever observational data is available to him? Has he made use of available reference material to the utmost that he is able? Has he applied a systematic thought process—probably including some mathematics—consistent with his own level of mental discipline? If the answer to each of these questions is yes, then the student's conclusion about the lunar origin should be accepted.

Of course, this is an approach to the problems of *scientific* education in the elementary grades—a rather specialized problem in the field of education. This approach is less applicable in the teaching of the more traditional subjects, such as mathematics, reading, and writing. In these fields, it is reasonable to demand that the elementary student learn to produce the right answer. But there are other fields of learning where the question is not so clear-cut, such as problems of political science—not just geography, but also the nature of various societies in the world; and history—not just names and dates, but the interpretation of human events which helps us to better understand our own world. Is it reasonable to demand "right answers" to questions which will come up in these fields? Are right answers even available to the teacher? Here again, perhaps a technique of thought, a technique of investigation is more important than any particular set of authorized right answers.

Such ideas as these have been the basis of my work in one of the most exciting new fields of education—television. I have had an opportunity to appear on a number of educational television programs, some dealing with purely scientific matters, and some deal-

ing with a broader range of subjects. The series which I have found most challenging is the one I am working with currently, as host of *Exploring*. This is a program aimed at an elementary school level, and intended to cover a broad spectrum of subject matter—literature, music and dancing, mathematics, science, history and social studies.

When I say "covering" all of these areas, I use the wrong word. It would be better to say "touching upon" all of these areas. For how much can be done in one hour at noontime on Saturday?

The restrictions placed upon such a television show are numerous, as are the possibilities. The primary restriction is the length of time available. One hour each week is certainly too limited a time to carry out any sort of an in-depth educational project. Second is the need for meeting a wide span of ages and background in the audience. We cannot approach a single class in a single school district, but must instead think about all the children from the ages of six to twelve in the U.S. Third is the question of scheduling. Not all school districts in the country include the same material at the same time, even at a single grade level. We will be describing Renaissance Italy one week and the history of the American Indian a different week, and if these two subjects should correspond to classroom activities in any particular school for those particular weeks, that must be accepted simply as a happy accident. (Unless, of course, this correspondence is arranged by the teacher on the basis of information in our Teacher's Guide.)

As well as these special restrictions, we have the ordinary restrictions of the television medium—the comparative remoteness between ourselves and our audience, the inability to get any feedback from this audience which would allow us to judge how well we are doing, and the numerous special requirements of stages, cameras, lights, and other production elements.

But, in contrast, we have special advantages. We have a week to prepare a one-hour presentation. Although we miss the classroom contacts, we avoid classroom problems. And then, of course, we are not charged with the specific responsibility of teaching special subjects, but can instead devote ourselves to the interesting, the unusual, the humorous, the fascinating aspects of human learning. In short, we can capitalize on the entertainment possibilities of the educational process, and indeed these possibilities are great. On the one hand, we have no opportunity to teach in the sense of a classroom teacher, so there is no point in our trying. On the

other hand, we have every opportunity to leap from peak to peak across the broad range of interest of our audience, stopping at each location just long enough to appreciate the excitement of the view.

When we visit new worlds of learning, we need explore them only enough to uncover the fascinating, and to learn a little about the dimensions of what is known and unknown. And, in fact, this is our intent: to stimulate the already powerful curiosity of children, to raise more questions than we answer but raise also a determination to find the answer, and perhaps to give a few hints as to where that answer might be hiding.

So far we feel that this experiment in educational television has been generally successful. We feel we have accomplished our principal objective of stimulating the curiosity and interest of our young audience. We have attempted a follow-up on this with the distribution of Teacher's Guides, containing a summary of background material associated with each show, and listing appropriate reference material. The demand for these Guides, which are published every three weeks, has exceeded a quarter of a million copies. And, of course, the more we work, the more we learn, discovering new techniques and new approaches for achieving our objectives.

One limitation which we always face, and which we will probably never overcome completely, is the lack of direct audience response. To some extent, this is compensated by the many letters we receive from teachers, students and parents. They tell us what they like and, in some cases, what they don't like. It is extremely important to us to have the opinions of educators as to ways to improve the program. This type of audience response is the most valuable. Of course, we have our own ideas for improvements and will carry out as many as we can. But the suggestions of those who daily face the classroom firing line are invaluable. We can never have too many.

THE STUDENTS ARE WATCHING

NED HOOPES

Since an English teacher is already considered by some to be a jack-of-all-trades, I would like to suggest that he has one increasingly important and demanding task, and that is to make use in the classroom of all the time his students spend in front of their television sets. We have all heard a variety of more or less conventional responses to such a challenge. "I haven't time to watch TV myself," says one teacher, "let alone be aware of all the programs students are watching." "How can I deal with television," says another, "when I can hardly spare time from an overcrowded curriculum now?" These are anticipated responses and, of course, they do reflect some genuine disadvantages in making greater use of the medium.

Yet I would argue that the medium can be put to work by the English teacher in many ways. It can, in the words of Marya Mannes, project students "into a world of action, distance, and difference." If teachers do not allow it merely to distract students, it can be employed in motivating them to respond with greater interest and deeper insights into the already existing curriculum. The central fact of teaching in our time is that teachers simply cannot ignore what students are watching, nor can they abdicate the responsibility to encourage young people to examine critically what they see.

No task of this magnitude, however, can be executed easily. Students cannot be made more discriminating viewers, or gain a better understanding of English, as a result of sporadic, superficial television assignments. Such a vision requires a concentrated, three-point plan of attack. First, the student must be provided ample opportunity to apply what he has seen on television to what is covered in the classroom. He must be led to analyze how television defines, illustrates, and sometimes exposes and interprets major aspects of our contemporary culture. Second, the teacher must examine in greater detail the content and form of television presentations, and be prepared to point out the relationships between television and literature. Finally, the teacher is obliged to become more aware of the circumstances and influences under which television in America operates, and transmit this knowledge and understanding to the students.

Television can, and does, at times deal concretely and lucidly with real problems and conflicts in our society. When it does, these problems are presented with dramatic and immediate impact. Often it even presents effective social criticism. Far too often, unfortunately, TV perpetuates negative aspects of our culture and encourages a kind of conformity that teachers may find reprehensible. TV tends to present standardized and false images of American language, values, attitudes, and preferences when it should be grappling with real issues and controversial problems. Broadcasters are so acutely receptive to the pulse of public opinion that they try to satisfy the demands of the populace more often than they try to appeal to thoughtful individuals. So we have a perpetuation of superficialities. Despite this trend, the teacher must be realistic—he must begin where the students *are*. He must begin by discussing the programs they actually watch, and often he will find this a rewarding teaching experience.

Television can, for instance, offer excellent re-enforcement of literature. By the same token, the analysis of literature can provide an excellent way to evaluate good and bad television. When a dramatic program echoes a universal theme of great literature, the teacher can help students to see such a relationship and appreciate both more. Sometimes the abstract ideas of a literary work can be seen more concretely in a highly compressed dramatic program simply because the producer has done for the audience what we expect students to do for themselves as they read.

No teacher can expect students to express ideas effectively in

discussion or on paper if they don't have any ideas. But they do have ideas about TV programs. Members of one of my own English classes, for instance, pointed out that "The Hero of the People" on *The Defenders* dealt with the same theme as Synge's *Playboy of the Western World,* which they had read and were discussing in class. Some students were having trouble understanding the motivation of Christopher Mahon in the play, but after they began to discuss the motivation of Harry Oberman in the *Defenders* episode, they were able to approach the play with greater insights.

The protagonist in this program stumbles upon a dead man in a car, removes the murder weapon and leaves his lunch box instead, hoping to be arrested. His lawyer, Preston, tries to get him to admit his innocence, but because the murdered man had peddled dope to children Harry becomes a hero. He refuses to give up this new position. Finally he is declared not guilty and the people reject him. A similar situation was presented in Synge's work, where Chris Mahon proudly announces to a group of strangers in a new town that he has killed his father. They admire his courage and consider him a hero. Then when his father suddenly appears, Chris knocks him down, thereby turning the admiration of the people to hostility. By comparing the plot, motivation, character and the theme of these plays, students derived the generalization that each man possessed a common need to be somebody. They also decided that good art deals with universal themes regardless of the time of its composition.

A *Ben Casey* episode provided another example of how TV viewing can make literature of the past seem more current. In a discussion of Hawthorne's "The Birthmark," one girl declared that the story was dated because plastic surgery has eliminated such problems, and she cited her own plastic surgery experience. Another student used a different episode of *Ben Casey* as evidence for refutation. It concerned a woman who, because of a congenital disease, was afflicted with an ugly facial scar which even Ben Casey could not remove. The doctor tries to convince her that she can live happily despite her handicap. Most of the other students had watched the show, so it was possible to compare two treatments of a similar theme. Students, in fact, decided that because Ben Casey was superficial in his solving of a serious problem the program was less satisfying than Hawthorne's treatment. These examples may indicate clearly that, because of their elementary, direct and

concise nature, TV dramas can actually help some students develop skill in analysis of literature.

These are not isolated instances of the usefulness of television in the English classroom. Through lively discussion of TV programs, other important critical insights can be brought forth. A group of my students discussing a recent Hitchcock program concluded that the central character's deadly plan for revenge was inconsistent with his previous behavior and personality. They pointed out that the program depended on superficial characterization and too-obvious coincidences. Still another group compared the characterizations of such TV heroes as Dr. Kildare, Ben Casey and Perry Mason with figures like Neil Brock and the Prestons—and concluded that, because the latter do not always accomplish what they set out to do, they are more true-to-life than the characters who find easy solutions to complex human problems.

Student examination of situation comedies also produces interesting and valuable new insights. A class analysis of *The Danny Thomas Show, Ensign O'Toole* and *The Beverly Hillbillies* led to new discoveries about the nature of comedy. One group recognized that such shows depend upon stock characters and situations in different settings, and suggested that audiences are supposed to laugh because they feel superior to the characters, are detached from their embarrassment, and are surprised by the unexpected. From these programs the students moved to an analysis of such programs as *The Entertainers* and *That Was the Week That Was,* whereof they observed that laughter may be produced by language as well as by action and situation. As a result of this concentrated analysis, some grew to a greater understanding of distinctions among comic forms.

Finally, television's news specials, documentaries and other public affairs programs can present, with power and dramatic effectiveness, the immediate impact of great historical events, current news stories, and major social and political structures and situations. Lucid and informative programs such as the coverage devoted to President Kennedy's assassination, a UN decision, the launching of a space ship, an analysis of a Russian leader's motivations, political conventions, a report on Cuba or Chinese communism—all can convey more than any written account. These provide stimulating material for discussion and composition assignments. They demonstrate, along with various fictional programs, TV's unique power—

a power which led Martin Mayer to describe the medium as "the most important of known audio-visual aids."

These existing works are infinite in their variety, their level of quality and their impact upon young viewers. All we know for certain is that the children are watching, and the teachers must join them if they are to make the classroom experience more meaningful. By putting themselves into the student's TV world, America's English teachers may awaken them to the wonders that exist outside the classroom.

GRASS-ROOTS WRITERS FOR TV

RICHARD SIEMANOWSKI

The position of the writer in television today is probably comparable to that of the film writer of three decades ago, which is to say that the writer is expected to perform a service for a production unit. The situation closely parallels that of a writer working for a book publisher, as many of them do—thanks to the dubious generosity of publishers in extending credit. But the working situation is often less happy in television and films than in publishing. In books, the editor stands between a writer and his published work. And often even this is a painful separation, despite the brilliance of the editor. (Witness the wild ambivalance Thomas Wolfe showed toward Maxwell Perkins.) In television it sometimes appears that just about everybody in the Western Alliance stands between the writer and the finished product. I've attended script meetings on Madison Avenue where I suspected there might be a leak in the IRT subway.

At these moments it is imperative for the writer to keep in mind that he is working for a production unit. Hs words—as painful and as denigrating as it might seem to him—are not the finished product. Most good writers feel the finished product is far inferior. But I don't think there can be any question that great directorial skill and

talented producers have made as many good films and television programs as good writers. In a sense, then, the writer is a second-class citizen.

The seemingly endless superstructure of administration in television is characteristic of the Hollywood film industry in its heyday. Even when the film moguls were willing to pay high prices for big-name writing talent—Faulkner, Hemingway, Nathaniel West, Ben Hecht—the writers felt denied. They accepted the assignments with resignation; Hollywood was just a place to make money. You made the money so you could work on the next book. And, amazingly, some of them did work on the next book. Most didn't, but they never worried very much about what happened to the film script.

In television, the writer is a contributor. The television writer has to fight for his position. If he is a good writer, it can be achieved. All too frequently, however, he becomes a producer in order to get it done *"his way."* Robert Herridge did that. Robert Saudek did that. It is, in this business, a reasonable thing for a writer to do.

Having briefly touched upon the natural limitations of television upon the writer's ego, we can consider the problems of developing future writers. Television is rich in writing forms and is useful, good practice for the literate student. The young writer can learn much by working for television. He can also learn by watching, selectively, what television presents. Then why isn't television attracting the good young writers, as once did newspapers?

The local newspaper used to be, and still is, a natural stopping-off place for the talented writer before he got out of town. The same cannot be said of the local radio or television station. The nature of the media explains the difference. No matter how extensive the coverage of the Associated Press or the United Press International, the burden is always on the local newspaper to cover local stories. Most local television and radio stations have tried to do as much. But, given the time requirements, when one compares newspaper columns to air time the difference is significant. The number of writers CBS News requires to fulfill its function is much less, for instance, than the staff the *New York Times* finds necessary. There is no equivalent in television or radio to the great tradition of writers who have worked for newspapers. Mark Twain, Faulkner, Hemingway, Stephen Crane, Ambrose Bierce—these are significant men in our literary tradition who have worked on newspapers.

Interestingly, few outside the business have ever heard of a television news writer. Instead we hear of television news commentators,

who, for the most part, are writers. At its best, television features *performing writers.* At its worst, it features *reading radio announcers.* Somewhere in the TV news shuffle, the writer has again lost his status and identity. Perhaps in this area more than anywhere else has the writer's plight come into focus. The average TV news writer is not a reporter. He is, in many cases, a man who tears the copy off the AP or UPI or Reuter's machines, changes the tenses of verbs, sometimes adjusts his copy to coincide with the simultaneous appearance of images on previously viewed film, and is often no farther from the news than his teletype room (where he can listen to what other reporters are trying to tell him about what is happening *outside* his frequently uncomfortable office).

If television is to be a training ground for writers, then the local stations have to employ them. And the writers have to be other than experienced continuity writers. The local stations should explore the development of counterparts of *Camera Three, Look Up and Live, Lamp unto My Feet, Exploring, Eye on New York* and other programs that go beyond the customary discussion format. Expansion of program origination could, on the local level, not only involve the hiring of writers, but the employment of performing artists in many related fields. It seems to me that teachers, many of whom, I suspect, are acquainted with either the managers or the owners of stations in their communities, are in a position to do a great deal for aspiring young talent. The networks can only provide limited work for the television writer; local stations must do their share.

To do this, local news coverage should be expanded, not just to provide for the hiring of news writers, but because this is a service teachers should demand of their local television station. But the local station as a training ground for writers would serve an incidental function. The larger purpose would be to make felt, in individual communities, the concern of people of intelligence and taste and influence. The teacher cannot create writers in the classroom alone; he must seek help from local media.

The status of the writer in television is a good index of the success or failure of the attempts of men and women of good will to hold on to some fragment of this vast power that will shape the minds of generations to come. The responsibility is the teacher's as much as it is the professional broadcaster's. Broadcasting has no future without good writers—and I fear our future is in danger without good broadcasting.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Tyrone Guthrie. A NEW THEATRE. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

In his latest book, Dr. Guthrie relates his adventures in establishing the theatre in Minneapolis which is named after him. I suspect that his primary objective in so doing was to create a blueprint from which other similar adventures can gain information and inspiration.

As one of the many who regard Tyrone Guthrie as the world's greatest living stage director, I approached his book with high expectations. I must admit a certain dissatisfaction with the total impact, although in all probability he has succeeded in the objective described above.

His wicked wit is ever-present, bringing a sharp edge to his description of the running battle with the architect of the building. There is also a delightful passage in which Claudia Cassidy is impaled on Guthrie's sharp rapier. In several places the story reads like adventure fiction. But the major contribution is in the chronology of decisions that went into selecting the repertoire, finding a city willing and able to build the theatre and, of course, picking the company itself.

I would have enjoyed further details about the actual productions of the plays and wish these elements had been as completely documented as were the pre-production problems. For example, in discussing his modern-dress *Hamlet* production, the costumes are given considerable space but little is written as to how the unusual approach illuminated or obscured the play. Dr. Guthrie quotes a number of criticisms of the production and, in his review of *Hamlet,* Walter Kerr hints at some startling but not uninteresting production elements about which I would like to know more.

The book has over 180 pages, although the next-to-last chapter headed "Amenity or Necessity" does not bear directly on the main subject. It is an essay about the importance of theatre in an increasingly automated society, a fascinating subject given complete treatment, but it seems to have been written for separate publication.

A particularly wise and knowing analysis of the New York theatre today is found in the chapter titled "Give My Regards to Broadway." The problems encountered recently by the Lincoln Center Repertory Theatre are problems from which there is no escape within the metropolitan area, according to Dr. Guthrie. The perspicacity of this analysis does not carry over into the next chapter, wherein a description of the formula for box office success with which David Merrick-style producers operate is rather naively and, in fact, inaccurately set forth.

Nevertheless, despite minor failings, any book by Dr. Guthrie on the subject of theatre in America is well worth reading. There are few men of vision and dedication who can pitch in and deliver results, and Tyrone Guthrie is their leader. His adventures in Minnesota contain more than ample rewards for anyone interested in the struggles of the professional theatre.

GEORGE SCHAEFER

Compass Productions, Inc.

Robert Brustein. THE THEATRE OF REVOLT. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1964.

In his Foreword to *The Theatre of Revolt*, Robert Brustein states:

> The modern drama has hitherto been studied largely from the point of view of style—as a manifestation of Realism, Naturalism, Symbolism, Expressionism, etc. By treating modern drama as an expression of revolt, I intend to illustrate how all these "isms" merely disguise the essential unity of this movement. For a movement it is, the most important modern dramatists being bound together by common assumptions and a common point of attack.

He opposes the theatre of revolt to the theatre of communion, by which he means "the theatre of the past, dominated by Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Racine, where traditional myths were enacted before an audience of believers against the background of a shifting but still coherent universe." By theatre of revolt he means "the theatre...where myths of rebellion are enacted before a dwindling number of spectators in a flux of vacancy, bafflement, and accident."

He goes on to say:

> If the theatre of communion climaxes with a sense of spiritual disintegration, the theatre of revolt *begins* with this sense, inheriting from the western tradition a continuity of decay in an advanced stage.

To chart the countless avenues of revolt, he distinguishes three main highways into which the avenues run: messianic, social and existential. "Messianic revolt occurs when the dramatist rebels against God and tries to take his place... Social revolt occurs when the dramatist rebels against the conventions, morals and values of the social organism... Existential revolt occurs when the dramatist rebels against the conditions of his existence."

For specific study, Mr. Brustein selects eight modern playwrights—Ibsen, Strindberg, Shaw, Chekhov, Brecht, Pirandello, O'Neill, and (considered together with Artaud) Genet—and analyses the men themselves and their work "in depth," demonstrating that each can be classified as a messianic, social or existential rebel. Some fall into one category, some into two, some into all three. His demonstrations are brilliant and complicated, perhaps too complicated to be grasped completely by the layman or the casual student of the theatre since they often assume a knowledge of history, philosophy and psychology, and pre-suppose a familiarity with what seem to be obscure plays.

But if Mr. Brustein is beyond most of us in his thinking, he is at least considerate in his writing, stopping often to explain, repeat, summarize and in other ways help the more plodding reader catch up. The most interesting aspect of the studies is their cumulative lucidity. They are not eight separate essays but constitute a whole and, furthermore, must be read in sequence. It is part of Mr. Brustein's point that he has not only arranged his playwrights chronologically in time but chronologically in thought, as well, so that his Strindberg is more easily understood than his Ibsen because it is *based* on his Ibsen; with Shaw and Chekhov the author's direction becomes clearer, and by the time we come to his O'Neill and his Genet, we at last begin to understand his Ibsen—and the circle is complete.

Mr. Brustein is Professor of Dramatic Literature at Columbia University and theatre critic for the *New Republic*. He is a theatre scholar, and words

have special, involved significance for him. The above indicates only superficially the many shades of meaning he gives to the word "revolt," and to him "theatre" is not simply a playhouse, an audience and a play; its definition seems to include the function of the dramatists, the engagement of the audience, and the nature of the worlds they imply and invoke. It is evident, then, that he intends his book to be comprehensive, as he says in his Foreword, "to suggest an approach to the modern drama as a whole," to do away with the "isms." It's impossible, therefore, not to wonder at his selection of these eight playwrights to the exclusion of all others (it is interesting that they represent eight different countries). In his text he makes references to others, but only as they bear on the writer under discussion. Mr. Brustein anticipates the question by bringing it up himself: "I was determined not to include any playwright who would not be read 50 years hence."

This, of course, cannot be challenged until the year 2015, but his statement "...my selection was guided partly by principle, partly by prejudice..." can and should be considered now. Sean O'Casey has always struck him as "an extremely over-rated writer...a lot of ideological bloat and embarrassing bombast." Giraudoux and Anouilh are "gifted stylists with shallow points of view and fragile sensibilities...Thornton Wilder, Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams all have enthusiastic partisans: I am not among them." Nevertheless, all these writers and many others *have* made recognized contributions and *are* part of the modern theatre; and if Mr. Brustein is to "suggest an approach to the modern drama as whole," they cannot be so lightly dismissed. When a dramatist sets out to write a play, he carefully selects his characters, his setting, his period in time and even his season of the year so that all these elements will demonstrate conclusively the validity of his theme. It seems possible that Mr. Brustein has done the same thing, choosing to write only of dramatists whose lives and whose work will support his theory of revolt. In a dramatist this is called "selection"; in a critic and historian, as Mr. Brustein admits, it must be called prejudice. It does not ease the situation to have him admit it; it only supports the reader's suspicion that rather than replacing the "isms", he may only have created another.

But he does succeed in relating these eight men to one another, to their time in history, and to an unconscious "movement" of their own—and the fascination of *The Theatre of Revolt* lies in this startling kinship. It leaves the reader wanting more, not only of Mr. Brustein, but of other critics, other points of view.

TAD MOSEL

Arthur E. Meyerhoff. THE STRATEGY OF PERSUASION. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1964.

It was inevitable, in this age of ubiquitous communication and mass persuasion, that some qualified authority in advertising would advocate the use of advertising sales techniques in American foreign policy. And that is precisely what Arthur E. Meyerhoff, head of a Chicago advertising agency, has done in this book which carries a foreword and introduction replete with endorsement from an observer of our foreign relations, Eugene Burdick, and from Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, who have examined the dangers to this country from the right and the left.

Mr. Meyerhoff's foray, despite its provocative title, is concerned only in the last analysis with strategy in persuasion. What he has written, in essence, is a three-part study, although the book itself has no arbitrary demarcations. Primarily this is a study of foreign propaganda techniques. Secondly, it is a stern critique of the failure of our own propaganda effort, and particularly of the USIA. Finally, it proposes a program of positive action predicated, not unexpectedly, on the use of proven advertising and marketing techniques.

The analysis of the Soviet offensive presents little that is new, even if one has depended for his information on the foreign correspondents and Mr. Reston's weekly summing up in the Review of the Week section of the *New York Times*. Indeed, one of the difficulties of any topical discussion of the Soviet campaign of persuasion is that USSR foreign policy just does not stand still. Citing the peregrinations and antics of Khrushchev, for example, became an anachronism even before the book was published. At the same time, something must be said for the validity of Meyerhoff's firm conviction—shared by many—that Russia has made strides toward winning the cold war simply by employing techniques winnowed from successful campaigns of American advertising and merchandising experts. In other words, the Russians have taken over the very techniques of persuasion which America has developed so brilliantly. This is a telling point and it is well taken. On other philosophical bases, however, Meyerhoff is not so sure of his ground or of his logic. If one cannot cavil with his criticism of the failure of American propaganda, one can question the ethical considerations involved. Is it good or bad, from the standpoint of morality, that Americans are urged to be factual and truthful in our cultural exchange program? If the Russians are trained to distort truth, must we follow suit? There appears to be a confusion of ends and means here, a philosophical dilemma that has proved tenacious from Plato to contemporary social and political theorists.

Meyerhoff confronts head-on the claim that one can't sell ideas as one sells soap, and asks in effect, why not? Selling soap and other commodities through advertising skills has made the United States the most productive country in the world and given its people the highest standard of living. The professors may cast disdainful aspersions on such techniques, but have they offered anything better? Meyerhoff offers documented evidence in the book to show, and with asperity, that the USIA has not made the grade as a voice of persuasion, primarily because its personnel are totally unsophisticated in the basic techniques of mass communication and persuasion. Reading some of the examples of typical prose, offered by the author, one is moved to wonder how ordinary citizens in other countries can understand them when they are barely comprehensible even to Americans who are schooled in such academic meanderings.

The challenge of the book comes in the final chapters, where the author offers a not-so-modest proposal for improving our own strategy of persuasion. The panacea is simple. Let us put an end to time-wasting efforts which reach few and move fewer. If the Soviets can borrow a leaf from our book, why can't we, the experts, put our advertising expertese to work in order to "sell"—that is the precise word—sell democracy and freedom and other hallmarks of the American system to the uncommitted nations of the world? Since our efforts can hardly be termed an unqualified success, Mr. Meyerhoff points out, why not use the skills of advertising experts? Let us, he suggests, stop viewing propaganda as something devised by the serpent in Eden and embark on a massive program of mass persuasion designed to sell other nations on the American way of life. The program

would be structured in the pattern of successful advertising agencies and would call for expert research, expert analysis and expert promulgation of a dynamic campaign of mass communication, using all of the media which have proven so dramatically successful.

The author anticipates criticism of such a program in a spirited defense of advertising. His rebuttal of academic condescension, even from such pundits as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is spirited; and he offers a dramatic defense of the advertising man's contribution, not only to our economy, but to our society as a whole. While this defense is vulnerable, it is also pragmatically justified. Indeed, there is much to be said, in view of our problems in the area of persuasion, for the utilization of the techniques Mr. Meyerhoff suggests. His thesis would have been stronger, however, if he had suggested substance as well as technique. Advertising is, after all, a means to an end. What is more important is a clear definition of purpose and content—or sales message—worthy of our democratic tradition. The reservation one has with this provocative book is not so much in the area of method as in the area of values.

CHARLES S. STEINBERG

Columbia Broadcasting System

A. William Bluem. DOCUMENTARY IN AMERICAN TELEVISION. New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1965.

This is a book which belongs in the library of every person interested in the documentary form, in communication by television, or for that matter in the medium of television itself. It is the first book dealing with what has come to be an important program form on television, a book that is well documented, well organized, interestingly written, and that provides a tremendous amount of information concerning the use of the documentary on television.

The approach is primarily historical. Early chapters lay a foundation by tracing the development of the documentary form from the early use of "stories" told through a series of still photographs to the production of documentary films, the presentation of journalistic drama in the theatre during the 1930's, and the use of the documentary on radio in the period preceding and during the second World War.

Most of the book, of course, deals with the television documentary, especially as developed in such long-continuing series as *See It Now*, *CBS Reports*, the *NBC White Paper* series, *The Twentieth Century*, and the ABC *Close-Up!* programs, and in such important historical compilations as *Victory at Sea*. Due attention is also given to biographical documentaries, to what Dr. Bluem refers to as "notebook documentaries" of which *Chet Huntley Reporting* and *David Brinkley's Journal* are illustrative, and to documentaries produced by local stations. Throughout, emphasis is placed on analyses of techniques used and on the producers who have contributed significantly to the development of the television documentary form. The book provides a wealth of historical detail with respect both to the various series and to individual programs.

Some readers may question Dr. Bluem's approach to analysis which places television documentary efforts either in the category of "news" documen-

taries (presumably impartial and objective), or in that of "theme" documentaries, described as being more "free in their use of techniques and approaches to advance the subjective purpose" of the producer or writer. But as Dr. Bluem himself points out, it is difficult to draw a clear line between the two, and the problem becomes especially difficult when attempts are made to apply such a system of classification to an entire series of programs. Others will wish, as does this reviewer, that Dr. Bluem had devoted more space to critical assessment of those documentary techniques which have become widely used on television or with which various producers have experimented, and given still further analysis to the possible weaknesses as well as obvious values of such work.

But Dr. Bluem's primary purpose has been to describe and analyze, rather than pronounce final critical judgments. His objective—to trace the development of the documentary form on television during the past 15 years—has been achieved in admirable fashion. His book is a definite contribution to the literature of television programming.

HARRISON B. SUMMERS

Ohio State University

Theodore Peterson. MAGAZINES IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964. Second Edition.

Dean Peterson's book has assumed new importance since the death last fall of Dr. Frank Luther Mott, for many years the foremost historian of the journalism of the United States and particularly of magazines in this country. The first three volumes of Dr. Mott's *A History of American Magazines* brought him a Pulitzer prize and the fourth, a Bancroft award. At the time of his death he was at work on a fifth, and proceeding toward the last of his six-volume history. The four already published brought his researches up to 1905.

Theodore Peterson, Dean of the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Illinois, brought out the first edition of *Magazines in the Twentieth Century* in 1956, winning a Sigma Delta Chi research award with it. It was in part an attempt to provide a book which would to some extent fill the gap until Dean Mott finished his work. But Mott's labors had to cease, and fortunately Peterson has been permitted to update his study covering the period from 1900 to 1964.

Here the comparison must end, for Peterson does not approach his subject in the way Mott did; it is not an almost absolute check list on the periodicals of the period nor does it follow a chronological order in presenting its material. Peterson begins with the late 1800's, which correctly he deems the birth time of modern magazines, then moves into an examination of advertising in relation to periodicals up to the early 1960's, and then goes back and forth in time in discussing the educational, population, and other changes affecting magazines in modern times. In this manner he also tells us of magazine economics, leaders (both human and printed), types, and problems, winding up with an assessment of the 1900–1964 period to which the book is devoted in the main.

Unfortunately Peterson has sliced the useful bibliography out of his first edition, a loss since such a list is difficult to obtain. His other changes are

all for the good: many new photographs of publications and persons; up-dating of the content by taking in the story of the Crowell-Collier debacle (the killing of *Collier's, American,* and *Woman's Home Companion*), relating the internal troubles still brewing at the Curtis Publishing Company (*Saturday Evening Post, American Home, Holiday,* and the others in the Curtis family), and covering other post-1956 important events. He also has rewritten various segments to broaden or deepen them.

The author makes no predictions about the future of the magazine in this country, being mainly content to describe the industry's performance and candidly explain the strengths and weaknesses of our periodicals. His emphasis, as in the early edition, still is on the consumer publication, but there is some compensation for this in a new chapter on the minority magazines. It does much to enrich this edition and give it originality.

Magazines in the Twentieth Century is not the source book Mott was producing. Peterson has a major start on such a volume and perhaps Mott's task will some day fall to him. In the meantime, the present book is a precious guide.

ROLAND E. WOLSELEY

Syracuse University

RTNDA/Time-Life Broadcast. TELEVISION NEWSFILM STANDARDS MANUAL. New York: Time, Inc., 1964.

This book is a faithful reproduction of the exciting conferences from which it came. It is a lean book, without adornment or padding, and one which will be a valuable asset to professional and student alike.

One of the greatest strengths of the book (and the conference) is the use of the *professional* as spokesman. Creative people rise to the top in broadcasting because they *know*. A student of the media can learn more about cameras and their newsfilm capabilities by spending a few minutes with the remarks by Robin Still than by reading a dozen books on cinematography. Likewise, John Fletcher, with his clear-as-glass presentation of the pitfalls and opportunities of using sound, cuts through the academese we so often find. The book runs the gamut of newsfilm ecology unscathed, and at last provides a long-awaited set of standards of practice of the highest order. Our profession is nearing a zenith of news reporting, but it has long needed to focus itself on the myriad possibilities of the means to reach even more effective interpretations.

The Manual is arranged well. The opening philosophical statement by Bob Shafer (which appeared also in *Television Quarterly*) sets the tone. A second section, "Tools of the Trade," touches on equipment, processing standards, lighting, and a discussion by Robert Rubin of experimentation in the use of film hardware. In the section on "Picture Making," any film department can find its counterpart. Vivid descriptions of the "innards" of one-man, two-men, and fully-crewed newsfilm departments are provided by men who have been on the firing line, and whose awards are the envy of the industry.

This book even has the courage to explore the shadowed vales of "editorial influence" on newsfilm. Ralph Paskman, Phil Scheffler and Walt Dumbrow of CBS attack the discussion with vigor, even to the point of

recommending authenticity in film-making by parachuting from an airplane, and by traveling to the ends of the earth for on-location shooting.

The final section, "Film Editing," is a fascinating journey into the ultimate decision-making function, unique to film. The discussion of the writer's role in the preparation of newsfilm, and the argument between the use of silent film and sound film, are potent and should furnish material for many debates.

The illustrations chosen for the book are excellent. They are, for the most part, pictures of newsfilm reporters at work. I'm sure that the charts of trouble-shooting devices for maintaining film quality will join a footage chart on many a newsroom wall. The glamor pics of the pros, I'm equally sure, will bring much good-natured ribbing from their peers.

Are there shortcomings? Not many. I can detect only one. I wish a composite review of all the films seen at the conference could be provided in support of the book's material.

This is a kind of before-and-after book. We used all sorts of reference material before, now we'll use the Manual. I know I will; and I hasten to recommend it to all who are interested in getting to the point fast. Landmark, benchmark, departure, etc., whatever you want to call it, you'd be right.

JOHN R. RIDER

Syracuse University

Richard Dyer MacCann. FILM AND SOCIETY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.

About none of the arts are we so anxious as the film. We have been puzzled by the ultimate in reductions: the absurdity of *Marienbad* and the nausea of *Malamondo*. To those who equate art with the ordering of social experience, the box-office syndrome of obscurantism and decay does not provide a workable esthetics for the enlargement of human discourse. Nor are Walt Disney and *Father Goose* of more than scant comfort; the syndrome of "family fare" leads to equally blind expressive alleys. Where is film to go as a communication art?

In the Introduction of his *Film and Society,* Richard Dyer MacCann articulates our discontent in terms of "the controversies swirling around the moving image today." MacCann asks, regarding film:

> Does it have a marked influence? If so, can that influence be measured? Should the moving image be controlled in some way? If so, by what standards and rules? By what agencies? Is self-control by the producers of communication enough to satisfy the public need? What, after all, is the public need? How is it different from what the public wants?

These questions are addressed, primarily, to the college and secondary-school student of mass media—the intended reader of this anthology. Yet the various reflections upon these issues, from various sources, are of concern to all who ponder the social significance of the popular arts. Included are essays and articles, "findings" of Senate subcommittee investigations, accounts of legal proceedings (the *Miracle* case), a film review (Agee on *Wilson*), and an interview with E. William Henry in the section

entitled "Should Films for Television Be Controlled?" All the selections are arranged under similar "problematic" headings, for MacCann's purpose is to provoke discovery, discussion and further research. The Appendix specifies some areas for inquiry.

All the dependable sources are here, as indeed they must be: Terry Ramsaye, Hortense Powdermaker's *Hollywood the Dream Factory,* Arthur Knight, John Grierson (to whom the book is dedicated), and Kracauer's *From Caligari to Hitler.* But there is also the unexpected: Irving Thalberg and Mervyn LeRoy ("...if Mona Lisa looked like Hedy Lamarr, more people would go to the Louvre"), Upton Sinclair, George Bernard Shaw—and Ernie Pyle, who was preparing himself for the boredom of senseless holocaust when he wrote, before the war:

> It isn't what the movies put in that makes them so wonderful—it's what they leave out...Maybe you'd like to have happiness strung out, instead of just a flash and a kiss denoting bliss forever. But not for me, I think not. Just a moment of happiness is all right, for then there is no dulling. Yes, just wake me up for the peaks and the valleys, and please have the anesthetist ready when we come to the plains, and the long days when nothing happens.

It may well be that "of happiness and despair we have no measure," but what we continue to seek are the meaningful symbols of the human adventure. Despite the divergent views in *Film and Society,* the point of MacCann's anthology is clear: a recognition of the social function of the communication arts toward "the eventual improvement of the quality of life."

RICHARD AVERSON

Syracuse University

Newton Minow. EQUAL TIME: THE PRIVATE BROADCASTER AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST. Edited by Lawrence Laurent. New York: Atheneum, 1964.

It is important to all of us that the various public arguments and statements of Newton Minow have been preserved in this permanent form. From his first, and best-known, "wasteland" charge (delivered at the National Association of Broadcasters Convention in 1961) to his final thoughtful address on the pitfalls of bureaucracy within his own regulatory agency (delivered before The Center for Study of Democratic Institutions in late 1963), the former FCC Chairman's chief concern has always been with law, freedom, and their relationships to a mighty and complex communications system. Along the way, he may not often have been able to generate more than mere controversy; but beyond any other man in this century, Newton Minow succeeded in bringing the issues and problems inherent to broadcasting's force and power within public purview.

The invitations to address various broadcasting groups as well as other agencies and institutions concerned with the public interest provided Mr. Minow with full and frequent opportunity to place his views before the people. His first major address following the "wasteland" explosion was delivered at The Conference on Freedom and Responsibility in Broadcasting sponsored by the Northwestern University School of Law, where he pre-

sented a logical exposition of the government's positive role in the regulation of broadcasting. For two years thereafter he used the platform to raise queries and suggest possibilities with regard to broadcasting's social and cultural responsibilities. He turned to a consideration of programs for children before the IRTS. He stressed the nation's need for increased news and public affairs programming in remarks to the Radio-TV News Directors Association. In 1962 he reviewed the challenges and potentials of all-channel television at The National Press Club, and next moved to an NAB conference on Public Affairs Editorializing, where he attempted to clarify the commission's position in the touchy area of broadcast editorials.

Minow's second NAB speech shifted attention to radio's scope, financing, and influence; and he later continued to prod and challenge the status quo in regard to ETV's development.

These matters, and more, are incorporated into the addresses and essays published in this volume. Mr. Minow has contributed a lengthy introductory essay which sets before the reader most of the problems he wrestled with during his tenure in office. Each of the addresses is carefully placed in its context of time, place, and climate by Editor Laurent, who also reviews the immediate results of each speech in a brief "aftermath" statement. Laurent also contributes a clear descriptive essay about the growth and prospects of pay-TV, an invaluable summary for the student of communications or for anyone not familiar with the potential advantages and disadvantages of the concept.

The book is solid history, told mostly by a man who made part of it in the early years of this decade. It is Minow's call and challenge, and reading it pulls one back into the exciting days of the New Frontier, when private and public shortcomings were being brought before us—and always faster than we could cope with them.

Throughout all of this volume there is a plan—a plan based in law. And it was not just his law, but the broadcaster's law and the great audience's law. What Newton Minow did was to remind us, forcibly and forcefully, that unless we continue to debate the law's meaning and significance, our hopes for survival are scant indeed.

A. William Bluem

Syracuse University

BOOKS RECEIVED

All the Silent Voices, by Roger Fuller. New York: Pocket Books, 1964.

Anxious Object, The: Art Today and Its Audience, by Harold Rosenberg. New York: Horizon Press, Inc., 1964.

Anyone Got a Match?, by Max Shulman. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.

Bad Guys, The, by William K. Everson. New York: The Citadel Press, 1964.

Brendan Behan's Island, by Brendan Behan. London: Bernard Geis Associates, 1962.

Broade's Treasury of Wit and Humor, by Jacob M. Broade. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Cocktail Party for the Author, by Alex Jackinson. Boston: Challenge Press, Inc., 1964.

Comedy in Action, by Elmer M. Blistein. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1964.

Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century, by Marvin T. Herrick. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

Culture for the Millions?, edited by Norman Jacobs. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Cultures in Conflict, by David K. Cornelius and Edwin St. Vincent. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1964.

Dictionary of the Cinema, A, by Peter Graham. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., Inc., 1964.

Documentary Film, by Paul Rotha, Sinclair Road and Richard Griffith. New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1964.

Family Movie Fun for All, by Myron A. Matzkin. New York: American Photographic Book Publishing Co., Inc., 1964.

Fear on Trial, by John Henry Faulk. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964.

Foreign Correspondence: The Great Reporters and Their Times, by John Hohenberg. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

Help! I'm a Prisoner in a Chinese Bakery, by Alan King. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1964.

Honor Awards Handbook (1964 Edition), by Milton L. Levy. Berkeley, California: Milton L. Levy, 1964.

I Can Tell It Now, edited by David Brown and W. Richard Bruner. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1964.

Ideas in the Drama, edited by John Gassner. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

If You Don't Mind My Saying So, by Joseph Wood Krutch. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1964.

Image, The, by Daniel J. Boorstin. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961.

Language and Thought, by John B. Carroll. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Life and Death of Tin Pan Alley, The, by David Ewen. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, Inc., 1964.

Many Worlds of Leo Rosten, The, by Leo Rosten. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.

Mass Consumption Society, The, by George Katona. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Milwaukee Journal, The: The First Eighty Years, by Will C. Conrad, Kathleen Wilson and Dale Wilson. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

Nazi Propaganda, by Z. A. B. Zeman. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Only You, Dick Daring!, by Merle Miller and Evan Rhodes. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1964.

Paperbacks in the Schools, edited by Alexander Butman, Donald Reis and David Sohn. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1963.

Play and Its Parts, A, by Gerald Weales. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Pornography and the Law, by Eberhard and Phyllis Kronhausen. New York: Ballantine Books, 1964.

Producer, The, by Richard Brooks. New York: Macfadden-Bartell Corporation, 1951.

Some of My Best Friends Are People, by Art Moger. Boston: Challenge Press, Inc., 1964.

Stanislavsky and the Method, by Charles Marowitz. New York: The Citadel Press, 1964.

Symbolic Leaders, by Orrin E. Klapp. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1964.

Theatre World, by Daniel Blum. Philadelphia: Chilton Books, 1964.

Theories of Comedy, edited by Paul Lauter. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1964.

To Hell with Culture, by Herbert Read. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

Word Finder, by Ruth Anderson, Lura Straub, and E. Dana Gibson. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

RECORDS

Air Power (Columbia ML-5214/MS-6029)

Music for Monsters, Munsters, Mummies and Other TV Fiends (Epic LN-24125/BN-26125): Addams Family; Alfred Hitchcock Theme; Bewitched; Outer Limits

Original Music from The Rogues (RCA Victor LPM-2976/LSP-2976)

Reporter, The (Columbia CL-2269/CS-9069)

Satins and Spurs (Capitol L-547)

Sophia Loren in Rome (Columbia OL-6310/OS-2710)

Stingiest Man in Town, The (Columbia CL-950)

Zabka's Themes from Television (Laura LLP-2025): Midnight Movie; Movie Four; Sunday Showcase; Tonight Show