

**SPRING
1971**



**Journal of
Broadcasting**

ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>University of Alabama University of Alaska American University Arizona State University University of Arizona Arkansas State University Ball State University Barton County Community College Baylor University Beloit College Blue Mountain Community College Boston University Bowling Green State University Brigham Young University Brooklyn College Butler University California State College at Long Beach California State College at Los Angeles California State Polytechnic College Capital University Central Michigan University Central Missouri State College Central State College (Okla.) Central Washington State College Central Wyoming College Chico State College University of Colorado Community College of Baltimore Cornell University Creighton University University of Dayton University of Delaware University of Denver University of Detroit Duke University Duquesne University East Texas State University Eastern Illinois University Eastern Michigan University Emerson College Endicott Junior College Florida State University Florida Technological University University of Florida Ft. Hays Kansas State College University of Georgia Grambling College University of Hawaii Hofstra University University of Houston University of Idaho University of Illinois University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Indiana State University Indiana University Iowa State University University of Iowa Ithaca College Jackson State Community College John Brown University Kansas State University University of Kansas Kent State University University of Kentucky Herbert H. Lehman College Lindenwood College Loma Linda University Los Angeles City College Louisiana Polytechnic Institute Louisiana State University Loyola University (New Orleans) University of Maine Marquette University Marshall University University of Maryland Memphis State University Miami University University of Miami Michigan State University University of Michigan University of Minnesota University of Minnesota at Duluth Mississippi State University University of Mississippi</p> | <p>University of Missouri Montana State University University of Montana Mount Wachusett Community College Murray State University University of Nebraska New Mexico State University New York University University of North Carolina University of North Dakota Northern Illinois University Northern Michigan University North Texas State University Northwestern University Northwood Institute University of Notre Dame Ohio State University Ohio University Oklahoma State University University of Oklahoma Oregon State University University of Oregon Pennsylvania State University Queens College University of Rhode Island Rochester Institute of Technology Sacramento State College St. John's University (Minnesota) St. John's University (New York) St. Lawrence University St. Louis University St. Petersburg Jr. College San Antonio College San Diego State College San Fernando Valley State College City College of San Francisco San Francisco State College San Jose State College Seton Hall University Shaw University University of South Carolina South Dakota State University University of South Dakota University of Southern California Southern Illinois University Southern Methodist University Southern Missionary College University of Southern Mississippi Southern Oregon College Stanford University State University College (Brockport) State Univ. of New York (Oswego) Stephens College Syracuse University Temple University University of Tennessee Texas A & I University Texas Christian University Texas Technological University University of Texas at El Paso Texas Woman's University University of Tulsa Utah State University University of Utah University of Vermont Villanova University Wabash Valley College Washburn University of Topeka Washington State University University of Washington Wayne State University Western Illinois University Western Michigan University University of West Florida Westminster College College of William and Mary University of Wisconsin University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee Wisconsin State University—Eau Claire Wisconsin State University—La Crosse Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh Wisconsin State University—Stevens Point Wisconsin State University—Whitewater University of Wyoming</p> |
|--|--|

The broadcasting stations of the United States through their membership
 in the National Association of Broadcasters
 and individuals interested in fostering the aims of the Association

JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING

Published Quarterly by the
Association for Professional Broadcasting Education

VOL. XV, No. 2

SPRING 1971

CONTENTS

RESEARCH/ISSUES IN BROADCASTING

- The Soviet Mass Media in the Sixties: Patterns of Access
and Consumption, *Rosemarie Rogers* 127
- Some Meanings Radio Has for Teenagers, *Neal T. Weintraub* 147
- Television and the Older Adult, *Richard H. Davis* 153
- Political Programs on National Television Networks: 1968,
Malachi C. Topping and Lawrence W. Lichty 161
- Second Service: Some Keys to the Development of FM
Broadcasting, *Christopher H. Sterling* 181

LITERATURE OF BROADCASTING

- A Selective Bibliography on the Evolution of CATV, 1950-
1970, *Don R. Le Duc* 195
- Books in Review 235
- Books Received 250

Subscription price \$8.00 per year. Special student rate \$4.00 per year. Annual dues of \$12.00 charged APBE Individual Members include a subscription to the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING. Checks should be made payable to the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, except that Individual Membership dues checks should be payable to the APBE and sent to the Executive Secretary, 1771 N St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

All other correspondence should be addressed to John M. Kittross, Editor, JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122. Second-class postage paid at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

© Copyright, 1971, by the Association for Professional Broadcasting Education.

EDITOR

John M. Kittross Temple University

STAFF

Book Review Editor Christopher H. Sterling
Business Manager Mortimer H. Jordan, Jr.
Editorial Assistant Barbara Ileen Berschler

CONSULTING EDITORS

Walter B. Emery, Ohio State University Law
Lawrence W. Lichty, University of Wisconsin Research
Harold Niven, National Association of Broadcasters Education
Bruce Robertson, Hollywood, California Industry Issues

THE ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

OFFICERS:

John H. Pennybacker, Louisiana State University, *President*
Clark Pollock, Nationwide Communications, Inc., Columbus, Ohio,
Vice-President
Robert L. Snyder, Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh,
Secretary-Treasurer

DIRECTORS:

Thomas Bolger, WMTV, Madison, Wisconsin
Burrell F. Hansen, Utah State University
Gordon L. Gray, Temple University
Ray Johnson, KMED, Medford, Oregon
Jack W. Lee, Lin Broadcasting Corp., New York, N. Y.
Donald E. McClintock, KFBB-TV, Great Falls, Montana
Leo A. Martin, Michigan State University
Joseph M. Ripley, University of Kentucky
Harold Niven, NAB, Washington, D. C., *Executive Secretary*

APBE COMMITTEE ON THE JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING:

Kenneth Harwood, Temple University, *Chairman*
Malthon Anapol, University of Delaware
Frank Kahn, Herbert Lehman College
Lawrence W. Lichty, University of Wisconsin
John Pennybacker, Louisiana State University
Donel W. Price, California State College at Los Angeles
Edgar Willis, University of Michigan

THE JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING welcomes the submission of articles and reviews from all sources. Attention is called to the suggestions for the preparation of manuscripts appearing on the last two pages of Vol. XV, No. 1 (Winter 1970-71).

Manuscripts, books for review, and editorial and business correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.

ROSEMARIE ROGERS

The Soviet Mass Media in the Sixties : Patterns of Access and Consumption

There is little question that recent changes in mass media availability and use in the U.S.S.R. have far outstripped awareness of these changes in the U.S.A. The mass communications system of one of the world's largest countries certainly is a topic of relevance to broadcasters and scholars elsewhere. Dr. Rosemarie Rogers is research associate in the Center for International Studies at M. I. T. and assistant professor in the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

IN the 25 years since the end of the Second World War, the Soviet mass media and their audiences have undergone a number of important changes. This paper describes and evaluates three types of developments in particular. One is the continued expansion of newspaper, magazine and radio facilities, and the growth of the newer electronic medium, television. It is to these four types of media that we shall be referring here when we talk about "the Soviet mass media." The second development that will be discussed is changes in exposure patterns, and in the uses that the audience makes of the media. The demand on the media, especially on television, to provide entertainment deserves particular attention in this context. A third development is the new ways in which the communicators' concerns with reaching the audience express themselves. A series of studies of various media audiences were undertaken in the Soviet Union during the sixties. They are worth analyzing since they provide us both with interesting data on the audiences and with an insight into some of the concerns of the Soviet communicators today.

The main elements of the philosophy behind the Soviet mass media have remained the same. The mass media continue to be viewed as

propagandists. They are expected to mobilize people for particular efforts in the society. They are also expected, in the long run, to bring about characterological changes. Attempts to involve people actively with the media continue, such as the organization of wall newspapers in schools and at places of work, and the incorporation of the mass media into study projects in the schools. And the media continue to present to the sub-elites the current "line" on political, economic and social questions.¹ The decisions on which events are newsworthy, and on how the news is to be presented, continue to be based on these functional goals. But the communicators are no longer satisfied with using letters to the editors as indicators of interest in a particular medium. Increasingly they turn to survey methods to learn about who is in the audience, what the audience values in the medium and what it misses. They expect to learn from such studies how they can reach the audience most effectively with the message they intend to convey. The first sections of this paper will be based in part on findings presented in these Soviet audience studies, in part on other published Soviet materials (handbooks, statistical information, time budget studies), and in part on data that were gathered first-hand in interviews with former residents of the Soviet Union and with a number of Soviet visitors to the West.²

Media Access

Table I shows the growing saturation of the Soviet population with the mass media. The country has well surpassed the standard laid down by UNESCO for developing countries, of 10 newspaper copies per 100 people and 5 radio receivers per 100 people.³ This statement also holds if we consider wireless radio sets alone, and not the wired sets which allow only a limited program choice. In 1967 slightly more than half of all radio sets were wireless.⁴

Distribution is no less important than volume. Newspapers, magazines, and radio are widely distributed throughout the country. There are complaints of tardy delivery of the print media to isolated places, and some rural areas are still largely served by wired radio sets only. But on the whole access to these media does not depend on residence. The case is different with television. By 1969 almost one-half of the Soviet population were still outside the reach of that medium.⁵ The projections for 1970 and 1975 were that 65% and 82-85% respec-

TABLE I
Number of Newspapers, Magazines, Radios, and Television Sets
Per 100 People for Selected Years

| | Newspapers | | Magazines | | Radio Sets ^a | | Television Sets | |
|------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | Per Issue Circulation (thousands) ^b | Copies/100 People ^c | Annual Circulation (thousands) ^b | Copies/100 People/year | Number of Sets (thousands) | Sets/100 People | Number of Sets (thousands) | Sets/100 People |
| 1940 | 38,355 | 19.8 | 190,236 | 98.0 | 7,000 ^d | 3.6 | (400 sets) | |
| 1950 | 35,964 | 20.1 | 136,665 | 76.6 | 11,460 ^e | 6.4 | 10 ^e | .006 |
| 1960 | 66,679 | 31.4 | 576,975 | 271.8 | 57,800 ^d | 27.2 | 4,800 ^d | 2.3 |
| 1967 | 119,891 | 51.1 | 1,664,053 | 709.9 | 80,200 ^f | 34.2 | 22,900 ^f | 9.8 |

^a Wireless and wired sets are combined in these figures.

^b Source: *Pechat' SSSR v 1967 godu (The Press of the Soviet Union in 1967)*, Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Kniga," 1968, pp. 66 and 56 for newspapers and magazines respectively. For 1967, per issue circulation for magazines is also given (*Ibid.*, p. 57). It was 109,967 thousand, which is 46.9 copies/100 people. Per issue circulation of magazines is not given for the earlier years we are considering, nor is it available in earlier volumes of *The Soviet Press*.

^c All calculations are based on population estimates for January 1 of the respective years, given in *Narodnoe khozyaystvo SSSR v 1967 godu (The National Economy of the USSR in 1967)*, Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Statistika, 1968, p. 7.

^d Source: *The National Economy of the USSR in 1960*, p. 576.

^e Source: *The National Economy of the USSR in 1956*, p. 198.

^f Source: *SSSR v. tsifrah v 1967 godu (The Soviet Union in Figures in 1967)*, Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Statistika, 1968, p. 100.

tively of the population would live in an area where television could be received.⁶

Television was the only medium in the case of which cost was cited in the Leisure Study interviews as a significant obstacle to access. Also, in a 1967 Leningrad television survey more than half of the respondents who did not have a television set at home said that this was due to their not being able to afford to buy a set.⁷ Access to the other media is inexpensive.

A particular characteristic of the Soviet situation is the wide availability of the print media in schools and at places of work. The respondents of the Leisure Studies were asked which newspapers and magazines they read regularly or occasionally and how they obtained them. As one would predict, subscriptions were cited less frequently as ways of obtaining a medium in the lower than in the higher educational and occupational groups. The converse was true for "reading the medium at one's place of work." But the result shown in Table II was particularly interesting: reading a newspaper or a magazine in a reading room at one's place of work went together with *regular* reading just as frequently as obtaining it by subscription did.

By criteria of saturation with the media, the Soviet Union today then presents itself as a "modern" mass media society. The media produce regularly and speedily a large number of messages. Especially the electronic media allow the news to be brought to the audience almost "as it happens." The spontaneity of its broadcasts was indeed

TABLE II
Relationship Between Five Ways of Obtaining a Medium
and Regularity of Exposure

| Titles obtained by: | Percent regularly consumed: | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| | Newspapers | Magazines |
| Subscription | (56) ^a 88 % | (40) ^a 100% |
| At place of work | (42) 90 | (35) 91 |
| At library, club | (27) 52 | (45) 82 |
| Newsstand buying | (41) 76 | (32) 75 |
| Pass-on (from individuals) | (22) 73 | (30) 40 |

^a Figures on the basis of which percentages were computed.

cited in a recent Soviet audience study as one of four qualities that make television popular.⁸ But this opportunity can cause tensions for the Soviet communicators. While the first criterion for an item's newsworthiness is its usefulness in the effort of "communist construction," emphasis on speed makes relevant considerations and decisions more difficult.⁹ Nevertheless it is official policy today to make as much use as possible of the quality of speed provided by the electronic media. This has not always been the case. Even during the fifties Soviet radio waited for *Pravda* to establish the "line" on the selection and particular treatment of news to be covered.¹⁰

Although the number of messages produced daily in the Soviet media is large, there are at the same time demands for *more* of certain *kinds* of news. In a 1968 poll conducted in 30 sampling points of the USSR, the respondents demanded more information, over radio and television, on the West and the Third World.¹¹ Our interviews with former Soviet residents brought out also the desire for a quite different type of news, which appears sparsely or not at all in the Soviet media: "human interest" news, news about accidents, and similar materials.

The Predominance of the Central Media

In any highly developed mass media system the media act as unifiers of the country. News and culture—highbrow and popular—are shared by people of similar tastes throughout the country. In the Soviet Union the unifying role of the media is furthered by uniform media policies and by the penetration of the country by the central media.

The organization of the Soviet mass media follows that of the governmental administrative units. There are newspapers, magazines, radio and television programs produced at the central (all-Union) level and intended for distribution throughout the Soviet Union. Media of all four types are also produced at lower administrative levels, where they are aimed at correspondingly narrower audiences—republic, *oblast* ("province"), city. Newspapers reach as far down as *rayons* ("districts") and individual enterprises. While the central media use for all practical purposes Russian only,¹² the media production at all other levels is divided between Russian language media and media in the language of the major republic nationality, as well as, in some cases, minority languages.

The central media have traditionally served as models for the regional media. But in addition, the penetration of the country by the central media themselves is constantly increasing. We are told that Radio Moscow's First Program can now be heard in all corners of the Soviet Union, and that by 1975 this will be true for at least two central radio programs.¹³ The *Journalist's Handbook* states that "the local [radio] committees and broadcasting studios organize their daily broadcasts with reference to the programs of Central Broadcasting. They select for their own broadcasts those time slots which can without harm be filled with local materials and retain thereby the most important central programs."¹⁴ Measured in per issue circulation, the proportion of central newspapers among all Soviet newspapers has increased from 23% in 1940 to 35% in 1960 and 46% in 1967.¹⁵

We have no direct evidence of the proportions in which the central newspapers are distributed over the 15 Soviet Republics.¹⁶ An analysis in which we correlated volume of newspapers published in a republic at various administrative levels with indicators of use of nationality language versus Russian language in a republic, however, pointed up a clear pattern. It showed that the Soviet newspapers are divided into two major functional groups: the central and republic level newspapers on the one hand, and the other regional newspapers (*oblast*, city, *rayon*, and house organs) on the other. The less Russian is used in a republic, the larger the volume of republic level newspapers. We interpret this to mean that the republic level newspapers (part of which are published in the language of the republic nationality, and in some republics also in minority languages) fulfill a similar function as the central newspapers (are allowed to substitute for the central newspapers) where this is necessary for reasons of language. For no relationship was observed between use of Russian and volume of regional newspapers *below the republic level*. Their volume was, however, found to be highly correlated with indices of education and urbanism. That of the republic level newspapers was not, which is consistent with the hypothesis that they stand in a relationship of substitutability with the central newspapers.¹⁷

The importance of the central newspapers is also confirmed by an analysis of the reading habits of our Leisure Study respondents: of the 88 respondents who knew Russian and were newspaper readers,

every one in the group with incomplete or complete higher education ($n = 39$) read *at least one central paper*, regardless of where he lived and what nationality he belonged to. This was not true for Russian speaking newspaper readers with a secondary education or less.

Patterns of Exposure

In their study of Soviet society, which refers to the years immediately preceding the Second World War, Inkeles and Bauer found the following variables to be most powerful in predicting communications behavior:

... (1) a combination of educational and occupational factors which affect interest in what is going on, shape reading and listening habits, determine access to information and the media, and generate situational pressures which put a premium on being well informed; (2) residence, which primarily affects accessibility to sources of information, but must also be presumed to present environments, which vary in degree of intellectual stimulation; and (3) attitudes toward the regime, which are reflected in turn in attitudes toward the media of communication. Obviously, differences on these various dimensions are highly correlated with social class, and the various classes are therefore characterized by marked differences in communications behavior. Except for a few instances, sex and age differences affect communications behavior surprisingly little.¹⁸

In the sixties exposure to newspapers and magazines continued to be positively associated with education and occupational status, but radio exposure differed little from one group to another; if anything, it was somewhat lower among the most educated. This indicates that Inkeles' and Bauer's findings reflected differences in motivation to consume the media (in the case of the print media) as well as differences in access (in case of radio). And the historical pattern observed with radio seems to be now repeating itself with television: audience studies show higher exposure to television among the more educated and those of higher occupational status, but findings on how the audience views the medium indicate that once access will cease to be an obstacle, the less educated are likely to become the heaviest television users.

Table III presents findings on exposure frequencies by education from a Soviet survey and from the Leisure Study interviews. The Soviet study, undertaken in 1966 by the youth newspaper *Komsomol'*

TABLE III
Frequencies of Exposure to Four Mass Media,
by Education, in the Leisure Study Interviews and
the *Komsomol'skaya pravda* Polls

| Education | Newspapers | | Magazines | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| | Leisure Studies ^a | <i>Komsomol'skaya pravda</i> ^b | Leisure Studies ^a | <i>Komsomol'skaya pravda</i> ^c |
| Higher | 93% (41 ^d) | 94.7% | 81% (42 ^d) | 90.5% |
| Secondary | 81% (31) | 94.6% | 70% (30) | 75.9% |
| Less than Secondary | 81% (31) | 82.8% | 60% (30) | 61.1% |
| No answer on regularity of reading | (4) | | (5) | |
| | (N=107) | | (N=107) | |

| Education | Television | | | Radio | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| | Leisure Studies ^e | | <i>Komsomol'skaya pravda</i> ^f | Leisure Studies ^e | <i>Komsomol'skaya pravda</i> ^g |
| Higher | 40% | 51% (43 ^d) | 46.4% | 55% | 79.5% |
| Secondary | 36% | 45% (33) | 39.3% | 49.3% | 79.5% |
| Less than Secondary | 32% | 35% (31) | 31.8% | 36.7% | 74.5% |
| | (N=107) | | | | |

^a Read "every issue" or "most issues" of at least one newspaper/magazine.

^b Read a newspaper "at least several times per week."

^c Read a magazine "at least several times per week."

^d Total number of respondents on the basis of which percentages were computed.

^e Classification arrived at from answers to several questions in the interview. Lefthand column: watched at least several times per week. Righthand column: watched at least several times per month.

^f Lefthand column: watched "at least several times per week." Righthand column: watched "at least several times per month."

^g Listened "at least several times per week." Note: the question was inadvertently omitted from the Leisure Study Schedule.

skaya pravda,¹⁹ remains the only Soviet source on frequencies of regular exposure to all four media.²⁰ It is based in part on a self-selected sample, which is biased toward the young and the more educated.²¹ The group of respondents who were given the Leisure Study interviews is biased in the same direction. We present the results less for what the absolute figures in the breakdowns are worth than for the intergroup comparisons they allow us to make. The considerable agreement between the two sources provides some basis for confidence in the results.

The pattern of increasing exposure to newspapers, magazines, and television with increasing level of education is evident from Table III. Exposure to television is, however, consistently lower in all groups than is exposure to the print media. The difference in radio exposure between the three groups is small: less than six percentage points. Results from various Soviet time budget studies also show heavier exposure to the print media in the more educated groups, and point to relatively heavier use of the electronic media in the middle and lower groups.²²

In addition to education and occupational status, Inkeles and Bauer found political involvement to be a predictor of communications behavior. Any evidence we have from the Leisure Studies and intensive interviews is consistent with the earlier findings. This author undertook also an experiment with 41 respondents, in which selection of content within newspapers was investigated in detail. The experiment confirmed the role of both education and political involvement (here indicated by Communist Party membership and/or particular occupational roles) in predicting newspaper reading behavior.²³

With increased circulation and improved distribution of the print media, with the expansion of the radio network and increases in the number of sets (in rural as well as in urban areas), the association between residence and exposure to these media has become weaker, indeed has for certain measures largely disappeared. The *Komsomol'skaya pravda* polls show an effect only in the case of magazines. The Leisure Study interviews point up no consistent differences in exposure frequencies to the print media and to radio. Television, of course, is still expanding and there is still a strong association between residence and exposure.

The only medium in the case of which we observe significant differences in exposure frequencies by sex is the newspaper; minor differences are observed in the case of the three other media.²⁴ The data on age are inconsistent.²⁵

Keeping and Widening the Audience

In the first section of this paper we described the growth of the Soviet mass media in the last years, in particular during the sixties. This growth undoubtedly reflects in part simply a greater responsiveness of those who make media policies to needs of the audience that have been present all along;²⁶ in the case of the print media it also reflects changes in the composition of the population as regards educational level: adults with less than four years of education represented 34% of the adult population in 1959, but only 25% in 1967. The largest proportional increases occurred in the higher educational groups (people with seven or more years of education), those which are the highest consumers of the print media.²⁷

The process by which people are socialized into the media would warrant discussion in a separate paper.²⁸ We shall merely supply one or two illustrations. Youth organizations and the school are important agents of socialization into newspapers, which begins at an early age. All respondents in our intensive interviews who themselves or whose children had attended secondary school in the fifties or sixties reported that they or their children had a subscription to the Pioneer paper, at least for some time, between the ages of 10 and 14. These subscriptions were taken out through the school. The impetus came either from Pioneer workers or directly from the teachers. Parents who themselves were little interested in the media nevertheless subscribed for their children. The Pioneer papers were considered children's papers generally, not papers specifically of a youth organization.²⁹ Pressures on adults to subscribe to the print media, and to consume the media generally, differ substantially with occupational status and Party membership.

The Soviet communicators want their media policies to be informed by a better knowledge of the audience. This is especially necessary today, where the audience has a choice, not only between different titles of print media and content within these media, but also on radio, and increasingly on television. Kogan undertook his study of the tele-

vision audience in Sverdlovsk *oblast* on the premise that it is desirable "to address each program to a certain viewer, to a certain group of people."³⁰ To do this it is necessary to find out who views (or listens or reads) what (and when).

Detailed audience studies began to be undertaken in the mid-sixties. Yaroshenko cites surveys of radio audiences undertaken in 1963, which were presumably the first of their kind.³¹ It is not clear whether the results of these surveys were published. In 1966 *Izvestia* and *Komsomol'skaya pravda* undertook inquiries into their own readership.³² Studies of television audiences also followed. In the later studies more rigorous sampling procedures are used or, at the least, the samples are more adequately described. Also, standard questions on times of exposure and content selection are increasingly supplemented by more sophisticated questions on what the media mean to the respondents, what functions they perform for them. The Soviet investigators are aware of commercial audience research organizations in the West, such as Trendex and Nielsen, as well as of the academic literature on the subject.³³ Some investigators model their work explicitly on Western audience studies.³⁴

Given what we know about media audiences in non-communist industrial societies, and given the developments that we have sketched in the earlier sections of this paper, which show that the Soviet media system today shares many of the features of media systems in these societies, the most important findings in the Soviet audience studies are not too surprising. They point, first, to a functional distinctiveness of the media; secondly, to variations in how different educational or occupational groups in the audience view the media and in what they value in the media.

The newspaper is the most important source of news, followed by radio and then television. It is valued especially highly by professionals and Party workers.³⁵ Radio and television, however, bring the news most quickly. Television is becoming the entertainment medium *par excellence*, especially for the less educated. A question in the intensive interviews and in a group of the Leisure Studies as to which medium was the most entertaining elicited practically unanimous citations of television from the less-educated respondents who had access to that medium. Respondents with more than secondary education who had access to television, however, were equally likely to cite radio, maga-

zine, or television as the most entertaining medium. Similarly, in the study of the Sverdlovsk *oblast* television audience, the two functions of the medium that were cited more frequently by blue collar workers than by engineering-technical personnel were "a way of passing time when there is nothing [else] to do," and "bringing enjoyment." (But television's function as a source of international news received the highest rating in both groups.)³⁶ In the poll of Leningrad television viewers the respondents cited "rest" and "entertainment" as the medium's prime functions.³⁷

There are a number of lessons that the Soviet communicators draw from these findings. The first is the need to be aware of the functional differences between the media: these differences are an asset when the particular potential of each medium is put to use. Not recognizing them, however, leads to poor use of the media and to boredom in the audience. Thus the analysts of *Izvestia's* poll conclude:

. . . If some stories drag on about what has been repeatedly discussed in previous issues, naturally this does not stimulate the reader. He expects essentially new material, nowadays especially. . . . If, for example, we were to represent the course of news (in the broad sense of the word) as a chain: radio-newspaper-magazine, we would obtain the following ratios of speed of transmission of news: 1:3:12. In other words, radio presents the news almost immediately; the newspaper, on the average for the country, within three days; and the magazine brings it no sooner than a fortnight. Yet editors sometimes assume that they alone are supplying the reader. . . . Today, more than ever, *each publication is required to have its own individuality*, its own characteristic selection of information. . . .³⁸

Along similar lines, television's important function as an entertainment medium is to be recognized and made use of in the total communications effort:

. . . The most serious thoughts and ideas should be presented on television through and with the help of [television's] hedonistic function. As long as this is not done, the broadcasts which are most important for ideological education will not find their audience.³⁹

The author does not say, however, how this policy is to be made operational.

Besides the recognition that the media are functionally distinct, there is also the recognition that different groups in the audience have different tastes as regards program content and form. We have already

cited the findings referring to the popularity of television entertainment among the lower educational groups. Gurevich recalls that blue collar workers and collective farmers are less interested in various forms of radio/TV news and especially in commentary than are engineering-technical personnel, students, and Party-government employees. He observes that this finding refutes an unwritten law of Soviet journalism that the less educated need commentary more and suggests that the nature of commentary and its role in radio and television programs be reconsidered.⁴⁰

Some studies of radio audiences have implications for a rethinking of the timing of broadcasts, for example the study of the Moscow audience cited by Yaroshenko:

. . . very indicative and somewhat unexpected is the fact that during the day a large number of workers listen to broadcasts of Central Radio. This is explained by the fact that during the day workers of evening and night shifts (and earlier this did not attract attention) may listen to the radio. In the future, in daytime programming of radio, it is essential in all probability to study the interests of this group of listeners.⁴¹

A type of question that we may expect will be asked more and more in future Soviet audience studies concerns the various effects of the mass media. The effects of duplication of audiences between types of media are already being discussed, as, for example, in the passage from *Izvestia* which we quoted above. In our intensive interviews we found evidence that one former function of agitation and propaganda has now been taken on almost exclusively by the four mass media which we are discussing in this paper: the information function (as far as it can be separated from agitation-propaganda). The respondents (except those who themselves were in responsible Party positions, and therefore attended different types of meetings) were unanimous in reporting that they hardly ever learned anything new at various agitation or propaganda meetings, that is, anything that they did not know already from the mass media or from conversation. The meetings served merely to provide additional explications and exhortations. This is a definite change from earlier times, when agitprop shared the information function with the other mass media.

Another question is that of the media's (in particular television's) influence on other leisure time activities. Kogan asked his respondents

whether they preferred to see certain events such as plays, sports events, etc. on the spot where they are happening or on television. He found that workers were most interested in watching the events on television, engineering-technical personnel less so, and high school and university students least. The most frequently cited reasons for preferring TV were the fact that this way costs less time, is easier with small children in the house and can be combined with other work. The author concluded that "in the estimation of the majority of television viewers the opinion was firmly fixed that television had a negative influence on their active cultural activities and on extra-familial forms of contact."⁴²

Conclusions and Discussion

As regards production, the diffusion network, and receiving facilities, the Soviet media system today resembles quite closely that of other "modern," industrialized societies. With the exception of television and to a minor extent of radio (wired sets with restricted program choice), the only limits on media exposure are motivational, not limits of access. An analysis of the relationship between volume of newspapers, language, education and urbanism, on which we reported briefly in this article, supports the assertion that in the case of newspapers supply is responsive to demand.⁴³ Some of the other evidence that we have cited indicates that this holds generally for all media except television. This was not the case before the Second World War, nor in the early post-war years. Indeed, when Lerner documented the systemic relationship between mass media development, urbanism and education, he consciously excepted the Soviet Union, as a case where the media are "a social commodity [which is] taken out of the economic market place."⁴⁴

Of course, by saying that its media technology resembles that of noncommunist industrial societies, we do not imply that other aspects of the Soviet media system do also. The most important difference can be summed up under the heading of Party control of the media. No attempt is made on the part of Soviet communicators to present the media as independent (although every claim is made that they are "objective"). The particular developments that we have sketched in this paper have indeed been to a large extent in the direction of making the Soviet case more similar to that of Western

industrialized societies. They should therefore be examined in the light of the relationship between the Party and the media. Our conclusion is not that the Party is losing control of the media, only that certain tensions exist for the communicators, as they are trying to elicit, respond to and make use of the audience's preferences.

One consequence of the Party control exercised over the Soviet media is their uniformity throughout the country. We did not elaborate on the well known facts of uniform media policies and centralized news agencies. But we observed that one of the main ways in which the Soviet media contribute to unifying the country is by the existence and wide distribution of the central media themselves. These media, which are the most authoritative and for many types of news the most interesting, penetrate every republic. Central newspapers are read especially by the most educated segment of the population. The trend over the last decade has been a disproportionate growth of the central media, as compared to the regional media.

The mass media on all levels acts as unifiers of the country also by virtue of the languages they use. A Russian national is able to consume the media in his language wherever he goes in the Soviet Union, just as he is able to send his children to Russian language schools. But he is the only one for whom this holds. A Latvian who moves to Kazakhstan has the choice between Kazakh and Russian in media consumption, in his daily affairs and in the choice of a school for his children, and more likely than not he will choose Russian over Kazakh. Also, anybody (except the very old) who has a higher education knows Russian, and, as we have indicated, he is more likely than a less educated person to read central newspapers, which are *only* in Russian.

Patterns of media exposure in the Soviet Union are coming to resemble more closely those observed in the West. In particular, we can point to the heavy use made of the print media by the most educated as compared to the lower educational groups, and to the absence of such differences in the case of radio. If we had measures of average time expenditure on television watching (as opposed to exposure frequencies) by education, we would very likely find that the heaviest viewing takes place in the lower educational groups.

The purpose of the Soviet media is to help the effort of communist construction, by inculcating correct attitudes, by elucidating policies, and so forth; their function is not to provide information that is irrelevant or opposed to this effort, nor were the mass media conceived of as sources of entertainment *per se*. But it appears that the Soviet citizen is nevertheless in the process of acquiring the same new human right that Lerner observed the American citizen had quietly acquired: "the right to be constantly entertained."⁴⁵ It remains to be seen how easily it will be possible to follow one Soviet investigator's prescription that full use be made in the propaganda effort of television's entertainment quality. Also, the demand for speed and spontaneity of the fare provided on the electronic media is bound to produce tensions for the communicator. Careful self-monitoring is more difficult under these conditions, yet the audience's loyalty seems to be based in good part on these features of the media.

Soviet studies of the media audiences are of interest to us both as data sources and as indicators of some of the questions Soviet communicators consider today when they address themselves to the problem that every communicator has: how to keep and to extend his audience. Some of these concerns seem to follow rather directly from the radical expansion of the media system that has taken place. The potential to create a situation of choice for the Soviet media consumer has never been so large as it is today. And he demands that it be utilized. (An important factor in bringing about today's situation seems to have been, indeed, the choice offered by foreign media — essentially foreign radio — at the time when the Soviet media were still much more uniform and dull than they are today.⁴⁶) The development of Soviet audience studies that we have been able to observe so far indicates that if these studies continue to be undertaken, we shall probably not be able to look to them, at least in the near future, for breakthroughs in communications research methodology, but that they will provide us with very useful substantive results. To learn about many aspects of Soviet audience behavior such studies will be at least as useful as time consuming and costly surveys of inevitably small and nonrandomly selected groups of emigrés, defectors and visitors. The fact that results obtained from both types of inquiries show so much consistency, however, strengthens our confidence in both.

Footnotes

¹ These elements of the philosophy underlying the Soviet communications system are discussed in Ithiel de Sola Pool, "The Mass Media and Politics in the Modernization Process," in Lucian W. Pye, ed., *Communications and Political Development*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963, pp. 238-241, and the works cited *ibid.*, p. 239, footnote 4. See also Frederick Williams, "The Soviet Philosophy of Broadcasting," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, VI (Winter 1961-62), pp. 3-10. For an extensive discussion of Soviet media facilities see Mark W. Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, New York: Pegasus, 1970. Two earlier studies are Alex Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950; and Inkeles, A., "Domestic Broadcasting in the U.S.S.R.," in Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton, eds., *Communications Research 1948-1949*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949, pp. 223-293.

² These data were gathered by the ComCom Project at M.I.T., under the direction of Professor Ithiel de Sola Pool. Respondents (N-107) who had left the Soviet Union between 1956 and 1966 were interviewed in Europe and the United States using a structured interview schedule ("Leisure Study"). A series of less structured, more intensive interviews dealing with various psychological aspects of media use were undertaken separately with 43 respondents by this author.

³ *Mass Media in the Developing Countries*, UNESCO, Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, No. 33, 1961, p. 16, cited in Herbert Hyman, "Mass Media and Political Socialization: The Role of Patterns of Communication," in Pye, *Communication and Political Development*, p. 143. Note that the Soviet figures for radio and television sets should be discounted somewhat, because of sets in need of repair. This explains why in 1968 *Pravda* registered "almost 48 million wave radio sets," while *Izvestia* talked about 42 million "functioning" sets. ("Without Paper, Without Distance," *Pravda*, May 7, 1968, p. 3; and "Radioelectronics and Society," *Izvestia*, May 7, 1968, p. 1.) Regarding television sets, see "Stolen Joy," *Sel'skaya zhizn (Country Life)*, March 30, 1967, p. 3.

⁴ 41,400,000. Source: see note f to Table I.

⁵ The figure of 123 million in reach of television is given in Leonid Maksakov, "Radio and TV March Ahead," *Moscow News*, No. 18, 1969, p. 15. The Soviet population was estimated at 237.8 million for July 1, 1968, in *The National Economy of the USSR in 1967*, p. 7.

⁶ "Tribune for Millions," *Pravda*, May 7, 1969, p. 1.

⁷ Another quarter cited constraining living conditions. However, only 270 out of the 1,916 respondents had no set at home, a fact which undoubtedly reflects the skewed nature of the sample with regard to respondents' socioeconomic status. The poll is reported in Boris Firsov, "There Is No Average Viewer," *Zhurnal'ist (Journalist)*, No. 12, 1967, pp. 42-45.

⁸ L. Kogan, "We and Contemporary Television," *Sovetskoe radio i televizionie (Soviet Radio and Television)*, 1969, No. 1, p. 24, citing an analysis in V. Sappak, *Televizionie i my (Television and Us)*.

⁹ Examples were provided during the Czechoslovak crisis in 1968. U.S. monitoring services recorded several news items that were broadcast by Radio

Moscow only once and were then withdrawn, not, it seems, because they were superseded by more important and timely news, but because they were censored. (For example, on the evening of June 30, a broadcast stating that the Warsaw Pact maneuvers in Czechoslovakia had ended.)

¹⁰ A new policy was explicitly stated in 1960, when a resolution of the Central Committee instructed TASS to transmit news immediately to central and local radio stations, stressing that radio should give the population the important news before the newspapers do. Concern with competition from foreign radio was explicitly mentioned as a factor in this decision. ("On Improving Soviet Radio Broadcasting and on Further Developing Television," *Partiinaya zhizn* [Party Life], No. 4 [1960], pp. 26-34; translated in the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 12 [1960], No. 10, pp. 18-21.)

¹¹ Pavel Gurevich, "Desire for Information," *Zhurnalists*, 8 (1969), p. 62.

¹² There are some minor exceptions, which need not concern us here: the central newspaper *Moscow News* appears in English, Spanish, German, and French (with very small circulation). And, according to the 1964 edition of the *World Radio and TV Handbook*, German was used in domestic central radio broadcasts to Siberia, Kazakhstan, Ural and Altai (Copenhagen: O. Lund Johansen Ltd., 1964, p. 127).

¹³ "Tribune for Millions," *Pravda*, May 7, 1969, p. 1.

¹⁴ I. Bogdanov and B. Vyazemskiy, *Spravochnik zhurnalista* (Journalist's Handbook), Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1965 (second edition), pp. 187-188.

¹⁵ Calculated on the basis of figures in *The Press of the Soviet Union in 1967*, pp. 65-66.

¹⁶ ". . . almost 53% of the total circulation of central newspapers published in Moscow is printed in localities throughout the country and delivered to subscribers at the same time that residents of the capital receive their copies." (K. Sergeichuck, "The Goal is Maximum Speed and Reliability." *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta* [Economic Gazette], 1969, No. 28, p. 6; translated in the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 21 [1969], No. 27, p. 24.) In 1963, one-third of *Pravda's* circulation was printed in Moscow, the remaining two-thirds in 26 cities of the R.S.F.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R., the Belorussian, Kazakh, Uzbek, Azerbaidzhanian, Georgian, and Lithuanian S.S.R. ("The Press in Figures," *Sovetskaya pechat'* [The Soviet Press], 1963, No. 4, p. 23.)

¹⁷ We analyzed data for 1957 and 1964. 1964 was the most recent year for which data were available at the time at which the analysis was undertaken; 1957 was a year for which we had additional data that were not available for other years. For 1964 the correlation between volume of republic (and autonomous republic) level newspapers and percent population of Russian nationality in the republic (which we used as an indicator—admittedly rough—of language use in media consumption) was statistically significant: $r = -.569$, $p < .05$; controlling for urbanism, $r = -.687$, $p < .01$; but the correlation between volume of newspapers below the republic level and the same indicator of use of Russian was not: $r = .374$, $p > .10$; when controlling for urbanism, $r = .185$, $p > .50$ ($N = 15$). See Rosemarie Rogers, "The Soviet Audience: How It Uses the Mass Media," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1967, pp. 37-49, for a detailed presentation of this analysis and that of the 1957 data, which provided additional indicators of language use and in which the relevant correlations reached still higher statistical significance ($p < .002$). It is not possible to discuss here the various indicators of language, education and urbanism we used. Since the

summary volume of the 1959 Soviet census does not give data on language use by republic, we chose for part of our analysis nationality as a rough indicator of language use.

¹⁸ Alex Inkeles and Raymond A. Bauer, *The Soviet Citizen: Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 165.

¹⁹ B. Grushin, "How You Spend Your Free Time," *Komsomol'skaya pravda* (*Komsomol Truth*), February 24-26, 1966.

²⁰ A study of the time budgets of the adult population of the city of Pskov provides data on the percentage of respondents engaging in various activities (including media consumption) *on a given day*. However, most of these results still remain unpublished. For preliminary results, see Alexander Szalai et al., "The Multinational Comparative Time Budget Research Project," *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 10 (1966), No. 4, entire issue and Statistical Appendix.

²¹ Two samples were used. A stratified quasi-random sample of the Soviet population consisted of 2,730 respondents, a second, self-selected sample from readers of the newspaper, in which men, young people, and the more educated were disproportionately represented, consisted of 10,392 respondents. In the presentation of the findings both samples apparently were combined.

²² See, for example, M. P. Goncharenko et al., "Methodology and Some Results of Concrete Social Research of Workers' Time Budgets," *Nauchnye doklady vysshei shkoly: Filosofskie nauki* (*Higher Education Scientific Reports: Philosophical Sciences*), 1963, No. 1, pp. 35, 37.

Note that with a few exceptions the usefulness of Soviet time budget studies to the student of media behavior is generally limited by the types of categories used (media behavior is often grouped together with other activities), the lack of attention paid to secondary activities, inadequate description of samples, and the fact that the findings tend to be presented in series of simple cross-tabulations, without appropriate controls. For an evaluation of the relevance of Soviet time budget studies (up to 1966) to the study of communications behavior in the Soviet Union, see Rogers, "The Soviet Audience," Appendix A ("A Note on Soviet Time Budget Studies"), pp. 290-296.

²³ Rosemarie Rogers, "Education and Political Involvement in USSR Elite Newspaper Reading," *Journalism Quarterly*, 47, No. 4 (Winter 1970) pp. 735-45.

²⁴ Leisure Study interviews, *Komsomol'skaya pravda* polls, unpublished tables from the Pskov study of the Multinational Comparative Time Budget Research Project.

²⁵ A detailed discussion of the age variable in the Harvard study, the Leisure Study interviews, the *Komsomol'skaya pravda* polls and a number of time budget studies is given in Rogers, "The Soviet Audience," *op. cit.*, pp. 58-64.

²⁶ For example, when ceilings on newspaper subscriptions were lifted around 1960, the circulation of a number of newspapers that were rather well liked by the audience rose considerably. The most dramatic increase occurred with *Izvestia's* circulation: from 2.3 million in 1961 to 8.3 million in 1965. See Bogdanov, *Journalist's Handbook*, *op. cit.*, 1961, p. 77, and 1965, p. 85.

²⁷ Estimates for 1959 were calculated from the 1959 Soviet census by John F. Kramer, "The Population of the Soviet Union, Broken by Age, Sex, Urban-Rural, Education, and Social Class," Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for International Studies, 1965 (mimeo.). 1967 estimates were

derived by this author from data in *The National Economy of the USSR in 1967*, pp. 7-38.

²⁸ Ch. V in Rogers, "The Soviet Audience," *op. cit.*, is devoted to this topic.

²⁹ Already in 1959 there were as many as 33 Pioneer newspapers/100 people in the age group 10-15, and 13 Komsomol newspapers/100 people in the age group 16-28. Between 1959 and 1967 the per issue circulation of Pioneer newspapers rose from 5.66 million to 17.118 million, that of Komsomol papers rose from 6.94 million to 13.175 million. (*The Soviet Press in 1967*, p. 70.)

³⁰ Kogan, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

³¹ V. N. Yaroshenko, "Soviet Radio: Is Anyone Listening?," *Vestnik Moskovskovo Universiteta: Seriya XI, Zhurnalistika (Moscow University Bulletin: Series XI, Journalism)*, 1966, No. 1, translated in *The Soviet Press: A Selection of Articles on Mass Communications in the Soviet Union*, Vol. 5 (1967-1968), No. 2, pp. 37-40.

³² "Poll of *Izvestia* Readers," *Nedelya*, No. 11, March 5-11, 1967, p. 4, and *CDSP*, Vol. 19 (1967), No. 16, pp. 27, 34; "Izvestia Studies Its Readers," *Zhurnalst*, No. 2, 1968, pp. 23-25; V. Davydchenkov and L. Karpinsky, "The Reader and the Newspaper," *Izvestia*, July 11, 1968, p. 5, July 12, 1968, p. 3, and *CDSP*, Vol. 20 (1968), No. 28, pp. 17-18, 33; "The Reader About Himself and His Newspaper," *Komsomol'skaya pravda*, October 12, 1966.

³³ See the discussion in Yaroshenko, *op. cit.* The article criticizes the lack of methodological sophistication of a number of Soviet radio audience studies.

³⁴ Kogan's work, for example, follows Belson's studies in England.

³⁵ See, for example, Gurevich, *op. cit.*, p. 61. (This article is particularly concerned with consumption of international news.)

³⁶ Kogan, *op. cit.*, p. 24 (Table #3).

³⁷ Firsov, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

³⁸ Davydchenkov and Karpinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 18 of *CDSP* translation. On this point, see also Firsov.

³⁹ Kogan, *op. cit.*, p. 23. See also the discussion in Wilson P. Dizard, *Television: A World View*, Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1966, p. 183.

⁴⁰ Gurevich, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁴¹ Yaroshenko, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁴² Kogan, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁴³ The point was made parenthetically when we noted that statistically significant correlations were observed between volume of regional newspapers below the republic level and indicators of education and urbanism for the 15 Soviet republics.

⁴⁴ Daniel Lerner, "Toward a Communication Theory of Modernization: A Set of Considerations," in Pye, ed., *Communications and Political Development*, p. 336. See also *The Passing of Traditional Society*, New York: The Free Press, 1958, Ch. II.

⁴⁵ Daniel Lerner, "Comfort and Fun: Morality in a Nice Society," *The American Scholar*, 27 (1958), No. 2, pp. 153-165.

⁴⁶ See footnote 10. Ithiel de Sola Pool discussed the role of competition from foreign radio in inducing change in the Soviet media in "Opportunities for Change: Communications With The U.S.S.R.," paper delivered at the Workshop on Communications with the Peoples of the U.S.S.R., Radio Liberty — New York University, November 20, 1965.

NEAL T. WEINTRAUB

Some Meanings Radio Has for Teenagers

Although a mass medium, radio serves different needs of different sorts of people—intentionally and unintentionally. Programmers and advertisers obviously need to construct and select their messages with care so that they will reach and serve the desired audience—and research such as the following may shed some light on a large and important part of the radio audience. Neal T. Weintraub is a writer-producer at Advertising Division Inc. in Chicago. This article is based on Mr. Weintraub's M.A. thesis in journalism, completed at Ohio State University under the direction of Dr. Galen Rarick and funded by a Research Grant from the National Association of Broadcasters.

ALTHOUGH station managers and advertising agencies have considered some of the economic functions radio serves for teenagers, little research has been devoted to the social or psychological aspects of the medium. Today, more than 15% of the radio listening population is composed of teenagers¹ and, in many markets, four or more AM stations compete for their attention.

Harold Mendelsohn, by examining the various subaudiences of radio (circa 1960), isolated some of these psychological meanings. He concluded that: "To the teenager who is often particularly in need of approved social cues, radio's role in providing him with such cues is significant."² Mendelsohn identified three psychological functions of radio for people of various ages: (1) utilitarian information and news function; (2) mood accompaniment; and (3) psychological release.³

Verling C. Troidahl and Roger Skolnik in their factor-analytic study of "The Meanings People Have for Radio" isolated six dimen-

sions of meaning among heads of households in Lansing, Michigan. These dimensions and the percentage of the total variance that each accounted for, were companionship (12%); programming evaluation (10%); worldly awareness (7%); portability (8%); pleasant environment (7%); and abrasiveness (7%).⁴

Method

The data for the present study were collected in three stages. The first stage was a non-directive telephone interview. The purpose of this exploratory interview was to get 60 teenagers in the Columbus, Ohio metropolitan area to talk about radio, so that the researcher could determine what kinds of items would be appropriate in the final stage of data collection. Three questions were asked of each teenager: (1) When you think of radio, what pops into your mind? (2) How, if at all, do you think your life would be different if there were no radio? and (3) How would you compare a radio station that you might run with the ones you presently listen to? The same questions were asked of 30 students at the Ohio State University who were not from Columbus. Students between 17 and 19 years of age were interviewed by telephone. Selection was made by choosing every 200th name from dormitory resident lists. These students were from farms, small towns, and cities; most of them were from Ohio, but a few were not. No meaningful differences between response themes of the two groups were noted.

At the second stage, as in the Troidahl-Skolnik study, a content analysis was made of the responses. This analysis produced a list of statements categorized by theme. From this list, 20 statements were selected that typified themes produced in the non-directive interviews. The statements were chosen by the author and Dr. Galen R. Rarick, graduate chairman of the School of Journalism at Ohio State University so as to include as heterogeneous a list of ideas about radio as could be derived from the responses of the teenagers. Four statements from the Troidahl-Skolnik study were added for use in the final stage of data collection because they had heavy loadings on factors reported in that study and because, at a manifest level, they had somewhat different meanings than did those derived from the non-directive interviews.

Consequently, the 24 statements were not a random sample, since only two or three of them represented each of the most common factors, instead of there being a large number of items reflecting the frequency of mention of each theme. The sample included both positive and negative statements. It should be emphasized that items were selected on the basis of manifest content rather than on the basis of reliability estimates. However, reliability of measurement was high enough to show many product-moment correlations between items of the magnitude of .3 to .4. Every item correlated with at least one other item at the level of .2 or higher. Correlations of this magnitude could not have been attained if the separate item reliabilities were of zero order. The reliability of measurement of the items was sufficient to produce a correlation matrix from which a factor analysis accounted for 53% of the variance.

The resulting questionnaire was administered in two high schools drawing students of different socio-economic levels in each of the metropolitan areas of Columbus, Chicago, and Philadelphia. Since this study was not intended to establish population parameters, the study did not go to the extra time and expense of drawing a probability sample of teenagers. Even so, the sample includes roughly equal numbers of males and females of widely varying socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. The purpose of the study was to determine psychological meanings of radio for teenagers. It was not intended that the study would show precisely what percentage of teenagers possessed each of these meanings.

The number of respondents in each high school varied from 82 to 98, with the result that the data were collected from a total of 350 teenagers. Each student responded to each of 24 statements by indicating, on a five-point scale, to what degree he agreed or disagreed with it. A factor analysis of the data was employed to identify response patterns from which radio's "psychological meanings" for teenagers might be inferred. A principle factor solution with varimax rotation was used.⁵

Findings

A little more than half of the variability was accounted for in eight general patterns of response. The 24 items and their primary and secondary factor loadings are given in Table I. A brief discussion of each factor follows:

Verbal Personality: This clustering of six items suggests that teenagers are very conscious of the verbal personality of radio. The items with high loadings on this factor concern disc jockeys, commercials, contests and talk. This pattern suggests that teenagers respond to what is termed "personality radio." Teenagers tend not to think that "better DJs" are needed or that there should be fewer commercials, contests or "dumb jokes." Furthermore, they do not want "less talk and more music." Instead, they tend to be pleased with "DJ chatter" and say they would run a radio station "the same as the station I listen to now."

Relevancy: This factor deals with the notion of making radio meaningful to the teenager. Teenagers want radio to deal with the problems facing their generation. Though they want a greater variety of music on radio, they also say that "radio stations should realize that teenagers could like other things on radio besides music." Among the "other things" they want is "better news coverage."

Worldly Awareness: This pattern of response suggests that radio serves an awareness function for teenagers. Radio makes the day go faster and tells "what's happening." And, say many teenagers, "without radio, I wouldn't get as much news." As one teenager stated in the open-ended interviewing, "Radio is a quick way to find out what's going on without really being bored."

Source-Message Distinction: This dimension reveals that teenagers draw a distinction between the DJs and radio. DJs and radio do not appear to mean the same thing to the teenager. Only one item had its primary loading on this factor. Five items, however, had secondary loadings on this factor, and in three instances, the loadings approached the magnitude of .4. These five items deal with such subjects as radio commercials, DJs, news and music. Apparently, teenagers make a distinction between the source and the message aspects of radio.

Portability: This pattern of response deals with comments on radio's portability. While teenagers in this group did not think that the music on radio is rotten or that radio should "serve God more," they liked the fact that radio can be taken with you and said it is important to have a portable radio in times of emergency.

Programming Evaluation: The two items with primary loadings on this factor concern radio's programming content. Teenagers said that most of the time they find radio wholesome and that radio should give the time and weather more often.

Time Filling: Teenagers said, "If there were no radio, I would watch more television" and would "listen to records." Some teenagers perceive radio as a time filler and do not seem to be concerned with what it has to offer in the way of meaningful content. These persons are different from those who use radio to make the day go faster in that teenagers who listen to radio to fill time do not appear to be concerned with the content.

Music: Teenagers said, "radio and music mean the same thing to me, and my life would be different without radio." This factor suggests radio is more than an alternative to records or cassettes.

Comparison with Adults

A meaningful comparison can be made of the factors revealed in this study and those observed in the Troidahl-Skolnik study of adults.

TABLE 1
Comparison between Adults and Teenagers

| Troidahl & Skolnik (Adults) | | Weintraub (Teenagers) | |
|--------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|
| Companionship | 12% | Verbal Personality | 13% |
| Programming Evaluation | 10% | Programming Evaluation | 5% |
| Worldly Awareness | 7% | Worldly Awareness | 7% |
| Portability | 8% | Portability | 5% |
| Pleasant Environment | 7% | Source-Message Distinction | 6% |
| Abrasiveness | 7% | Relevancy | 8% |
| | | Time Filling | 5% |
| | | Music | 4% |
| (Variance explained) | 51% | | 53% |

While the dimension of companionship explained the most variance in the study of adults, no such factor was found for teenagers. This was true in spite of the great similarity of items in the two studies. The companionship factor in the adult study included—among other items—the following statements: “Radio makes the time go faster for me;” “Most of the time, I find radio wholesome;” and “I like the chatter on radio . . . it makes the day brighter.” In the teenage study, the worldly awareness factor included this item: “The day goes faster when I listen to radio.” The programming evaluation factor included this item: “I would say most of the time I find radio wholesome.” And the verbal personality factor included this item: “I like the DJ chatter on radio . . . it makes my day brighter.” Troidahl and Skolnik found an “abrasive” factor for adults, but no such factor emerged from teenage responses. Factors of music, time-filling, source-message distinction, and verbal personality were discovered among teenagers, but were not observed for adults. Factors in common to the two studies were programming evaluation, worldly awareness, and portability.

The data suggest many problems for further, more definitive research. Among them would be the determination of to what degree individual radio stations serving teenagers provide programming relevant to their needs, how teenage subaudiences are served by radio, and how radio station management could serve the needs of the teenage audience.

Footnotes

¹ American Research Bureau, “Radio Market Audience Estimates,” Detroit, San Antonio, Indianapolis, Chicago (October/November, 1970).

² Harold Mendelsohn, “Listening to Radio,” in *People, Society, and Mass Communications*, ed. Lewis Dexter and David M. White (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1966), 245.

³ Mendelsohn, *op. cit.*, 247.

⁴ Verling C. Troidahl and Roger Skolnik, “The Meanings People Have for Radio,” *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, XII:1:57-67 (Winter, 1967-68).

⁵ Copies of the factor-loadings table may be obtained from the author at 8815 Ewing, Evanston, Illinois 60203.

RICHARD H. DAVIS

Television and the Older Adult

Richard Davis is Publications Editor for the Gerontology Center at the University of Southern California, and is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Telecommunications in the same institution.

MUCH attention has been directed toward investigating the influence of television in the lives of that large and willing audience, the children. Another large and willing audience for television is one that is more often overlooked—the elderly. Census figures for 1966 indicate that there were then 18.5 million Americans age 65 and above, representing approximately 9.4% of the total population.¹ As the rate of longevity continually increases, it can be assumed that the 1970 census will reveal even a larger elderly population. As it is, the current age 65+ population exceeds the total population of the 20 smallest states. This is a significant audience. It is for the purpose of investigating the place of television in the lives of an older audience that this study was conducted.

Methodology

A questionnaire was distributed to members of the American Association of Retired Persons (age ranges 55-80) all living in greater Long Beach, California. The sample was chosen from those living in private housing, since such living accommodations, rather than nursing homes, retirement communities, etc., are representative of the norm for the age category.² The survey was taken in December of 1969 when it was felt that the new viewing season had been sufficiently established for viewing habits to be fairly stabilized.

Slightly more than 350 questionnaires were distributed to participants at "The Institute of Lifetime Learning" in Long Beach. Almost 50%, or 174, were returned. Eight of these returns proved to be useless, since the respondents did not own television sets. This made 166 the base number for tabulation purposes. No follow-up study was made to determine how non-respondents differ from respondents. Questionnaires were coded for data processing; punch cards were made and fed to an IBM sorter for numerical analysis. The questionnaire dealt with four areas: (1) demographics, (2) television use and viewing habits, (3) program preferences, and (4) attitudes and opinions. A total of thirty questions was asked. The project was regarded as an exploratory effort, concerned primarily with obtaining a quantitative description of findings that could lend itself to some interpretation. More important, some implications were identified and questions were generated.

Results

The study population. The 174 elderly respondents consisted of 39 males and 135 females. This disparity reflects not only the greater number of females in the elderly population, but also the demonstrated tendency for the wife in the family unit to honor requests for information such as this questionnaire. 74% of the study population was over the age of 66. That 28% of the study population was *over* the age of 75 further emphasizes the fact that the results reflected the orientation to television of a large group of people who, unlike that other captive audience, the children, have long ago formed their personalities and relationships with environmental factors. 54% of the population lived alone. A demographic factor not representative of the general aged population was the education level. This sample population evidenced 53% claiming additional education beyond high school. It can be assumed that these demographics, among others, help to influence viewing habits and attitudes.

Viewing habits. An overwhelming majority (75%) of viewers indicated that they watched television five hours or less per week. Since the weekly average according to the December, 1969, Neilsen national survey is 26:52 hours for males over 50 and 33:33 for

females over 50,³ one may question this response. In other respects, the older population reported a viewing pattern quite similar to that of the national trends as reported by Nielsen. Viewing was lowest in early morning and built rapidly toward the middle of the day. By evening the older audience had doubled its size, reaching its peak between 8 and 9 p.m. Viewing trends by days of the week also reflected national norms.

Program preferences. The elderly viewers were asked to choose and rank their three top preferences from a list of ten program types.⁴ Respondents indicated their three top choices of program type to be: (1) news and public affairs, (2) educational programs, and, (3) travelogues. As a check against this, respondents were also asked to list by title (or starring personality) their favorite shows. These specific indications were then categorized into the same ten program types presented earlier to the respondents. In this latter instance the three top choices as identified by specific listing were (1) news and public affairs, (2) music and, (3) drama.

Of the top 15 programs listed by Nielsen in the 1969 national survey, only four were listed by the elderly as being among their top preferences. These four were: "Bonanza," "Red Skelton," "Mayberry, RFD," and "Gunsmoke."⁵ The elderly sample was asked in another open-end question to list their favorite television performers and personalities. A wide variety of responses (246 separate names) indicated no clear-cut viewer favorite. However, receiving 10% or more of viewer recognition were Lawrence Welk, Bob Hope, Walter Cronkite and George Putnam, a local newscaster.

Audience opinion. Respondents were asked to make subjective evaluations on aspects of television in their lives. A majority of 64.5% classified television as being "satisfactory" to them. The companionship service of television was recognized by 63.3% most of whom termed this a moderate to strong function. Older viewers overwhelmingly (77.7%) denied the influence of television advertising on their buying habits.

A comparison between the 1968 Roper national sample (145 total mentions) and the current study (158 total mentions) on selection of sources of most news indicated a similarity in rank

ordering of television, newspapers, radio, and magazines as first, second, third and fourth choice respectively. A disparity in the two samples existed in the proportion of persons using radio as a primary news source. Significantly fewer of the elderly indicated that they utilized this source. When asked if the image of older persons was presented factually and honestly on television, the majority (44.6%) of those who answered the question indicated that it was. Exception was taken to the presentation of the older person in commercials, with 48.7% indicating negative response to this image.

The audience sampled was given an opportunity through an open-end question to identify areas of programming they found less than satisfactory. There were three areas of lack which could be categorized from their statements: educational, musical and philosophical (that is, programs dealing with problem-solving techniques and concerns with various aspects of the human condition). Another open-end question allowed for the specification of program materials judged to be objectionable by the elderly respondents. 48% of the sample indicated objections to program content. Violence, sex, commercials, and "over-exposure" of minorities were the prevalent objections. Finally, the older audience indicated a feeling that their needs, as they saw them, were not adequately met through current television programming. They requested more information, but in most cases were vague as to the specific information needed.

Discussion

Any segment of the audience brings to the viewing situation its own particular set of biases and social and psychological conditioning. Results of this survey of this sample verified previous research demonstrating that an elderly audience tends to accept television and to depend on it to serve companionship and information functions in their lives.⁶ Additionally, there is evidence to support a contention that it serves to separate the day into meaningful time segments. The study also revealed that in areas of opinion and attitude as well as viewing patterns this elderly sample reflected, but did not completely coincide with national norms. In the area of program preferences what may be an age-related difference was indicated.

The conclusions to be reached from such an inquiry and, more especially, the implications, are of much greater interest than the

gross figures and raw data generated by the study. Here is an audience representative of a large group of people who have lived through many, many sociological and technological changes with television being a comparatively recent environmental influence in their lives. It might be expected that attitudes and opinions about television as well as the use of television in general would reflect a very different orientation than would be representative of a much younger sample. But how much of a "generation gap" does exist?

The older population reported a set of viewing patterns similar, if not identical, to national norms. Behavioral patterns which are not identified with "old age" are more acceptable in our society; the continuance of middle age activities and attitudes is encouraged.⁷ Television viewing is one activity that can be easily carried from middle age into old age without drastic curtailment.

Other studies⁸ have demonstrated the older audience's preference for news and public affairs programs. The older adult in the present study indicated a desire to "keep up with things." Marginal (and unsolicited) commentary abounded, indicating a preference for what the older audience could identify as relevant and meaningful in programs. This attitude is reflective of a sample which may not be completely representative of the total elderly population. The respondents were largely self-selective and were taken from a large group of comparatively well-educated, active and involved senior citizens. Nevertheless, the popular and often erroneous concept of the elderly as a group consciously disengaging and withdrawing from social involvement is not supported by the responses given in this survey. However, these older adults do not respond that the prevalent themes of romantic love and violence, both strongly related to youth, are of interest to them; they indicate that much of what they are offered on television is irrelevant and not pertinent to their lives. Thus they choose to watch current news and factual programs such as travelogues and documentaries. For escape viewing they prefer those comedy figures who represent "the good old days": Skelton, Benny, Hope and "Lucy" Ball.

The older audience has been labeled "embracers,"⁹ viewers who accept without excessive question or criticism all that is offered on television. Although respondents in the present sample voiced general dissatisfaction with programming and subject matter available

on television, by and large they confirmed such a labeling. More than half of the sample indicated that they were satisfied with television, then they proceeded to detail dissatisfactions. This is not so incongruous as it may seem. The audience evidently felt that whatever its faults, having television is more satisfactory than not having it. Still, like all viewers, they had complaints. Most complaints were predictable and perhaps can be explained by the conditioning that stems from exposure to social criticism. Everyone has been indoctrinated; violence and sex are "bad"; therefore, television is bad when it deals with violence and sex. At least it seems that these older viewers are prone to accept this reasoning.

An additional cultural bias may reflect both the age category and the socio-economic category of the survey sample. A significant percent of respondents identified Negroes and "hippies" as being given more television coverage than they felt was warranted. The social order is not static. Perhaps the threat of change is greater for an older population. It would be interesting to compare the attitudes toward these and other aspects of television with those of a much younger group in the same community.

In addition, respondents apparently accepted the visual and behavioral definition of older people as they appear in current television formats. An interesting speculation is that people are molded to a great extent by the media that serves them. Identity is derived in part from definitions society provides. As the housewife or teenager is influenced to adapt herself to the image of her counterpart that she sees portrayed on the television screen, so might the elderly person relate positively to the image presented of himself. Information (and character definition is information) gains legitimacy through exposure via mass media. In a developmental stage such as old age where our society has not established set behavior norms, an available and powerful source of reference will be television. Investigation has been devoted to the influence of violence on behavior; one may wonder what are the more subtle, but more pervasive influences on behavior patterns in audiences who are seeking role definition.

Finally, this older audience requested more programming of an informative or educational nature. Perhaps this more mature audience attributes greater value to that which can be readily identified as

practical information rather than that which seems to have only an entertainment function. What opportunity has an older audience to have communicated to them information about Social Security, Medicare, recreation availability and so forth? A *Sesame Street* may give four-year old viewers some valuable tools for living. Where is a *Sunset Street* to give similar tools to a 74-year old?

Footnotes

¹ Brotman, H. B., *Memorandum from Administration on Aging*, October 28, 1966, Washington, D.C.

² Brotman, H. B., *A Profile of the Older American*, paper presented at the Conference on the Consumer Problems of Older People at the Hudson Guild-Fulton Center, New York City, October, 1967.

³ A. C. Nielsen Company, *Nielsen TV 1970*, Media Research Division, Chicago, Ill. 1970. (The Los Angeles office of the A. C. Nielsen Company estimates that the September, 1970, national average of weekly viewing for all adults over 50 is 30 hours.)

⁴ The ten program types were arbitrarily defined as: comedies, documentaries, dramas, educational or instructional programs, movies, news and public affairs, sports, "specials," travelogues, and variety shows.

⁵ Although it would be interesting to make additional comparisons of older audience preferences with a wider local sample, useable local market demographics for an over 50 age group audience are not provided as part of the regular Nielsen station index of average television audience estimates. Nor is there an attempt to break down on a local basis the "top 15" favorites, the assumption being that they will coincide in this market with the national ranking.

⁶ Few in-depth studies have been made of this aspect of audience survey. Several researchers have incorporated information regarding the older audience into related research problems. Of most significance are these:

Glick, I. D. and S. J. Levy. *Living with Television*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1962.

Myersohn, R. B. "A critical examination of commercial entertainment," in R. W. Kleemeier, (Ed.), *Aging and Leisure*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Schalinsie, T. F. "The Role of Television in the Life of the Aged Person." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1968, 29 (3, pt. 1) 989-990.

Steiner, G. A. *The People Look at Television*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Tennant, F. B., Jr. "A Descriptive Estimate of the Adequacy of Network Television Service to Older Viewers." Unpublished masters thesis, University of Southern California, 1965.

⁷ Glick and Levy, *op. cit.*, 55.

⁸ See especially: Tennant, *op. cit.* and Steiner, *op. cit.*

⁹ Glick and Levy, *op. cit.*, 46.

Individual Membership in APBE

Any individual with a concern for professional broadcasting education, as teacher, broadcaster or student, is eligible for Individual Membership in the Association for Professional Broadcasting Education. Many individuals who are affiliated with institutions that also belong to APBE nevertheless find it desirable to join APBE as Individual Members.

Individual Members will receive a subscription to the *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING* and copies of the member newsletter, *Feedback*, as well as other privileges. In addition they will be able to attend the annual meeting of APBE and NAB regional conferences as well as open sessions and exhibits of the NAB Annual Convention. Individual Memberships do not carry with them the right to attend NAB closed sessions or receive NAB membership materials.

Annual dues are now \$12.00. The membership year runs from April 1 through March 31, with applications received after the first of December normally credited to the following year. An Individual Member is entitled to all four issues of the *JOURNAL* volume year current during the first nine months of the membership year. Applications should be sent to, and further information and application forms obtained from, the Executive Secretary of APBE, Dr. Harold Niven, 1771 N Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

MALACHI C. TOPPING and LAWRENCE W. LICHTY

Political Programs on National Television Networks: 1968

In its Summer 1965 issue, the JOURNAL published a report on "Political Programs on National Television Networks: 1960 and 1964" by Lawrence Lichty, Joseph Ripley and Harrison Summers. This sequel, incorporating additional data, should be of interest and value to politicians, broadcasters, legislators and researchers—and is, we are glad to say, published well in advance of the 1972 campaigns. Dr. Malachi Topping is associate professor in the Speech Department (radio-television-film) of Bowling Green State University, and Dr. Lawrence Lichty is associate professor in the Communication Arts department of the University of Wisconsin.

BROADCAST advertising costs for the quadrennial madness of choosing a President have nearly doubled each election since 1960. In 1968 political advertising for programs was \$58,900,000—2% of radio and television network and station revenues. Nearly one-half (48.3%) of the total was spent on the Presidential campaign; 17.7% went for senatorial contests and 10.5% in governors' races.¹ This is a study of the use of network TV advertising for Presidential candidates in 1968. There were 67 days of general election activity—August 30 to November 4. This was just one more day than the 1964 campaign. In 1960 the campaign was 88 days.

Primary Elections

The general election itself was almost anti-climactic. It was a tragic political year. As early as May 1967, the stage was set. On CBS's *Town Meeting of the Air* Governor Ronald Reagan and Senator

Robert F. Kennedy "debated." Viewers frequently saw the two facing each other from opposite sides of a split screen, the continent, and political poles. According to *Newsweek*:²

Not since John F. Kennedy dueled Richard Nixon during the 1960 campaign had television boasted such a star-dusty political attraction—and viewers could be excused if they mistook the show for a dry run for some future set of Great Debates.

By November 1967 there had been two network documentaries on possible candidates and issues (ABC and NBC) and Governor George Romney had canceled a scheduled paid program (CBS) because he would not announce that he was a candidate for the Republican nomination as demanded by the network. In December President Lyndon Johnson sought support for his Vietnam policy in a speech before the AFL-CIO. The *New York Times* heard "the ring of a campaign speech, as if he were outlining his 1968 election theme."³ In a three-network interview December 19, Mr. Johnson talked of the "Kennedy-McCarthy movement." "Friends" of the President placed advertisements in the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Los Angeles Times* to promote the program. Senator Eugene McCarthy asked for "equal time" to reply—this was refused by the networks. The FCC agreed. Already a third party candidate—George Wallace—was campaigning in key states.⁴ McCarthy on November 30, 1967, had announced he was seeking the Democratic nomination to "challenge" the "President's position" on Vietnam. His "children's crusade" through New Hampshire for the first primary shook the administration. However, ". . . it can't be said that McCarthy's success in New Hampshire was entirely due to a spontaneous popular uprising. The McCarthy demeanor was made visible by a good amount of money put into simple, straightforward TV spots."⁵

By January 1968 possible candidates were visiting the talk shows. The day following the New Hampshire primary Walter Cronkite devoted more than half of the *CBS Evening News* to a live interview with Senator Kennedy. Three days later, March 13, in a three-network televised press conference, the Senator became a Democratic Presidential hopeful. The next day, Sunday, there was a game of musical chairs on the news interview programs. Producers substituted Kennedy on *Meet the Press*, McCarthy on *Face the Nation*, and Humphrey on *Issues and Answers*. On March 31, the Sunday

before the Wisconsin primary, President Johnson announced the cessation of bombing part of North Vietnam, and that he would not be a candidate. Primaries in Wisconsin, Indiana, Nebraska, Oregon, and California were interspersed with the assassination of Martin Luther King, the beginning of peace talks in Paris, and renewed street fighting in Saigon. In California on June 1, before the primary, Kennedy and McCarthy met on a special edition of *Issues and Answers*. A coup for ABC, it would be the only face-to-face "debate" of Presidential aspirants in 1968. The TV networks' coverage of the California primary turned into a death watch and then a funeral, as the American people were shocked by the assassination of Senator Kennedy. The three networks each provided 40 to 55 hours of coverage. The assassination brought a brief lull in the barrage of political programs.

In all, the networks broadcast 45 programs of news interviews, totaling more than 26 hours, with candidates and their supporters from January to the start of the general election. (See Table I.) There were more appearances by Democrats than Republicans, probably because there were more Democratic candidates and Nixon was reluctant to appear. The networks also broadcast 40 programs, nearly 27 hours, of news specials, documentaries, analysis, and roundups.⁶ This does not include the continual reporting of primary election tabulations. However, it includes several documentaries or roundups containing reports of primary tabulations. For example, on the evenings of several of the primary elections one or more of the networks presented, in addition to the vote tabulation, one-hour news specials reviewing the primary campaign. This round up category also includes news specials reviewing both Republican and Democratic platform hearings—but does not include the coverage of, or documentary reports about, the political conventions themselves.

The primary roundup category does not include the three networks' live coverage of press conferences of Humphrey and Kennedy saying they would be candidates.⁷ Rockefeller held two press conferences—first saying he would not run, then saying he would. Many of the news conferences were hastily called. Wallace introduced his running mate General Curtis LeMay to the press, and the General admitted he favored the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam if necessary. The

TABLE I
**Network Television Political Interviews, News Specials,
 Documentaries, Analyses, and Roundups
 during Primary Elections**

| | Political Party | | | Network | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|-----|
| | Rep | Dem | A I | ABC | CBS | NBC |
| INTERVIEWS* | | | | | | |
| Number | 17 | 25 | 3 | 20 | 12 | 13 |
| Total Minutes | 690 | 810 | 90 | 630 | 360 | 600 |
| OTHER** | | | | | | |
| Number | | | | 8 | 14 | 18 |
| Total Minutes | | | | 255 | 645 | 710 |

*Includes *Issues and Answers* (ABC), *Face the Nation* (CBS), and *Meet the Press* (NBC).

**News specials, documentaries, analyses, and roundups, including documentary or roundup coverage of primary races, but not the actual news reporting of primary results as they are tabulated.

governor quickly explained that the general had not meant what he said. The American Independent party, Wallace said, did not advocate the use of nuclear weapons. This category also does not include several live speeches by President Johnson. The interview programs in Table I refer only to the news interview-forum programs and, of course, do not include all of the interviews used as part of regular news (straight reporting) broadcast. Also, interviews on *Today* (NBC) are not tabulated.

During the primaries there was light use of TV network advertising. Republican candidates for the nomination purchased about 4½ hours of program time and 21 spot announcements. Democratic candidates purchased about half of that — 2 hours of time and 11 spots. In comparison, however, a great deal of money was spent for radio and television local time.⁸ (See Table III.) When the primary verbage had quieted, the Republicans had nominated Richard M. Nixon, who had been defeated eight years before, and Spiro T. Agnew, governor of Maryland. The Democrats at a stormy convention in Chicago chose

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and Senator Edmund Muskie, but the focus of the nation was on the confrontation along Michigan Boulevard between young people (mostly anti-war and all anti-Johnson) and the Chicago police. Wallace's American Independent Party nominated him; he chose LeMay as his vice-presidential candidate.

General Election

The pattern of program buying and of appearances on free programs by the candidates was markedly different. The Nixon forces, with planning that reached back to early spring, had the most controlled pattern of broadcasting exposure. The Democrats actually changed advertising agencies well into the campaign in September.⁹

FIVE-MINUTE PAID POLITICAL PROGRAMS

Republicans bought more five-minute network programs in 1968 than did the Democrats. (See Table II.) Nixon forces bought earlier and bought more programs—36 to 25. However, this did not match the 48 five-minute programs purchased for John Kennedy in 1960.¹⁰ The peak for such programs in 1968 was in late October.¹¹ The networks in 1968 offered special prices for these shorter programs. In fact, the five-minute programs averaged only about one-half the cost of one-minute spots in the same prime time periods. The networks explained that purchase of the five-minute program was the purchase of the time for a program, but that the purchase of a one-minute spot included the price of the entertainment program in which the spot was placed.¹² The most interesting placement of the five-minute programs was by the Democrats following *Dr. Strangelove*, the ABC Wednesday movie on October 9. The motion picture ends with a nuclear explosion. A Humphrey advertisement following the movie traced Humphrey's work for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Nixon's five-minute programs had the theme that "America is in trouble." His voice was used over stills and film clips reminding us of our greatness.

In the evening, the ratings for five-minute shows were higher than for 30-minute or longer political programs. The Arbitron rating is for 15-minute segments and thus the ratings for a five-minute political program include ten minutes of preceding entertainment.¹³

TABLE II
Programs and Announcements during
General Election Campaign

| | Political Party | | | Network | | |
|---|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Rep | Dem | A I | ABC | CBS | NBC |
| Five-Minute Paid Network Television Political Programs | | | | | | |
| DAYTIME (To 6:00 P.M.) | | | | | | |
| Number of Programs | 14 | 8 | — | — | 19 | 3 |
| Total Minutes | 70 | 40 | — | — | 95 | 15 |
| Average Cost | NA | NA | — | — | NA | NA |
| Average Rating* | 5 | 4 | — | — | 5 | 4 |
| Average HUT | 19 | 18 | — | — | 19 | 17 |
| Average Share | 28 | 24 | — | — | 27 | 25 |
| NIGHTTIME (After 6:00 P.M.) | | | | | | |
| Number of Programs | 22 | 17 | 9 | 10 | 31 | 7 |
| Total Minutes | 110 | 85 | 45 | 50 | 155 | 35 |
| Average Cost** | \$12,113 | \$12,400 | \$11,488 | \$11,170 | \$12,458 | \$11,733 |
| Average Rating* | 15 | 16 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 19 |
| Average HUT | 56 | 58 | 57 | 55 | 58 | 55 |
| Average Share | 26 | 28 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 35 |
| Longer Than Five-Minute Paid Network Television Political Programs | | | | | | |
| DAYTIME (To 6:00 P.M.) | | | | | | |
| Number of Programs | 4 | 2 | — | — | 2 | 4 |
| Total Minutes | 120 | 60 | — | — | 60 | 120 |
| Average Cost/ 30 Minutes*** | NA | NA | — | — | NA | NA |
| Average Rating* | 5 | 4 | — | — | 4 | 5 |
| Average HUT | 20 | 21 | — | — | 15 | 23 |
| Average Share | 25 | 19 | — | — | 27 | 22 |
| NIGHTTIME (After 6:00 P.M.) | | | | | | |
| Number of Programs | 9 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 13 |
| Total Minutes | 420 | 540 | 210 | 270 | 420 | 480 |
| Average Cost/ 30 Minutes*** | \$70,375 | \$77,294 | \$70,986 | \$62,122 | \$82,150 | \$74,640 |
| Average Rating* | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 9 |
| Average HUT | 59 | 57 | 56 | 59 | 57 | 57 |
| Average Share | 14 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 21 | 16 |
| Paid Network Television Announcements | | | | | | |
| NUMBER OF COMMERCIALS | 110 | 37 | 4 | 20 | 35 | 96 |

TABLE II—Continued

| | Political Party | | | Network | | |
|---|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Rep | Dem | A I | ABC | CBS | NBC |
| DAYTIME | | | | | | |
| Average Rating* | 9 | 21 | 11 | — | 8 | 20 |
| Average HUT | 20 | 41 | 42 | — | 20 | 36 |
| Average Share | 45 | 51 | 26 | — | 40 | 56 |
| NIGHTTIME | | | | | | |
| Average Rating | 17 | 17 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 17 |
| Average HUT | 56 | 59 | 51 | 58 | 55 | 56 |
| Average Share | 29 | 28 | 25 | 20 | 26 | 30 |
| Average Cost for 1-Minute Commercial**** | \$26,218 | \$25,466 | \$21,000 | \$60,167 | \$42,833 | \$22,791 |
| Network Television Political Interview Programs, News Specials, Analyses, and Roundups | | | | | | |
| INTERVIEWS | | | | | | |
| Number | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| Total Time in Minutes | 300 | 360 | 210 | 480 | 210 | 180 |
| Average Rating* | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Average HUT | 25 | 26 | 24 | 23 | 28 | 18 |
| Average Share | 12 | 12 | 17 | 8 | 18 | 15 |
| OTHERS | | | | | | |
| Number***** | | | | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| Total Minutes | | | | 60 | 265 | 300 |
| Average Rating* | | | | — | 10 | 3 |
| Average HUT | | | | — | 61 | 31 |
| Average Share | | | | — | 16 | 11 |

* Ratings, Homes Using Television, and Share of Audience are from Arbitron, American Research Bureau, New York market area only; rounded to nearest whole number. (For 5-minute programs, based on quarter-hour segment including the 5-minute political program; for political announcements, based on programs containing the commercial—averages are for 89 of 151 programs, other information not available).

** Cost based on reports for 47 of 48 nighttime programs.

*** Cost based on reports for 28 of 30 programs.

**** Cost is for a one-minute commercial based on reports of 67 nighttime commercials. The number and cost of commercials shorter than one minute is unknown.

***** News specials, documentaries, analyses, and roundups, including a "non-political" speech by President Johnson (stop bombing North Vietnam, Oct. 31) with discussion following; 30 minutes on NBC, 55 on CBS, and 60 on ABC—not included in audience figures.

Nearly all of the daytime and 50 of the total of 70 five-minute programs were on CBS. Although no party garnered a lion's share of the audience, there was a quickening of interest in all candidates as election day approached.

PAID POLITICAL PROGRAMS LONGER THAN FIVE MINUTES

As the Democrats convened, the Nixon television campaign opened with two 30-minute programs on August 23 which included highlights of his acceptance speech two weeks after it was delivered. (Note: these programs are not here included in the tabulations for the general election.) The Wallace campaign opened with two 30-minute programs on September 3 and 9. Both were filmed montages of speeches. Just prior to the World Series, he appeared on a panel with two former baseball players. He also had another informal talk session with laymen, including one Negro. The first half-hour purchased by the Democrats was for Humphrey's September 30 address from Salt Lake City explaining his views on Vietnam. It was this speech that President Johnson later labeled as being partly responsible for the Humphrey-Muskie loss. Mr. Johnson felt the Democrats would have fared better had Humphrey firmly supported the administration. Nixon's first 30-minute program after the Democratic convention was on October 3.

Later, when Nixon would not meet in a joint TV appearance, the Democrats dramatized the fact on October 20 in a 25-minute "debate" format with empty chairs for Nixon and Wallace. According to Humphrey, Wallace would appear only if Nixon did, and Nixon did not answer the invitational telegram. The "debate" was followed by a five-minute political commercial with Senator Kennedy speaking in behalf of Humphrey and Muskie. This was followed by a 30-minute "documentary-type" program review of political history from the 1920s to the present—with an important part played by Humphrey. (The Democrats abandoned as "rather childish" a proposal for a mock debate among the candidates using puppets.)

The most confused programming of the campaign came October 30. The *Kraft Music Hall* was replaced with a 15-minute endorsement of the Humphrey-Muskie ticket by President Johnson, followed by a 15-minute "documentary" on Muskie, "The Man from Maine." Then came eight minutes of a slide "Technical Trouble Please Stand By." Next without explanation viewers saw a music program iden-

tified near its close as a rerun of *The Lively Ones* (1962). This was followed by a five-minute political program for Nixon-Agnew. NBC said it received the Democratic preemption request less than four hours before air time.

The biography-documentary was widely used during 1968. One on Humphrey, "What Manner of Man," was used at least four times. "Nixon—A Self-Portrait" was used several times. These were 30-minute films, parts of which were used in five-minute programs and one-minute spots. Incidentally, these "biographies" were widely used in campaigns for other offices (e. g., senate candidates Gravel, Alaska; Gilligan, Ohio; and McGovern, South Dakota).¹⁴ An excellent satire of these biographies was the only major political program used by "splinter" candidate Patrick Layton Paulsen and his Straight Talkin' American Government (STAG) Party. Wallace used a living room discussion format for his longer programs but did not use a biographical documentary.

More than a third (38%) of all the longer program time was used on the final day of the campaign, November 4. Both the American Independent Party (42%) and the Democrats (40%) used election eve blitzkriegs, but the Republicans also accounted for one-third of their long program time on the final night. In fact, two-thirds of all prime-time network programming was political that night, and NBC's *Tonight* was delayed 30 minutes for a Humphrey-Muskie broadcast.

Both the Republicans and Democrats used phone call question and answer formats during that last evening. *Call Dick Nixon* (NBC 9:00-11:00 ET) had questions being phoned in by listeners filtered through Bud Wilkinson. The Democrats' program was more informal (ABC 8:30-10:30 ET) and featured a number of Hollywood stars.

POLITICAL COMMERCIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Republicans used three times as many commercial announcements as the Democrats. Nearly two-thirds of the spots were on NBC. Total NBC charges were about one-third the regular price. The network was giving a 50% discount to political advertisers on certain shows. The most discussed spots were produced by filmmaker Eugene S. Jones (*A Time for Burning* and *A Face of War*) for Richard

Nixon. They carried titles of "Crime," "Order," "Black Capitalism," and "Vietnam (E.S.J. #1)" which went as follows:¹⁵

SOUND EFFECT: bombs, drums

NIXON: Never has so much military, economic, and diplomatic power been used so ineffectively as in Vietnam. If after all of this time and all of this sacrifice and all of this support there is still no end in sight, then I say the time has come for the American people to turn to new leadership—not tied to the policies and mistakes of the past. I pledge to you: we shall have an honorable end to the war in Vietnam.

ANNOUNCER: This time vote like your whole world depended on it.

There were 31 shots in this spot—mostly still pictures; faces of American GIs in Vietnam. A 40-second version of the same commercial did not use the first 11 shots and "military, economic, and diplomatic" are left out of the text preceding "power." The Nixon spots ignored Wallace. One Democratic spot used actor E. G. Marshall attacking the feelings brought out by the Wallace campaign. Most of the Humphrey spots listed his "accomplishments" including Medicare and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and often ended by asking "What has Richard Nixon ever done for you?" One spot titled "What's Nixon Ever Done?" went as follows:

ANNOUNCER: What has Richard Nixon ever done for you?

MAN: (CU talking into camera) What has Richard Nixon ever done for me? Ah, Medicare. No, that was Humphrey's idea. But Nixon, Nixon. Oh, the bomb, the nuclear bomb. No, it was Humphrey's idea to stop testing the bomb. Nixon, now what has Richard Nixon ever done for me. Ah, let's see. Working people—I'm a worker. Nixon ever do anything, um, no. Humphrey and the Democrats gave us Social Security. But Nixon, nothing in education, nothing in housing, he hasn't done anything there either.

ANNOUNCER: The preceding has been a paid political announcement by citizens for Humphrey-Muskie.

MAN: Funny, there must have been something Nixon's done.

Another Democratic commercial asked "where does Richard Nixon stand on the nuclear test ban treaty?"; the visual then showed a bomb exploding and then reversing itself. Both major parties used entertainment personalities.

Both used commercials that brought cries of "foul." The Republicans had a spot with photos of Humphrey laughing and grinning

to the song "Happy Days Are Here Again," but intercut with pictures of riots, the Vietnam war and refugees. It ran first during *Rowan and Martin's Laugh-In*, drawing more than 200 phone complaints in New York alone. The Democrats also touched a nerve with a short spot saying only "Agnew for Vice-President" with a sound track of increasing peals of laughter. Both spots later were withdrawn. However, few complaints were reported on offensive commercials in 1968. Most announcements were "mild," skirting the "issues," and stressing the "qualities" of the candidates.

At least one Nixon announcement was tailored for a specific program—just as Humphrey scored following *Dr. Strangelove*. A Nixon spot during the Olympic Games coverage (ABC) depicted the candidate in heroic terms, as a sportsman, and linked campaigning with the challenge of athletics. The American Independent party used very few commercials. One showed a burning building with shadowy figures in the foreground and with this voice-over: "Look, American, take a good look . . . This was done by anarchists, revolutionaries, the Molotov cocktail set . . . Ask yourself, why are the anti-American, anti-God anarchists also violently anti-Wallace? Want to get rid of them? . . . vote for a law-abiding, God-fearing America."

INTERVIEW PROGRAMS

Programs devoted wholly to interviews with one or more of the candidates or their supporters were about equally divided among the three parties and the three networks. However, ABC doubled the interview time by expanding *Issues and Answers* to one hour in September and October. Other than Republican, Democratic and American Independent, there were no "other party" candidates on these programs. However, some appeared on entertainment programs. Nixon refused to appear on interview programs until the final weekend before the election, when on Sunday (November 3) he was on *Meet the Press*. Agnew appeared on two network panel shows. Both Humphrey and Muskie appeared extensively on these and entertainment programs. They actively sought exposure on local TV interview and entertainment programs as they campaigned. Wallace and LeMay both appeared on the three network Sunday panel shows.

NEWS SPECIALS, DOCUMENTARIES, ANALYSES, AND ROUNDUPS

There were fewer non-interview programs on the networks than in previous years. Most were on NBC, which created a special program

(the only one of its kind) for campaign coverage — *Campaign and the Candidates* with Elie Able. This program started as a special on March 10, then replaced *Vietnam: The War This Week* in its Sunday time period until August 25. It then was moved to Saturday and was on each week in September and October. CBS produced two specials, one with Walter Cronkite two nights before the election and one earlier in the campaign on *60 Minutes*. Both magazine documentary programs — *First Tuesday* and *60 Minutes* — devoted some time to the campaign.

REGULAR NEWS PROGRAMS AND OTHER COVERAGE OF CANDIDATES

A content analysis of the 1956 campaign indicated that about 20% of regular network news was concerned with the Presidential race. A tabulation of a sample of evening network news programs from February through June 1968 — even before the conventions and general election campaign — indicated that about 25% of the network news on the three evening programs was given over to the campaign for the Presidential nomination.¹⁶ Additionally, there were appearances by candidates and their supporters on shows not included in these tabulations. For example, *The Joey Bishop Show* devoted at least two hours to candidates of the Socialist Labor and Socialist Workers parties; the *Dick Cavett Show* (ABC morning), and *Today* also devoted a number of hours to the appearances of candidates.¹⁷

DEBATES?

Congress was pressured by some to suspend the “equal time” clause (Section 315) of the Communications Act so that debates between major candidates could be aired (as in 1960) without having to provide equal opportunity for the candidates of minor parties. Neither Nixon nor Humphrey (until it was clear he was behind) was anxious to debate with or without Wallace. Nixon’s advisers were aware that in a debate there would be comparisons with his 1960 loss. They retained “control” of his TV image in all his appearances except the one on *Meet the Press*. The prime mover for the suspension of Section 315 was CBS President Frank Stanton. Both the House and Senate considered suspension, as was done in 1960, with support of the administration. But the Republicans killed the move. In 1964 the Democrats had prevented similar bills because President Johnson did not want to appear with Barry Goldwater.

In 1968, even after Wallace accepted separate-but-equal time so Nixon and Humphrey could meet on the same program, Nixon refused.

REGIONAL TELEVISION CAMPAIGN

Both Nixon and Wallace used regional TV networks. Wallace, with a smaller budget, aimed at supportive audiences in regional areas. Nixon made limited use of the large televised political rally (in 1960 a camera caught him whispering instructions on the platform to others to lift their arms and smile). His ten regional appearances were intimate (for television) press conferences—a form well-known to TV viewers. They were “live” for suspense and credibility. Unlike candidates before the wide use of broadcasting, Nixon made similar statements (promises) in each region. He repeated himself—but seemed less repetitious than if the programs had been national.

RADIO CAMPAIGN

Network radio accounted for only 2% of the Republican broadcast time purchases; 1% for the Democrats. Nixon made six major network radio addresses during the primary campaign and 14 after the convention. There were 13 on CBS, four on NBC, and one each on ABC and MBS. One was carried on both NBC and CBS. They were considered as position papers on such topics as “The Nature of the Presidency,” Vietnam, Crime, NATO, “The American Spirit,” “A Better Day for the American Indian,” and the like.¹⁸ None of the speeches was telecast; however, he often used phrases from them to answer questions on the regional telecasts and at press conferences. There had been evidence in 1960 that those who had listened to radio versions of the “Great Debates” had been more favorable to Nixon. In 1968 he did not hesitate to use radio. Humphrey used less radio and did not differentiate its use from that of television.

CATV

The use of regional broadcasts, the wider use of radio, and a “low profile” campaign were not the only innovations in 1968. Perhaps the most prophetic technique was the use of cable TV for political programs. This was the first wide use of CATV by candidates.¹⁹ *Variety* reported a special Nixon-Agnew program produced

TABLE III
Cost of Paid Political Broadcasts during Primary and General Election Campaigns

| | Political Party | | Network Television | | | Political Party | |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | Republican | Democratic | A I | ABC | CBS | NBC | Total |
| PRIMARIES | | | | | | | |
| Television: | | | | | | | |
| Networks (3) | \$1,007,759 | \$511,024 | — | \$347,470 | \$481,859 | \$689,454 | \$1,518,783 |
| Stations | \$2,513,671 | \$6,449,451 | \$408,797 | | | | \$9,371,919 |
| Radio: | | | | | | | |
| Networks (7) | \$29,066 | — | — | | | | \$29,066 |
| Stations | \$1,804,739 | \$5,457,185 | \$302,911 | | | | \$7,564,835 |
| Total Primaries | \$5,355,235 | \$12,417,660 | \$711,708 | | | | \$18,484,603 |
| GENERAL | | | | | | | |
| Television: | | | | | | | |
| Networks (3) | \$4,189,298 | \$2,500,517 | \$672,425 | \$1,190,704 | \$2,177,232 | \$3,327,879 | \$7,362,240 |
| Stations | \$10,993,574 | \$7,923,423 | \$807,790 | | | | \$19,724,787 |
| Radio: | | | | | | | |
| Networks (7) | \$468,871 | \$117,803 | \$16,000 | | | | \$602,674 |
| Stations | \$6,853,115 | \$4,846,246 | \$954,436 | | | | \$12,653,797 |
| Total General | \$22,504,858 | \$15,447,989 | \$2,450,651 | | | | \$40,403,498 |
| Grand Total | \$27,860,093 | \$27,865,649 | \$3,162,359 | \$1,538,174 | \$2,659,091 | \$4,017,333 | \$58,888,101 |

Source: FCC, *Survey of Political Broadcasting*, August, 1969. The breakdown for the TV networks was specially provided by A. Korn, Chief, Research Branch, Broadcast Bureau, FCC.

just for their "cable network" was seen in 45 states. A Humphrey-Muskie program was distributed in 44.²⁰ The National Cable Television Association (NCTA) reported that cable operators did not join in national networks, but that 375 to 400 systems participated in a plan to offer political time. Though the offer was extended by systems throughout the country, "both Republicans and Democrats . . . focused their particular attention on states that they believed crucial to the election." Tapes and films compatible to various systems were made available by the three major parties. "While Mr. Wallace's party did not do so nationally, it did provide films and video tapes to CATV systems in several states." There was some linking of systems and in several areas operators put a "video machine and a modulator" in a vehicle and transported it to systems with inadequate origination equipment. Time, with one exception, was donated and in the case of the Democrats, the industry helped with production costs.²¹

THE RISING COST OF POLITICS

The cost of political broadcasting has plagued politicians since 1924. In 1968 at least two broadcasting organizations lowered their advertising rates — NBC and Storer Broadcasting. The NBC rate for one-minute commercials during evening hours was about half the ABC rate and one-third the CBS rate. All three networks offered low rates for five-minute programs. At Congressional hearings in 1969 NBC agreed to reduce its rates for political broadcasts 50% (as it did in 1968 for programs of five minutes and less); ABC agreed to a 33% reduction.²²

Comment

In 1968 Nixon had a media "game plan" for his campaign. The GOP used more short programs and announcements spread out over a longer period of time. Humphrey used more long programs bunched near the end of the campaign. It is clear that Humphrey had the poorer organization. Probably this was due partly to the vice-president's indecision over his advertising agency. All three networks preferred to sell five-minute programs, and succeeded by charging less for these than they did for one-minute commercials. Weekly programs like NBC's *Campaign and the Candidates*, devoted

TABLE IV
Network Television Total Political Time 1960, 1964, and 1968
during General Election Campaign

| | 1956 | 1960 | 1964 | 1968 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| NUMBER OF PROGRAMS | | 169 | 133 | 141 |
| TIME IN MINUTES | | | | |
| 5 Minute Programs | | | | |
| Rep | | 95 | 130 | 180 |
| Dem | | 240 | 135 | 125 |
| Other | | — | — | 45 |
| Total | | 335 | 265 | 350 |
| Longer than 5 Minutes | | | | |
| Rep | | 735 | 630 | 540 |
| Dem | | 270 | 240 | 600 |
| Other | | — | — | 210 |
| Total | | 1,005 | 870 | 1,350 |
| INTERVIEW | | | | |
| Rep | | 585 | 285 | 300 |
| Dem | | 615 | 345 | 360 |
| Other | | 30 | 180 | 210 |
| Total | | 1,230 | 810 | 870 |
| PROGRAM TOTAL* | | | | |
| Rep | | 1,415 | 1,045 | 1,020 |
| Dem | | 1,125 | 720 | 1,085 |
| Other | | 30 | 180 | 465 |
| News Specials, Documentaries, Analyses, Roundups | | 1,080 | 1,095 | 625 |
| Grand Total | | 3,650 | 3,040 | 3,195 |
| AUDIENCE | | | | |
| Average Rating | | 8 | 8 | 9 |
| Homes Using TV | | 40 | 43 | 43 |
| Share of Audience | | 20 | 19 | 21 |
| NUMBER OF COMMERCIALS | | NA | NA | 151 |
| COST | | | | |
| Rep | \$1,733,073 | \$1,820,360 | \$1,911,616 | \$4,189,298 |
| Dem | \$1,197,441 | \$1,106,875 | \$1,895,395 | \$2,500,517 |
| Other | — | — | — | \$672,425 |
| Total | \$2,930,514 | \$2,927,235 | \$3,807,011 | \$7,362,240 |

* Program time in minutes includes "non-political" speeches by President Johnson in both 1964 and 1968; these are not included in the tabulation of audience rating, HUT, and share.

entirely to coverage of the election, added dimension to regular news coverage and special documentaries. There was not as much programming of this type as in 1960 and 1964. This is an ominous trend, since such programs might ease party financial burdens.

In 1968 most commercials were technically and artistically better than in previous Presidential campaigns. Those by Eugene S. Jones were particularly skillful, if not always entirely to the point at issue. There was little of the personal attack and bitterness that characterized 1964. The "biography-documentary" for candidates was widely used for the first time. Either Richard M. Nixon had learned a great deal about broadcast campaigns in eight years or was badly misjudged as to his effectiveness in 1960. He had used television effectively before. His "Checkers" speech was a political highlight of 1952. He did not do well—at least in comparison with John Kennedy—in 1960, when he depended on televised mass rallies where he seemed a distant, mechanical, uninspired lecturer. In 1964 President Johnson used a type of "fireside chat"—for example, with students and housewives visiting at the White House to discuss problems. The premise is difficult to accept and the program was not particularly successful. The 1968 Nixon campaign innovation of the regional, staged, "press conference" (his advisers called it "the arena concept") was effective, relatively inexpensive and probably will be imitated. The Nixon campaign was a compromise between total image packaging in 1968 and haphazard packaging in 1960. Broadcasting was the keystone of the successful marketing process.

Footnotes

¹ See, Federal Communications Commission, *Survey of Political Broadcasting*, August 1969, Table 3; and *Broadcasting Yearbook*, 1970, A-124 and B-293.

² "The Ronnie-Bobby Show," *Newsweek*, May 29, 1967, 26.

³ "Johnson Rakes GOP for 'Obstruction Policy,'" *Wisconsin State Journal*, December 12, 1967, 1.

⁴ For example see advertisements in southern California newspapers for the registration campaign for the American Independent Party in California and announcing the personal appearances of Wallace. For a great deal of the material cited here we are grateful to Kenneth Lichty and Blake R. Kellogg for a steady stream of clippings and observations.

⁵ Jeremy Lerner "NOBODY KNOWS . . . Reflections on the McCarthy Campaign: Part I," *Harper's Magazine*, April 1969, 66.

⁶ For definitions of categories see Lawrence W. Lichty, Joseph M. Ripley and Harrison B. Summers, "Political Programs on National Television Networks: 1960 and 1964," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, IX:3 (Summer 1965), 217.

⁷ Information on programs and spots was, for the most part, compiled by the authors by actual observation; however, we also wish to acknowledge the help of Richard P. Gitter, ABC; James L. Abernathy and Robert D. Wood, CBS; and Paul V. McCarthy, Jr., NBC.

⁸ Information on the program time and number of spots is reported in "Campaign '68 Yields Record Buys," *Broadcasting*, January 6, 1969, 61. However, note that the information on cost reported there is *not* correct. See FCC, *Survey of Political Broadcasting*, Table 1. A letter from Alexander Korn, Chief, Research Branch, Broadcast Bureau, FCC, February 13, 1970, to Topping notes the earlier figures were slightly revised because "of a revision made by one of the networks."

⁹ See Joe McGinniss, *The Selling of the President 1968* (New York: Trident Press, 1969), or the shorter version in *Harper's Magazine*, August 1969; and Thomas J. Fleming, "Selling the Product Named Hubert Humphrey," *New York Times Magazine*, October 13, 1968.

¹⁰ Lichty, Ripley, and Summers, *op. cit.*, 219.

¹¹ A list of programs in all the categories discussed here from December 19, 1967, to November 4, 1968, can be obtained from Lichty, Radio-Television-Film, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706. The listing includes date, network, time, regular program title (that included the political commercial or was replaced by the political program), the topic, subject or speaker on the political spot/program, cost, type, Arbitron HUT and rating.

¹² The three television networks responded similarly concerning the price difference. NBC's Paul McCarthy wrote ". . . charges for a five minute program were for the purchase of air time only, whereas charges for a minute announcement were for the purchase of the air time as well as for the content of the program in which the announcement was included."

¹³ The average rating, homes using television (HUT) and share figures reported here were computed from American research Bureau, *New York ARBITRON*, information. We wish to thank Mark D. Munn, ARB, for his help. Information on the costs of programs and spots was compiled from numerous trade magazine articles, from network sources (above), and from the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting using Broadcast Advertisers Reports, Inc. We also want to thank Robert Bailey, Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire for special information.

¹⁴ *Wall Street Journal*, October 9, 1968, and *Los Angeles Times*, May 12, 1968.

¹⁵ The text of the two commercials was directly transcribed from films of the spots. The Nixon commercial (E.S.J. #1) varies somewhat from the scripts on pages 90-95 and 240-253 of McGinniss. The film viewed for this article contained the photo of the young soldier with "Love" printed on his helmet.

¹⁶ The sample for this was more than 150 evening news programs—every other weekday evening for the three network programs. The percentage cannot be reported more accurately without a far more detailed content analysis than was done here because "campaign news" often overlapped with other cate-

gories such as coverage of the President, Vietnam protests, and the like. The information was collected by Lichty and tabulated by both authors. The 25% is of the "news hole"—about 21 minutes—and thus, represents an average of about five minutes of "campaign" on each program each night.

¹⁷ These other appearances are not tabulated here but as many as we could record (including *Today*) are listed in the available compilation; see footnote 9.

¹⁸ These Nixon speeches were collected and published by the Nixon-Agnew campaign committee, *Nixon Speaks Out: Major Speeches and Statements by Richard M. Nixon in the Presidential Campaign of 1968*. Significantly, this collection includes 19 radio speeches, 15 other statements, but none from television. Some of the radio speeches also were published in small, separate brochures.

¹⁹ In 1960 at least one CATV operator videotaped the TV speeches of Senator Goldwater, replayed them several times on vacant channels, and announced at station breaks that the Goldwater speech was being repeated—this was *not* done for Johnson speeches (Topping observation). However, because they were not required to report information as are the licensed stations, it is impossible to have much more information on CATV and political programs. According to new FCC rules (*1st Report and Order on Docket #18397*, October 24, 1969), in the future CATV systems would be required to report (Section 74.1113) political programs in the same manner as broadcast stations.

²⁰ "CATV Has Good Political Season," *Variety*, November 13, 1968, 121.

²¹ This paragraph is based on a letter from Charles Walsh, assistant general counsel of National Cable Television Association, Inc., November 13, 1970. The association had about 2,000 members in 1968.

²² On their evening news programs (10/22/69) ABC (Reynolds-Smith) and NBC (Huntley-Brinkley) each mentioned that both had agreed to reductions. On CBS (Walter Cronkite) all that was included was a statement by Dr. Frank Stanton, CBS President, that if political time were free there would be too much. Nothing was mentioned on the *CBS Evening News* about the ABC and NBC concessions. In February 1970, CBS News President Richard Salant admitted this was "an error in news judgment." See *Broadcasting*, February 16, 1970, 63. For additional information on costs and some recommendations see, *Voters' Time: Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era* (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1969). Also see Herbert E. Alexander, "Political Broadcasting in 1968," *Television Quarterly*, IX:2 (Spring 1970), 41-50. Congress is expected to take some action in this area before the 1972 campaign.

for class use . . .

Free & Fair

Courtroom Access and the Fairness Doctrine

Now, all of the important JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING articles on two of the most interesting and serious problems facing American broadcasting have been collected in one book of readings.

The two main topics of FREE & FAIR are the access of broadcasters to the courtroom for the purpose of reporting what transpires in a law case, and the fairness with which broadcasters treat controversial issues and individuals.

These problems are to be found in the trade press almost every week—but as current events, not in full perspective. FREE & FAIR: COURTROOM ACCESS AND THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE covers all of their aspects in more than 20 articles.

FREE & FAIR contains a wide range of articles on Canon 35, the Fairness Doctrine, and similar topics, including the recent Supreme Court "Red Lion" decision. Articles were prepared by government officials (such as former FCC Chairman Frederick W. Ford), lawyers, researchers, and broadcasters (such as Rex Howell and Joseph Brechner).

FREE & FAIR is intended to provide sufficient argument, data and citations for the student, faculty member, professional broadcaster or broadcast newsman to pick his way through part of the maze of broadcast law and regulation with some confidence and comprehension.

208 pp.

Paperbound

\$3.95

Order from: JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING PUBLICATIONS
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

CHRISTOPHER H. STERLING

Second Service: Some Keys to the Development of FM Broadcasting

There are many examples of folklore being substituted for the history of broadcasting. One topic which has led to an embarrassment of "single-cause" explanations is that of the ups and downs of frequency modulated sound broadcasting in the United States. The following article is drawn from Christopher Sterling's dissertation, completed in the University of Wisconsin under the direction of Professor Lawrence Lichty. Dr. Sterling is assistant professor in the Department of Radio-Television-Film of Temple University.

AS the American broadcasting industry celebrated its 50th anniversary,¹ there was a tendency to look back and see where radio and television had been in order to gain insight as to where broadcasting might be going. One part of the industry, commercial FM radio, has had a long, checkered development which might be used to exemplify some problems of technological innovation in broadcasting. Until the last half of the 1960s, FM survived as a second service supplementing AM, or "standard" radio broadcasting. In recent years, however, FM has become one of the fastest growing parts of broadcasting in the United States.

Major factors underlying this long period of secondary importance and recent growth are explored below in two ways. A brief analysis of major periods in FM development provides a chronological framework for discussion of nine selected "keys" to FM's history.² Each "key" represents a critical element in FM's rise, decline and recent success. FM will be considered as (1) the product of a single inventor, (2) an innovation pioneered by a few broadcasters, (3) subject of a major frequency allocation change, (4) a long-time secondary

service to AM and television, (5) subject to two distinct types of management decision-making, (6) a broadcast service almost totally lacking in appeal to audiences and (7) advertisers, (8) a subject of governmental regulation, and (9) a good example of "developmental competition" in broadcasting.

Periods in FM Development

Experimentation (to the end of 1940): From the first patent on FM radio (1905)³ through years of criticizing FM as a useless side-product of AM radio transmission, the story of FM to about 1930 is basically one of little interest and thus no progress. Only after Edwin Howard Armstrong's intensive developmental work of 1928-34 did a workable system of FM radio arise. Only after the 1934-36 struggle by Armstrong for industry and government recognition did FM get even a limited chance to prove itself. And only after the pioneer stations of 1937-39 went on the air and showed the feasibility of FM in practice did the system get a full Federal Communications Commission (FCC) hearing (1940) and approval for commercial operation.⁴

The War Years (1941-45): After a year of planning but limited growth, FM expansion was stopped in early 1942 because of lack of wartime material priorities.⁵ About 45 FM stations operated by the end of the war, with their limited hours of programming being received on some 400,000 FM receivers made before the wartime freeze. Although plans were made for postwar expansion, this time can best be seen as a prolonged hiatus in FM growth.

Allocations and Arguments (1944-48): The most confusing and controversial years in FM development were marked first by the FCC General Allocation Hearings that, among other topics, delved into the possibility of atmospheric interference on the then FM band of 42-50 MHz.⁶ With the end of the wartime freeze on radio station and receiver production in mid-1945, the FCC had to act rapidly if changes in spectrum or standards were to be made before resumed civilian production perpetuated things as they were. Forced by events and pressures (including those from promoters of television) to forgo projected propagation research, the FCC ordered FM up into the 88-108 MHz band in June of 1945.⁷ That ruling brought forth petitions for reversal,⁸ and two Congressional investigations,⁹ but the decision stood amidst a controversy which lasted for years.

Second Start (1945-48): The shortest period in FM history, this was the medium's first chance to seek commercial success amidst increasing AM and rising TV competition. Due primarily to the war-time hiatus and the 1945 frequency change (the latter forcing disposal of lower-band transmitters and receivers),¹⁰ the immediate post-war years became a time of confusion as factions of the broadcast industry debated AM-FM program duplication, limited receiver production,¹¹ and FM's lack of advertising revenue. Many prospective broadcasters and sponsors sat out this confusion (many who entered FM in this period lost heavily), and the lack of support contributed to FM's failure to expand to its predicted importance.

Decade of Decline (1949-57): The number of stations on the air, FM receiver sales, advertising revenue and other indicators all pointed down in this "dark age" of FM history. The medium's lack of separate identity (plus the absence of FM networks, national advertisers, large audiences, and the heavy competition from AM and TV) eased FM into this decline. It seemed that although FM was a marked technical improvement, commercially it was a flash in the pan.¹²

Decade of Development (1958-69): The late 1950s brought conditions for fundamental change in FM's fortunes as expansion in AM and TV leveled off (due to competition and spectrum saturation in urban areas), and broadcaster attention was free for application to underdeveloped FM. The development of FM stereo,¹³ increased program variety, and availability of cheaper FM portable receivers all contributed to FM's growth in broadcaster, audience, and advertiser acceptance.

Nine Keys to FM History

While the six periods illustrate the up and down growth of the medium, they do not illustrate the causes of variation in FM development. To fill out the chronological framework, nine keys (no single one of which can explain FM's problem) are discussed which taken together clarify the medium's problems and potential.

FM as the product of a single inventor: For years the common approach to FM history was to project the role of one man—Edwin Howard Armstrong—to the medium he can be said to have fathered. There are many who believe that the day of the lone inventor-innovator is past,¹⁴ and some see Armstrong as the last of the breed.¹⁵

Armstrong's emotionalism and single-mindedness were of utmost importance in the initial success of FM. Although his driving approach antagonized many potential backers of FM, it is clear that without his devotion to his invention, FM would not have developed at all. While Armstrong's feeling that FM would eventually replace AM greatly disturbed Radio Corporation of America President David Sarnoff,¹⁶ RCA and much of the broadcast industry were moving to a total television commitment anyway. Against this competition, FM might well have been sidetracked just as facsimile was. Both media were highly touted in the 1940s—but facsimile had no single backer with a stake as large as that that Armstrong had in FM.¹⁷

Centering one's FM history approach on Armstrong is useful to a point, for he was certainly *the* key in FM development up to 1940, and he continued to play a major role in FM until his death in 1954. Unfortunately, when used alone this approach has led to emotionalism rather than detached observation. Centering on Armstrong can lead one to see the near-failure of FM after 1948 as a massive broadcaster-manufacturer-FCC plot to hold FM down until it could be either controlled or molded so as not to cause economic upheaval in the existing broadcasting establishment. As Armstrong held this view, so do most of his biographers.¹⁸ But this single-factor analysis of FM problems is too simple, and only blinds us to the real value of Armstrong's role of single-handedly pushing FM to acceptance by a few critically important broadcasters.

FM as an innovation pioneered by few: With the impetus supplied by Armstrong, a few broadcasters and engineers experimented with FM in the years prior to the war. Without their time and advice, FM could not have achieved commercial status, for they were instrumental in finding out the limitations and capabilities of FM in actual broadcast conditions. Just as important, they were the only means by which FM could win approval from broadcasters as a group. FM pioneer John Shepard III, for example, was a respected group owner in New England who was looked upon by others in the field as a man to be counted on to see any commercial potential in a broadcast innovation.¹⁹ Once these pre-war innovators had worked out operational bugs to prove FM to themselves, they (and only they) could supply pressure on the FCC to give FM commercial status, which occurred on January 1, 1941.

This step of advancing an invention to the stage of a more widely known and accepted innovation is a process any new development must go through if it is to be a long-term success. Too small an amount of interest in such a development will kill it for lack of active promotion, while too much interest may well lead to the mis-directed development or rapid-fire rise and fall of a mere fad.²⁰

FM as subject of a frequency change: The mid-1945 shift in FM's allocation from 42-50 MHz to 88-108 MHz had a bad effect on the medium in the immediate post-war years. FM was stopped in its tracks, as existing receivers and transmitters were made obsolete though they continued in limited use for a two-year period of transition. Set makers had to retool to make the new high-band FM receivers and this helped delay FM for two years.²¹ Starting all over, FM had to face post-war competition from rapidly growing AM and television. But taking a longer view, the 1945 shift was critically important to FM's later growth. Not only was projected interference lessened,²² but FM had more spectrum space to expand in when the medium began growing in the 1960s. Without that space, there could have been no growth.

FM as a secondary service: The year 1948 marks a key dividing point in FM development. Before then there was confusion among broadcasters and regulators as to just what role FM would fulfill in radio. Some observers felt FM would *replace* AM, others felt it would *supplement* AM, and a few felt FM had no particular future at all. Broadcasters were divided between the obvious technical superiority of FM versus the certain economic dislocation if FM replaced AM. The FCC felt FM would be a way of bringing new blood into radio as FM made possible the granting of stations licenses to thousands of new owners. Advertisers, noting the public's happiness with AM and interest in newly-arrived TV couldn't see a role for FM. These views existed before FM's commercial approval,²³ were discussed during the war hiatus,²⁴ came to the fore during the frequency change debate,²⁵ and were more or less resolved by 1948. By 1948 the frequency change had survived even Congressional challenges,²⁶ program duplication on AM and FM stations was accepted by most broadcasters and regulators (and certainly by advertisers who usually got FM exposure free on duplicated AM programs),²⁷ and the majority ownership interest in FM held by AM licensees was an accepted fact as well.²⁸ These factors, plus limited audience interest in buying

expensive FM receivers, assured FM a role secondary to AM. The new medium would fill in coverage and content holes of the old. This certainly was the desire of the AM-based radio industry because of a felt need to protect earlier AM investments, and because of fast-rising commitments to television development.²⁹

FM as subject of management decision-making: Although AM and TV competition helped maintain FM in its secondary status for two decades, another key factor in the medium's lack of development was its own lack of appeal to audiences and thus to advertisers. Most of this, in turn, was a matter of competition which is clearly part of the decision-making process of management. In examining FM development however, two separate managerial roles must be considered: the independent (or FM-only) owner, and the AM owner of an FM station. In the months of commercial operation before and during the war, both groups performed much the same role of innovation in FM programming and techniques, even though AM owners of FM stations (who might be expected to limit FM in favor of AM) far out-numbered FM-only licences.³⁰

In the immediate post-war years, however, FM for the first time came face to face with inter-medium competition that threatened its survival. Not fully convinced (perhaps because of the massive post-war growth of AM) that FM should replace AM, AM owners of FM stations opted for unlimited program duplication and short hours of FM operation (at least until the audience was larger) while the independents, hopeful of FM's future, opted for independent programming and longer hours of operation.³¹ The difference was based on outlook—the independents felt a strong FM system was the future of radio while AM owners of FM stations wanted to get into FM "on the ground floor" to protect their earlier media investments, and to keep FM controllable.³²

Survival became very difficult in 1949-57 as an increasing number of FM operators gave up the fight and left the air.³³ AM stations increased by nearly 1,000, television grew (mainly after the 1948-52 freeze) by 420 stations, but FM *declined* by 170 stations.³⁴

Both types of FM owner aided and harmed the medium. AM owners helped save FM's existence during the decline of the 1950s by airing over their FM outlets programs duplicated from their AM operations so that there was some FM service, a reason for buying

receivers, and a base from which FM could grow in the 1960s. FM independents provided most programming innovations and the backbone of FM trade organizations which initiated early audience surveys and advertiser presentations. However, the AM owners long soft peddled FM to preserve AM (particularly in light of TV's inroads), while FM independents saw too much in FM so that their lack of realism attracted many who lost heavily in the years of decline.³⁵

FM as a medium lacking audience appeal: Until the mid-1960s, FM radio presented two kinds of programs—duplicated AM programs, or classical/orchestral music, the latter usually on the FM independents.³⁶ Stations programming classical music catered to a small (but loyal) minority, typically in the larger urban markets.³⁷ Few FM stations offered news unless it was duplicated from an AM station. The potential audience was bored by this lack of appeal (most listeners were happy with choices available on AM or TV), and stations seldom sought out listeners. Thus the FM audience remained but a fraction of that for either AM or television.

A contributing factor to this lack of interest was the comparatively high prices of FM receivers. Until the early 1960s, the cheapest FM set seldom cost less than \$50. Aside from static elimination and less interference from distant stations, in the minds of many potential possible buyers there was no need for FM as programs were either duplicated from AM stations (and AM sets could be had for under \$10) or were just music (and \$50 would buy a lot of recordings and even a player). Thus relatively few FM sets were sold in the 1950s (2.2 million FM sets compared to 75 million AM receivers in 1952-57), and, without demand, prices stayed high—which further depressed sales.³⁸ Lacking a satisfactory rationale for its existence, FM could not appeal to prospective listeners sufficiently to break the circle of limited interest-high costs.

FM as a medium lacking advertiser support: Lacking an audience of significant size, FM was unable to appeal to national spot advertisers—especially as FM audience research was insufficient until recent years.³⁹ A distinction should be drawn between national and local advertisers, however, as many local merchants have benefited from FM's low rates (even though often worked out to high cost-per-thousand figures because of the small FM audiences). Many FM advertisers had little or no previous radio advertising experience before they began use of local FM stations.⁴⁰

For years the lack of major advertising of FM stations was aggravated by a lack of constructive communication between sponsors and station managers. The former did not know how to use FM, and the latter couldn't successfully present the medium to the advertisers.⁴¹ After years of mutual recrimination, specialization eased the first problem (FM was found to be good at selling certain types of goods and services in a soft-sell fashion), and audience surveys of some depth improved the second. The rise of firms representing FM stations, starting in the early 1960s,⁴² helped further to ease what is still the medium's major problem in the 1970s—appeal to advertisers.⁴³

FM as a subject of government control and regulation: Next to station management, government regulators of broadcasting (primarily the FCC, but including other executive agencies, Congress and the courts) have at times had major voice in FM trends. Government has served primarily to place limits within which business competition takes place rather than directly controlling FM trends. The FCC, for example, provided spectrum allocations, technical standards, and rules, and station managers have taken it from there.

Up to 1936, apparently the FCC did not understand FM and thus the Commission was something of a stumbling block to FM progress. In 1936-37 allocations, for example, television was given more favorable experimental channels than those supplied for FM.⁴⁴ The innovator activities of 1937-39, however, finally persuaded the FCC to see the potential in FM—and commercial approval came shortly thereafter.⁴⁵ With that approval, FM became the protectorate of the FCC and has more or less retained that status to the present. This FCC support is based partially on FM's technical superiority to AM, but more importantly, FM offered an opportunity to avoid some of the technical and regulatory confusion historically evident in allocations and standards for AM.⁴⁶

FCC desire for orderly FM development is evident in its decisions on supplemental functional music operations. In the first decade after the war, many FM stations "simplexed" their signal—that is, they allowed businesses, stores, and offices to pick up their signal, delete talk portions, and play the remaining music (at a monthly charge). During the mid-1950s a more sophisticated system for functional music was developed. Termed "multiplexing"⁴⁷ it relegated the sub-

scriber-based functional services to a separate sub-carrier of a station's transmitter, thus not interfering with the station's broadcast schedule for a public audience. With multiplex, both services could operate separately and at the same time, whereas with simplex both types of audience got much the same service. The Commission banned simplex in 1955 (in a rule made final only in 1964) in favor of the more versatile multiplex approach which, while more expensive, allowed fuller use of FM spectrum while preserving technical standards.⁴⁸

There is little doubt about the boosts given FM by such FCC decisions as the 1961 stereo ruling (which added another feature to FM's technical superiority and appeal),⁴⁹ the 1962 FM channel re-classification (which by setting up new station classes, power limits, and antenna heights, cleared the way for orderly FM growth in the 1960s),⁵⁰ the program non-duplication ruling (e.g., AM-FM owners now had to independently program their FM outlets) of 1964-65 (the key factor in the recent increase in program variety and appeal of FM),⁵¹ the talk about possible separation of AM-FM ownership to improve FM's independent development (on which initial action was taken early in 1970),⁵² and the 1969 proposed rule-making which would make FM the focus for future extensions of radio coverage.⁵³ Clearly, the Commission, by acting ahead of business trends, was demonstrating its conviction that FM should be more the equal of AM.

FM as an example of developmental competition in broadcasting: Both FM and UHF television have growth patterns similar in many ways. Both arrived on the scene years after their respective primary services (AM and VHF television) had been established, and yet both began commercial operation (FM in 1941 and UHF in 1952) amid great optimism that each represented the future of its respective aural or visual service. After a short and confused initial spurt of growth, both of these secondary services went into more than a decade of decline, to emerge only in the 1960s as growth elements in U.S. broadcasting. Both got critical boosts from government action at low points in their development—UHF with the 1962 Act which required a UHF-VHF capability on all TV sets sold in interstate commerce,⁵⁴ and FM with the FCC stereo decision of 1961 and the even more important 1964 program non-duplication ruling. Without these governmental interventions, it is possible that both services would have languished years longer, though both probably would

eventually have grown as their respective primary services got more crowded. The pattern of both UHF TV and FM shows the importance of government's role if new services are to successfully break into the arena of competitive business practice. The FM pattern demonstrates further that to be successful, government intervention is not enough—a medium must develop a unique service by doing something different from or better than any other medium if it is to assume an important role.

Comment

Taking a long view of FM's development and prospects is made difficult because even now FM is entering another period of development—a time of what well may be sustained growth. Modifying the terminology W. W. Rostow developed for his theory on the drive of developing nations for economic maturity,⁵⁵ we can examine the growth of FM. The periods Rostow uses are the traditional society (in this case, U.S. broadcasting prior to 1935), the preconditions for "take-off" to development (the 1935-40 period of FM discovery and innovation), the "take-off" itself (the entire 1941-57 period of ups and downs), the drive to maturity (very akin to FM's 1958-70 growth trend), and finally, the era of self-sustained growth which Rostow terms the "age of high mass-consumption" which is the period that FM commercial broadcasting may just now be entering where it would grow in a fashion similar to, yet independent of both AM and television. For, in this period, FM finally shook off the stigma of being but a "second service" and began to grow to importance on its own.

Footnotes

¹ Somewhat late, since, according to some, the anniversary should have been celebrated in 1959. See Gordon B. Greb, "The Golden Anniversary of Broadcasting," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING* III:1 (Winter 1958-59), pp. 3-13.

² This article is based on the author's "Second Service: A History of Commercial FM Broadcasting to 1969," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969.

³ Cornelius D. Ehret, "Art of Transmitting Intelligence," and "System of Transmitting Intelligence," Patent Nos. 785,803 and 785,804. *Specifications and Drawings of Patents* (March 1905, Part II), March 28, 1905, pp. 3661-3672.

⁴ For one version of this early period see Lawrence Lessing, *Man of High Fidelity: Edwin Howard Armstrong* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1956), Chapter 11. This biography was re-issued in 1969 with some added material but under the same title by Bantam Books.

⁵ *Broadcasting* (July 27, 1942), p. 18. All of broadcasting, of course, was similarly affected.

⁶ The question of interference was raised first in the 1940 hearings which led to FM's approval as a commercial medium. Major attention to the issue came with FCC-Radio Technical Planning Board consideration in 1943-44, and with the September-October 1944 hearings on the technical pros and cons of pushing FM "upstairs" from 42-50 MHz. The hearings' highlight came with the testimony of Kenneth A. Norton (formerly an FCC engineer but then with the armed forces) that FM should be moved above 120 MHz to eliminate interference. Norton made use of secret Army data (some of which turned out to be incorrect) and FM proponents claimed this testimony was the basis for the later FCC decision to move FM up to the 88-108 MHz area. See Lawrence D. Longley, "The FM Shift in 1945," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING* XII:4 (Fall 1968), pp. 353-365. See also issues of *Broadcasting* for October 16, 1944 (Supplement, p. 1), November 6, 1944 (pp. 23-26), January 16, 1945 (p. 17), and May 21, 1945 (p. 13).

⁷ "FCC Allocates 88-106 mc Band to FM," *Broadcasting* (July 2, 1945), p. 13. The 106-108 MHz band was temporarily assigned to facsimile, but FM stations had use of the space before the year was out. Facsimile was then placed higher in the spectrum, but was later assigned as a possible sub-channel service of FM stations in the regular FM band.

⁸ "FM High-Band Controversy is Re-Opened," *Broadcasting* (January 7, 1946), p. 15. The petition was filed by Zenith but was turned down by the FCC after a one-day hearing a week later.

⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, *Hearings, Radio Frequency Modulation*. 80th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1948 (two parts) and U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Commerce, *Hearings on the Progress of FM Radio*. 80th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1948. The House hearings probed the FCC allocations decision while the Senate investigation looked into charges that RCA had obstructed FM, but it too touched on the controversial allocations.

¹⁰ Low-band FM transmissions to existing home receivers were not stopped overnight, but were phased out over the 1945-48 period, the sets finally becoming useless when all low-band FM transmissions ceased December 1, 1948. *Broadcasting* (September 20, 1948), p. 28.

¹¹ Basic re-tooling by manufacturers was necessary before high-band FM sets could be made. In the meantime there was a massive AM market to be served. *Broadcasting* (April 1, 1946), p. 28.

¹² See, for example, Jack Gould, "Problems of FM," *New York Times* (August 17, 1952), p. D20.

¹³ "Finally, FCC Okays Stereo," *Broadcasting* (April 19, 1961), pp. 65-66.

¹⁴ See, for example, W. Rupert Maclaurin, *Invention and Innovation in the Radio Industry*. (New York: Macmillan, 1949).

¹⁵ See especially Carl Dreher, "E. H. Armstrong: The Hero As Inventor," *Harper's* (April 1956), pp. 58-66.

¹⁶ Lessing, *op. cit.* pp. 219, 223.

¹⁷ Perhaps the nearest equivalent to Armstrong that facsimile backers had was John V. L. Hogan—and he had nowhere near the drive of Armstrong. Facsimile came from many people and organizations whereas FM was clearly one man's work in its initial stages. See Charles R. Jones, *Facsimile* (New York: Rinehart, 1949), pp. 1-14.

¹⁸ See Lessing and Dreher. See also almost any of Armstrong's own published papers (listed in Lessing, pp. 313-315) as well as his testimony at the Congressional hearings noted in note 9.

¹⁹ Gleason L. Archer, *Big Business and Radio*. (New York: The American Historical Co. Inc., 1939), pp. 424-425.

²⁰ See Maclaurin for examples of both problems.

²¹ See *Broadcasting* (November 12, 1945), p. 28; and (April 1, 1946), p. 28.

²² See note 6.

²³ "Birth of Commercial FM This Year Seen," *Broadcasting* (April 1, 1940), pp. 18-21, 80-93.

²⁴ Much of the war-time discussion as to FM's role grew out of the 1941 hearings on newspaper ownership of broadcast stations. *Broadcasting* (March 24, 1941), p. 8; (April 7, 1941), p. 13; and "FCC v Press," *Business Week* (July 26, 1941), p. 33.

²⁵ Much of the basis for the various viewpoints expressed during the hearings of 1944-45 can be found in the views of FM's role held by the hearing participants. See the sources cited in note 6 and also Milton B. Sleeper, "Outline of the FCC Hearing on FM," *FM and Television* (October 1944), p. 13; and "Battle Over FM," *Business Week* (November 11, 1944), pp. 19-20.

²⁶ See note 9.

²⁷ A major problem holding up unlimited duplication, especially of network programs, was the "Petrillo Ban," the American Federation of Musicians' demand for double pay on musical shows carried on both AM and FM stations. See "Mr. Petrillo Again," *Broadcasting* (October 29, 1945), p. 16. The ban on music shows was lifted early in 1948 [*Broadcasting* (March 15, 1948), p. 29]. The fight against duplicated programs was led in the FCC by Commissioners Clifford Durr and Paul Walker [*Broadcasting* (September 30, 1946), pp. 15-16]. That fight was lost early in 1948 when the networks announced a policy of either total or no duplication in order to be fair to their sponsors [*Broadcasting* (April 5, 1948), p. 29; and (June 7, 1948), p. 62].

²⁸ In early 1947, about 75% of all FM applications filed were filed by AM licensees—a pattern set in 1945 which persisted [*Broadcasting* (January 20, 1947), p. 40]. For an extreme view of the "monopoly" situation see "Ex-Radioman Labor Spokesman Claims AM 'Giants' Are Monopolizing all FM," *Broadcasting* (August 19, 1946), p. 30.

²⁹ For a good discussion of the role of FM to newspaper owners of radio, see Harvey J. Levin, *Broadcast Regulation and Joint Ownership of Media*. (New York: New York University Press, 1960), pp. 54-56. Levin's reasoning for newspaper owners can be applied to other AM owners as well.

³⁰ Of the 46 commercial FM stations on the air by 1944, all but six were owned by AM licensees. Only four of the stations operating before the war-time freeze were controlled by non-AM licensees [*Broadcasting* (April 24, 1944), p. 18; and *Journal of Frequency Modulation* (February 1946), pp. 22, 24].

³¹ See note 27.

³² See note 29.

³³ FCC data as reprinted monthly in issues of *Broadcasting* shows that early FM deletions (1948-50) were of construction permit holders, few of which were actually on the air. Only in 1950-53 did licensed stations begin to leave the air in appreciable numbers (40 to 60 a year).

³⁴ Figures from Federal Communications Commission, *36th Annual Report: 1969*. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970), pp. 126-128.

³⁵ The optimism was shared by official quarters in the immediate post-war years. Both the FCC and the Senate issued publications with glowing predictions of FM's future and gave detailed information on how to apply for an FM station license. See especially U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of Small Business. *Small Business Opportunities in FM Broadcasting*. 79th Cong., 2nd Sess., April 10, 1946.

³⁶ There are no solid figures on FM programming until the mid-1960s, but trade magazine discussions of FM in the 1940-65 period consistently spoke of either popular or classical orchestral music (on FM-only operations) or the AM programming duplicated on nearly all AM-owned FM stations. Only in the early 1960s were trade magazine program discussions devoted more to the exceptions (other program types) rather than the rule. See, for example, "Programs for FM," *Broadcasting* (June 1, 1940), p. 18; "Local Programs Basic FM Principle," *Broadcasting* (October 21, 1946), p. 92; Seymour M. Siegal, "FM's Programming Outlook," *Frequency Modulation Business* (June 1947), pp. 13, 36; John M. Conly, "FM to the Rescue," *Atlantic* (January 1951), p. 92; David Hall, "FM: An Unaccepted Challenge," *Nation* (December 4, 1954), pp 487-488; and *Hi-Fi Music At Home* (July-August 1957), entire issue.

³⁷ For examples of this format see "Catering to Highbrows Pays Off," *Business Week* (October 21, 1961), pp. 118-123; and Alfred Balk, "Chicago's FM War," *Saturday Review* (April 1, 1967), p. 38. Both of these articles refer in large part to Chicago's WFMT, an FM station the *Chicago Tribune's* broadcasting subsidiary attempted to buy in 1967, but which it eventually turned over to an educational TV station because of private and public pressure against the cross-media ownership situation and a strong public campaign to prevent programming changes that might reduce the amount of classical music aired. [*Broadcasting* (February 16, 1970), p. 42].

³⁸ According to statistics of the Electronics Industries Association, in no year from 1952-58 were more than 700,000 FM sets made, and from 1954-58 (inclusive) fewer than 375,000 FM sets were made each year—seemingly barely enough to take care of replacement needs, let alone allow for much audience expansion.

³⁹ An example of this complaint is in "Have Audience, Can Sell—FM," *Broadcasting* (February 9, 1959), p. 132.

⁴⁰ See "Local FM Success Stories," *U.S. Radio* (July 1960), pp. 42, 44; and "What Can You Do For Me for \$10," *Sponsor* (July 9, 1962), p. 35 for typical examples of trade stories on local advertiser use of FM.

⁴¹ "How to Buy (And Sell) FM," *Sponsor* (December 12, 1960), p. 38.

⁴² *Broadcasting* (April 11, 1960), p. 68; (June 27, 1960), p. 60; and "Special Report: FM Reps," *FM Management* (National Association of FM Broadcasters, July 1968), pp. 1-5.

⁴³ "FM, At Long Last, Is Making Its Move," *Broadcasting* (February 23, 1970), pp. 47-58.

⁴⁴ Paul A. deMars, "Frequency Modulation: History and Progress," *Broadcasting Yearbook*, 1940, p. 372.

⁴⁵ Sol Taishoff and Lewis V. Gilpin, "Birth of Commercial FM This Year Seen," *Broadcasting* (April 1, 1940), pp. 18-21, 80-93. A very complete 25,000 word report on the hearings of March 1940.

⁴⁶ Problems with AM signal contours, station power, spacing, directional antennas, etc. were cited by the Commission as examples of problems in AM which would hopefully be avoided in FM. "Is FCC Making FM Basic Medium?" *Broadcasting* (July 3, 1961), p. 23.

⁴⁷ Lessing, *op. cit.*, pp. 293-294.

⁴⁸ For the early history of this proceeding see Walter B. Emery, *Broadcasting and Government*. (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1961), pp. 103-107. See also Federal Communications Commission, *Report and Order on Docket 15028* (FCC 64-517), June 5, 1964.

⁴⁹ Federal Communications Commission, *Report and Order on Docket 12517*, April 20, 1961 as reprinted in *Broadcast Engineering* (May 1961), pp. 28-36.

⁵⁰ "FCC Rules Decision Overhauls FM Band," *Broadcasting* (July 30, 1962), p. 32.

⁵¹ Federal Communications Commission, *Report and Order On Docket 15084* (FCC 64-609), July 1, 1964. See also various issues of *Broadcasting* in the 1965-67 period for details on delays and exemptions granted to the ruling. For some stations it went into effect on October 15, 1965, but for most, January 1, 1967 was the deadline.

⁵² Federal Communications Commission, *Notice of Proposed Rule-making on Docket 15084* (FCC 63-468), May 15, 1963, paragraphs 15-22, pp. 6-10. This to date is the clearest statement of long-range FCC plans to separate AM-FM ownership. Part of those plans (a rule against any future combinations except with Class IV AM stations in markets under 10,000 population) were made final in Federal Communications Commission, *First Report and Order on Docket 18110* (FCC 70-310), March 25, 1970, paragraphs 45-62, 35 *Federal Register* 5953.

⁵³ Federal Communications Commission, *Notice of Proposed Rule-Making and Memorandum Opinion and Order on Docket 18651* (FCC 69-960), September 11, 1969. This docket is one of the clearest expositions of the FCC's current AM-FM allocations policy.

⁵⁴ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Commerce, *Hearings on All-Channel Television Receivers*, 87th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1962; and Lawrence D. Longley, "The FCC and the All-Channel Receiver Bill of 1962," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING* XIII: 3 (Summer 1969), pp. 293-303.

⁵⁵ W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1961).

DON R. LE DUC

A Selective Bibliography on the Evolution of CATV 1950-1970

A full bibliography on one of the most active areas of broadcasting—CATV—is long overdue. Don Le Duc originally prepared this compilation while working on his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin. It is based on an extensive clipping file collected by Kenneth Lichty of Indio, California, and by the author's major professor, Lawrence W. Lichty of the University of Wisconsin. Support for completing the collection came, in part, through a fellowship awarded by the Department of Communication Arts and a travel grant from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Le Duc is a member of the State of Wisconsin and United States Supreme Court Bars, and is on the publications committee of the Federal Communications Bar Association and the communications committee of the American Bar Association. Formerly on the faculty of the University of Maryland, he will be assistant professor in the Department of Speech at the Ohio State University starting this fall.

THE rapid expansion in the cable television industry during the past decade has stimulated an almost equally rapid increase in the volume of CATV literature being produced each year. More than 3,000 of the nearly 4,000 articles, studies and reports on CATV published between 1950 and 1971 appeared in print after 1960; a mass of research material which is broadening constantly, both in range of treatment and degree of detail. The very breadth of this recent interest, however, has operated to limit ready scholarly access to these new studies, for publication is now occurring across a spectrum of sources far wider than the scope of any single periodical indexing system.

This bibliography has been designed with the intent of re-establishing access through a combination of basic reference listings and article citations. A general compilation of scholarly, legal and trade indices citing CATV material has been augmented by a selected collection of almost

© JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, VOL. XV, No. 2 (Spring 1971)

1,200 articles, arranged chronologically within topic headings. Through this type of organization a researcher is provided with the option of either proceeding directly to the articles cited in the body of the bibliography, or using their titles as an historical index to suggest the most useful eras for intensive search of the general periodical guides.

Because of the vast array of CATV material available, bibliographic citation has been selective rather than exhaustive. In cases of duplicated coverage, an effort has been made to list only that single source adding the greatest amount of detail or interpretation. Similarly, cable television trade journal citation has been limited to articles of broad scholarly interest, although more specific information may be found through the annual indices published in some trade journals. In transcribing some titles (notably from law reviews and the *New York Times*), some references have been shortened or condensed. Similarly, some citations (particularly from *Broadcasting* and *Variety*) have had titles expanded in the interests of clarity. Finally, some minor grammatical or punctuation corrections have been made. These changes from a literal transcription standard were made in the interests of enhancing the utility of this compilation as a source locator, rather than as a traditional bibliography.

Indices of the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* have been searched extensively, whereas other newspapers have been examined only during periods when CATV issues in their localities assumed national significance. Whenever possible, legal digest references have been employed rather than extensive listings of individual cases or statutes. Use of such legal digests not only avoids duplication of material already organized for research purposes, but also allows analysis within a body of other relevant cases, rulings and enactments.

The time-sequence-within-topic arrangement of this bibliography initially was employed because it furnished the most effective method of organizing material for a dissertation (soon to become a book) tracing the regulatory history of CATV in the United States. No system of alphabetizing seemed to provide equal ability to isolate particular aspects of CATV evolution, and none appeared to offer the same vantage point for tracing trends through time.

The author would be grateful to learn of any significant references that may have been omitted from this work.

CONTENTS

General Reference Materials

| | |
|--|--------|
| CATV Periodicals, Textbooks, Annual Cable Reports | p. 197 |
| Major Hearings and Studies | p. 198 |
| Basic Legal Decisions | p. 200 |
| CATV Index to Periodical & Legal Systems, Bibliographies | p. 200 |

Specific Citations Arranged by Topic and Date

CATV History

| | |
|---|--------|
| Pre-History: Wired TV Developments through 1945 | p. 201 |
| Pioneering: CATV Development, 1945 through 1957 | p. 202 |

Operations in the Modern Period

| | |
|---|--------|
| Economics and Ownership | p. 203 |
| Management, Programming and Operation | p. 205 |
| Industry Trends and Surveys | p. 207 |
| Predictions | p. 210 |

Intermedia Competition

| | |
|-----------------------|--------|
| Economic | p. 211 |
| Legal | p. 215 |
| Common Carriage | p. 219 |
| Copyright | p. 221 |

Regulation

| | |
|---------------|--------|
| Federal | p. 225 |
| State | p. 231 |
| Local | p. 233 |

General Reference Materials

CATV PERIODICALS

- Broadcast Management/Engineering* (BM/E). Monthly. Mactier Publishing Corp., 820 Second Ave., New York, N.Y., 10017. Started January 1965 (undated preview issue). Covers wide range of practical topics relating to cable operation; excellent series of individual CATV system case histories.
- Cablecasting & Educational Television*. Monthly. C. S. Tepfer Publishing Co., 140 Main Street, Ridgefield, Connecticut, 06877. Started January 1964. Best source for ITV and educational applications of cable.
- Cable/News*. Weekly. Cable Communications, Corp., 146 Executive Bldg., 2801 Northwest Expressway, Oklahoma City, Okla., 73105. Started March 1968. Maverick business oriented cable news flier.

CATV. Weekly. CATV Publications, Inc., 1900 West Yale St., Englewood, Colorado, 80110. Started July 1967. Older, less controversial cable trade news service.

TV Communications. Monthly. CATV Publications, Inc. (as CATV above.) Started January 1963. Uneven collection of articles, primarily concerned with CATV technology and system operation.

Television Digest. Weekly. Television Digest, Inc., 2025 Eye Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., 20006. Started January 1945. Most authoritative source of empirical and general trend information about cable industry.

TEXTBOOKS

No comprehensive CATV text has yet been published. However, one publisher, TAB Books, Blue Ridge Summit, Pennsylvania, 17214, offers several informal treatments of cable operation in book form, including *CATV Systems Management and Operation*, by Robert Cooper (1966), a useful work which provides some practical insights into general problems faced by cable operators. TAB will furnish a list of similar offerings upon request.

ANNUAL CABLE REPORTS

CATV Equipment Directory, Systems Directory and Atlas.

CATV Publications, Inc., 1900 West Yale St., Englewood, Colorado, 80110. Listings of cable suppliers, operators and system locations supplied as part of publisher's weekly news service, CATV.

Television Factbook, CATV and Station Coverage Atlas.

Television Digest, Inc., 2025 Eye St., N. W., Washington, D. C., 20006. "Station" volume provides television ownership and coverage data; "services" volume, the most comprehensive single source of comparative television-CATV information, and "atlas" locates all CATV systems and TV Grade "B" contours.

MAJOR HEARINGS AND STUDIES

Congress

All government documents, unless otherwise indicated in the citation, may be obtained from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Congressional documents have been cited by the number and session of the Congress producing them (e.g., 85.2 signifies 85th Congress, Second Session) to facilitate their procurement.

U. S. SENATE, COMMERCE COMMITTEE

(85.2) "Review of allocation problems of television service to smaller communities," Hearings, 1958.

(85.2) "The problems of television service for smaller communities," Staff report (Cox), Dec. 1958.

(86.1) "VHF boosters and CATV legislation," Hearings, 1959.

(86.1) "Licensing of CATV," Report on S. 2653, Sept. 1959.

U.S. SENATE, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

(91.1) "Revisions of Copyright Act of 1909," Hearings on S.543, 1969.

U.S. HOUSE, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(89.1) "Regulation of CATV," Hearings on H.R. 7715, 1965.

- (89.2) "Regulation of CATV," Hearings on H.R. 12914, H.R. 13286, H.R. 14201, 1966.
- (91.1) "Rescind interim procedures . . . authorize FCC regulation of CATV," Hearings on H.R. 10268, H.R. 10510, 1969.
- U.S. HOUSE, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
- (89.2) "Proposed amendments to Copyright Act of 1909," Hearings on H.R. 4347, H.R. 5680, H.R. 6831, H.R. 6835, 1966.

Federal Agencies

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

FCC docket numbers provide the broadest access to all information relevant to a particular topic. PIKE & FISCHER RADIO REGULATION (R.R.) Current Service, Vol. 1, page 5:287 locates each docket report in its digest system; and at page 1:51, lists any proposed rules relating to the docket. Both FCC and RR citations have been used interchangeably in this study. For a table converting FCC citations to their RR counterparts, see RR, Current Service, Vol. 1, page 6:301.

- 13 RR 1546a, "Rules and regulations incidental to restricted radiation devices," Subpart D, Part 15, Docket 9288, July 11, 1956. (First FCC rules pertaining to CATV).
- 18 RR 1573, "In the matter of inquiring into the impact of CATV . . . on the orderly development of television broadcasting," Docket 12443, April 13, 1959, (1959 Report and Order).
- 22 RR 193, "Carter Mountain Transmission," Docket 12931, Feb. 16, 1962. (Cable microwave threat to TV justifies restraints).
- 38 FCC 683, "First report and order on Dockets 14895, 15233," April 25, 1965. (FCC asserts control over microwave CATV).
- 1 FCC 2d 463, "Notice of inquiry and notice of proposed rulemaking on Docket 15971," April 25, 1965. (Imposed freeze upon CATV top 100 market signal importation pending rules).
- 2 FCC2d 725, "Second report and order on Dockets 14895, 15233 and 15971," March 8, 1966. (FCC asserts general CATV control).
- 15 FCC2d 417, "Notice of inquiry and notice of proposed rulemaking in Docket 18397," Dec. 13, 1968. (Retransmission consent).
- 20 FCC2d 201, "First report and order on Docket 18397," Oct. 27, 1969. (Cablecasting approval; cf. CFR 74:1111-1117).
- 19 RR2d 1775, "Second report and order on Docket 18397," 1970. (Restrictions upon broadcaster ownership of CATV).

U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE

- "General revisions of Title 17," Reports of Register of Copyrights (6 pts.; CATV, cf., pts. 3, 4, 6, 1964-1965).

Government Commissioned Studies

- Martin Seiden, *An Economic Analysis of Community Antenna Television Systems and the Television Broadcasting Industry*. Feb. 12, 1965. (USGPO).
- Mayor's Advisory Task Force, *A Report on Cable Television and Cable Communication in New York City*, Sept. 14, 1968. (New York: Superintendent of Documents, 1968).
- President's Task Force on Communications Policy, *Final Report*, 1969. (USGPO).

Private Studies and Reports

- Franklin M. Fisher, *The Impact of CATV Competition on Local Television Stations*, NAB appendix, Dockets 14895 and 15233.
- Herman W. Land and Associates, Inc., *Television and the Wired City: A Study of the Implications of a Change in Mode of Transmission*, Washington: NAB, 1968.
- Leland L. Johnson, *The Future of Cable Television: Some Problems of Federal Regulation*. (RM-6199, Jan. 1970) Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand Corp., 1970.
- N. E. Feldman, *Cable Television: Opportunities and Problems in Local Program Origination* (570 FF, Sept. 1970) Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand Corp., 1970.
- Leland L. Johnson, *Cable Television and the Question of Protecting the Local Broadcaster* (R-595 MF, Oct. 1970) Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand Corp., 1970.
- Rolla Edward Park, *Potential Impact of Cable Growth on Television Broadcasting* (R-587-FF, Oct. 1970) Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand Corp., 1970.

BASIC LEGAL DECISIONS

- Intermountain Broadcasting v. Idaho Microwave*, 196 F. Supp. 315 (D.C., Idaho, 1961). Denied basis of "unfair competition" for broadcasters to charge for use of programming once it was broadcast to the public.
- Carter Mountain Transmission v. FCC*, 321 F.2d 359 (D.C. Cir., 1962) Cert. den. 375 US 951 (1963). Affirmed FCC authority to restrict microwave service to CATV system if end result of increase would be to adversely affect a competing local broadcaster.
- Cable Vision v. KUTZ*, 335 F.2d 348 (9th Cir. 1964) Cert. den. 379 US 989 (1965). Denied broadcaster right to block CATV carriage of its signal on basis of exclusive contract.
- United States v. Southwestern Cable* 392 US 157 (1968). Affirmed FCC authority to regulate CATV as adjunct of agency's general powers over electronic media.
- Fortnightly Corp. v. United Artists Television*, 392 US 390 (1968). Held CATV to be essentially a reception, not broadcast service, so carriage of TV signals not "performance" which would make system liable for copyright infringement.
- TV Pix v. Taylor*, 304 F. Supp. 549 (D. Nev. 1968) affirmed 396 US 556 (1970). Recognized right of state to exercise control over domestic cable systems in all areas not expressly pre-empted by federal control.

CATV INDEX TO PERIODICAL AND LEGAL SYSTEMS

CATV articles may be found under the following headings:

Business Periodicals Index

Television; broadcasting, community antenna; prior to 1967 under Television, antenna (also, multiple outlet system).

Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals

Radio & Television

Index to Legal Periodicals

Radio & Television

*Index to Periodical Articles Related to Law
Television*

International Index: . . . Social Sciences and Humanities
CATV; prior to 1968, *Television*, antenna.

Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature
CATV; prior to 1968, *Television*, broadcasting, community antenna.

Topicator
Cable TV; also *NCTA* and *Copyright*

Newspapers

New York Times
Television, community antenna TV; prior to 1969, *Television*, antenna or equipment.

Wall Street Journal
Communications, Radio & TV; prior to 1969, no sub-heading.

Legal Digests

American Jurisprudence (AM Jur 2d)
Vol. 44, *Radio & Television*

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)
47 CFR Parts 74.1100ff. (CATV rules of the FCC)

Corpus Juris Secundum (CJS)
86 CJS, *Telegraph & Telephone*, section XX

Pike & Fischer, Radio Regulation (RR)
Para. 54 Digest and Current Service, Vol. 2; also see, for material not otherwise cited in this study, *Docket 18373*, carriage of distant signals; *Docket 18891*, newspaper and multiple cable ownership; *Docket 18892*, proper state and local jurisdiction and *Docket 18894*, CATV technical standards.

West Digest system
Key numbers, *Copyright* 2-67; *Telecommunications* 382-428.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

bcg Communique, 1966, No. 8, 9. (Broadcast Communications Group, Inc.; now Avco Radio and Television Sales).

"Preliminary Checklist of Materials in the Legal Aspects of CATV," *New York Bar Record*, Oct. 1966, 494-505.

Kenneth Gompertz, "A Bibliography of Articles about Broadcasting in Law Periodicals, 1956-1968" *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, XIV:1 (Part II), Winter 1969-70, or *Federal Communications Bar Journal*, XXXIII:3 (Part II), 1969. cf. "Community Antenna Television" and "Copyright" topic headings.

Specific Citations Arranged by Topic and Date

HISTORY

Pre-History: Wired TV Developments through 1945
1927

"Seeing over the telephone," *Review of Reviews* (May), 18.

1930

"Two way television: a demonstration," *Scientific American* (June), 467.

1931

H. E. Ives, "Two way television," *Smithsonian Report*, 297.

1935

"TV takes a step nearer reality, AT & T's coaxial cable," *Newsweek* (Aug. 3), 24.

1937

"Television and the coaxial cable," *Science News Letter* (Nov. 20), 326.

1938

R. L. Ives, "Pictures through a pipe: coaxial cable," *Science News Letter* (March 12), 170.

1940

A. P. Peck, "TV relayed; makes network possible; uses directional transmission of high frequencies," *Scientific American* (May), 282.

1944

"Television dream; use of ordinary telephone wire demonstrated," *Business Week* (Nov. 4), 86.

1945

"Television by telephone," *Science Digest* (Jan.), 93.

S. J. Mallory, "Wave guides for piping TV programs," *Radio News* (Dec.), 36.

1965

Robert D. L'Heureux, "CATV industry; its history, nature and scope," *TV & Communications*, (June), 25; (July), 72; (Aug.), 55; (Sept.), 39; (Oct.), 35; (Dec.), 30; (Jan., 1966), 36.

Pioneering: CATV Development, 1945 through 1957**1946**

"TV via light beam-photovision," *Business Week* (Dec.), 66.

1949

I. Kamen, "Television master antennas," *Radio & TV News* (April), 31.

R. W. Sanders, "Fringe area television reception," *Radio & TV News* (Oct.), 44.

1950

"Master TV antenna system for apartment buildings," *Popular Mechanics* (Nov.), 230.

1951

E. D. Lucas, "How TV came to Panther Valley," *Radio & TV News* (March), 31.

"Community aerial stretches TV," *Science Digest* (April), 94.

"Community antennas bring TV programs," *Science News Letter* (June 2), 345.

J. A. Stanley, "No television in your city?" *Radio & TV News* (Dec.), 40.

1952

"TV piped into residences of New Hampshire," *Science News Letter* (July 12), 20.

"Community television systems," *Radio & TV News* (Oct.), 8.

1953

"Community TV antenna system—Laconia, N. H.," *Popular Mechanics* (Jan.), 227.

1954

"Community TV antennas; a nationwide survey," *Colorado Municipalities*, 123.

"TV comes over the mountain," *Fortune* (Oct.), 155.

E. D. Lucas, "TV Cinderella; CATV a wide open field for profit," *Radio & TV News* (Oct.), 47.

"G. E. begins first promotion of closed circuit TV equipment," *New York Times* (Nov. 30), 41.

1957

R. B. Laursen, "Free TV, a new city service," *American City* (May), 12.

1967

"CATV's 16 year growth pattern," *Television Digest* (supp.) (Feb. 27).

1969

John Shampton, "The childhood of CATV," *Ohio State Law Journal XXX* (Spring), 382.

OPERATIONS IN THE MODERN PERIOD

Economics and Ownership

(Includes financing and acquisition of systems; excludes broadcast ownership, which is cited under *Intermedia Competition: Economic*).

1959

"Rank buys a pipe," *Economist* (Feb. 14), 628.

I. V. Cobleigh, "Tele Prompter Corp.," *Commercial & Financial Chronicle* (April 23), 11.

1961

"Tele Prompter acquires 3 CATV systems for 1 million," *New York Times* (June 9), 47.

1962

"Biggest CATV sale yet; \$10 million. Sammons sells 18 systems to group headed by Stern," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 6), 44.

1963

"Brokerage house for CATV systems," *Business Week* (Sept. 1), 98.

1964

"CATV into pay TV? Not so easy.," *Broadcasting* (July 13), 27.

1965

"Focus on H&B American Corp.," *Television* (March), 16.

"CATV investment given cautious recommendation," *Editor & Publisher* (May 22), 98.

"CATV: how it can affect advertising," *Printer's Ink* (May 28), 33.

"Focus on Tele Prompter Corp.," *Television* (June), 14.

"Telesis Corp., a 9 month old giant," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 13), 62.

"Kaiser and Cox join to build CATV gear," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 4), 62.

"Ranking the cable operators," *Television Digest* (Oct. 25), 2.

"CATV takes its case to the money men: New York Seminar with security analysts," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 31), 33.

"Where the money goes," *Television Age* (Feb. 14), 29.

"CATV wins big money support in new growth race," *Business Week* (Feb. 19), 100.

"New CATV entry: General Cablevision," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 21), 34.

"CATV: new industry—with data on specialists in the field," *Financial World* (April 13), 125.

"CATV firms bigger, stronger," *Broadcasting* (June 27), 44.

"Publishers watch microwave systems," *Editor & Publisher* (July 9), 42.

"CATV manufacturers gauge industry outlook," *Television Digest* (July 11), 34.

"CATV and Viking Industries," *Commercial & Financial Chronicle* (Aug. 4), 418.

"Room at the CATV top," *Television Digest* (Aug. 15), 3.

"Move into CATV: advice to dailies," *Advertising Age* (Nov. 7), 50.

"CATV cable and microwave systems," *Business Week* (Dec. 3), 57.

1967

"Lusty youth: with data on leading CATV operators," *Financial World* (March 1), 10.

"Jack Kent Cooke says he plans to sell 21 of his CATV systems in 14 states," *Wall Street Journal* (March 27), 1.

"There may be CATV in your future, newspaper publishers are advised," *Advertising Age* (April 28), 1.

"FC & B invades CATV field," *Broadcasting* (June 26), 71.

"General Instrument-Jerrold merger intensifies CATV interest," *Television Digest* (Sept. 4), 2.

"RI Bulletin examines CATV opportunities," *Editor & Publisher* (Nov. 11), 24.

"New entry in CATV ad lab research," *Media/Scope* (Dec.) 58.

1968

"CATV: panacea for ad testing?" *Television Age* (April 22), 26.

"H&B's quantum jump with Cooke acquisition," *Television Digest* (July 15), 3.

S. W. Little, "CATV: the big growth industry in broadcasting," *Saturday Review* (Oct. 12), 79.

E. A. Lacy, "10,000 technical jobs in CATV," *Popular Electronics* (Nov.), 27.

T. Ryan, "Role of independent in CATV," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Dec. 5), 196.

1969

"Who's who among top cable groups," *Television Digest* (Feb. 3), 3.

"Cox acquires Telesystem; second largest CATV group owner," *Broadcasting* (March 17), 56.

"Justice agency opposed CATV ownership by newspapers, TV," *Wall Street Journal* (April 10), 2.

"ANPA head scores action by federal agencies to bar newspaper ownership of CATV," *New York Times* (April 23), 2.

"How newspapers and CATV mix," *Broadcasting* (April 28), 58.

"Size and shape of CATV industry," *Television Digest* (April 28), 1.

"Publishers form group to fight cable TV ban," *Editor & Publisher* (May 31), 45.

"Multi-million CATV combine," (TelePrompTer-H&B) *Variety* (Aug. 13), 31.

1970

- "Another giant CATV complex formed," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 19), 57.
- H. E. Goodfriend, F. T. Pratt, "Community antenna television," *Financial Analysts Journal* (March), 48.
- D. D. Hale, "Financing CATV," *Journal of Commercial Banking and Lending* (March), 43.
- P. Kagen, "Exciting picture: prospects have brightened for makers of cable TV equipment," *Barrons* (March 9), 11.
- "Differences in evaluating cable TV system value are pointed up," *Television/Radio Age* (March 23), 51.
- "Line up of top 50 cable operators," *Television Digest* (April 20), 4.
- "Tele Prompter—H&B get FCC go-ahead," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 10), 36.
- J. C. Ohis, "Marginal cost pricing: investment theory and CATV," *Journal of Law and Economics XIII* (Oct.), 439.
- "Two big cable systems plan merger," *Television Digest* (Oct. 12), 29.
- "Zenith edges into CATV," *Electronic News* (Dec. 28), 14.

Management, Programming and Operation

1959

- "Now closed circuit TV makes a direct pitch to customers," *Business Week* (Oct. 17), 54.

1960

- "TV for a mountain top village," *American City* (Oct.), 102.

1964

- "TeleGuide cable grows in New York: hooked to nearly 50 hotels," *Sponsor* (Feb. 3), 52.
- Milton Shapp, "CATV for rural areas?" *Broadcasting* (Dec. 14), 47.

1965

- Lon Cantor, "CATV in 10 proven steps," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (preview issue), 24.
- "A closer look at CATV systems: Berkshire, Telecable, Atlantic Coast," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (Feb.), 29.
- "CATV systems seek to tap big city markets," *New York Times* (Feb. 7), III, 1.
- "Modern broadband CATV systems," *Electronic World* (Feb.), 37.
- "What pattern for CATV success? Elmira Video," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (April), 20.
- "CATV—14 years of service: Potomac Valley TV," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (June), 24.
- "Now visual news for CATV," *Broadcasting* (July 26), 54.

1966

- Julian Bradbury, "CATV: Wisconsin's growing giant," *Municipality* (Jan.), 19.
- "Ft. Madison, Iowa CATV providing view of teletype," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 31), 58.
- "Common carrier microwaves serving CATV systems," *Television Digest* (March 14), 61.
- "Everything available for CATV operations," *Broadcasting* (April 11), 84.
- "Hughes develops experimental microwave: relays 12 color channels from one transmitter; Tele Prompter to test," *New York Times* (April 28), I, 8.

- Jack Gould, "Comments on Hughes-Tele Prompter venture," *New York Times* (April 29), 95.
- "Candidate pipes political pitch by CATV," *New York Times* (June 26), I, 58.
- "F. W. Ford urges CATV operators to produce local shows," *Advertising Age* (July 4), 20.
- "CATV's new look—local origination," *Television Digest*, (July 4), 1.
- "Will origination build CATV audience?" *Television Digest* (Oct. 24), 2.
- "Here and there—program origination on CATV," *Television* (Dec.), 44.
- "CATV by laser is plan in New York," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 12), 82.

1967

- Irving Kahn, "CATV's growing impact, from low budget production to smash-eroo," *Variety* (Jan. 4), 98.
- C. E. Feltner, Jr., "Considerations for CATV program origination," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (March), 56.
- Leonard Traube, "Cable operations in New York," *Variety*, (May 17), 31; (May 31), 35; (June 7), 35.
- "Where are CATV operators headed?" *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (July), 20.
- "CATV in Great Barrington, Mass.," *Merchandising Week* (July 24), 24.
- Walter Spence, "Wiring New York; greatest risk, wildest promise for cable TV," *Television* (Sept.), 67.
- "CATVer jailed for origination," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 4), 70.

1968

- "Class struggle on TV; Manhattan Cable and TelePrompTer in New York," *Nation* (Jan. 15), 70.
- "Big cities brighten CATV future," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 29), 66.
- Neil Spahn, "CATV controversy: what's at stake for retailer?" *Merchandising Week* (Feb. 5).
- H. T. Ozaki and L. S. Stokes, "Amplitude modulated link," *TV Communications* (March), 42.
- "CATV air link?" *Television Digest* (April 22), 5.
- "TelePrompTer gains speed with FCC 18 GHz grant," *Television Digest* (May 20), 2.
- "Musical note for CATV, with editorial comment," *Business Week* (June 22), 44.
- "CATV delivers daily newspaper by wire," *Broadcasting* (June 24), 22.
- "Cable TV's programming fever," *Variety* (July 3), 33.
- "Stern proposes new name, services for cable TV," *Advertising Age* (July 8), 66.
- "Filling local program voids," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 30), 47.
- B. Summers, "Vikola spots rifts in clouded CATV picture," *Electronic News* (Dec. 23), 18.

1969

- "We'll sell time on CATV if OK given: Stern," *Advertising Age* (Feb. 10), 10.
- "FCC approves experimental use of high frequency microwave by CATV operator," *Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 14), 4.
- "Can cable make it in New York?" *Broadcasting* (March 3), 23.
- "Cable only TV sets proposed," *Broadcasting* (May 2), 74.
- "Manhattan Cable signs 1 year pact with Madison Square Garden for 125 sports events," *New York Times* (May 23), 4.

- "Scratching the itch to originate," *Broadcasting* (June 30), 69.
 "Hardware for the cable originator," *Broadcasting* (June 30), 73.
 "For hire: an electronic nanny," *TV Guide* (Aug. 23), 24.
 "CATVs with ads now number 98—program origination," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 22), 46.
 "Country Newspaper of the air," *TV Guide* (Oct. 11), 28.
 "Tele Prompter studying plan for own satellite system," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 27), 72.

1970

- "What educational media specialists ought to know about CATV," *Educational Digest* (Jan.), 48.
 "Kahn plans a satellite for CATV," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 9), 38.
 "Two-way circuit for CATV may be near," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 9), 42.
 "A syndicator eyes the big CATV market," *Broadcasting* (March 2), 54.
 "CATV, Elmira, N. Y.; 21,000 out of a possible 25,000 households; common cultural denominator," *New York Times* (May 4), 39.
 "CATV origination," *Television Digest* (May 4), 2.
 Louis Schwartz & Robert A. Woods, "Dollars for education in CATV," *Educational Broadcasting Review IV* (June), 7.
 "CATV may soon play postman," *Broadcasting* (June 15), 54.
 "FCC's 2-way CATV proposal seen as doorway to big market," *Electronic News* (June 29), 6.
 Jack Gould, "Breakthrough for neighborhood TV," *New York Times* (Oct. 5), 87.
 "TelePrompTer sets season's 1st theatrical premiere on CATV," *New York Times* (Oct. 8), 95.
 "Spotlight put on CATV programming," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 12), 36.
 "Rediffusion unveils pilot US CATV system," *Television Digest* (Nov. 2), 2.
 "A CATV goes after instant saturation," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 14), 66.
 "Hughes files for CATV satellite system," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 28), 9.

Industry Trends and Surveys

1961

- "The growth of CATV," *New York Times* (Oct. 22) III, 1.

1962

- A. Glenn, "Strong reception throughout the US, the market for CATV is growing," *Barrons* (Sept. 2), 51.

1963

- Dennis Duggan, "CATV: it's coming in loud and clear," *Los Angeles Times* (Nov. 29), III, 4.

1964

- C. S. Tepfer, "Cable TV on the move," *Electronic World* (Jan.), 40.
 "CATV: problems and promise," *Freedom of Information Report No. 122*, U. of Missouri School of Journalism, (May).
 "TV on the wire," *Economist* (May 9), 595.
 Albert Kroger, "CATV revisited," *Television* (Sept.), 20.
 "CATVs pass 1,400—still going," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 30), 52.
 Helen Shaffer, "Community antenna television," *Editorial Research Report* (Dec. 16).
 Jack Gould, "Network of receivers," *New York Times* (Dec. 27), II, 15.

1965

- "CATV—past, present and future," *TV & Communications* (Jan.), 28.
 "Outline for 1965," *Television Digest* (Jan. 4), 2.
 "CATV systems number 1,600," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 25), 51.
 "TV's lusty offspring: the booms and brawls of CATV," *Newsweek* (Feb. 1), 62.
 T. J. Murray, "Golden antenna of CATV," *Duns Review* (May), 44.
 "New factbook, fresh data, CATV analysis," *Television Digest* (May 3), 3.
 "CATV: the communication revolution," *Television Digest* (July 26), 2.
 "CATV: static in the system, still fantastically profitable, but faces problems from courts and FCC," *Forbes* (Aug. 1), 39.
 "Community antenna enters the big TV picture," *Fortune* (Aug.), 146.
 J. L. Reinsch, "Cable TV is here to stay and will grow," *Commercial & Financial Chronicle* (Aug. 18), 604.
 Edwin James, "The growing snarl for wired TV," *Television* (Sept.), 42.
 "Community antenna television systems," *Municipality* (Oct.), 252.
 "Growth of CATV—1957-65," *Sponsor* (Oct. 18), 72.
 Morris Gelman, "Will wire take over?" *Television* (Dec.) 28.
 R. J. McGeehan, "CATV outlook: 500% increase in 5 years," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 20), 69.

1966

- Leo Soloman, "CATV: the year of decision," *The Viewer* (Jan.)
 "CATV may become an ad medium: Ford," *Advertising Age* (Jan. 31), 8.
 "How CATV makes room for more," *Business Week* (Feb. 19), 102.
 "CATV expands markets but blurs them," *Advertising Age* (March 28), 1.
 "Pros and cons of CATV," *Broadcasting* (March 28), 84.
 "Big changes ahead in TV; wider choice for watchers," *U. S. News & World Report* (April 4), 92.
 W. A. Stocklin, "CATV: booming new industry," *Electronic World* (May), 75.
 Frederick Ford, "CATV fights back," *Journal of the Screen Producers Guild* (Sept.), 31.
 Chris Wells, "The tangled tower of CATV," *Life* (Nov. 18), 54.
 "The official facts and figures of CATV," *Television Digest* (Dec. 9), 1.

1967

- "The dimensions of CATV," *Television* (March), 2.
 Leonard Traube, "Introduction of a nationwide survey of cablecasting," *Variety* (July 26).
 Albert Warren, "The four letters that have rocked broadcasting," *TV Guide* (July 29), 4.
 J. E. Hastings, "CATV: past, present and future," *Electronic World* (Aug.), 23.
 "CATV operators hail favorable breaks," *Television Digest* (Oct. 9), 1.
 "FCC's CATV statistical analysis," *Television Digest* (Nov. 6), 2.
 David Loehwing, "How much interference? Nobody likes cable but Wall Street and main street," *Barrons* (Nov. 13), 3.
 R. Angus, "Cable: parasite or panacea?" *High Fidelity* (Dec.), 50.

1968

- "An economic history of CATV from 1958," *Broadcasting Yearbook*, 16.
 M. Rarzinan, "Fast growing segment of CATV field," *Electronic News* (Feb. 5), 28.

- "The future that is now available," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 19), 72.
- A. Simon, "Look at CATV," *Journal of Commercial Banking* (April), 42.
- "CATV annual growth pattern," *Television Digest* (May 13), 3.
- Ralph Smith, "The battle over cable TV," *New York Times* (May 26), (magazine), 35.
- "Summary of CATV home data," *Television* (June), 64.
- "Optimism prevails in CATV," *Broadcasting* (June 24), 33.
- "Caution signals on CATV open road," *Broadcasting* (July 8), 32.
- "Heard on the street: fast growing CATV continues to attract increasing number of investors," *Wall Street Journal* (July 15), 3.
- "CATV: clearer view," *Financial World* (July 24), 14.
- "CATV's signal still not clear," *Wall Street Journal* (Aug. 3), 12.
- C. H. Simonds, "Wanted: an electronic pipeline," *National Review* (Sept. 10), 917.
- "Ubiquitous cable," *Newsweek* (Nov. 4), 86.
- "Heard on the street: effect on CATV stocks of FCC proposed inquiry," *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 16), 3.
- 1969
- H. Fanlet, "CATV: a perfect picture and more channels, too," *Popular Science* (Jan.), 68.
- "Confusion in TV land: fee, free or what?" *Senior Scholastic* (Feb. 14), 14.
- Wayne Varga, "Cable TV's antenna out and quivering," *Los Angeles Times* (Feb. 23), 1.
- B. Hutchinson, "CATV—under wraps, misunderstood, but potential basis for advertising revolution," *Advertising Age* (June 2), 66.
- Larry Michie, "CATV as a pending industry," *Variety* (June 18), 35.
- Larry Michie, "Cable TV rides into show biz," *Variety* (June 25), 1.
- Cleveland Amory, "About Cable TV," *TV Guide* (Sept. 27), 36.
- Roger W. Hill, Jr., "Educational considerations of CATV, cablecasting, telecommunications," *Educational/Instructional Broadcasting* (Nov.), 57.
- "Cablemen claim tide turning their way," *Television Digest* (Nov. 3), 4.
- R. H. Smith, "More wraps off CATV," *Publishers Weekly* (Nov. 3), 196.
- "Cable TV leaps into the big time," *Business Week* (Nov. 22), 100.
- 1970
- "Heard on the street: high ratings on Cable TV stocks," *Wall Street Journal* (Jan. 2), 1.
- "Cable promoters start thinking big," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 26), 54.
- "Hint of the future," (ed.) *Broadcasting* (Feb. 9), 86.
- Kenneth Cox, "New developments make CATV picture brighter," *Television/Radio Age* (April 6), 66.
- "4.5 million CATV homes," *Television Digest* (April 6), 3.
- "CATV headed for an ad supported network?" *Broadcasting* (May 4), 23.
- "CATV: up and coming industry," *Financial World* (May 4), 7.
- "Pinpointing 3.7 million CATV homes," *Broadcasting* (June 1), 58.
- Jack Gould, "Rapidly changing status of CATV," *New York Times* (June 14), II, 15.
- Kenneth Cox, "A U. S. government view of CATV and its future," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, LVIII (July), 963.
- E. Stratford Smith, "The emergence of CATV: a look at the evolution of a revolution," *Proceedings of the IEEE* LVIII (July), 967.
- "Big changes in TV, phones: upheaval in communications," *U. S. News & World Report* (July 13), 50.

- "CATV: a pioneering industry," *Magazine of Wall Street* (Sept. 12), 22.
 "Telcon's Reeves bids cable avoid trap of imitating 'high mass' TV," *Variety* (Oct. 21), 31.
 James P. Forhan, "CATV looks like a lusty infant heading for a fast growth era," *Advertising Age* (Nov. 2), 98.
 "Brighter picture for CATV," *Financial World* (Dec. 16), 8.

Predictions

1965

- "The TV system of tomorrow: Future of Broadcasting panel report," *Broadcasting* (March 29), 68.

1966

- R. L. Shayon, "Whither cable TV?" *Saturday Review* (Sept. 17), 63.
 S. Miller, "CATVs on the way with dream services," *Electronic News* (Oct. 31), 27.

1967

- E. Zarbin, "Rapid growth ahead for cable TV," *Electronic News* (March 20), 112.
 "Crystal ball sees nothing but upheavals," *Broadcasting* (April 10), 96.
 "CATV program origination; present and prospective," *Television Digest* (June 9), 2.
 "Own programs in CATV future," *Broadcasting* (July 3), 46.
 "14 experts project TV evolution," *Television* (Sept.), 36.
 "A searching look at hardware that can reshape TV broadcasting," *Television* (Sept.), 55.

1968

- Herman Finkelstein, "Whither TV and CATV? New markets opening new fields," *Variety* (Jan. 3), 88.
 "Vast possibilities seen for cable TV," *Los Angeles Times* (March 23), II, 1.
 "Is the future out of control?" *Broadcasting* (April 1), 86.
 "Is TV explosion cable?" *Television Digest* (April 1), 5.
 "CBS's Schneider sees larger role for cable as cities grow upward," *Variety* (April 3), 35.
 Maurice Christopher, "Broadcasters alerted to wired city plan," *Advertising Age* (April 8), 1.
 David Lachenbruch, "Looking ahead: an expert predicts your TV set will be capable of almost anything," *TV Guide* (April 13), 8.
 Harold Barnett & Edward Greenberg, "The best way to get more varied programs," *Trans-Action* (May), 39.
 Harold Barnett & Edward Greenberg, "On the economics of wired city television," *American Economic Review* (June), 503.
 "NCTA head foresees a wired country," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 9), 29.
 "CATV: wave of communication future?" *Publishers Weekly* (Dec. 16), 23.

1969

- Richard Doan, "Wired for everything; a new examination of Cable TV," *TV Guide* (Jan. 11), 6.
 "The day after tomorrow," *Television Age* (Jan. 27), 31.
 "Direct satellite to home broadcast seen as too expensive for 15 years," *New York Times* (Feb. 23), XII, 1.

- "The road ahead for CATV," *Broadcasting* (April 7), 43.
 Jack Gould, "If cable ever goes, where it could go," *New York Times* (June 15).
 "Wall Street ponders; whither CATV?" *Television Age* (June 16), 24.
 "Ford Foundation allocates 165 Gs for Rand study of CATV," *Variety* (June 25), 35.
 "Wired for growth—if official interference ends, cable TV could fulfill its promise," *Barrons* (June 30), 3.
 "Communications" special issues of *Law & Contemporary Problems XXXIV* (Spring & Summer), 203-670.
 "Cable opts for networking role," *Broadcasting* (June 30), 71.
 "Future of CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (July 5), 23.
 "Battle for control will shape media of tomorrow," *Media/Scope* (Sept.), 68.
 "TV future; off air, on cable: Electronics Industry Association report," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 3), 23.
 "Program network projected for CATV," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 1), 42.
 "Bright outlook for CATV in view of new copyright bill," *New York Times* (Dec. 21), III, 1; (Dec. 28), III, 10.

1970

- F. H. Belt, "Television: twenty years from now," *Electronic World* (Jan.), 25.
 "CATV prophecies as 'cable fable' to some TV station operators," *Variety* (Jan. 21), 35.
 "Now that government has given CATV OK to carry advertising, what do you think of its potential . . .?" *Media/Scope* (March), 17.
 D. Cordtz, "Coming shake-up in telecommunications," *Fortune* (April), 70.
 William Houlton, "Wide horizons for global CATV," *Variety* (April 8), 54.
 Ralph Smith, "Wired Nation," *Nation* (May 18), 582.
 "New kind of television?" *Economist* (June 6), 45.
 "One man's vision—all TV on cable; none on the air," (L. N. Papernow) *Broadcasting* (July 27), 77.
 "\$4.5 billion CATV industry by 1980," *Television Digest* (Aug. 3), 3.
 Paul Klein, "Marriage for a new TV: cable, cassette and computer," *Variety* (Sept. 16), 35.
 "Manhattan Cable: future of Cable TV," *New York Times* (Oct. 18), III, 13.
 "Cable Television: birth of a new giant?" *Changing Times* (Nov.), 19.
 C. D. Crowley, "CATV in your future," *Public Relations Journal* (Nov.), 20.
 "Troubles of television and a coming revolution," *U. S. News & World Report* (Dec. 21), 58.

INTERMEDIA COMPETITION

Economic

(Includes all non-legal elements of competition between broadcasters and CATV; mergers, and allegations and studies of adverse impact to broadcasters caused by CATV operations).

1945

- A. L. Leiden, "Future of UHF," *Radio News* (June), 25.

1952

- N. Shlarewitz, "What's ahead for small town TV?" *Radio & TV News* (June), 31.

1958

"Collision on TV delivery route; CATV and small market TV," *Broadcasting* (May 12), 33.

"FCC promises new study of UHF survival difficulties," *Wall Street Journal* (June 12), 3.

"TV outlets cite CATV problems," *Broadcasting* (June 30), 70.

H. J. Levin, "Economic structure and the regulation of TV," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* LXXII (Aug.), 424.

1959

Jack Gould, "The need for more channels," *New York Times* (May 19), 1.

1960

"One year experiment: UHF in New York," *New York Times* (July 11), I, 3.

1962

"In this case the twain does meet: CATV and TV find both sides have their points," *Broadcasting* (May 28), 56.

"Darkened channels: UHF and the FCC," *Harvard Law Review* LXXV (June), 1578.

"Community antenna television, friend or foe," *Television* (June), 49.

"CATV attracts interest of broadcasters," *Broadcasting* (June 25), 68.

1964

"CATV battle brews in NAB," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 10), 65.

"FCC lets CATV firm buy TV in same city," *Wall Street Journal* (March 16), 3.

"Should TVs own CATVs?" *Broadcasting* (April 20), 106.

"CATV industry, boon or bane?" *Electric Merchandising Weekly* (May 18), 28.

"Capital Cable, Austin, Texas and President Johnson," *Wall Street Journal* (June 25), 2.

"Seiden takes up residence at FCC; economic study of CATV field," *Broadcasting* (July 20), 58.

"UHF operator says CATV destroys free TV," *Sponsor* (Aug. 10), 18.

"The economic impact of CATV," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 26), 74.

"CATV: how it can affect advertising," *Printers Ink* (Nov.), 33.

William Blundell, "TV tempest, cable TV systems spurt; prompts clash with local stations," *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 15), 1.

1965

"Cable TV firm acts to bar repeat of sabotage," *Los Angeles Times* (Jan. 1), II, 2.

"TV's lusty offspring: the booms and brawls of CATV," *Newsweek* (Feb. 1), 62.

"CATV's threat to TV overemphasized: Seiden Report," *Broadcasting* (March 8), 28.

"Three networks in every market? Seiden tells FCC translators the answer," (March 8), 30.

"Seiden denies errors in report: answers Fisher's questions about CATV impact study," *Broadcasting* (April 19), 64.

"Community antennas enter big TV picture," *Fortune* (May), 146.

"Is Britain cooling off on UHF?" *Variety* (June 9), 48.

"CATV no threat, NCTA declares," *Broadcasting* (June 21), 62.

- "Rivals in South Bend, UHFers join up to enter CATV," *Broadcasting* (July 5), 36.
- "ABC's 10 million plunge into CATV," *Television Digest* (July 12), 1.
- "CATV: little cause for alarm: CBS report," *Broadcasting* (July 26), 38.
- "FCC clears way for common ownership of TV, CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (July 29), 6.
- "Two poles of opinion on CATV: AMST and NBC comments," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 2), 50.
- "FCC promises action if abuse of common ownership of TV, CATV," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 2), 56.
- "CBS economic analysis of CATV growth and impact," (reprint) *Television Digest* (Aug. 2), 10.
- "San Diego UHF sees CATV as help, not hinderance," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 6), 63.
- "CBS easing into San Francisco CATV," *Television Digest* (Nov. 1), 2.
- "UHF five years from now," *Television Age* (Dec. 20), 34.
- "CATV ownership, broadcast groups," *Television Digest* (Dec. 27), 3.

1966

- Franklin Fisher, "CATV and local television station audiences," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* LXXX, 227.
- "Fisher CATV view mellow," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 3), 121.
- "CATV jitters," *Variety* (Jan. 12), 57.
- "Newhouse moves into CATV cross-ownership," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 17), 56.
- "Cox Broadcasting group granted Atlanta CATV permit," *Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 18), 2.
- "CATV expansion will weaken local TV, Burnett, Banks, Wyatt view," *Variety* (March 30), 50.
- "Formulas for UHF success," *Broadcasting* (April 4), 113.
- "Blurred reception: CATV impact," *Sales Management* (April 15), 39.
- "CATV growth patterns," *Television Digest* (April 18), 2.
- Philip Hinerfeld, "CATV: does it carry my commercials?" *Journal of Screen Producers Guild* (June), 23.
- "Ad firm feels CATV could materially change TV's advertising patterns," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 29), 38.
- Vance Hartke, "CATV—salvation or doom of UHF," *Journal of Screen Producers Guild* (Sept.), 35.
- "Liberty TV merges with 5 CATVs," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 10), 54.
- "Michigan CATV tiff ends in merger," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 14), 54.
- "Best defense: local programs," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 28), 63.
- "Stations asked to help CATVs provide local originations," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 5), 70.
- "New York Cable silenced 8 hours after began servicing local hotel; lines cut," *New York Times* (Dec. 17), 4.

1967

- "Advertisers watch progress of CATV in New York: effects on TV viewing pondered," *Advertising Age* (Feb. 13), 30.
- "Broadcasters in CATV," *Television* (March), 96.
- "CATV-broadcast; mixing problem," *Broadcasting* (April 3), 78.
- "CATV penetration," *Broadcasting* (April 3), 113.
- "CATV feels at home at NAB convention," *Broadcasting* (April 17), 78.

- "Fresh UHF figures," *Television Digest* (July 1), 4.
 Albert Warren, "The four letters that have rocked TV," *TV Guide* (July 29), 4.
 "Nobody wants wire ownership limits," *Broadcasting* (July 31), 30.
 "Station into CATV trend continues," *Television Digest* (Sept. 25), 4.

1968

- "CATV and radio natural allies," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (Feb.), 37.
 "Study details CATV threat," *Broadcasting* (March 18), 40.
 J. Tebbel, "What is happening to UHF," *Saturday Review* (April 13), 89.
 "CATV suppliers display wares at NAB convention," *Broadcasting* (April 15), 95.
 "Station-CATV ownership in jeopardy," *Television Digest* (April 16), 3.
 "Stein, Kahn and Reinsch tell NCTAers to align selves with corporate giants to fight networks," *New York Times* (June 30), 1, 1.
 "Seiden, government officials warn CATVers against possible monopoly charges through mergers," *New York Times* (July 3), 3.
 "End run: unable to beat CATV, broadcasters join it," *Forbes* (Aug.), 26.
 "Pitt's WHIC-TV earns solid payoff from be kind to CATV policy," *Variety* (Dec. 15), 36.
 Kenneth Cox, "Competition in and among broadcasters, CATV and Pay-TV industries," *Anti Trust Bulletin XIII* (Fall), 911.

1969

- Leonard Chazen, "The price of free TV," *Atlantic* (March), 59.
 "Justice Department supports FCC proposal to prohibit CATV ownership by local TVs or newspapers," *Wall Street Journal* (April 9), 1.
 "Justice Department v. media ownership of CATV in same market," *Variety* (April 16), 34.
 "CATV penetration," *Broadcasting* (May 26), 113.
 "CBS strengthens CATV ties, buys Tele-Vue," *Broadcasting* (June 2), 40.
 "CATV group owner moves into radio," *Broadcasting* (July 1), 24.
 "Year of the UHF dropout," *Variety* (Sept. 24), 35.
 J. D. Matthews, "CATV from the industry viewpoint," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Sept. 25), 66.
 "The snares in the wire," (ed.) *Broadcasting* (Nov. 10), 98.
 S. J. Paul, "The long haul for UHF," (ed.) *Television Age* (Nov. 17), 12.
 "Broadcasters fault origination," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 8), 46.
 "Economics blamed for UHF ills," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 29), 56.

1970

- S. R. Barnett, "Cable television and media concentration," *Stanford Law Review* XXI (Jan.), 221.
 "Report would free CATV of curbs," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 2), 36.
 "Barking back at the Rand Report," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 9), 42.
 "Small market TVs face viewer loss," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 16), 52.
 "Rand conclusions assailed again," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 23), 36.
 "Cross ownership ban finds another booster," *Broadcasting* (March 16), 48.
 "Who's afraid of CATV?" *New York Law Forum* (Spring), 187.
 "Where UHF penetration is greatest," *Broadcasting* (May 4), 57.
 "Half million grant for cable TV study," *Broadcasting* (June 15), 20.
 Paul Gardner, "Canadian group bids \$23 million for CBS owned National Cablevision," *Variety*, (June 24), 31.

- "Where the CBS cable systems are," *Broadcasting* (July 6), 20.
 "ETV's now eyeing cable ownership," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 10), 36.
 "Making the most of cross ownership ban," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 21), 35.
 "Sloan CATV panel girds for action," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 21), 44.
 "Rand criticizes FCC CATV approach," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 26), 46.
 "Coming up—battle of CATV statisticians," *Television Digest* (Oct. 26), 3.
 "What CATV competition has in store," *Editor & Publishers Weekly* (Nov. 21), 20.
 "CBS defends spinoff of cable as consistent with FCC rules," *Variety* (Dec. 30), 27.

Legal

(Includes all legal and political activities of industry groups—but excludes challenges to governmental authority, which are found in the sections following this one under the appropriate regulatory heading).

1958

- "FCC ought to rope, brand CATV, western TV operators tell Hill," *Broadcasting* (June 2), 56.

1959

- "CATV controls; NAB TV Board, Moss bill ask restrictions," *Broadcasting* (June 22), 62.
 "CATV team enters fray," *Broadcasting* (July 13), 82.

1962

- "TV set makers generally feel requiring all new sets to be UHF equipped not good idea," *Wall Street Journal* (May 3), 26.
 "NAB seeks answer to CATV inroads in TV," *Broadcasting* (June 26), 70.

1963

- "Little give; NCTA is making bid but FCC is standing pat," *Broadcasting* (June 10), 70.
 "Note on: Intermountain Broadcasting v. Idaho Microwave," *Maryland Law Review* XXIII (Fall), 365.
 "Big 64 issue: CATV regulation; operators urged to oppose FCC's proposed rulemaking," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 30), 28.

1964

- Robert L'Heureux, "CATV: a TV service beset," *Federal Communications Bar Journal* XIX (Winter), 27.
 "CATV faces new foe: antenna makers plan to educate public with 'TAME'," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 27), 52.
 "FCC-NCTA talk about compromise," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 3), 68.
 "FCC seeks NAB views on CATV legislation," *Broadcasting* (March 2), 70
 W. Rogers, "More regulatory encroachment may be attempted," *Sponsor* (May 4), 16.
 "Law requiring TV sets to be UHF equipped takes effect; comments about impact," *New York Times* (May 13), 67.
 "ABC gives FCC its views on CATV," *Broadcasting* (June 15), 66.
 Kenneth Cox, Frederick Ford, "FCC should regulate wire TV," *Advertising Age* (June 22), 3.
 "Should FCC have CATV control? TV Board seeks Congressional assistance," *Broadcasting* (June 22), 27.

- W. Rogers, "Control works two ways; industry asking for further control in asking CATV regulation," *Broadcasting* (June 22), 53.
- "CATV, yes; but not Pay-TV: general attitude of broadcasters at GAB session," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 10), 66.
- "NCTA rebuts broadcaster argument at FCC," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 10), 70.
- B. Merrill, R. L'Heureux, "CATV leaders offer olive branch to broadcasters," *Sponsor* (Aug. 10), 18.
- "MPTA and union seek injunction to keep New York CATVs from showing movies in New York," *New York Times* (Sept. 18), 50.
- "How TAME would regulate CATV," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 21), 75.
- "Federal control of all CATVs: ABC," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 19), 27.
- "NAB tells FCC needs protection from CATV," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 2), 47.
- "CATV battle lines take shape: NCTA fires away at NAB Fisher Report," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 21), 32.
- "ABC rebuts critics of its CATV stand," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 28), 32.

1965

- "The NAB-NCTA-CATV impasse—no solution reported for 'leapfrogging' issue," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 4), 36.
- "Can NAB-TV Board solve CATV puzzle?" *Broadcasting* (Jan. 25), 50.
- "Ford's view of future of CATV," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 25), 56.
- "Snarl in wired TV; CATV and NAB split on regulation to be sought; FCC starts on own policy," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 1), 23.
- "Power bloc forms against CATV," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 8), 23.
- "Report on CATV backs FCC plan to assert control," *Advertising Age* (March 15), 1.
- "Comment on: Cablevision v. KUTV, 335 F2d 348," *Texas Law Review* XXXIII (April), 810.
- "Rift over CATV widens: dissident members of AMST petition FCC to go slow on wire regulation," *Broadcasting* (April 12), 52.
- "Muzzle for CATV? AMST tells lawmakers that unbridled it will wreck local TV," *Broadcasting* (April 19), 60.
- S. E. Cohen, "Broadcasters oppose FCC interference in programming; liken it to CATV rule," *Advertising Age* (May 3), 70.
- L. H. Rogers, II, "Control of CATV needed to protect free broadcasting," *Advertising Age* (May 10), 44.
- "NAB behind FCC plan to control CATV," *Broadcasting* (May 17), 30.
- J. P. Cole, "CATV, the broadcast establishment and federal regulation," *American University Law Review* XIV (June), 124.
- "Positions harden on CATV," *Broadcasting* (June 7), 74.
- "Way to a CATV settlement?" *Broadcasting* (June 21), 56.
- "NAB: Future of Broadcasting report," *Television Digest* (supp.) (June 21).
- "NAB calls for more CATV restrictions," *Broadcasting* (June 28), 56.
- "Opposition to microwave plan: NCTA common carriers criticize FCC proposals to restrict CATV," *Broadcasting* (July 12), 74.
- "NCTA's biggest pow-wow; about 2,000 expected in Denver; to discuss government regulation; pole lines, copyright," *Broadcasting* (July 19), 54.
- "O. Harris; stop bickering," (NAB-NCTA) *Broadcasting* (July 26), 78.
- "Opinions split on CATV rules," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 2), 52.
- "NAB urges FCC to take jurisdiction over CATV," *Sponsor* (Aug. 9), 59.
- "What's the status of CATV? Question at appeals court—proposed Rollins System," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 30), 41.

- "CATV clearances solvable—AMST," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 20), 81.
 "More flak on CATV: reply comments on FCC proposals," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 27), 38.
 "NCTA view of Part II, CATV regulations," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 27), 40.
 "Another skirmish on CATV; comments on Part II," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 4), 44.
 "NAB petitions FCC for sharp CATV curbs," *Sponsor* (Oct. 4), 19.
 "CATV big topic at NAB conference," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 25), 56.
 "Microwave proposals run into criticism," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 22), 83.
 Kenneth Cox, "FCC must keep CATV out of big TV markets," *Advertising Age* (Nov. 29), 1.

1966

- "Fisher CATV view mellows: stricter controls might not be necessary," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 3), 121.
 Stanley Cohen, "Battle Line-up; broadcasters and FCC vs. CATV, their friends in Congress," *Advertising Age* (Jan. 24), 41.
 L. H. Rogers, B. J. Conroy, "Act now to curb CATV—It helps advertisers, viewers," (debate) *Advertising Age* (Jan. 24), 43.
 "Flag still waves on hill; NCTA campaign bombards Congress with letters opposing CATV regulation: FCC bends a little," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 24), 46.
 "Broadcasters and NCTA lock swords on CATV," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 24), 54.
 "NAB Board votes a harder line on CATV," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 31), 28.
 P. Cook, "Meeting the regulatory challenge," *TV & Communication* (Feb.), 49.
 "Broadcasters to add CATV views to Congressional deluge," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 7), 29.
 "Plan to wire nation charged," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 21), 34.
 "CATV-Part 1," (ed.) *Broadcasting* (Feb. 21), 118.
 "CATV dissent characteristics," *Sponsor* (Feb. 21), 24.
 "Growing dispute over a growing form of TV—CATV," *U. S. News & World Report* (Feb. 28), 6.
 Larry Michie, "CATV hottest issue in broadcasting, but not on agenda of NAB meeting," *Variety* (March 23), 24.
 "The bill broadcasting wants," *Broadcasting* (March 28), 86.
 "Talk but no facts; Congressmen decry lack of data," *Broadcasting* (April 11), 35.
 Lester Lindow, "CATV cannot have it both ways," *Journal of Screen Producers Guild* (June), 7.
 Newton Minow, "Private rights vs. public interest," *Journal of Screen Producers Guild* (June), 14.
 A. Warren, "Coming Cable TV war," *Saturday Review* (June 11), 90; (Aug. 13), 43.
 "Report filed on CATV bill," *Television Digest* (June 20), 2.
 "NAB vetoes CATV section," *Broadcasting* (June 27), 66.
 "NCTA origination code hits snag," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 24), 60.
 "CATV called a racket," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 31), 52.

1967

- "Word war set off by CATV order," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 23), 48.
 "Text of NCTA code of ethics," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 13), 54.
 "Translator group opposes CATV," *Broadcasting* (March 13), 65.
 D. C. Beelar, "Cables in the sky and the struggle for their control," *Federal Communications Bar Journal XXI* (Spring), 26.

- "Control CATV; OK pay TV and let it fail, Martin advises broadcasters," *Advertising Age* (April 10), 3.
- "UHFers organize outside NAB," *Broadcasting* (May 1), 41.
- "Another NCTA inspired mail barrage hits Washington," *Broadcasting* (May 8), 62.
- "Old foes fight in CATV brawl," *Broadcasting* (May 8), 65.
- "AMST knocks on FCC door; vents CATV worries," *Television Digest* (May 15), 2.
- "NCTA convention—approaching maturity," *Television Digest* (June 26), 1.
- M. Roth, "Minow's tall story—CATV," *Variety* (June 28), 29.
- "AMST cleared of 'ex parte' contacts in CATV," *Broadcasting* (July 31), 39.
- "AMST-FCC meetings taken to court," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 18), 55.
- "NCTA on a lobbying kick," *Variety* (Oct. 25), 29.
- "Hatch, Stein spearheading NCTA's special committee on coexistence," *Variety* (Oct. 25), 38.
- "CATV—from ETV's viewpoint," *Television Digest* (Oct. 31), 4.
- "ACTS aims its guns at CATV rules," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 11), 34.

1968

- "Broadcasters and CATV," *Triangle Publications* (study of broadcast ownership of CATV systems in relation to NAB membership).
- "More arguments in CATV case," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 1), 49.
- "How small market TV can delay CATV," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 15), 58.
- "Objections to CATV plan dismissed," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 29), 80.
- "ACTS proposal rebutted by CATV," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 29), 81.
- "Microwaves hit CARS ruling," *Broadcasting* (March 25), 159.
- Larry Michie, "NAB opens war on 'wired cities' concept," *Variety* (April 3), 31.
- "More muscle for UHFers," *Broadcasting* (April 8), 54.
- "Spectrum battle kitty voted," *Broadcasting* (April 8), 100.
- "TV-CATV pact no longer solution," *Broadcasting* (May 6), 53.
- W. Walbridge, J. Crosby, "Should CATV be allowed to originate programs?" *Television* (June), 60.
- "Optimism prevails at NCTA convention," *Broadcasting* (June 24), 33.
- "Court and cable," *Newsweek* (July 1), 78.
- "NCTA's legal panel," *Television Digest* (July 4), 4.
- "They can't have it all," (ed.) *Broadcasting* (July 15), 84.
- "Wire grid plan blasted by Land," *Broadcasting* (July 22), 23.
- "ABC presents proposals on CATV rules," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 4), 54.
- "AMST backs FCC on CATV origination," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 25), 65.
- H. J. Barnett, E. Greenberg, "Proposal for wired city television," *Washington University Law Quarterly* XXVI (Winter), 1.

1969

- "CATV issue is a worrisome thing," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 13), 30.
- "NAB Board endorses new CATV policy; proposes modified rules," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 20), 28.
- "CATV beefing up team," *Television Digest* (Jan. 20), 4.
- "Interim CATV rules blasted; new voice in cable dispute," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 20), 43.
- "Dispute over distant signals lends disenchantment to CATV view," *Variety* (Jan. 22), 31.
- "CATV rules create more heat, less light," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 10), 56.
- "CATV moves to Stagers, McClellan front," *Television Digest* (Feb. 10), 5.

- "New regulatory clashes over wire," *Broadcasting* (March 24), 68.
 "UHFers ask total CATV ad ban," *Broadcasting* (March 24), 82.
 "ACTS carves out an image for UHF," *Broadcasting* (March 31), 54.
 "Industry-CATV positions polarizing," *Television Digest* (April 7), 1.
 "CATV-FCC downbeat; Justice Department bullish," *Television Digest* (April 14), 2.
 "Ford leaves NCTA Jan. 1, 1970 to practice law," *Television Digest* (May 5), 1.
 "Broadcaster—CATV rap cable rule," *Broadcasting* (May 19), 57.
 "Exclusive CATV franchise could wind up in court," *Variety* (May 21), 46.
 "NAB-NCTA pact—pending Congressional & FCC OK . . .," *New York Times* (May 30), 7.
 "Wording of NAB-NCTA compromise agreement," *Broadcasting* (June 2), 24.
 W. Green, "CATV industry seen switching strategy in proposed agreement with broadcasters," *Wall Street Journal* (June 2), 3.
 "Thumbs down on cable agreement," *Broadcasting* (June 9), 24.
 "Cablemen devise PACCT to lobby on Hill," *Broadcasting* (June 9), 30.
 "ACLU proposes CATV be declared public utility; channels available to all at reasonable rate," *New York Times* (June 15), II, 1.
 "Wrecking crew hits cable compromise," *Broadcasting* (June 16), 44.
 "Back to negotiations on cable: NAB Board votes to scrap staff's agreement," *Broadcasting* (June 23), 42.
 "PAACT prepares for political action," *Broadcasting* (June 30), 73.
 "Little action from NAB-CATV group," *Television Digest* (July 14), 2.
 "CATV gangs up on FCC cable rules," *Broadcasting* (July 28), 34.
 "It's all over on cable negotiations," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 8), 38.

1970

- R. L. Shayon, "Battle stations," *Saturday Review* (Jan. 31), 50.
 "CATVs back plan to help little guy," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 9), 61.
 "Solution to Cable TV controversy sought as FCC takes up proposals on ownership," *Wall Street Journal* (June 11), 4.
 "Frederick Ford—on cable regulation," *Television Digest* (supp.) (June 15).
 "NAB moves to block cable thaw," *Television Digest* (June 22), 4.
 "FCC cable plan gets its lumps," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 2), 170.
 "NAB warns that CATV perils radio too," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 9), 45.
 "UHF swings at CATV; both punch FCC," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 16), 46.
 "MCA, NCTA decry cable proposals," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 7), 29.
 "Kaiser wants public subsidy for CATV," *Television Digest* (Dec. 7), 3.
 "Ford non-profit CATV pitch," *Variety* (Dec. 9), 25.
 "Distant signal plans sparks replies," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 14), 63.
 "Proposals on Cable TV flood FCC," *Variety* (Dec. 16), 30.

Common Carriage

(Includes all issues involving telephone carriers and CATV, both leasing arrangements and carrier ownership of facilities. See also FCC Docket 18509, "Inquiry into CATVs Affiliated with Telephone Companies," and Section 214 cases in USCA, Title 47).

1965

- "Telephone companies entering CATV field," *Broadcasting* (May 10), 56.
 "Broadcasters at odds over Michigan CATV; one has franchise, other has phone company pact," *Broadcasting* (May 24), 58.
 "Phone companies offer CATV in 500 localities," *Broadcasting* (May 31), 65.

- "Bell's CATV rates probed in New Jersey," *Broadcasting* (July 5), 37.
 "NCTA dickers with phone companies," *Television Digest* (July 5), 2.
 "CATVs big issue—pole lines," *Broadcasting* (July 12), 54.
 "Struggle for CATV control; cable operators fear being forced off poles by telephone," *Broadcasting* (July 26), 66.
 "CATV-phone company maneuvers indecisive," *Television Digest* (Aug. 30), 2.
 "AT&T gets letter from FCC on CATV," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 5), 46.
 "Are you in telephone or communications business?" *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Oct. 28), 48.
 R. W. Miller, "Bell answers FCC on CATV authorizations," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 6), 46.

1966

- "FCC will regulate phone company tariffs for intrastate use of services," *Broadcasting* (April 11), 40.
 "Phone companies becoming major CATV force," *Television Digest* (Oct. 10), 1.
 "FCC asked by NCTA to bar AT&T tariffs used on services by CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 14), 3.
 "NCTA charges AT&T stalls use of poles to force CATVers to join 'lease-back' program," *New York Times* (Oct. 15), 60.
 "AT&T defends stance towards local CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 31), 4.
 "CATV excites Bell Lab scientist," *Television Digest* (Nov. 7), 3.
 "FCC hit grill for AT&T-CATV hearing," *Television Digest* (Nov. 14), 3.
 "AT&T counters NCTA charge," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 21), 50.

1967

- "Phone systems active in CATV; bring capital, management skill to new and growing systems," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 13), 52.
 "The telephone and the medium," *Variety* (July 26), 50.
 "CATV—telephone's competitor," *Telephony* (Dec. 16), 15.

1968

- "FCC caught in telephone-CATV tangle," *Broadcasting* (March 4), 62.
 "Phone companies and CATV—Commissioner Cox," *Television Digest* (March 4), 2.
 "NCTA, AT&T discuss pole rates, programs," *Broadcasting* (April 29), 57.
 "Phone firms told FCC backing required for CATV franchise; provides forum to oppose cable plans," *Wall Street Journal* (June 27), 3.
 "Another CATV win as FCC orders phone company certificates on pole fees," *Variety* (July 3), 32.
FCC Dockets 16928, 16943, 17098 (Sec. 214 certificates and pole rental).

1969

- "FCC to question phone-CATV ownership," *Television Digest* (March 10), 4.
 "Phone cables stay under FCC control," *Broadcasting* (May 5), 65.
 "FCC slaps show cause on General Telephone & Electronics," *Broadcasting* (May 12), 56.
 "FCC should leave CATV franchising to state and local authorities, AT&T comments," *Broadcasting* (July 7), 48.
 "Justice Department warns of phone companies in CATV," *Broadcasting* (July 28), 52.
 "FCC common carrier bureau and CATV task force argue section 214," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 4), 34.

- "FCC 4-3 allows microwave company to enter private line phone service in competition with AT&T; experiment," *New York Times* (Aug. 15), 14.
- "General Telephone & Electronics may sell two CATV systems; cite recent FCC pressure," *Wall Street Journal* (Sept. 12), 2.
- W. E. Baker, "CATV problems from the telephone carrier's point of view," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Sept. 25), 76.
- "AT&T drops leash on CATV leaseback," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 3), 48.
- "General Telephone & Electronics eases policy on CATV; to rent line space and may offer other services," *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 2), 3.

1970

- Final Report and Order*, 21 FCC 2d 307 (Jan.) (Denying telephone carrier right to own CATV system within its service area).
- California Water and Telephone*, 22 FCC 2d 10 (Specifying terms of CATV pole attachment).
- Application of Telephone Companies for Section 214 Certificates*, 22 FCC 2d 746 (Indicating procedure for approval of telephone construction or operation of CATV facilities).
- "FCC holds up grant to Michigan Bell," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 5), 38.
- "FCC would ban phone concerns from owning CATV system where they provide local service," *Wall Street Journal* (March 13), 6.
- "FCC moves to resolve pole fee problem," *Broadcasting* (March 23), 41.
- "FCC seeks to clarify order on phone lines," *Broadcasting* (April 27), 39.
- "Cable Bureau urges denial for telcos," *Broadcasting* (June 1), 34.

Copyright

(Includes all issues of property right in broadcast material, whether asserted by copyright holder, broadcaster or others).

1961

- C. Egge, "The action of CATV in using TV signals for their own profit without obtaining permission of originating stations does not constitute unfair competition," *Georgetown Law Review* L (Fall), 171.
- "TV station held not to have property rights in its broadcasts," *Columbia Law Review* LXI (Dec.), 1524.

1964

- "CBS sues to set copyright rules for TV programs," *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 14), 2.
- D. Epstein, "Copyright protection and CATV systems," *Federal Communications Bar Journal* XVIII (Winter), 97.

1965

- "Tele Prompter denies CBS's claim cable infringes copyrights," *Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 10), 2.
- J. O'Shea, "CATV—reaction of the industry," *Notre Dame Law Review* XXXX (Spring), 311.
- "CATV v. the copyright bill," *Broadcasting* (June 28), 66.
- "FCC action sought on CATV copyright," *Broadcasting* (July 19), 48.
- "Is copyright solution to CATV?" *Broadcasting* (Aug. 23), 52.
- "Senate rerun on copyright bill; CATV's stickiest problem," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 23), 55.
- "NAB seeks tighter copyright on CATV," *Sponsor* (Aug. 23), 19.
- Pro football wants CATV controls," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 6), 46.

- "CATV still unsettled copyright problem," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 6), 48.
 "CATV: liability for uncompensated transmission of television programs,"
Minnesota Law Review L (Dec.), 349.
 "Columbia Broadcasting System v. Tele Prompter Corp.," 251 F. Supp. 302
 reported at 7 *RR2d* 2022 (Dec. 16).

1966

- J. E. Keller, "Is CATV a copyright infringer?" *University of Detroit Law
 Journal* XXXXIII (Feb.), 367.
 "All CATV to be divided into three parts," *Broadcasting* (May 9), 9.
 "Congress's first thoughts on CATV copyright," *Television Digest* (May 9), 1.
 Larry Michie, "CATV; all white, greys and black to subcommittee; three
 layered plan to end copyright dilemma," *Variety* (May 11), 33.
 "New approach to CATV copyright," *Broadcasting* (May 16), 62.
 Larry Michie, "White, grey or black; copyright status of CATV looks mired in
 foggy bottom," *Variety* (May 18), 30.
 "Is CATV's free ride over?" *Broadcasting* (May 30), 31.
 "CATV copyright edges towards middle ground," *Television Digest* (Aug. 8), 3.
 "Senate copyright hearings stall on issue of CATV," *Publishers Weekly* (Aug.
 22), 57.
 "Justice agency opposes having CATV subject to copyright liability," *Wall
 Street Journal* (Aug. 26), 2.
 "Copyright hearing ends; status vague," *Television Digest* (Aug. 29), 2.
 "ASCAP's compulsory licensing gives special CATV status," *Variety* (Aug. 31),
 42.
 "Unlicensed transmission of a licensed broadcast infringes exclusive statutory
 right to perform publicly a copyrighted work," *Iowa Law Review* LII (Oct.),
 334.
 "TV broadcasting and copyright law," *St. John's Law Review* XXXXI (Oct.),
 225.
 "Pennsylvania CATV ops have own version of what copyright bill should be,"
Variety (Nov. 9), 38.

1967

- "Is CATV infringing proprietary rights in TV broadcasts?" *Copyright Law
 Symposium* XV, 153.
 R. Woody, "CATV and the copyright law; end of the honeymoon," *Kansas Law
 Review* XV (March), 325.
 "CATV—a copyright infringer?" *Washington Law Review* XXXXII (March),
 649.
 "Copyright reform passed by House panel which rebuffs jukebox, CATV opera-
 tors," *Wall Street Journal* (March 3), 1.
 "Much at stake in copyright fight," *Broadcasting* (April 3), 106.
 "Big CATV waiver, FCC copyright views," *Television Digest* (April 3), 3.
 House approves copyright overhaul bill; CATV section dropped," *Wall Street
 Journal* (April 12), 2.
 "CATV and copyright liability," *Harvard Law Review* LXXX (May), 1514.
 "Lower courts upholds CATV copyright liability," *Variety* (May 29), 1.
 "CATV's dilemma: copyright—cablecasts?" *Media/Scope* (July), 26.
 "Hatch group seeks station-CATV detente," *Television Digest* (July 24), 4.
 Jack Valenti, "Major CATV issue; the copyright," *Variety* (Aug. 16), 32.

- "Film producers seek to intervene at FCC on CATV copyright," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 4), 68.
- "Screen Actors Guild bucks CATV on copyright law," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 11), 72.
- CATV-copyright talks educational," *Television Digest* (Sept. 18), 2.
- G. Meyers, "Nine myths of CATV," *Federal Bar Journal* (Fall), 431.
- E. S. Smith, "CATV; a tainted virgin?" *Federal Bar Journal* (Fall), 451.
- C. Hunke, "CATV operation as 'a performance'; an application of the principle of semantic extension in the federal copyright law," *Notre Dame Law Review* XXXIV (Fall), 17.
- "CATV-film copyright talks cautious start," *Television Digest* (Oct. 16), 3.
- "Electronic plagiarism — the display of copyrighted works on TV," *Georgetown Law Review* LVI (Dec.), 360.
- "High court takes copyright case," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 11), 48.
- "Hatch-Stern committee reaches concord on 10 points," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 18), 48.
- "CATV copyright — committees, court and Congress," *Television Digest* (Dec. 18), 2.
- "CATV-broadcasters panel pinpoints principal issues in final report," *Variety* (Dec. 20), 32.
- "Supreme Court rejects government bid for delay in CATV copyright ruling," *Variety* (Dec. 20), 33.

1968

- "TV broadcasting and copyright law; the CATV controversy," *Copyright Law Symposium* XVI, 170.
- H. K. Finkelstein, "Music, CATV, educational broadcasting and juke boxes," *Iowa Law Review* LIII (Feb.), 870.
- "Complexities of CATV seen hobbling US on copyright law revision," *Variety* (March 27), 2.
- "Is CATV's future in FCC's hands?" *Broadcasting* (June 24), 19.
- "US Supreme Court decision on CATV copyright," *Television Digest* (supp.) (June 24).
- "CATV wins copyright . . ." *Television Digest* (June 24), 1.
- "Victory for CATV," *Time* (June 28), 55.
- "High Court assures CATV free use of materials," *Publishers Weekly* (July 1), 28.
- "Copyright hitch in staff CATV views," *Television Digest* (Sept. 16), 5.
- M. W. Krasilovsky, "The copyright dilemma," *Television Quarterly* VII (Fall), 33.
- "CATV and the scope of 'performance'," *Ohio State Law Review* XXVIII (Fall), 1038.
- "CATV carriage of copyrighted material does not constitute infringement," *Vanderbilt Law Review* XXI (Oct.), 854.
- "Supreme Court declines review of copyrighted movies—royalties issue," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 15), 2.
- "Copyright positions are set," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 11), 67.
- "Section III approach to forefront in copyright owners fuss with CATV," *Variety* (Nov. 13), 126.
- "CATV and copyright liability; the final decision," *Commercial Law Review* (Dec.), 401.

"CATV and copyright infringement," *Boston College Industrial and Commercial Law Review* IX (Winter), 459.

"Copyright liability for communications satellite; a bridge from CATV," *Idea* XII (Winter), 1161.

1969

Stanley Rothenberg, "Need to assist Congress in a modern copyright law," *Variety* (Jan. 8), 8.

"Copyright action promised this year," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 13), 54.

"McClellan's futile search for CATV accord," *Television Digest* (Jan. 13), 1.

"CATV copyright gets a new focus as FCC and House unit swap views," *Variety* (March 12), 34.

"CATV: the continuing copyright controversy," *Fordam Law Review* XXXVII (May), 597.

J. Lippe, "Congress, the courts and the commissioners; a legacy of Fortnightly," *New York University Law Review* XXXIV (May), 521.

"Comment on Fortnightly Corp. v. United Artists," *American University Law Review* XIX (June), 644.

Comment on Fortnightly Corp. v. United Artists . . .," *North Carolina Law Review* XXXVII (June), 914.

"CATV and copyright legislation," *Copyright Law Symposium* XVII, 102.

"Cable-copyright maneuvering continues; await NCTA acceptance of offer to discuss CATV differences," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 11), 56.

M. Hall, "CATV standoff may snarl bill on copyright revision," *Billboard* (Aug. 16), 1.

"It's all over between NAB, NCTA on cable talks," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 8), 38.

"Copyright action shifts to Hill; McClellan looks again at cable copyright; MacDonald plans House hearing," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 15), 76.

"Copyright law and its relevance to CATV; can an old dog be taught new tricks?" *Buffalo Law Review* XVIII (Fall), 65.

G. N. Cary, "CATV—the Fortnightly postlude," *Bulletin of Applied Sociology* (Fall).

"Nizer lays out copyright plan for cables," *Variety* (Oct. 1), 38.

"Copyright issue back on Hill; possible inclusion of CATV in 1970 copyright bill," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 6), 46.

R. L. Shayon, "Signals; one, two, three," *Saturday Review* (Dec. 6), 75.

"Copyright reform bill approved by Senate sub-committee would free CATV of various restrictions . . ." *New York Times* (Dec. 11), 11.

"Cable and copyright; new brawl starts," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 15), 19.

"Copyright bill; many battles ahead," *Television Digest* (Dec. 15), 2.

"CATV bill; cheers and jeers," *Variety* (Dec. 17), 41.

C. Lydon, "CATV picture brightens," *New York Times* (Dec. 21), III, 1.

"Old foes line up on copyright bill," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 22), 50.

"Places everyone," (ed.) *Broadcasting* (Dec. 22), 70.

1970

"CATV's solid front on copyright jarred," *Broadcasting* (March 2), 46.

"Burch cites defects in copyright bill," *Broadcasting* (March 16), 56.

"More critics of copyright bill," *Broadcasting* (March 23), 46.

R. H. Smith, "Who sets the boundaries of creativity?" *Publishers Weekly* (Aug. 17), 1.

"No new copyright bill this year," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 24), 37.

"Copyright revision recedes further into the future," *Publishers Weekly* (Dec. 7), 27.

REGULATION

Federal

(Includes all acts of government agencies, statements of officials relating to such acts, and law suits challenging governmental authority. Private law suits not involving jurisdiction are found in the preceeding section).

1955

J. C. Doerfer, "Community antenna television systems," *Federal Communications Bar Journal* XIV, 4.

1958

"FCC to study effects on regular TV of service which redistributes their broadcasts," *Wall Street Journal* (May 23), 10.

"Study group tells senate FCC can't solve UHF-VHF problem; urges new inquiry," *Wall Street Journal* (Sept. 25), 4.

1959

"FCC reverses booster field; small town TV made legit as legislation requested; CATV rules also proposed," *Broadcasting* (April 20), 76.

"Senators to hear CATV-booster bills," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 31), 78.

1960

"CATV bill fails by single vote; legislation to place CATV under FCC back to committee," *Broadcasting* (May 23), 38.

1961

"Allocating radio frequencies between common carriers and private users—the microwave problem," *Yale Law Journal* (May), 954.

"FCC adopts principle of CATV impact; informal vote backs KWRB-TV opposition to microwave grant," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 18), 68.

1963

J. Palmer, J. Smith, E. Wade, "CATV; survey of a regulatory problem," *Georgetown Law Review* LII (Fall), 136.

"Carter Mountain (321 F2d 539) comment," *American University Law Review* XIII (Dec.), 98.

"FCC eases up on CATV rulemaking; local station protection; orderly CATV growth is aim," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 16), 71.

1964

"What does FCC have in mind for CATV?" *Broadcasting* (Feb. 10), 64.

"Blueprint for CATV regulation?" *Broadcasting* (Feb. 24), 69.

"FCC reconsiders CATV policy; withdrawal of microwave grant and setting it for hearing; different practices?" *Broadcasting* (March 9), 56.

"What to do with CATV? It's destined for federal regulation, but how much?" *Broadcasting* (March 23), 60.

"Two plans for CATV relayers; new service microwaves; new criteria for common carrier users," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 3), 69.

R. L'Heureux, "CATV; a television service beset," *Federal Communications Bar Journal* XIX, 27.

1965

H. S. Levy, "Problems raised by CATV," *ABA Public Utilities Law Report*, 48.

"How Commissioner Lee feels about CATV," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (Feb.), 19.

"CATV microwave rule clarified," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 8), 48.

- "FCC given hot foot on CATV; Pastore told decisions will be made in month; but differences growing," *Broadcasting* (March 1), 64.
- "Microwaves challenge constitutionality of FCC condition on Idaho CATV grant," *Broadcasting* (March 1), 62.
- "Tighter rules for CATV? FCC considers extending TV protection to B contours," *Broadcasting* (March 15), 64.
- "UHF failures a blow to FCC," *Broadcasting* (March 22), 118.
- "FCC moves towards CATV control," *Broadcasting* (April 19), 60.
- "Now tight controls on all CATV: FCC makes its move," *Broadcasting* (April 26), 23.
- "FCC asserts unrestricted jurisdiction over CATV; cable rules same as existing microwave," *Wall Street Journal* (April 26), 2.
- "Antenna TV rules introduced in house; FCC chastised for bypassing Congress," *Wall Street Journal* (April 29), 2.
- "Proposed CATV legislation and regulation," *TV & Communication* (May supp.).
- "Harris stakes claim to CATV; his bill would give Commerce Comm. final CATV say," *Broadcasting* (May 3), 66.
- "CATV on a hot tin roof," *Economist* (May 29), 1035.
- "Loevinger — forget CATV fears; 8 point program would call for lighter regulation," *Broadcasting* (June 14), 74.
- "Court challenge on CATV rules; Midwest says FCC beyond statute," *Broadcasting* (June 28), 52.
- "Two CATV decisions affect FCC policy," *Broadcasting* (July 19), 58.
- Ernest James, "Growing snarl in wired TV," *Television* (Sept.), 42.
- R. E. Huntley, C. F. Phillips, "CATV — a regulatory dilemma," *Alabama Law Review* XVIII (Fall), 64.
- "CATV coverage called unfair; FCC defines limits," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 27), 50.
- Grover Cooper, "Analysis; new FCC rules," *TV & Communication* (Oct.), 30.
- "Black Hills blasts ex parte charge," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 11), 46.
- "CATV regulation; still before congress," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Oct. 28), 64.
- "Wire mire; the FCC and CATV," *Harvard Law Review* LXXIX (Dec.), 366.
- "FCC, state rulings could curb growth of local antenna systems," *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 2), 1.
- "Court hears CATV — common carrier arguments," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 6), 48.
- "CATV waiver deadline: FCC says microwave systems must protect local or ask waiver," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 13), 60.
- 1966**
- S. E. Cohen, "Battle line-up; broadcasters, FCC vs CATV, their friends in congress," *Advertising Age* (Jan. 24), 4.
- "FCC takes Cooks tour of Harrisburg CATV," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 31), 34.
- Frederick Ford, "The FCC and Congress," *TV & Communications* (Feb.), 44.
- "Up for action: tough cable rules: what staff wants FCC to do," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 7), 27.
- "Vacation mystery: who wrote letter to states about CATV and phone companies?" *Broadcasting* (Feb. 7), 36.
- "Big issues before FCC; report to Congress pushes CATV forward as major problem," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 7), 43.
- "Forbid big city CATV; FCC staff urges," *Television Digest* (Feb. 7), 1.
- "CATV brought under FCC jurisdiction; FCC reduces CATV protection for local broadcaster," *Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 16), 2.

- "FCC decision on CATV regulation," *Television Digest* (Feb. 21), 1.
- "FCC rules for CATV regulation," *Municipal Attorney* (March), 34.
- "Washington dims CATV picture," *Electronics* (March 7), 151.
- "FCC closes fist around CATV," *Broadcasting* (March 14), 48.
- "FCC final CATV decision; full text of 'Second Report and Order,'" *Television Digest* (March 14), (special supp.).
- "Fuzzy picture; federal regulation has cast a long shadow over CATV," *Barrons* (March 21), 9.
- R. E. Huntley, C. F. Philips, "CATV; some issues of public policy," *Alabama Law Review* XVIII (Spring), 296.
- "FCC—the impatient regulators," *Television Age* (March 28), 59.
- "CATV rates taken from state," *Broadcasting* (April 11), 40.
- "CATV waiver requests hit peak on deadline," *Broadcasting* (April 25), 61.
- Franklin Fisher, "CATV and the regulation of TV broadcasting," *American Economic Review* LVI (May), 320.
- "House unit votes bill for regulation of CATV by FCC," *Wall Street Journal* (June 10), 2.
- Kenneth Cox, "FCC regulation and the CATV," *Journal of Screen Producers Guild* (June), 3.
- Robert T. Bartley, "CATV should stay in its own back yard," *Journal of Screen Producers Guild* (June), 11.
- "House group favors complete FCC-CATV control," *Television Digest* (June 2), 2.
- "CATV front: FCC task force, copyright," *Television Digest* (Aug. 1), 4.
- "Mass action for CATV: case by case nearly impossible—Sol Schildhouse," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 31), 52.
- "CATV; the new federal exercise of jurisdiction," *Iowa Law Review* LI (Winter), 366.

1967

- "FCC refuses to restudy recent rule for CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (Jan. 20), 17.
- "Dingell chides FCC on CATV monopoly," *Television Digest* (March 13), 3.
- "CATV rules reviewed—part I," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (April), 16.
- "FCC begins to study ownership patterns in CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (April 18), 5.
- "The CATV rules—part II, top 100 markets," *Broadcast Management/Engineering* (May), 16.
- "FCC jolted by California court CATV decision," *Television Digest* (May 8), 1.
- "CATV change considered," *Broadcasting* (May 15), 52.
- "FCC asks nod from Justice Dept. in appeal to high court in California CATV cases," *Broadcasting* (May 31), 28.
- "FCC orders CATV system to stop bringing in too distant signals," *Wall Street Journal* (May 31), 5.
- "Loevinger says FCC should read own rules on smalltown CATV; no automatic freeze intended," *Variety* (July 5), 29.
- "Communication task force seen as most significant event," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 28), 43.
- James Dunne, "Controlling the explosion in the spectrum," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 11), 105.
- "FCC seeks lever in CATV logjam," *Television Digest* (Sept. 25), 2.

- E. Greenberg, "Wired TV and the FCC 2nd Report and Order," *Journal of Law and Economics* X (Oct.), 181.
- "Lengthy procedures rattle Loevinger," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 9), 38.
- "Nick Johnson splits on CATV," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 9), 65.
- "Cox hits CATV waiver," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 16), 60.
- "CATV—courts, Commissioner Cox and copyright," *Television Digest* (Oct. 30), 2.
- Nicholas Johnson, "CATV: promise or peril?" *Saturday Review* (Nov. 11), 87.
- "Triangle turned down on its TV protection plan," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 13), 51.
- "CATV; objections to proposed microwave rule," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 4), 63.
- "Bartley flails ACTS filing," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 25), 52.

1968

- "FCC jurisdiction over CATV; a need for reins—Buckeye Cablevision vs FCC," *Georgetown Law Review* LVI (Jan.), 597.
- "A new storm around Austin CATV system," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 1), 49.
- "Bartley CATV backlog plan killed," *Television Digest* (Jan. 8), 1.
- "FCC doesn't want CATV research; vetoes request for CATV UHF impact," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 15), 56.
- "Congress flooded by subscriber mail; NCTA instigated," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 15), 56.
- "CATV equipment plans get FCC heave-ho," *Television Digest* (Jan. 15), 2.
- "Are cable rules doing their job?" *Broadcasting* (Jan. 22), 36.
- "Task force to step up CATV waiver requests," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 22), 42.
- "FCC may complete CAR rules; new home for CATV microwaves expected," *Broadcasting* (Jan. 22), 53.
- "Commissioner Cox sees little chance of all wire TV," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 5), 20.
- "Commissioner Johnson complains about his appearance on CATV film," *New York Times* (Feb. 9), 94.
- "Lee hopes to extend local service to entire grade B contour," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 26), 46.
- "The FCC and regulation of CATV," *New York University Law Review* XXXXIII (March), 117.
- Robert E. Lee, "UHF and CATV," *Television Age* (March 25), 58.
- Nicholas Johnson, "FCC in the world of tomorrow," *Television Age* (March 25), 66.
- "Equal time on CATVs," *Broadcasting* (April 15), 99.
- "TelePrompTer gets FCC clearance to use airways for CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (May 20), 3.
- "CATV regulation by FCC upheld by high court," *Variety* (June 12), 34.
- "CATV gets a monitor," *Business Week* (June 15), 44.
- "New sweep of FCC powers; Supreme Court OK's jurisdiction over all cable," *Broadcasting* (June 17), 23.
- "Is CATV future in FCC's hands? Congress could come up with new regulation," *Broadcasting* (June 24), 19.
- "High court's dual CATV rulings—challenge FCC, Sol Schildhouse," *Variety* (June 26), 30.
- "CATV on a leash," *Economist* (June 29), 40.
- "UHF's protected from CATV threat," *Broadcasting* (July 1), 20.
- "California CATV firm's expansion denied by FCC—need of UHF cited," *Wall Street Journal* (July 1), 12.

- "FCC temporarily waives order requiring Commission OK before TVer could provide CATVer with channel service," *Wall Street Journal* (July 5), 2.
- "FCC poised for critical CATV action," *Television Digest* (Aug. 5), 1.
- "FCC starts work on basic cable policy," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 12), 58.
- "Origination problem has FCC on spot," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 2), 49.
- "Task force plan; air plus cable," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 9), 27.
- "Task force and FCC mull shape of TV to come," *Television Digest* (Sept. 9), 2.
- "If FCC crystal ball isn't fuzzy, there's licensing future for CATV," *Variety* (Sept. 11), 37.
- "Supreme Court declines to review if FCC can prohibit same day duplication by CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 15), 34.
- "FCC cautions New York on cable originations," *Television Digest* (Oct. 21), 5.
- "CATV regulation heads for new climax," *Television Digest* (Nov. 4), 2.
- "CATV importation request denied," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 11), 62.
- "Rep. Van Deerlin—CATV's buddy on hill," *Television Digest* (Nov. 18), 4.
- "The Cox plan for cable TV," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 25), 54.
- "FCC view on TV from satellite to home," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 2), 68.
- "FCC proposed CATV rules and inquiry," *Television Digest* (Dec. 16), (supp.).
- "FCC draws line for cable TV," *Business Week* (Dec. 21), 28.
- David Cobin, "CATV regulation; a complex problem of regulatory jurisdiction," *Boston College Industrial & Commercial Law Review* IX (Winter), 429.
- Jack Gould, "At least and at last—a beginning," *New York Times* (Dec. 22), 19.
- "Nothing settled yet on CATV; pay TV," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 23), 17.
- "Optimistic view of CATV rule," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 23), 22.
- "CATV on a hot tin roof," *Newsweek* (Dec. 23), 74.
- "Cross current in wake of CATV decision," *Television Digest* (Dec. 23), 3.

1969

- Larry Michie, "CATV on a roller coaster," *Variety* (Jan. 8), 87.
- "Calling all Congressmen: FCC regulations," *Forbes* (Jan. 15), 35.
- "FCC's Lee says CATV to stay as is till UHF builds," *Variety* (Feb. 5), 44.
- "FCC responds to McClellan's CATV needle," *Television Digest* (Feb. 24), 45.
- "CATV finds two important friends," *Broadcasting* (March 17), 146.
- "Rostow (Presidential Communications Task Force) says FCC inquiry on CATV caused delays," *Electronic News* (March 17), 51.
- "The FCC creates some static," *Newsweek* (March 17), 80.
- "CATV—the FCC's dilemma," *Suffolk University Law Review* III (Spring), 343.
- Kenneth A. Cox, "CATV—why is it so complicated?" *Advertising Age* (March 24), 68; (April 7), 32; (April 21), 30.
- Dick Nelson, "CATV—enter the FCC," *Freedom Of Information Report No. 210*, U. of Missouri School of Journalism, (April).
- "Federal Court holds FCC stay of Bucks County CATV operation unconstitutional," *Broadcasting* (April 21), 41.
- "CATV—FCC weighing; Congressmen inveighing," *Television Digest* (April 21), 4.
- "Justice Dept. rebuked on cable comprehension," *Broadcasting* (April 28), 56.
- "Canada issues guidelines for cable-TV; local programs urged, networks banned," *Wall Street Journal* (May 15), 8.

- "CRTC (Canada) puts tight leash on CATV," *Broadcasting* (May 19), 74.
- "FCC amends its CATV proposals," *Broadcasting* (May 19), 40.
- "Will task force report help CATV?" *Broadcasting* (May 26), 19.
- "Task force study finally reaches hill," *Broadcasting* (May 26), 24.
- "Here's the record on FCC—CATV," *Broadcasting* (May 26), 28.
- "FCC seeks \$1 million solution," *Broadcasting* (June 2), 38.
- "A 'good cause' permits leapfrogging," *Broadcasting* (June 9), 46.
- "FCC's proposed CATV regulation," *Stanford Law Review* (June), 1685.
- R. L. Shayon, "What's at stake: FCC-CATV struggle over integrating cable into over air program transmission," *Saturday Review* (June 21), 30.
- Sid Adelman, "Canada classifies CATV owners as broadcasters who must 'fall up' to programming," *Variety* (June 25), 38.
- "Supreme Court upholds FCC authority to let CATV into small TV markets" (Vumore-Colorado Springs), *New York Times* (June 28), 4.
- "FCC doesn't belong in some CATV areas," *Broadcasting* (July 7), 48.
- "FCC gets 'A' for effort," *Broadcasting* (July 7), 50.
- "A too-heavy hand on Canadian CATV?" *Broadcasting* (July 28), 54.
- "Full CATV competition Justice Dept. goal; NAB-NCTA proposed compromise not in best cable interests," *Broadcasting* (Sept. 15), 73.
- S. Schildhause, "CATV—from the regulator's point of view," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Sept. 25), 78.
- "FCC opens new vistas for CATV programming; rule requires origination; may begin cable net," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 27), 9.
- "Diversity wins CATV a round at FCC," *Television Digest* (Oct. 27), 1.
- "Supreme Court lets stand FCC guidelines . . . CATV authority," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 28), 4.
- "FCC casts CATV in new role," *Advertising Age* (Nov. 3), 26.
- "FCC OK to use of microwaves by CATV; move would allow firms to save considerably in transmission of programs to customers," *Wall Street Journal* (Nov. 10), 17.
- "Canada won't license microwaves; CATV from US; threat to domestic industry," *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 4), 19.
- D. Le Duc, "The FCC v. CATV; a theory of regulatory reflex action," *Federal Communications Bar Journal* XXIII, 93.

1970

- "Burch would give CATV top-drawer bureau at FCC; cites potential," *Variety* (Jan. 14), 68.
- "Court backs distant signal curbs," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 9), 46.
- "Unleashing cable TV," *Economist* (Feb. 28), 48.
- "Regulators move fast on CATV," *Broadcasting* (March 2), 32.
- "CRTC proposes new curbs on CATV in Canada," *Variety* (April 15).
- "Regulation of community antenna television," *Columbia Law Review* LXX (May), 837.
- "New FCC tune elates cable TV," *Business Week* (May 23), 38.
- "Different versions of the CATV-UHF plan," *Broadcasting* (May 25), 26.
- "Planned obsolescence," (ed.) *Broadcasting* (May 25), 80.
- Larry Michie, "CATV public dividend plan," *Variety* (May 27), 22.
- "FCC proposed CATV regulation," *Cornell Law Quarterly* LVI (June), 244.
- L. Chasen, L. Ross, "Federal regulation of cable television: the visible hand," *Harvard Law Review* LXXXIII (June), 1820.
- "Court upholds FCC stay rule," *Broadcasting* (June 15), 23.

- "FCC at last drops all those shoes," *Broadcasting* (June 29), 23.
 "How FCC would cut cable loose," *Broadcasting* (June 29), 24.
 "Cable package draws mixed review," *Broadcasting* (June 29), 26.
 "Economics of commercial substitution," *Television Digest* (July 27), 3.
 P. Mullally, "CATV: where do we go from here?" *Illinois Bar Journal* LVIII (Aug.), 954.
 P. F. Kagan, "Clearer signal? The FCC's public dividend plan would spur cable television growth," *Barrons* (Aug. 3), 5.
 "Who's in charge of cable regulation?" *Broadcasting* (Aug. 3), 19.
 "McClellan buries CATV bill this session," *Television Digest* (Aug. 24), 3.
 "Microwave ruling hailed," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 31), 40.
 "Comment on FCC report defending cable TV," (ed.) *Wall Street Journal* (Aug. 31), 6.
 Amitai Etzioni, "Solutions to problems facing CATV," *Wall Street Journal* (Sept. 8), 16.
 "Burch says program diversity will have to come from non-commercial TV outlets such as CATV," *New York Times* (Sept. 12), 55.
 "Regulation of community antenna television," *Arkansas Law Review* XXV (Fall), 432.
 M. Boteen, "CATV regulation: a jumble of jurisdictions," *New York University Law Review* XXXV (Oct.), 816.
 F. W. Friendly, "Asleep at the switch in the wired city," *Saturday Review* (Oct. 10), 58.
 "FCC geared for renewed CATV policy rush," *Television Digest* (Oct. 12), 1.
 "Can FCC force CATV programming?" *Broadcasting* (Oct. 19), 70.
 "CATV live repeat of 1948-52 TV freeze," *Television Digest* (Nov. 9), 2.
 "Justice Department in FCC territory," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 30), 21.

State

(Includes all actions and deliberations of state agencies affecting CATV. For a more complete set of state public utility deliberations, see C.C.H. UTILITIES LAW REPORTER, Chicago, a loose leaf service of current actions and enactments).

1951

"In re Edwin Francis Bennett," 7 RR 2054.

1954

"Opinion, New Mexico Attorney General, No. 5942," 10 RR 2058.

"Opinion, Arizona Attorney General, No. 55-206," 12 RR 2094.

"Opinion, Washington Attorney General, No. 346," 14 RR 2059.

1956

"Opinion, Utah Attorney General, No. 56-129," 14 RR 2063.

"Television Transmission Inc. v. PUC," 47 Cal 2d 82, 301 P2d 862.

"Can CATV be enjoined?" *Albany Law Review* XX, (Jan.), 69.

L. G. Sands, "California regulates CATV," *Radio & TV News* (April), 43.

"In the matter of CATV systems of Wyoming et al; Wyoming Public Service Commission," 17 RR 2131 (May 28).

1959

"Note: state regulation of radio and television," *Harvard Law Review* LXXIII (Dec.), 386.

1963

General Statutes of Connecticut, Chapt. 289, Sect. 16-330.

1964

- "Waiting and watching in Connecticut; Public Utilities Commission issues rules on state CATV operation," *Broadcasting* (March 30), 133.
- "How much should CATVs make? That's question Connecticut Utility Commissioner must answer before grants franchise," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 9), 60.
- "What's CATVs effect on UHF? Question raised as Connecticut PUC continues its hearings," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 16), 115.

1965

- "Dispatch Inc. v. City of Erie," 249 F. Supp. 267, 7 RR2d 2026.
- "Ohio hearings on CATV bill," *Variety* (March 31), 32.
- "California ruling cheers CATV operators," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 16), 74.
- "States grab for CATV; most state utility commissioners favor plan for CATV," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 4), 56.
- B. Conroy, Jr., "We're not a public utility," *TV & Communications* (Dec.), 27.

1966

- Joseph Klein, "Indiana ruling against exclusive CATV franchises called rules," *Variety* (Feb. 2), 36.
- "Draft of state laws for regulation of CATV," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (March 17), 55.
- "See Indiana pushing states rights in CATV area to thwart FCC," *Variety* (Dec. 14), 29.

1967

- Nevada, *Revised Statutes, Paragraph 711-0-10*.
- Joseph Klein, "Indiana legislature stands mute on CATV: freezing hot issue to 69," *Variety* (March 1), 29.
- "State bars TV-owned CATVs," *Broadcasting* (March 27), 70.
- "Connecticut PUC kills own CATV OK," *Variety* (May 24), 35.
- "Delaware bill would put CATV under PSC," *Variety* (Aug. 9), 31.
- M. Roth, "Licensing and regulation omitted in Illinois 'regulation' of CATV," *Variety* (Aug. 16), 34.

1968

- "Strict CATV rules pushed in Massachusetts," *Broadcasting* (April 22), 34.
- "PUC reins on CATV attacked," *Broadcasting*, (June 3), 42.
- "CATV pros and cons heat the air at consumer council hearing in Massachusetts," *Variety* (June 17), 31.
- "Public utility regulator counsel urges state regulatory control for CATV." *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (July 18), 46.
- "1969 CATV legislation seen shaping in Indiana," *Variety* (Nov. 20), 56.
- G. Anthony, "A regulator looks at state CATV regulation," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Dec. 5), 28.

1969

- "Public utility control over CATV again being considered in nearly a dozen states," *Broadcasting* (March 24), 68.
- E. Shafer, "Cable TV—is state regulation needed?" *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (July 3), 23.

"Guidelines for New York CATV supported," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 20), 75.
 "TelePrompTer's Kahn would limit New York State to advisory role on CATV,"
Variety (Oct. 22), 49.

R. Taylor, "The case for state regulation of CATV distribution systems," *Federal Communications Bar Journal* XXIII, 110.

1970

"NARUC-NCTA discuss federal-state control," *Television Digest* (Feb. 6), 2.

"CATV faces control by states and FCC," *Broadcasting* (Feb. 9), 44.

"New Mexico court voids franchise for CATV," *Broadcasting* (March 9), 41.

"FCC asks for public comment on how cable TV controls should be divided among states and local," *Wall Street Journal* (June 17), 10.

"Can they or can't they tax CATVs?" *Broadcasting* (June 20), 83.

J. R. Monaghan, "Federal-state regulation of CATV explored," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (July 16), 40.

"Gross receipts tax fails again in court," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 17), 28.

FCC, "Amendment of Part 74, subpart K . . . regulations relative to federal-state or local relationship in (CATV) fields . . ." *Docket 18892*.

Local

(Includes all actions of county or municipal governing bodies, and deliberations affecting their jurisdiction. For more specific information about particular local systems, see pp. 202-210; also see Docket 18892 for proposed restraints upon franchising powers).

1964

"Decision on New York CATV delayed month," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 26), 76.

"Three more apply for New York CATV," *Broadcasting* (Nov. 16), 106.

"New York City franchise bureau, under Estimates Board, will grant CATV franchise; treat as utility," *New York Times* (Dec. 3), 91.

"Will New York CATV set pattern? City proposes utility type regulation," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 7), 44.

1965

"Bristol, R. I. station attempts to enjoin city from granting CATV franchise," *Broadcasting* (April 19), 62.

"CATV; a blurred picture; questions and answers summarizing some issues facing cities," *Nations Cities* (May), 25.

"CATV; yes or no? A challenge for our cities," *Popular Government* (May), 8.

"Master antenna proposed for city," *New York Times* (May 2), 1.

K. D. McGinnis, "CATV franchise in New York; a proposal," *Albany Law Review* XXIX (June), 321.

Lester W. Lindow, "Local officials and CATV," *Ohio Cities & Villages* (June), 4.

"Model ordinance—CATV system," *Nebraska Municipal Review* (Aug.), 17.

Lawrence Savage, "The city and CATV," *Michigan Municipal Review* (Sept.), 278.

David Stahl, "CATV—further developments," *Local Government Newsletter* (Oct.), 3.

Frank Thompson, "CATV and the municipalities," *Illinois Municipal Review* (Nov.), 4.

"Mayor Wagner, after probe, approves CATV franchise in New York," *New York Times* (Dec. 18), 19.

C. W. Elzroth, "CATV and local government," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (Dec. 23), 33.

"R. D. Heffner named by Mayor Lindsey to study impact of CATV on New York," *New York Times* (Dec. 29), 61.

1966

"Anti-CATV force in Indiana town lays down stiff rules for cable," *Variety* (March 30), 54.

"A CATV primer: what every governing body should know when considering applications," *New Jersey Municipalities* (May), 10.

1967

"Raleigh (N.C.) going to polls May 2 for decision on award of CATV," *Variety* (April 19), 75.

Don Reed, "Five franchises busy laying cable in Seattle," *Variety* (May 24), 47.

Joseph Klein, "Cities as CATV operators," *Variety* (June 14), 33.

Jerry Gaghan, "Camden asks ½ million for 25 years—no takers," *Variety* (July 26), 50.

"NY Mayor Lindsey names task force headed by Friendly to make exhaustive study of NY CATV," *New York Times* (July 28), 63.

"CATV rate increased: franchise cancelled," *Broadcasting* (Aug. 28), 44.

1968

"Groups line up as Burlington, N. C. sets new law on CATV," *Variety* (Jan. 10), 38.

L. Littman, "State tribunal voids Pitt suburban CATV pact; irregularities hinted," *Variety* (March 20), 39.

"Massachusetts switches to local cable control," *Variety* (July 17), 34.

J. W. Witt, "CATV and local regulation," *California Western Law Review* (Fall), 30.

"NY mayor's group gung-ho for cable," *Television Digest* (Sept. 23), 1.

"New York appellate court upholds rule that Comtel may operate in New York without franchise," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 21), 3.

"New York City approves program origination by 3 franchised CATVs for 1 year," *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 12), 17.

1969

"Leaseback; a shelter from local rule?" *Broadcasting* (Jan. 13), 47.

"Cities and cable television," *Nation's Cities* (Aug.), 10.

1970

"New York City franchise bureau director says franchises for city CATV's should be awarded without competitive bidding; no other competitor in area," *New York Times* (March 29), 60.

"Local franchises are challenged," *Broadcasting* (April 20), 42.

W. G. Salan, "CATV is coming to your town," *Popular Science* (June), 88.

"Details of New York franchise negotiated," *New York Times* (June 19), 75.

"Debate on New York franchise proposal continues," *New York Times* (July 8), 87.

S. W. Dean, "Hitches in the cable: television in New York," *Nation* (July 20), 41.

"Sides drawn on New York cable plans," *Broadcasting* (July 27), 50.

"Local regulation of CATV favored," *Broadcasting* (Oct. 12), 29.

"Cable TV's high cost of bidding: win or lose, it's a rich man's game," *Variety* (Oct. 14), 72.

"Macy tells mayors: build, lease CATV," *Broadcasting* (Dec. 14), 66.

Books in Review

Anyone who wishes to volunteer as a reviewer, or who wishes to submit or suggest books for review, is invited to write to the Book Review Editor, Dr. Christopher H. Sterling, c/o the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.

DOCUMENTS IN AMERICAN BROADCASTING. Edited by Frank J. Kahn. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968. 598 pp. \$4.95 (paper).

The inscription on the National Archives Building in Washington, D. C., "WHAT IS PAST IS PROLOGUE" has been somewhat overworked in recent years. Nevertheless, the thought it conveys of background-precedence-experience-and-knowledge of what has gone before is indispensable to an intelligent formulation of future regulatory policy for broadcasting. A thorough knowledge of how the present policies were developed and the nature of those policies is essential for all students of the subject, to understand where we are in the evolution of broadcast regulation and how we got there.

This compilation of the full text of original materials, most of which are either out-of-print, such as the "Blue Book," or difficult to locate, constitutes a judicious selection of documents basic to our present broadcast regulatory scheme. Moreover, documents are included which show the development of policy and broadcast regulation in action — thus, the book is considerably more than "prologue."

The book is divided into five parts, with an excellent bibliography at the end of each part. The documents in these parts, in order, cover (1) the basic constitutional and statutory provisions; (2) freedom of expression and the regulation of programming, including materials on self-regulation; (3) freedom of expression and broadcast journalism such as the "Report on Editorializing," expounding the "Fairness Doctrine," including its mutilation by the Commission in its letter to WCBS-TV, in effect, declaring "good health" to be a controversial issue of public importance when applied to the advertisement of cigarettes (the desirability of "good health" had never been controversial before), and the political broadcast primer; (4) the regulation of competition; and (5) educational broadcasting.

The convenience and usefulness of this book is unduplicated in the field and should be of inestimable value, both as a reference work and as a basis for the systematic study of the regulation of broadcasting. A supplemental volume will be desirable as new developments generate sufficient materials.

Frederick W. Ford
District of Columbia Bar

RADIO, TELEVISION AND AMERICAN POLITICS. By Edward W. Chester. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969. 342 pp. \$7.50/3.45.

All teachers challenged by advanced undergraduate courses dealing with mass media developments in the United States are constantly searching for historical textbook treatments which are encyclopedic and lively enough to hold student attention. This chronicle of pre-1968 events earns endorsement, if qualified, on both counts. Professor Chester has taken pains to provide a substantial documentary ranging over a half-century of quick changes and persistent problems. He begins with the first timid Presidential uses of radio and concludes with perspectives of radio and television as the media have progressed in the past decade.

The greatest virtue of the work is that it is such a compact guide to a vast amount of information. Its defect flows from compressions which are often less than potent for the uninitiated reader. The students will need guidance and much in-class elucidation if the steadily running and the somewhat bloodless discourse is not to overwhelm.

One illustrative problem is that his early history of radio is so matter-of-fact. To be sure, the author has collected appropriate commentary on the major campaigns and campaigners, but his objectivity on the Coolidge, Hoover and Roosevelt periods is bought at the cost of deep personal understanding of the general situations. There is an obvious ancient history approach, however legion the sources. One longs for the applied insights which can be gleaned from contemplative works such as Edward Robb Ellis' *A Nation In Torment* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1970), or James MacGregor Burns' provocative *Roosevelt: The Lion and The Fox* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1956). In short, while the over-all story is admirably recounted from the radio angle, there is insufficient fleshing out of the times the listeners lived through and of the personalities vital to the story.

These reservations are not intended to disparage but to alert professorial clientele that they had best be prepared to move their students slowly through this book, supplementing an informational treasure house with other materials stressing relationships between social and political developments. In short, historical *mood* is the missing ingredient.

Professor Chester is at his best dealing with organizational matters and with the preparation of summarizations of long-fused political debates. Thus, one applauds his over-view of such subjects as equal-time, the fairness doctrine and editorializing. In language he is succinct, in approach direct and in organization encompassing.

Perhaps the current need we all feel for social evaluation makes us less enthusiastic about traditional documentary history. We want to learn how the popular endurance contest of past decades helps us to fathom saner and safer penetrations of the near future. No longer can we afford to separate mass media power from the welfare of the entire body politic. At the least it is necessary to learn the bad teachings of such characters as Father Charles Coughlin and Senator Joseph McCarthy. The powerful motives and persuasive abilities of a Franklin D. Roosevelt and a General Hugh Johnson must be weighed against the earlier and present talents of a Richard Nixon or a William Buckley. We desperately need some rationale of how the *selling* of political men or ideas can be controlled in the public interest.

The author betrays so little of his own emotion and displays so much representative commentary for each period of radio and television history, that the reader is left wondering whether the facts are enough, if the underlying story is ever to be stripped away from the interplays of legislation and administration.

One tends to compare Chester's work with several of the new-style treatments such as Robert MacNeil's *The People Machine* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968) and the British analysis, *Television in Politics: Its Uses and Influence* by Jay G. Blumler and Denis McQuail (University of Chicago Press, 1969).

It may be that too much was attempted in the format of a one volume treatment. The histories of radio and television are made too overly-entwined. The result is that each medium is not properly analyzed for its peculiarities. When television emerged as a dominating mass medium it forced a quality decline of radio which is, lamentably, still continuing. At the end of the volume the author persists in dragging the reader back to the 1930s, as he compares the media. He does not allow himself to get tangled up in underlying problems and therefore is hardly involved with problem-solving.

In recent years penetrating scholars and on-the-spot journalists have offered us such a mother-lode of insightful work that traditionally minded researchers are forced to veer away from standardized accounting. With the spectrum of observation wide enough to accommodate Theodore White, Gladys and Kurt Lang, Stanley Kelley, Charles A. H. Thompson, Murray Levin and Joe McGinnis, the receptivity for the thoroughly detached treatment is less than it was. Chester did his job well enough to stimulate these comparisons. He is talented enough to meet the competition on the new terms. Curiously, objections to his work are based on his approach to key political figures who have dominated the public stage, as one learns enough about Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Stevenson, Goldwater, Johnson, Kennedy and Nixon to lament the lack of truly interpretive analysis.

We are with you Professor Chester! Dare all the next time. Forgo the doctoral thesis type of straight-jacket, even if it means that the woods are just as stark to our vision as are the trees.

Bernard Rubin
Boston University

THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY. New York: Bantam Books, 1970. 700 pp. \$1.65 (paper).

This book cannot be "reviewed" in the ordinary sense. That is, one cannot assess its utility as a source book or the closeness of its hit to the mark of literary excellence. The report obviously attempts neither of these. It is a political and persuasive attempt to implement a series of legislative actions. The report's true review will come in the legislatures in the years to come. One can however, provide some descriptive comments and an analysis of the elements used to develop the arguments presented.

The report is actually three reports. The first is the majority report supported by 15 of the 18 Commissioners. The second is the first minority report written by two Commissioners and concurred in by another. The third is a minority report written by a single Commissioner. All three reports rest on the definition of what behaviors relating to sexuality are disruptive of the good of society. The majority of the Commissioners rest their definition on certain overt social behaviors. Their arguments in support of the removal of legal restraints on pornography for adults relate to the failure of their investigations to show any reliable association between pornography and changes in established patterns of sexual behavior, changes in sexual attitudes, or the appearance of criminal and/or delinquent behaviors. The minority Commissioners approach the definition from the position that pornography is an intrinsic threat to the existing moral standards of society and therefore wrong in itself. Obviously there can be no resolution of these two definitions. The two positions, while in conflict in this report, are truly irrelevant to one another. As a result this review shall treat the development of each of these positions independently.

The majority report is divided into four parts; an overview (actually a summary of part three); the recommendations of the Commission; the panel or sub-committee reports; and the separate statements by various Commission members. The overview we shall ignore as we will treat the separate parts. The legislative recommendations are simply stated:

. . . the Commission recommends that federal, state, and local legislation should not seek to interfere with the right of adults who wish to do so to read, obtain, or view explicit sexual materials. On the other hand we recommend legislative regulations upon the sale of sexual materials to young persons who do not have the consent of their parents and we also recommend legislation to protect persons from having sexual materials thrust upon them without their consent through the mails or through open public display. (p. 57)

The primary support for these recommendations comes from the panel report on the impact of erotica. In the course of gathering data relevant to the recommendations above, the Commission funded 39 studies. Of these, 32 collected or re-analyzed original data. In presenting the results of these studies the panel first articulates a number of *caveats* which should be carefully attended. The members note:

Questions will be raised about the studies reported here. Were the most relevant criteria of effects employed? How valid were the measures of impact? How much reliance can be placed on self report of response to erotica? How representative were the populations studied; [d]o statistical correlations provide a strong basis for inference? (p. 170)

If one were inclined, each of these questions could be answered negatively. The decisional crunch can always be resolved by what one is willing to accept. This reviewer is not willing to accept a) studies which are based on retrospective measures — selective retention and the operation of the social desirability variable are all too functional, b) inferential studies which are based on available rather than random samples — particularly when the sample sizes are small and the decision in question obtains support from the finding of no significant differences, or c) studies which attempt to relate the availability of pornography to an increase/decrease in arrests or convictions for "sex crimes." There are simply too many variables relating to the production of

arrests and/or convictions to provide meaningful comparisons by isolating one of them. These fairly stringent rules remove between 11 to 13 of the studies from consideration. The precise number is indeterminable from the necessarily short descriptions provided. In addition, another five studies or so appear to be irrelevant to the decision, as their only visible purpose is to rank the arousal effects of various forms of pornography. (Results may be eminently useful to the pornographer, however.) After these deletions, 13 studies remain which clearly deal with the issues at hand and appear to substantially support the recommendation within their limitations.

Of these limitations two appear to be major. The studies, as noted by the panel members, do not deal with any but a limited number of short-term effects. Equally important, the studies' primary support for the recommendations comes from the studies' failure to find significant effects. As is well known, the finding of no significant differences is decisionally confounded. That is, such a finding could equally be an indictment of the methodology used as it could be substantive result. Whether these limitations are sufficient to negate the recommendations is beyond the scope of this review, as the original sources would have to be studied. They are however a major opening for attack.

The minority Commissioners do indeed attack. They begin by claiming that the majority of the Commission were dupes of the chairman and the ACLU. They continue by complaining that the Commission gave money "primarily to 'scholars' who would return conclusions amenable to the extreme and minority view." They respond to a probability sample of American adults with a "cross-section of the community ranging from members of the judiciary to members of women's clubs." In criticism of the studies they emphasize findings which are apparently deviant and minor. They roundly reject a study for its methodology and then a few pages later use it to support their point of view. They dismiss Denmark as failing to be committed to the "Judeo-Christian tradition." (This statement is, however, somewhat more sophisticated than Mr. Keatings'. He writes, "God is gone from the hearts, the minds, and the souls of the people of Denmark.") This reviewer finds the minority Commissioners' attacks most lamentable. They might have been able to sound a reasoned note of warning. But only if they were willing to operate within the assumption that pornography might be something other than intrinsically evil. As they were not, their alternatives were to attack credibility and reputation.

As a final note of particular interest to the readers of the JOURNAL are the recommendations of the Commission concerning broadcasting. Of these recommendations the Commission first states that the existing federal code prohibiting the broadcast of "obscene" material should be repealed, as it is vague in definition. The Commission then "exempts broadcast or telecast activity" from regulation under the model statute. The Commission argues that "Industry self-regulation has resulted in little need for governmental intervention." But then adds that, if regulation be necessary, it should come from the FCC rather than the separate states.

There are pitfalls in this recommendation. Industry self-regulation has on the one hand been stultifying. Movies and dramatic presentations are regularly edited to school-marm taste. The Victorian decisions of "standards and practices" are legend. On the other hand self-regulation has been anything but 100% effective. If the major recommendations of the Commission were to be adopted, the likelihood of more libertine films appearing on the air or via CATV is in

direct relation to their perceived profitability. It is at this point that the wish of those who do not want to be exposed to (or perhaps tempted by) such material needs to be balanced against the wish of those who desire ready access to such entertainment. There are solutions to the problem. One such solution would be cabled signals scrambled for all but those adults who have purchased the necessary decoding devices. Given the curious—almost unnatural—sensitivity of the majority of the industry and its regulatory Commission to the demands of the puritan sex ethic, however, it is doubtful if even tentative experimentation would not be squashed by repressive regulation. Consequently, this reviewer would have preferred the Commission to have developed a model ruling for adoption by the FCC. Such an action would have been more in keeping with the position of the report, and could benefit industry and artist alike by removing one area from regulation by raised eyebrow. The obvious need for work in this area forces one to wonder why the Commission saw fit to deal with broadcasting and cable-casting so superficially. As a major force in our society the media deserved better. The Commission had adequate expertise in its membership for this issue, but apparently chose not to use it.

James A. Anderson
Ohio University

Two points of view . . .

HOW TO TALK BACK TO YOUR TELEVISION SET. By Nicholas Johnson. Boston: Little-Brown, 1970. ix+228 pp. \$5.75. [re-issued with added bibliographies and an index by Bantam Books, 1970. 245 pp. 95¢.]

One in favor . . .

This book by the youngest and most vocal member of the Federal Communications Commission is one of a growing list of sharp critiques of the fare available from American commercial television. It is also one of the most pointed. His fiery style and sharp accusations have made Johnson a principal target of the TV establishment. His purpose here is simple and straight-forward: "to encourage bringing more national resources of talent and creativity to bear upon the national policy questions involving broadcasting." In his listing of these resources he leaves plenty to do for industry, universities, foundations, research organizations and the public. Little that he proposes would require government censorship, as many seem to imply.

He is, of course, not the first to note how "citizens of all ages, in all corners of this country, have begun to grasp the absolutely crucial need to reform television." Johnson has run into a refreshingly large number of businessmen, Senators, Congressmen and their staffs, and even "a few scattered professors, who are focusing their talents on broadcasting." He notes that in view of all the lobbies imposed on the FCC, much action by it (or by him within it)—other than mere words—is impossible.

Johnson understands, as few others have, that no medium ever existed comparable to TV for revealing to the deprived ghetto dweller, in daily color ads and programs, the shiny new consumer services and products which "you" (the medium tells its viewers) are entitled to. No wonder violent means are sometimes used to get a part of the action. It is possible that the principal

reason why Johnson makes many industry spokesmen apoplectic is the way he treats the problem of violence portrayal and effects. He notes how the industry cites the fact that television has created favorable buying habits and behavior. With this evidence that TV does have effect, he wonders, "Could it be that the crime and violence content, directly interspersed with this advertising material, did not influence [viewers'] motivation *at all*?" Yet any effort to curb the freedom to show such force and violent solutions, Johnson notes, evokes tons of shiny paper and thousands of voices protesting against violations of First Amendment freedoms of the press.

Another of the problems of big broadcasting which most worries Commissioner Johnson is that same confluence of the military-industrial complex which President Eisenhower warned of. Johnson made a detailed study of the 1966-67 proposed ITT-ABC merger in his chapter, "The Media Barons." How the news we hear might have been manipulated if ITT owned ABC is suggested by tactics of ITT during the preliminary skirmish: ". . . a willingness to spread false stories in furtherance of self-interest, contempt for government officials as well as the press," and others. Monopoly worries him as well because of the increasingly narrow base of ownership, the lack of diversity of viewpoint in even the largest population centers, and the control of half the newspaper-owned stations in the U.S. by only *seven* groups—which he lists (p. 63).

For a medium as jealous of its freedom to tell the whole truth as TV is, Johnson is concerned at the regularity with which remarks by so-called controversial figures (even Johnson himself) are "bleeped" out. Are we sure there's not a lot of useless TV censorship now? How about news: ". . . How much has television told you about the multibillion-dollar corporate profits from the [Vietnam] war," for example? Or how about consistency? Why is it discriminatory for government to outlaw cigarette advertising, or to attempt a political spending limit on TV when it's perfectly okay for the NAB itself to discriminate against hard liquor advertising in its codes? Consistency and censorship issues concern Johnson greatly: "I am delighted the networks have raised the issue of censorship in America. I hope they will permit us to discuss it fully."

But all is neither hopeless nor black in this book. Johnson comes up with many examples of good practices, such as good race relations journalism in Los Angeles. He sees many ways to provide access to the airways without bankrupting stations or networks, recognizing in many cases, usable ideas from other countries' experiences.

It is in his solutions and suggestions for "talking back" that we run into the greatest difficulty in abbreviating his proposals, as they should be read in their entirety to be fully appreciated. He calls his proposals a "systems approach," and believes that television, if freed from its present glut of trivia pollution, and used with other societal institutions and services, can help to remake the world. He is at times impractical, angry and unfair in laying too much blame on the men who determine broadcast policy today. But this young man is desperately serious and concerned. Perhaps CATV *won't* do all he hopes it may. Perhaps satellites may not make our world a *happy* global village. Idealistic as he may be, he realizes that change brings with it dangers not yet fully perceived. But the idea of living with the status quo is far worse.

Therefore, he sets forth what he calls "institutional realignments" which take the bite out of the image and function government *can* have in a democracy. He calls for many things which *will* be possible if we survive: broad citizen (group) involvement and participation; stronger support of public broadcasting; a muscular FCC or other government arm; new types of ownership; new types of fiscal support; program and technical innovation freed from the pressure groups which now stifle them; professionalism; new types of access; new citizens' commissions and research; letters to regulators, Congressmen and sponsors; insistence on local public hearings for license renewals; monitoring programs (by schools and groups); petitions to deny license renewals when standards sag; formation of and membership in radio-TV listener and viewer groups in each community; courses in broadcasting in public and private schools, and so on.

The list is endless. And we still may lose. But since "there is little that touches our lives as consumers more than the ever-present radio and television that fills our eyes and ears," it is worth the effort. "Besides, whoever said democracy—or consumer sovereignty—was going to be easy"? Recommended reading, regardless of how mad it makes you.

Harry J. Skornia
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

. . . and the other opposed.

In his brief introduction to this newly bound set of earlier articles, Commissioner Johnson offers a brief and uncharacteristically mild caveat. ". . . Much of this book," he admits, "was originally prepared under much greater pressure than the most thorough and thoughtful scholarship would require." In its present mood, the Federal Trade Commission would hardly stand still for so modest a warning to consumers.

Commissioner Johnson echoes the familiar charges of TV being a school for violence, making the point that depicted violence must cause violent behavior because it is a fact that television advertising is effective. Any argument against his contention he labels "self-contradictory." Yet he should recognize the difference between a commercial for Brand X soap seen by a viewer who is going to buy some brand of soap, and a program in which a policeman shoots a homicidal gangster. The effect, if any, of the latter depends on many factors: how realistic it is, the context in which it takes place, whether the social consequences are shown, whether the weapons are glorified, whether the shooting is justifiable, other artistic and social considerations and, most important of all, who is the viewer. The fact is that the violent incident may be part of a drama that will produce an abhorrence of violence and an understanding of the need for alternatives to violence. But the Commissioner, in typical simplistic fashion, accepts all the anti-TV allegations as gospel. This, like all scapegoatism, frustrates our coming to grips with the real, social causes of violence.

The Commissioner speaks up in favor of minorities. But he frequently builds his arguments on shifting sands. For example, he quotes the work of Bradley S. Greenberg who wrote that "40 per cent of the poor black children and 30 per cent of the poor white children (compared with 15 per cent of the middle-class white youngsters) were ardent believers of the true-to-life nature of the television content." One might expect that this was a national picture; the Commissioner fails to mention that it was a study of a few hundred children in

a single city. He also fails to mention that this "ardent belief" was judged solely by having the children rate their own attitudes—a not-very-reliable indicator. Throughout the book he mentions studies which can be used to buttress his case, ignoring the many analyses which find the shortcomings in the studies rather than in television.

"Network officials have been quick to promise reform, but slow to deliver," he writes. "Violence continues." Because the text has not been updated, no account is taken of the substantial reduction of depicted violence. And he fails to differentiate meaningfully between entertainment and news. "I would not for a moment suggest that a government commission ought to be providing standards for what is reported as 'news,'" he declared, but he goes on to say that when "the violence quotient in televised news" is discussed, the broadcasting establishment is "apt to come out with something about the First Amendment." He should, and does, know better. Riots, assassinations, wars, anti-war protests, strikes, lockouts and other things we find deeply disturbing are no more caused by television newscasts than are heart transplants, Olympic track records or volcanic eruptions which television reports. In an era when editors and other observers have been noting threats to free expression in many areas, "something about the First Amendment" needs strengthening—and one would hope Commissioner Johnson would defend broadcast journalists instead of adding fuel to repressive fires. He does say that after Vice President Agnew's November 1969 speech, "government censorship became a real threat," but adds, "it did nothing, however, to remove the continuing threat of corporate censorship." Unfortunately, Commissioner Johnson's major efforts seem to be spent on hobbling the broadcaster, rather than in defending TV's freedom to inform the public.

In his attack on the "media barons," the Commissioner shows confusion. Since 1945 the number of radio stations has soared from 961 to 6,885 and TV stations have zoomed from 6 to 889. While there has been some decline in the number of daily newspapers and only three cities have at least three competing papers, the public has a wide choice of media voices. (M. H. Seiden and Associates, economic analysts, recently reported that there are 610 media serving the New York area; even in Yuma, Arizona, there are 79.)

Broadcast channels—commercial and educational—operate with a sense of responsibility to the many elements that make up their communities and with the principle of fairness in presenting controversial issues. That they may not be as *avant garde* as the Commissioner wishes and may reflect a variety of pressures—audience and governmental—rather than baronial isolation. Moreover, there is the fact that group ownership has kept some marginal stations going and allowed for better news coverage. In attacking "bigness," Commissioner Johnson is barking up the wrong tree.

The central theme of this book "talking back to your television set," is narrowly conceived—rising as it does from the premise that the set is a hypnotic monster operated by men whose sole concern is profits. The Commissioner's recipe for reform is more power to the non-government, non-industry citizens' commissions that have sprung up to challenge broadcasters and usurp the role of the FCC itself. In other words, power to the pressure groups as long as they are "good" pressure groups. He ignores the continual measurement of public preference which broadcasters and advertisers perform through audience research; no other communications medium is as heavily researched. Commissioner Johnson seems to lack faith in what the viewers, as viewers,

will choose. He offers no proposals for the greater utilization of the acknowledged achievements of television programming (such as documentaries and cultural programs), but concentrates instead on negative criticism. It bespeaks his impatience with democratic process, his disdain for people's own preferences and his reluctance to recognize the relatively slow elevation of their artistic standards.

In exasperation one thinks of a book on "How to Talk Back to Your Carping Commissioner." But we are in an era of consumerism and our long-standing activities with our consumers (which is everybody) need to be increased, rather than diverted. The broadcaster must continue to study his audiences and their attitudes, to get out and talk with them, to respond to their justified criticisms and to correct their misconceptions. By serving the public and strengthening their ties with all segments of their communities, broadcasters can best answer Commissioner Johnson and similar discontents.

Roy Danish
Television Information Office

MEDIA SOCIOLOGY: A READER. Edited by Jeremy Tunstall. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970. x+574 pp. \$12.50.

England is testing its Open University, one aim of which is to speed the glacial pace of social change. Techniques combine study of print with weekly lessons by radio and television. Jeremy Tunstall is a senior lecturer in sociology at the Open University. His books include *Advertising Man, Old and Alone*, and *Political Journalists*. He made his newest book "for students taking introductory social science courses dealing with the media."

Ten of the 25 readings are new to public print. Television gets most attention, followed by newspapers, books, films, and the advertising agency. Several readings look to two or more media. Writers and writings represent more than one country. Of 28 contributors, 19 are identified with the United Kingdom, six with the U.S., two with Norway, and one with Poland. University affiliation is typical. Sites of study include West Germany, Egypt, Poland, and the U.S.S.R., as well as the U.K. and the U.S.A.

Five articles make up the opening part on cross-media patterns and media research. Melvin L. DeFleur's "Mass Communication and Social Change" is reprinted from *Social Forces* (1966), while Winston Fletcher's "Britain's National Media Pattern" is new.

Part two is on communications organizations and communicators. Among the five pieces Malcolm Warner's "Decision-Making in Network TV News" is from *Television Quarterly* (1968) and Oliver Boyd-Barrett's study of newspaper recruitment and training in Britain is new.

Communicators, performers, and content are the topics of the four articles of part three. *Journal of International Peace Research* first ran "The Structure of Foreign News" by Johan Galtung and Mari Holmboe Ruge in 1965, which is a good example of a way to advance theory through straightforward techniques of content analysis. A new piece by Michael Lane, "Books and Their Publishers," shows that different kinds of publishers may be described through Max Weber's theory of ideal types.

Seven readings are in the fourth part on content and audience. Denis McQuail's new article contains a comparison of audiences for television plays from the British Broadcasting Corporation with audiences for plays from Independent Television. B. P. Emmett's "The Design of Investigations into the Effects of Radio and Television Programmes and Other Mass Communications" is from *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (1966).

The final part has four readings on media and politics. A previously unpublished article, "The Audience for Election Television," by Jay G. Blumler and Denis McQuail draws upon two books describing British elections of 1959 and 1964, one by McQuail and Joseph Trenaman and the other by McQuail and Blumler. Ronald F. Bunn's "The Spiegel Affair and the West German Press: The Initial Phase" is from *Public Opinion Quarterly* (1966).

Unlike related books of readings, this one is substantially transatlantic and nearly down-to-date. Is it worth \$12.50? Figure 25 articles to copy at about 50 cents each. Throw in free of charge the notes, suggested readings, bibliography, two indexes, introduction, and hard binding. Then order it for your college library, if not for your own.

Kenneth Harwood
Temple University

TELEVISION: SELECTIONS FROM "TV GUIDE" MAGAZINE. Edited by Barry G. Cole, New York: Free Press, 1970. 605 pp. \$12.50/5.95.

If a reviewer is to offer sincere and just comment on a book, he must suffer some of the author's labors. Taking this approach, I spent three days amidst bound volumes of *TV Guide* matching my powers of selection against those of the editor. Upon finishing, I experienced a form of media narcosis similar to that described by Charles Sopkin in his *Seven Glorious Days, Seven Fulfilled Nights* (1968) of television viewing.

There are, as with any anthology, a few articles better left out and a few good ones omitted. This reviewer questions the inclusion of "Who Speaks for the Viewer?" by Richard Doan on the ineffectual NCCB (1969), "Is Television Killing the English Language?", a plug for Random House dictionaries by Jess Stein (1966), or the venerable "Television's Contribution to the Senior Citizen" by Eleanor Roosevelt (1959). Among the recent *TV Guide* articles which might have been substituted are Margaret Mead's "Our Leaders do not Understand Television" (12/6/69, p. 12), Max Lerner's "In Defense of Television: But Above All the Greatest Force for Democracy" (3/8/69, p. 6), and Robert Higgins' "It Fizzled When it should have Crackled" concerning public affairs (4/5/69, p. 4).

Not all of the best articles would have suited the book's format. *Television* is divided into six chapters, most of which are composed of sections containing several related articles. These divisions correspond to logical development as well as to the availability of suitable articles. The chapters touch on the areas of News, Programming, Censorship and Control, Audience, Effects, and The Future.

Unfortunately, a full decade of *TV Guide* articles provides but mediocre coverage of some areas. The important consideration of films on television is dealt with under Censorship and Control as "Permissiveness." Two articles, Peggy Hudson's "How Will TV Handle Sexy Movies?" and "The New Movie Code," give little insight into programming practices or regulation. These might well have been replaced by Judith Crist's "Tailored for Television" about movies made specially for prime time television (8/30/69, p. 6). The great influence of advertising in our commercial system is dealt with superficially in terms of commercials from the viewers' standpoint. A critical omission is Public Television, particularly "Sesame Street." Richard Doan wrote "Going to Class by Way of Sesame Street" (10/4/69, p. 6) but it was not included.

Of course the editor cannot be expected to cover everything and certainly not to supply articles where *TV Guide* provides none. Herein lies the editor's dilemma: is this a worthwhile undertaking? Dr. Cole states in his preface that "much of the most significant material about television has appeared in *TV Guide*. . . ." (p. v) If one accepts this, it may be concluded that merely reprinting these writings is useful in itself. However, like the print advertisements of McLuhan's *Mechanical Bride* (1951) which lost their force out of context, *TV Guide* articles are more effective in their natural environment. They seem weightier and more impressive next to the program listings. When the articles appear in anthology form, they comprise a rather disappointing whole. Although a wide range of topics is found in *TV Guide*, the individual articles suffer from a sameness dictated by pressures of time, format, audience attention, and editorial policy. Of the reprints in *Television*, fully one half were originally written by *TV Guide* editors and staff writers or "frequent contributors." The first chapter on News contains 11 articles, seven by *TV Guide* regulars. The guest authors, impressive at first glance, are equally disappointing. For instance, Nicholas Johnson's statement was better supported when he wrote on a similar topic for *Atlantic Monthly* (June, 1968), Gilbert Seldes is represented by a single article from 1960, and William S. White's discussion of TV and politics came from the 1964 election.

An editor must decide whether or not the selected articles can stand on their own merit as forceful and important statements. If they cannot, he may offer his own depth of background. This is traditionally done with introductions to chapters, and this is what Dr. Cole did. But the faults of brevity which necessarily mark most of the articles from the weekly publication are also evident in these introductions. Except for his updating of the chapter on News, the editor offers little besides synopses of the articles. This is more than simply a shortcoming of the book. It is a genuine loss of Dr. Cole's intimate knowledge of broadcasting, especially of regulation and licensing with which he is currently involved. The mere collecting of articles could be handled as well by the editors of *TV Guide* (who did issue *TV Guide Roundup* (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston: 1960) and *Television '62*).

Lee Loevinger, in an excellent article reprinted in *Television*, admits that his material "requires a more detailed analysis than is possible here. . . ." (p. 455) That, to a large extent, is the problem with this entire collection. Like much of television programming, these writings attract our interest but stop short of providing satisfaction. It is the role of the editor to provide the depth which would give importance to these articles.

Television does provide a convenient repository for some worthwhile writings especially as most libraries do not keep back files. It offers little that cannot

be found in more substantial form elsewhere or that most of us have not already read week-by-week in *TV Guide*. As a likely audience for this book, I would recommend young students of mass media and sociology in high school and first year college. Older students, aware of most of this material simply by living in this television culture, are ready for a more substantial approach.

Paul T. Prince
Boston University

INTRODUCTION TO MASS COMMUNICATIONS. By Edwin Emery, Philip H. Ault, and Warren K. Agee. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1970 (third edition). 444 pp. \$8.95.

THE MASS MEDIA AND MODERN SOCIETY. By William L. Rivers, Theodore Peterson, and Jay W. Jensen. San Francisco: Rinehart Press, 1971 (second edition). 342 pp. \$8.95.

THE COMMUNICATIVE ARTS: AN INTRODUCTION TO MASS MEDIA. By Charles S. Steinberg. New York: Hastings House, 1970. 371 pp. \$10.00/6.00.

There are only a handful of basic textbooks (as opposed to books of readings) designed as general introductions to the field of mass communications. The three top contenders are discussed here, two in recent revised editions, the third a new entry. While all three have their strong points and weaknesses, the Emery-Ault-Agee is clearly the best of the lot.

The Emery-Ault-Agee first was issued in 1960, was revised in 1965, and is now in its third edition. The book has four major sections: the role of mass communications (two general overview chapters on the social importance and functions of media), the historical perspective (three chapters tracing the rise of newspapers, broadcasting and film, stressing the journalistic side of each), current problems and criticisms (three chapters examining, in turn, the drawbacks of broadcasting, print media, and "intermedia" problems), and the last and longest portion of the volume, industries and professions (with 11 chapters each examining a particular medium and how it operates today). The organization is logical and flexible enough for adaptation to most course outlines. It concludes with a valuable 35 page annotated bibliography (divided on chapter lines) discussing several hundred of the major books and articles in the field. The book is strongly oriented towards the historical approach, and its chapters on the background of media are well done. There is a similar emphasis on the journalistic rather than the entertainment functions of media (probably because two of the authors teach journalism courses and the third practices it). The chapters on the various media industries examine not only recent economic and organizational changes, but prospects and qualifications for employment.

Rivers-Peterson-Jensen has changed the order of its authors in this second edition of a book first issued in 1965, thus suggesting that Rivers was chiefly responsible for the revisions. More than 80 pages have been added in the revision, though the basic organization is nearly identical. The book's 16 chapters deal first with media and society in general; then (in 30 pages) with media history and organization/support; two chapters on the intellectual environment of media (stressing libertarianism and social responsibility—two of the famous

"Four Theories of the Press" which Peterson helped describe in 1956); three chapters on media regulation (almost totally lacking in the first edition, this is the major change in the second); a chapter on current economic organization of the various media; then chapters on media as informers/interpreters, persuaders and entertainers; a chapter on media audience and effects; brief discussion of media criticisms; and a conclusion. The brief bibliographies at the end of each chapter in the first edition have been consolidated into a 10 page listing, divided on chapter lines, at the end of the book, unfortunately unannotated. The book's division is topical rather than on media lines, which leads to good in-depth analysis of issues but often skimpy information on individual media. There are more specific examples in this edition, and the updating seems general and complete.

Steinberg's book is brand new (though he has issued two previous general communications books) and takes an approach somewhat between the other two volumes. He, too, begins with general observations on communications; then examines the various media in individual chapters on books, newspapers, magazines, cartoons, motion pictures, broadcasting . . . (two chapters, the second dealing with public TV and CATV), and the information [computer] industry. Each chapter analyzes the history, organization, and problems of the medium. The last five chapters are devoted to issues such as international communications, public opinion and propaganda, advertising and public relations, media impact on the audience, freedom and control, and a brief summation. Each chapter is followed by a brief bibliography and the book ends with 40 pages of appendix made up of the various media self-regulatory codes. While in some ways I like the chapter order of this book best, it is clear that, on comparison with the other two, Steinberg's content is by far the weakest. His internal chapter organization is fuzzy and too general and most of his facts are badly dated—in a field where obsolescence comes fast enough as it is. Even in the discussions of broadcasting (where the author, a vice-president of CBS, should be most comfortable), information is generalized and dated almost to the point of distortion. Examples of this include (on p. 139), "The difficulty experienced by the National Broadcasting Company in becoming established resulted in the FCC's so-called Chain Broadcasting Regulations of 1941. . ." Surely it was the *success* of the two NBC radio networks rather than any problems in starting them which brought on the regulation—and even that is far too simple a cause-and-effect relationship. Earlier, the author tells his readers that "Each of the three major television networks owns five stations and has affiliation agreements with about 600 stations," when, in fact, the largest network has affiliations with about 250. This kind of sloppiness with facts (and there are many more examples in the broadcasting chapter alone) is unfortunately carried over into the bibliographies, each of which has one to five typographical or factual errors. The broadcasting chapter's bibliography leaves a whole page blank that could have better been used to list Summers and Summers' *Broadcasting and the Public* (the best recent introduction to the industry), possibly the two Archer volumes, Rucker's *The First Freedom*, a couple of the many works on political broadcasting, etc. Few of the broadcasting books cited are recent, and of the total of 26 books, seven were published by Hastings House (throughout the book, the only publisher whose recent releases and latest revisions are cited). The only work listed which pertains to technical topics is Zworykin and Morton's 1940 volume. Certainly something more up-to-date and aimed at a general audience would have been more fitting. Similar errors and omissions can be seen in each of the other chapters in Steinberg's work.

Information and citations simply can't be trusted—especially in situations in which this book might serve as the only text. Better editing and cross-checking are badly needed, and the book demonstrates too well the drawbacks of a general mass communications introduction authored by a single man active in but one of the media.

Perhaps the shortcomings of Steinberg's book have been over-stressed. It is sad, however, when one of the few publishers specializing in media books issues with much fanfare such a disappointing book. As teachers in this field, we badly need a choice of general introductory texts and this book is simply not in the running. Emery-Ault-Agee is not without its faults (the bibliography is missing some key works), and Rivers-Peterson-Jensen is in many places too general, but at least these two works have basically correct information with some depth to offer. The choice between the two seems to boil down to the choice between a fairly specific book stressing media economics, organization and content (Emery-Ault-Agee), or a more general and theoretical approach emphasizing the phenomenon of media within society (Rivers-Peterson-Jensen). While these two books are competent and up-to-date, there is little question that more variety in the field would be welcome.

C.H.S.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS: THE BOOMING TECHNOLOGY. By Ronald Brown. New York: Doubleday, 1970. 191 pp. \$5.95.

This is one of the newest additions to the publisher's "Science Series" of illustrated volumes introducing various elements of applied science. The author, an "electronics engineer turned science journalist and author," deals in a clear non-technical fashion with the technical background and functions of telegraph, telephone, radio, and television. In each case good use of (often color) photographs and clear diagrams is made. Long chapters deal with cable systems and communication satellites. The book is an excellent brief introduction to the all-too-often complicated world of communications technology.

C.H.S.

THE EMMY AWARDS: A PICTORIAL HISTORY. By Paul Michael and James Robert Parish. New York: Crown, 1970. 384 pp. \$9.95.

As the title says, the book is mainly pictorial, but in the pictures and listings of winners and losers of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences' "Emmy" winners is a history of network television programming and what the industry thought of its own product. The nostalgia impact is incredible, with some of TV's darker moments ("\$64,000 Question" as best audience participation series for 1955) and high spots (Murrow, original drama's "golden age," *Death of a Salesman* and many others) being scattered amongst programs often now hard to remember. A brief introduction traces the story of the Emmy, with some statistical information on which programs and individual's won most, and how many Emmys were awarded each year (the number ranged from a low of 6 in 1948, the first year, to a high of 43 in 1958). In all, an interesting record of the first two decades of network television's highpoints.

C.H.S.

Books Received

*Books marked * had been assigned to a reviewer as this issue went to press. Publication in this list neither promises nor precludes later review.*

- CHURCH-COMMUNICATION-DEVELOPMENT. By the Committee on Society, Development, and Peace. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1971. 111 pp. \$3.50 (paper).
- FROM THOSE WONDERFUL FOLKS WHO GAVE YOU PEARL HARBOR: FRONT-LINE DISPATCHES FROM THE ADVERTISING WAR. By Jerry Della Femina with Charles Sopkin. New York: Simon and Schuster/Pocket Books, 1970. 256 pp. \$6.50/1.25.
- THE RADIO AMATEUR'S HANDBOOK. Edited by Doug DeMaw and the Headquarters Staff of the American Radio Relay League. Newington, Conn.: ARRL, 1971 (48th Edition). 688 pp. \$7.50/4.50.
- COMMUNICATION CONCEPTS AND PROCESSES. Edited by Joseph A. Devito. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971. 232 pp. \$8.50/4.95.
- METHODS OF RESEARCH IN COMMUNICATIONS. Edited by Philip Emmert and William D. Brooks. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970. 517 pp. \$9.25.
- THE FUNCTION OF TELEVISION FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS. By Takeo Furo. Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1971. 323 pp. \$9.50.
- THE MOVIES. By Richard Griffith and Arthur Mayer. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971 (Second Edition). 495 pp. \$19.95.
- SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE. By Denis Grogan. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1970. 231 pp. \$7.00.
- INTRODUCTION TO APPLIED NUMERICAL ANALYSIS. By Richard W. Hamming. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. 331 pp. \$14.95.
- BASIC MOTION PICTURE TECHNOLOGY. By L. Bernard Happé. New York: Hastings House, 1971. 362 pp. \$10.00.
- TELEVISION AND RADIO ANNOUNCING. By Stuart W. Hyde. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1971. 549 pp. \$9.95. *
- MOVIES AND SOCIETY. By I. C. Jarvie. New York: Basic Books, 1970. 394 pp. \$10.00.
- THE LEFT-LEANING ANTENNA: POLITICAL BIAS IN TELEVISION. By Joseph Keeley. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1971. \$8.95.
- ECOLOGY OF THE AIRWAVES. By LeRoy E. Kennel. Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1971. 64 pp. \$1.50 (paper). *
- THE EMMY AWARDS: A PICTORIAL HISTORY. By Paul Michael and James Robert Parish. New York: Crown, 1970. 384 pp. \$9.95. *
- WHY AREN'T WE GETTING THROUGH? THE URBAN COMMUNICATIONS CRISIS. Edited by Edmund M. Midura. Washington: Acropolis, 1971. 191 pp. \$6.95/3.95.
- PROBLEM-SOLVING METHODS IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE. By Nils J. Nilsson. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. 225 pp. \$10.50.
- INTRODUCTION TO PROGRAMMING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE. By Anthony Ralston. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. 513 pp. \$9.95.

- FORTTRAN IV PROGRAMMING: A CONCISE EXPOSITION.** By Anthony Ralston, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. 177 pp. (paper).
- A GUIDE TO RADIO & TELEVISION ENGINEERING.** By E. L. Safford. Blue Ridge Summit, Pa.: TAB Books, 1971. 286 pp. \$12.95.
- OPEN TO CRITICISM.** By Robert Lewis Shayon. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971. 324 pp. \$9.95. *
- ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: THE HEURISTIC PROGRAMMING APPROACH.** By James R. Slagle. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. 196 pp.
- PROCEEDINGS OF THE SYMPOSIUM ON CABLE TELEVISION.** By the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers. New York: S.M.P.T.E., 1971. 140 pp. \$6.50 (paper).*
- FUNDAMENTALS OF MARKETING.** By William J. Stanton. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971 (Third Edition). 729 pp. \$10.95.
- THE SERIALS: SUSPENSE AND DRAMA BY INSTALLMENT.** By Raymond William Stedman. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971. 514 pp. \$9.95.
- HANDBOOK OF PUBLIC RELATIONS: THE STANDARD GUIDE TO PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS.** Edited By Howard Stephenson. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971 (Second Edition). 836 pp. \$24.50.
- THE NEW YORK TIMES GUIDE TO MOVIES ON TV.** Edited by Howard Thompson. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970. 223 pp. \$1.95 (paper).
- ADVERTISING.** By John S. Wright, Daniel S. Warner, and Willis L. Winter, Jr. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971 (Third Edition). 816 pp. \$10.95.
- INFLUENCING ATTITUDES AND CHANGING BEHAVIOR: A BASIC INTRODUCTION TO RELEVANT METHODOLOGY, THEORY, AND APPLICATIONS.** By Philip Zimbardo and Ebbe B. Ebbesen. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970 (Revised Printing). 162 pp. (paper).

As a broadcaster, have you considered sending presentation subscriptions of the **JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING** to high schools and colleges in your area? More and more young people are becoming interested in broadcasting as a career, and a subscription to the **JOURNAL** would be an excellent introduction to broadcasting for them, as well as being a continuing reference source. The **JOURNAL** would be glad to send blank cards for your convenience in indicating your selections. All presentation subscriptions will be sent directly to the schools you select, along with a letter announcing your gift. A letter is also sent to you, thanking your station in behalf of APBE and the **JOURNAL**.

We hope that you noticed . . .

that the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING published more than 500 pages during 1970, an increase of more than 37% over 1967 (before our last reluctant increase in subscription rates). The increased number of pages has enabled us to publish many more manuscripts on many more topics, and has permitted us to experiment with lengthy bibliographies that previously were beyond our abilities.

Subscribers to the JOURNAL in the past year received a special "Part II" of the Winter issue containing a complete bibliography of articles about broadcasting published in law periodicals from 1920 through 1968. In 1971, a 15-year topic and author index to the JOURNAL will be published. The Books in Review section is being expanded, at the same time that the average number of regular articles published in each issue has been increased by more than a third.

All this has been made possible by increasing the number of pages in an average issue to 128, which in turn was made possible by the 1968 increase in subscription rates and the decision of the APBE Board of Directors to expand the JOURNAL even in the face of inflation and increased costs. In the current economy, our current costs have nowhere to go but up (inflation was more than 7% last year; first class letters only cost 4¢ not too long ago; our printing costs have more than doubled in seven years—and are due for another hike), but we hope to hold the line with our present rates—for a little while longer, anyway.

Here are our current rates. Because of the nearly-prohibitive cost of reprinting back issues that go out of stock, we must charge the same for back issues as we do for the current volume.

| | <u>Regular</u> | <u>Student</u> |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Annual subscription | \$8.00 | \$4.00 |
| Single copies, current issue | 2.50 | 2.00 |
| Back issues, complete volumes (four consecutive issues) | 8.00 | 6.50 |
| Back issues, single copies | 2.50 | 2.00 |

All back issues either are in stock or in the process of being reprinted. In case you wish only a copy of a particular article, it may be that we have an offprint in stock. These may be had for 2½¢ per page, plus 10¢ for each order (check or stamps to accompany order, please). Copies of the 7-year topic and author index cost 25¢, postpaid. Please write for special prices on multiple copies.

In addition, arrangements have been made to supply a microfilm edition of the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING to those librarians and others wishing to store the JOURNAL in this form. Please write directly to University Microfilms (Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107) for exact prices, shipping and other information.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

We recognize radio and television broadcasting as powerful and significant forces in the lives of our people, and the American system of broadcasting as particularly suited to their needs and desires;

We believe that colleges and universities have both an opportunity and an obligation to advance broadcasting, both as an art and as an industry by preparing for the profession qualified men and women alert to their duties as citizens and capable of assuming productive and responsible roles therein;

We recognize the existence of a group of colleges and universities aware of these responsibilities and presently maintaining effective programs of professional broadcasting education; and further, we see growing evidence of increased interest on the part of other colleges and universities in the establishment of such professional programs;

We further recognize an awareness on the part of broadcasters of the necessity of continually improving the professional competency of persons entering the broadcasting industry;

And finally, we believe that many mutual advantages would flow from a continuing relationship established and maintained between such educational institutions and the broadcasters themselves.

To secure these advantages and to foster these ends, we hereby establish the Association for Professional Broadcasting Education, declaring our intent to encourage and maintain in colleges and universities professional broadcasting education that will produce such men and women as can command the respect of the colleges that graduate them and of the industry that employs them.

