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INTRODUCTION

Guglielmo Marconi acquired his first patent on wireless communication in 1896 and opened the wireless era but the birth of broadcasting did not really begin until November 1920 when KDKA transmitted the presidential election returns. The distinction between these two events is very important from a social point of view. Marconi had developed the means of transferring information great distances without any physical connection between sender and receiver. KDKA used this invention actually to transfer information to the public. The use of radio had become a matter of public interest and public concern:

What is said or shown in broadcasting instantly becomes a part of the social environment. In consequence it becomes a subject of public concern and of social policy.1

The use of broadcasting and the effects of that use have been a matter of public and private discussion since the first days of broadcasting. As H.V. Kaltenborn so aptly stated: "just because we have learned how to reach millions of people with a single voice does not mean that we have
learned what to say to those millions."^2

One of the major arenas for discussion of the uses of broadcasting was the Institute for Education by Radio-Television (hereafter referred to as the Institute). In 1949 Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, referred to the Institute as "the world's finest forum for the study of broadcasting as an educational and cultural medium."^3

The Institute was an annual conference sponsored by The Ohio State University to provide a common meeting ground where commercial broadcasters and educators could discuss the problems of educational broadcasting in an atmosphere of mutual cooperation. These conferences which were held each year from 1930 through 1965, except 1945, at The Ohio State University were the forum for a continual dialogue on all the major problems which involved the educational and public service functions of broadcasting.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to (1) describe and evaluate the growth, development and activities of the
Institute, and (2) analyze the major issues in educational and public service broadcasting as they were articulated in the speeches and discussions at the yearly meetings of the Institute.

Description of the Institute will involve: (1) identifying the people who conducted the Institute; (2) listing the stated objectives of the Institute; (3) explaining how these objectives were pursued in administrative policies and activities of the Institute; and (4) detailing the planned schedule of activities (the format of the Institute).

Evaluation of the Institute will focus on: (1) tracing changes in policies and activities of the Institute; (2) determining reasons for changes in and reactions to activities of the Institute; (3) detecting trends underlying the changes; and (4) identifying relationships of Institute activities to events outside the Institute.

The analysis of major issues in educational and public service broadcasting will be concerned with the ideas presented at the Institute. The analysis of these issues will involve: (1) specifying major issues; (2) outlining the opinions and ideas expressed on the issues; (3) identifying the trends in expression of opinion on these issues;
(4) relating to other situations which influenced either speaker or issue and therefore influenced the ideas expressed; and (5) analyzing the level of opposition or support for these ideas.

Organization of the Study

Since the Institute was created to serve a need of society, the circumstances or situations existing in the society and related to broadcasting must be considered in an analysis of the Institute. In order to place the Institute activities in historical context, this writer isolated three areas of outside activities which were particularly important in influencing the Institute and the issues discussed at the Institute. Various histories of broadcasting, FCC reports, trade magazines, yearbooks, and textbooks in broadcasting were investigated to provide a background on these three areas: (1) commercial broadcasting, (2) educational broadcasting, and (3) federal government involvement in broadcasting prior to the Institute and throughout its existence. The opening chapter of this dissertation summarizes the activities in these three areas.
before the beginning of the Institute. Each succeeding chapter begins with a discussion of the activities in each area during the time period covered by that chapter.

The organization of the dissertation is chronological so that the relationships and trends among various activities of the Institute, the issues discussed at the Institute and the activities in allied fields could be more easily identified and analyzed. The dissertation was divided into periods of time based on both changes within the Institute and the overall progress of broadcasting. The first period, 1930-1935, ended with the recognition of the importance of the Institute by the commercially oriented National Advisory Council for Radio in Education. 1935 also saw the end of the first attempts to set aside broadcast channels specifically for educational uses. The next period, 1936-1945, was the period of greatest growth for the Institute; it ended with the first and only break in consecutive annual meetings. The 1944 Institute was also the last Institute of the war period. The third period, 1946-1953, ended with the last consecutive publication of the annual proceedings, Education On The Air. By 1953 broadcasting could report on its first full year under the television allocation plan.
issued by the FCC in April 1952. This was the "Dawn of a New Era" as Harold Hill stated in his history of the NAEB.4

An investigation of the Institute speeches and discussion in the annual proceedings revealed that the material could be categorized into five major areas: (1) communications research, (2) broadcast programs and programming service, (3) training and instruction about broadcasting, (4) broadcast activities by other countries, and (5) administration of broadcasting. Closer inquiry indicated that the administrative area contained most of the material involving issues of national scope and issues having continuing relevance. The single major issue which was discussed throughout the history of the Institute was the determination of the proper role for broadcasting in education. The discussion of this broad issue ranged over many areas of debate. But no single static answer to this question was found, since the role must continue to change as the society changes.

During the first period (1930-1935) the role of broadcasting was discussed primarily in relationship to existing educational institutions and methods of education. The emphasis was on the use of radio in an instructional application. In the second period (1936-1945) the discussion
emphasized the role of radio in adult education and as an informational medium. Responsibility of broadcasting (radio and TV as a reporter of society's condition and a stimulant to citizen's involvement) was the emphasis in the third period (1946-1953), while in the fourth period (1954-1965) the development of a social conscience in the broadcast media was discussed.

Related to this major continuing issue, some periods contained other issues which were of major importance and interest for that particular period. These issues are: (1930-1935) educator ownership of station facilities, (1936-1945) use of radio during World War II, and (1946-1953) initial development of educational TV. There were many other problems discussed at these annual Institutes, the detailed analysis of which are beyond the scope of this dissertation. Brief summaries of the discussion on these problems are given just prior to the analysis of major issues of each period.

Importance of the Study

The rapid changes which have brought broadcasting to its present state of operation have also introduced many
problems. Statements such as the following suggest the scope of these problems:

Dr. Looney declared that television, "the electronic intruder," has replaced both parent and teacher as the primary educator of children.

Just in terms of time alone, Dr. Looney points out, the American pre-school child during his critical pre-school years spends more time watching TV than he would in the classroom during four years of college.

And what is he learning?

American commercial broadcasting today operates under a series of controls, responsibilities, and rights which have evolved from decisions on the interpretation and application of a few basic principles. These principles are that broadcasting is a: (1) competitive, (2) free enterprise, (3) profit motivated, and (4) government regulated system.

Many of the problems in broadcasting involve these basic principles:

Radio and television broadcasting by the nature of their means of transmission must, as compared with the printed media, subject themselves to some degree of government regulation. To what degree has been a question for discussion and some action since the advent of radio, but many of the basic problems have not yet been solved.

The two Mayflower decisions on editorializing present a good example of the way the basic principles have been re-interpreted in the light of changing needs and desires.

Understanding the changes in the interpretation of these
principles requires an analysis of the evolution of the principles. The history of discussion and debate on the principles is invaluable for consideration of their meaning today. Although the history of broadcasting is relatively short, the leaders and decision makers can no longer depend upon their personal experience to recall the pertinent details of previous decisions. The discussion and debate over principles which have shaped the American system of broadcasting are part of the experience of the early leaders and are vividly recalled to the second generation. However, the third generation of leadership must capture the flow of tradition and an understanding of the intent and goal of principles through the written history of such discussion and debate.

The Institute was an attempt to provide a sounding-board for opinions; it sought to be a bridge between the divergent commercial and educational interests in broadcasting, striving to obtain cooperative analysis of mutual problems. In 1950 W.W. Charters, co-founder of the Institute recalled the original intent of the Institute:

It so happened that in 1930 there was a definite cleavage between the educational radio people and the commercial broadcaster.
We thought that by bringing them together, the educators would learn techniques from the broadcasters, and the broadcasters would learn, on the other hand, that there was such a thing as education by radio, and that attention should be paid to it in their programs.  

The Institute was one of the earliest and most consistent annual conferences in broadcasting. In its thirty-six year history as a formal conference, the Institute failed to hold its annual meetings on only one occasion—1945. The Institute attracted national leaders in both educational and commercial broadcasting with the specific purpose of sharing ideas for mutual assistance.

No study of these annual conferences, as a whole, has ever been made. The records of the speeches and discussion at the Institute provide a collection of the opinions of early broadcasting leaders regarding major issues in educational and public service broadcasting. An analysis of these opinions contributes a background and perspective to some major issues which confront broadcasting today and also provides insight into how and why the American broadcasting system has developed its present role in the society.
Sources and Related Materials

The primary source material came from the Institute files located in the archives of The Ohio State University. Although much potentially helpful information had been lost or destroyed by 1965 when this investigation was started, several file drawers of Institute records remained. In addition, some records were located in the files of Institute staff members Dean C. Cannon and Martha Haueisen. Detailed interviews with Richard Hull and I. Keith Tyler added considerable insight into the activities of the Institute.

The majority of valuable material which had been lost or destroyed consisted of copies of speeches from the Institutes after 1953. The tape recordings of these speeches were also destroyed.

The remaining files of the Institute contained some correspondence and records of planning activities as well as copies of a few speeches from most of the Institutes after 1953. Also all financial information and publication information for "Education On The Air" reported in this dissertation was gathered from these files or from the minutes of the various Planning Committee meetings. A complete set
of the twenty-four volumes of the proceedings, *Education On The Air*, was used as was a complete set of official program announcements for the Institute.

Various histories of broadcasting were studied as well as reports and proceedings of other broadcast conferences. A thorough search of the *New York Times Index* and *Broadcasting* magazine was the major source of press coverage of the Institute. Other material was found in various publications listed in *Readers Guide to Periodical Literature*, *Education Index*, and *Business Periodicals Index*. Scrap books and clipping files in Institute records provided limited coverage but introduced some articles from *Variety* and *Billboard* newspapers as well as some large Ohio daily newspapers.
INTRODUCTION: FOOTNOTES


CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Commercial Radio Broadcasting to 1930

The early history of radio broadcasting was punctuated with patent struggles, government intervention, popular acceptance, and determination of its primary function. Until 1906, technological development in the radio field permitted only the controlled interruption of a continuous signal; thus giving it the name and function of wireless telegraphy. The previously established function of telegraphy, referred to as point-to-point communication, could now be performed without stringing wires between the points of communication. Even the development of voice transmission did not stir the imaginations of pioneers to the possibilities of broadcasting. The primary function of radio was thought to be in the field of mobile communications with ships at sea. This proved to be the most immediate need to
be fulfilled and mobile communications continues to be an important function of radio. But the great potential of a system which could deliver a message to an entire city simultaneously was not realized by most people until several years had passed. The potential was demonstrated on November 2, 1920, when radio station KDKA in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania inaugurated the broadcasting age with a much-publicized transmission to the public of the presidential election returns.

In that same year, the major patent problems, which had severely restricted development of marketable equipment, were substantially eliminated. Back in 1915, the control of several major patents for building effective transmitting and receiving equipment was split between large organizations. One of these companies, American Marconi, was bidding for exclusive rights to the Alexanderson Alternator being developed by General Electric for reliable long distance radio communications. World War I interrupted these negotiations as the Navy took control of all private wireless facilities in April 1917. By the time negotiations were reopened in March 1919, it was clear to the industry and the U.S. Navy that such an agreement would give American Marconi control of shipping communications and; together
with its parent organization, British Marconi, a virtual monopoly on international communications. The spectre of such control falling into the hands of a foreign country--Britian--moved the U.S. Navy to propose government monopoly of all radio as the only answer. This position satisfied neither Congress nor the major American private industries involved, but provided a bargaining point from which Owen D. Young, vice-president of General Electric, finally fashioned a solution in November 1919. Radio Corporation of America was organized to take over the assets and operation of American Marconi. Since RCA was an American controlled corporation, the threat of foreign control of U.S. communications was eliminated. In addition, this arrangement created a source of common interest between the three remaining organizations with large patent holdings. These companies, General Electric, Westinghouse, and AT&T proceeded to negotiate cross-licensing agreements with RCA in 1919, 1920, and 1921 which allowed development and manufacturing of radio receivers and transmitters. What had threatened to become a government monopoly finally resulted in a four-company private industry monopoly created with the dubious blessings of the federal government.
The man considered most responsible for engineering this four-company monopoly, Owen D. Young, later testified that there was no consideration of broadcasting to the public in 1919 or 1920. The industry giants were still concerned primarily with point-to-point communications because that was where the most obvious profit could be made. However, Westinghouse found it advantageous to provide a broadcast service to encourage the sale of radio receivers to the public. Thus, their station KDKA inaugurated this service on November 2, 1920. This was a significant step in the development of a second theory for the use of radio communications. General Electric and Westinghouse as manufactures of electrical and communications equipment and RCA as the sales agency for this equipment saw a lucrative market in the sale of home receivers. These three companies held the theory that the public was interested in receiving a program service in their homes and any company who wished to create good will for its product would operate a separate station for that purpose. Therefore, the station facilities and the program or messages sent over these facilities would be financed by the organizations operating such stations. AT&T and its subsidiary, Western Electric, held to the original point-to-point theory and saw broadcasting as an extension
of the telephone service. Under this theory, any individual would be allowed to broadcast his message, much like a toll phone call, and the station would assume no responsibility for the content of the message. Over the next ten years, the industry would change considerably as the market for receivers and components expanded and the problems of providing a program service intensified.

By the end of 1921, there were only twenty-eight licenses issued for broadcast stations; but by August of 1922, this new novelty had captured the imaginations of various interest groups to such an extent that the total licenses issued reached 459. An initial peak in station license issuances reached 576 in early 1923, but the mortality rate was great since many station operators did not have sufficient financial resources to keep pace with the changing function of radio. Almost 40 percent of those early 1923 license holders consisted of communications manufacturers and dealers while another 31 percent belonged to educational institutions, publishers, department stores, and religious institutions. By the time AT&T began operation of its station, WEAF, on August 16, 1922, there were over 200 stations operating in this country with fifteen already in operation in New York City alone.
WEAF was the most active and expensive broadcast operation of its day. From its inception in 1922, to its sale to RCA in July 1926, WEAF developed many of the standard practices used in the radio broadcast field today. In the field of financing, WEAF broadcast the first commercial as a "toll" broadcast and based its support of the broadcast operation on this means of revenue. In the field of operation, WEAF developed the first network organization and many technical innovations.

Meanwhile, RCA had purchased WJZ from Westinghouse in 1923, and became the chief competitor to WEAF. WJZ set up a second network which was not as extensive or reliable as the WEAF network. Several restrictions imposed by AT&T prevented WJZ from developing this network completely. By 1926, AT&T decided that their idea of toll broadcasting controlled by a few stations as just another branch of the telephone service, was an inadequate concept. They decided to get out of the broadcasting business and agreed to a revision of the original cross-licensing agreement made in 1919. The result was that AT&T was guaranteed all business in interconnection of radio stations for networking but RCA was given full freedom to develop broadcasting and allowed to purchase WEAF. RCA moved swiftly, organizing the National Broadcasting
Company and retaining the WEAF network as the "Red" network while the WJZ network became known as the "Blue" network. The inaugural broadcast of NBC took place on November 15, 1926, with a coast-to-coast twenty-five station hookup.

In January 1927, United Independent Broadcasters was formed to provide programming on a network basis to some of the many stations which were not affiliated with NBC. This network operation floundered until sufficient financial backing was provided in 1928 through the purchase of a controlling interest by the William S. Paley family. The purchase of a key New York station and profitable operations in 1929 established this network as a worthy competitor to NBC.

Regulatory practices developed slowly, more in response to the business of broadcasting than to the public interest. Early development had emphasized the use of radio as an instrument of point-to-point communications. The Radio Act of 1912, had not anticipated the use of radio as a means of communication to the general public and therefore, reflected little need for regulation. The law merely required every station to be licensed by the Secretary of Commerce and specified bands of frequencies for different classes of stations. However, the Secretary of Commerce was given no discretionary power to choose among applicants,
specify particular frequencies, power, hours of operation, or period of the license. In other words, he was legally powerless to do anything but maintain a registry service. By 1922, it was evident that the existing means of regulation were not adequate and Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce and Labor, called a conference of radio experts to meet in Washington, February 27, 1922, to discuss possibilities of new regulations. Recommendations from this conference led to the introduction of a bill in the U.S. Congress but failure of this bill persuaded Hoover to call a second conference in 1923, in an attempt to promote self-regulation among broadcasters. Two more conferences followed this in 1924 and 1925, while Congress continued to debate the matter but took no action. Hoover was not waiting for congressional action. On the recommendation of these yearly conferences, he was taking some action to maintain a semblance of order and allow some broadcast service to survive. The limitations of the Secretary of Commerce regarding the Radio Act of 1912 were open to debate and were not clearly defined until 1926; so Hoover took the necessary steps of assigning frequencies, power, and hours of operation in many instances. A Federal Court decision in 1926, clearly indicated that Hoover had no regulatory power and the
U.S. Attorney General concurred. The complete chaos which had been avoided for the past five years on the strength of assumed regulatory power by Hoover, now broke out in full scale as stations changed frequencies, power, and operating hours at will. The resulting interference to all broadcasting finally forced Congress to recognize the need for action in order to preserve the broadcasting service; and, in February 1927, a new broadcast law was enacted. The industry recommendations for broadcast regulations which had been molded in the four radio conferences plus the several congressional hearings during this period formed the basis for the Radio Act of 1927 which became law on February twenty-third of that year. Among other principles, this law established the public ownership of broadcast frequencies with the requirement that any grant or renewal of a license could be made only when the public interest would be served thereby. During the next six years, the Federal Radio Commission would establish technical requirements, assign specific frequencies and power, and reduce the number of authorized stations in its task to eliminate broadcast interference.

AT&T had demonstrated the way to finance the business of broadcasting which was becoming a very big business
Indeed. Before selling its broadcast operation, AT&T had been grossing over $750,000 annually with toll broadcasts. Other station were also accepting fees for the use of their facilities, but few were realizing full operating expenses from such advertising revenue. However, it was generally recognized by 1926, that advertising was an accepted principle of the industry. By 1930, advertising agencies had gained major control of programming and the resulting establishment of all-out direct advertising.

By September 1926, some of the large-city stations were presenting some musical variety programs; however, establishment of the NBC and CBS networks provided the financial and sales basis for program development. In September 1926, the larger commercial stations were providing about seven hours of daily programs while small stations gave two to four hours of daily program service. By the end of 1929, approximately one-third of the more than 600 operating stations were providing an eighteen-hour-per-day program service. During 1928-29, total revenues from the sale of time amounted to about $14,000,000 with at least 80 percent of the total going to networks. Nearly all sponsored programs were 30 or 60 minutes long and presented on a once-a-week basis. The public had accepted
radio as an entertainment medium with approximately 9,000,000 homes containing radio sets.¹⁹ The novelty of listening to the radio merely to hear voices of people from far away was wearing off and entertainment programs were succeeding in keeping people listening.

Educational Broadcasting to 1930

During the early research period of radio, educational institutions were deeply involved in station operation. As broadcasting developed into a profitable business, many educational institutions could afford neither the financial commitment nor the philosophic commitment which broadcasting reflected. Therefore, education found itself with a continually smaller share of broadcasting stations in the U.S. and a smaller voice in the destiny of radio broadcasting.

Carroll Atkinson reports three or four universities were experimenting with wireless communication before the turn of the century.²⁰ By the time World War I arrived, twenty-five institutions were operating wireless facilities, and nine of these remained on the air during the war at the request of the government for research and training purposes. With the KDKA broadcast in November 1920, and the subsequent
rush of private interests to obtain licenses and share in the ultimate prosperity of this innovation, competition for licenses grew rapidly. The first official broadcast licenses granted to educational institutions were granted simultaneously to the University of Minnesota and the University of Wisconsin on January 13, 1922. The content summary in Chapter II of this paper relates some of the problems of the University of Minnesota. By 1925, approximately 100 educational institutions were actively operating broadcast stations, but only about half of that number remained on the air by 1932. Several causes of this high mortality rate are discussed in excellent early historical volumes. Several documented cases of extreme pressure from commercial operators are available as evidence of causes for the reduction in the number of educational licenses. Educators frequently complained of favoritism to commercial operators by the Federal Radio Commission. The fact of the matter was that the educators were often in no financial position to use their licensed frequency as much as the commercial operator. The FRC was not as concerned with the type of service provided to the public at that time as they were with the amount of service. Frequency space was scarce, thus those who held this space should use it as much as possible. Of 124
institutions of higher learning which were granted licenses by 1935, only a few had sufficient rationales within their university function to command the necessary financial assistance. The initial personal and professional forces within the university administration structure responsible for obtaining and holding these licenses were listed as follows:

Electrical Engineering Department... 33
Physics Department.................. 27
Administration...................... 13
Faculty Hobby......................... 8
Student Hobby......................... 8
Other................................. 3523

Of the top five areas listed above, only administration sources would have the clear rationales within the university structure to defend the financial investment necessary to use their broadcast facility in acceptable amounts for maintaining the license. Although commercial operators were not providing all-day service, they were on the air for considerably more time than educational stations.

The public schools of Oakland, California, began broadcasting in 1921, with Indianapolis, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh joining Oakland in 1922, as active broadcasters
of regular series of programs under the auspices of their local school officials. Early test experiments in school broadcasting were conducted in 1923, when the Haaren High School faculty broadcast lessons in accounting in New York City. In the succeeding two years, many experimental programs of an instructional nature were tried at various places throughout the country. In the fall of 1926, Cleveland and Chicago sources launched the most ambitious programs of that period. Under the leadership of Alice Keith, the Cleveland schools received a music appreciation course over WTAM twice weekly. The first radio-textbook (listening guide) for students was developed for this series. Meanwhile, Judith Waller, manager of WMAQ in Chicago, spearheaded the preparation and broadcast of three half-hour instructional programs per week. The acceptance and demand for expanded programming finally convinced Chicago school officials to give their endorsement and support to these programs in 1929.

In 1928, Alice Keith took charge of the education department of RCA and was influential in the success of the first network series of educational programs which premiered in October 1928. That was the famous NBC music appreciation series hosted and guided by Walter Damrosch. You might say that was the one shining exception to a rather general policy
of coolness toward instructional programming shown by net-
work organizations. Educators themselves seemed unconvinced
of the benefit of such programs in addition to which a net-
work hookup could lead to some loss of local autonomy in
subject matter and technique of teaching—a carefully guarded
right in educational circles. This lack of demonstrative
support by educators proved to be the major hurdle when Ben
Darrow tried to establish a nation-wide school broadcast in
1927. The Payne Fund of New York once again provided the
forward thrust by authorizing a survey of educators to de-
termine their support of network educational broadcasting.
This survey which showed educators overwhelmingly in favor
of network educational broadcasting was submitted to the
National Education Association in February 1928. Although
this report appears to have influenced many educators to
look more closely at the possibilities of radio education,
the National Education Association deferred any formal
action on this matter until well after the turn of the decade.
Their later expression of favorable attitude toward broad-
casting could be interpreted as a weak gesture of support.

Dr. John L. Clifton, state director of education in
Ohio, did not await the delayed response from the National
Education Association. Financial aid from the Payne Fund
enabled him to appoint Ben Darrow as the first state director of educational broadcasting, and together they developed the Ohio School of the Air. No small portion of the success of this venture is attributed to the contribution of free time for broadcast of these programs by WLW, the high-powered Cincinnati commercial station.\textsuperscript{27} The inaugural broadcast of this first state-sponsored school of the air was on January 27, 1929.

Although many educational stations and some commercial organizations were experimenting with educational programming, there was little opportunity for coordination of effort and communication of results. The need for cooperative effort to determine goals and means of promoting education by radio led to the establishment of several national organizations. Although these organizations did not begin effective operation until 1930, their concept and basic structure were in existence before 1930.

The Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations (ACUBS)

The early National Radio Conferences called by Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Herbert Hoover, recognized the need to protect educational services and the responsibility of broadcasting to provide such services. However,
broadcasters provided no concrete evidence of following this policy. At the last of these conferences in November 1925, educational broadcasters, realizing the need for united action, formed the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations. This was a loosely-knit organization with no definite goals or services to offer its members, except to promote educational broadcasting by mutual cooperation and united effort. Forty-one stations formed the original group, with this number whittled down to twenty-two by 1929. Several of the large educational stations did not join this organization because they saw no activity or benefit in membership. Indeed, the first annual convention of this organization was not held until 1930, when it gathered at Columbus, Ohio in conjunction with the Institute for Education by Radio. From its inception in 1925, it existed more in the minds and aspirations of a few broadcasters than in any actual accomplishment. Dues for membership were $3.00 per year which allowed little more than postage for an occasional newsletter. The officers and members were so occupied with problems of keeping their own stations on the air that no concerted effort toward any mutually beneficial project could be generated. The Institute gathering in Columbus, Ohio, gave them the opportunity to meet together
and plan action for survival and growth.

Nearing the end of this period, some educational interests began to realize the need for more organized action groups to develop the radio potential. As early as 1921, Armstrong Perry, radio counsel for the Payne Fund, had tried to interest the U.S. Office of Education in radio activities. However, no formal steps were taken until Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, under whose authority the office of education was operated, called a meeting of fifteen nationally known educators and commercial broadcasters on May 24, 1929, to discuss a course of action regarding the use of radio in public education. Although there was much disagreement among this elite group as to the proper course of progress for educational broadcasting, all recognized that the logical first step should be an investigation of the entire situation of educational radio. Wilbur appointed a sixteen-man committee on June 6, 1929, which made its final report on February 15, 1930. The conclusions of that investigation were:

1. There was a widespread interest in educational broadcasting.

2. Much educational material was being broadcast.

3. Nevertheless the present activity was in a
confused state, both as to school and adult broadcasts.

4. There was a lack of cooperation between educators and broadcasters, both of whom had valuable contributions to make.

5. Specific research problems could already be identified.

6. There should be established in the office of education a section devoted to education by radio.

7. This section should be supported by the federal government.

8. It should have an advisory committee representing educational institutions, the radio industry, and the general public.

The National Advisory Council for Radio in Education (NACRE)

Broadcasters and educators did not wait for the conclusions of the office of education investigation to take action in some areas. From the first meeting in May 1929, it was clear that two "camps" were forming regarding the best route for conveying educational programs. Should educational institutions operate their own stations or depend upon donations of free time from commercial stations? Educational interests generally felt that radio practice as it
existed in 1929 did not provide adequate safeguards for education while the commercial interests felt that adequate safeguards existed. However, a number of educators agreed with commercial interests that a group of outstanding educators could work successfully with networks and individual commercial stations providing all the advantages education required without disturbing the "existing status in radio." Further explanation of this position is found in the speeches of Levering Tyson noted later in this chapter. The existing status in radio was one in which no preferential treatment was officially granted to educational broadcast licensees or applicants for a license. Many educational broadcasters were requesting special consideration, some to the point of reserving a portion of the frequency space for educational broadcast stations only. Commercial broadcasters were apprehensive lest some of their existing stations would be taken from them as well as the limitations on future expansion.

While the office of education investigation was continuing, fifteen people were called to a meeting of the American Association for Adult Education in December 1929. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss cooperation with commercial networks and stations to provide educational broadcasting. The result was the formation of the
National Advisory Council for Radio in Education which consisted of a charter group of forty educators. Financed by contributions from the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, with the blessings of Secretary Wilbur and Commissioner of Education, William J. Cooper, NACRE appointed Levering Tyson as its director. Tyson had just completed an extensive study of college and university broadcasting for the American Association for Adult Education and was formerly director of extension activities at Columbia University.

The National Committee on Education by Radio (NCER)

The other "camp" that arose from the office of education conference in May 1929, was not as quickly organized and thus was not formally activated until the next period. It is introduced here because of the ideological connection to the 1929 conference. Many educators felt that commercial stations would not provide the time or facilities necessary to fulfill the needs of education in the years ahead. Although cooperative efforts were necessary and desireable, these educators felt that educational institutions must operate their own stations if the demands of education and the potential of educational radio were to be reached. With
the steady increase in the amount of radio advertising and
the equally steady decrease in the number of educational
stations, these educators determined that action to encourage
educational radio was imperative. Commissioner of Education,
William J. Cooper, convinced of the need, arranged a confer­
ence in Chicago on October 13, 1930, attended by educators
and commercial and educational station operators at which
the National Committee on Education by Radio was formed.
Cooper's opening remarks identified the purpose of the con­
ference:

We have been receiving a number of letters which in­
dicate that there is fear that before education knows
what it wants to do, commercial stations will have prac­
tically monopolized the channels open for radio broad­
casting, and that expressed fear was one reason I thought
it well that we should come together.... The purpose of
this conference is to assemble as many as possible of
those interested in various aspects of this subject with
a view to talking it out and deciding perhaps which is­
sues are the more important, which ones are to be attacked
first, and then considering ways and means of attacking
those particular issues.36

The discussion indicated much concern on the part of
several associations, land-grant colleges and educational
stations, and a five-point approach was advocated as follows:

1. The appointment of a committee to represent The
Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations,
the Land-Grant College Association, the National University
Extension Association, the National Association of State University Presidents, the National Education Association, the National Catholic Education Association, the Jesuit Education Association, the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, the Payne Fund, and other similar groups. Commissioner Cooper was to appoint this Committee.

2. The protection and promotion of broadcasting originating in educational institutions.

3. The promotion of broadcasting by educational institutions.

4. Legislation by Congress which will permanently and exclusively assign to educational institutions and government educational agencies a minimum of 15 percent of all radio broadcasting channels which are or may become available to the United States.

5. The calling of an organization meeting of this Committee at the earliest possible moment.

These were the activities that tumbled the broadcasting industry into 1930 and the decade of decision. Government was moving cautiously to maintain and promote an equitable service for the public while also recognizing the need of protecting free speech principles so jealously guarded by the print media. Commercial broadcasting had established its
organizational structure, financial support, and operative goals. The struggle for commercial broadcasting would now be concentrated on establishing an independent, vital, and profitable industry. Educational broadcasting had barely survived the turbulent twenties. As educators began to realize what they should be doing, the economic depression withdrew their means for doing it. Organization was still in initial stages with the door of opportunity being open only by a few fingers. The battle for survival was still to be fought.
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CHAPTER II

THE BEGINNING, 1930 - 1935

Background

Commercial Broadcasting

During this period the commercial broadcasting system was characterized by consolidation of network operations, establishment of advertising agencies' activities in radio and development of new program forms. The number of stations remained relatively stable during this period at about 600.

By 1930, General Electric and Westinghouse had withdrawn from NBC thus leaving the network a wholly-owned subsidiary of RCA. Two years later an anti-trust suit caused both General Electric and Westinghouse to sell their stock in RCA. Early arguments against commercial broadcasting referred to this monopoly position of RCA. Institute speeches, noted later in this chapter, indicate that such business dealing did not reflect a healthy situation for
encouraging cooperation from educational institutions. As RCA expanded its activities and holdings in various other areas of communication, NBC was relatively free to develop and establish command of radio network operations. With two network operations, the Red and Blue networks, NBC had competition only from CBS and there seemed to be plenty of room for both organizations to set up effective and profitable operations since most major markets had at least three commercial stations.

The two NBC networks and CBS operated coast-to-coast programming by 1935 with each carrying anywhere from 80 to 120 affiliates. The Mutual Broadcasting System was organized in 1934 as a network owned by its participating stations. It had about sixty affiliates by September 1935, consisting mostly of smaller stations but could not be considered a serious rival to the other three networks.

Although the number of radio stations did not increase during this period, power and operating hours were substantially increased. In 1935, 90 percent of the stations were operating from 16 to 18 hours daily with 30 stations using 50,000 watts power while nearly 150 stations were operating at 5,000 watts. Radio revenues from advertising rose steadily during this period in spite of the depression.
Although many stations were still not reporting a profit from operations, by 1935 they were much closer to that goal. However, the depression took its toll in advertising practices on radio. The depression brought out the worst in advertising and program standards particularly on the local level but also reflected somewhat at the networks. Sidney Head refers to such as "unethical medical-advice programs, astrologers, fortune-tellers, quack psychologists, and the like."³

The survival techniques during the depression consisted primarily of: (1) accepting "selling" commercials when previously all commercials were of the institutional type; (2) accepting commercials for products and services which had previously been considered in bad taste such as deoderants, laxatives, and funeral homes; (3) accepting direct selling or "cost-per-inquiry" commercials.⁴ In the five year period through mid-1935 local station revenues had more than tripled while network revenues increased a little over half of the 1930 total.⁵

This was the period of greatest invention of new programs forms in the history of broadcasting. During the winter season of 1934-35, over 45 percent of the 113 weekly hours of evening network programming consisted of musical
programs while more than 21 hours each were devoted to dramatic programs and variety programs. Daytime network programming was almost tripled during this period as the 1934-35 season provided nearly eighty hours weekly to affiliates with the largest increase in the field of drama. About twelve hours weekly went to women's daytime serial drama which were dubbed "soap operas." By 1931 virtually all sponsored network programs were developed and produced by advertising agencies. Thus control of content had substantially shifted out of the broadcasters' hands.

Although the once-a-week, 30 to 60 minute single sponsor program had been fairly well established by 1930, the daily across-the-board, 15 minute program was developed in this period for daytime programming. Most programs were fed "live" to all participating stations with an occasional arrangement for two performances of a show so that the West Coast could program at a convenient time. The idea of using electrical transcription recordings was considered somewhat of a fraud on the public: "The Department of Commerce actually forbade their use at one time, and one of the first rules of the FRC was the requirement that recordings be clearly announced as such." Late in this period, Institute discussion indicates educational broadcasters would not
accept the idea of a recorded program distribution system in the early thirties. As will be noted later in this chapter, the commercial ban on such use may have influenced educational broadcasters considerably.

The 1930-35 period saw the creation of the majority of accepted program practices in broadcasting. The tremendous success of the "Amos 'n' Andy" series stimulated experimentation as its "combination of comedy, excellent characterization, use of the same leading characters in a continuing dramatic series, and effective use of radio's ability to stimulate the imagination of listeners" provided an excellent model for imitation. Comedy-variety programs, featuring a "name" comedian and one or more permanent secondary characters, made its bid for prominence in the early thirties with more than a dozen such night-time shows presented by the 1933-34 season. Such well-known stars as Eddie Cantor, Ed Wynn, Fred Allen, and Jack Benny were establishing their places in radio's hall of fame. "The Breakfast Club" started its record longevity on network daytime radio in 1932.

The local programming situation saw major innovations in an effort to survive the depression. Time was sold for religious programs, self-styled astrologers, and "advice"
programs with funds solicited from the listening audience on the religious and astrology programs. Many stations carried programs of local hillbilly music sponsored by Crazy Water Crystals Laxative, while the great majority of stations introduced homemaker's programs, farm programs and some recorded music programs, all of which could be sponsored on a participating basis. Such activities on the local stations did not give the educator a very good impression of advertising and solidified their resistance to commercial sponsorship of educational programs.

During this unprecedented development of programming there were industry problems which occupied much concern from the administrative sector of broadcasting. The American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP) continued to demand greater revenues from stations for music licensing rights. Both CBS and NBC developed their own talent agencies as a means of insuring continued access to the stars which they were creating. The biggest problem during this period however, was access to news information. Newspaper publishers became increasingly disturbed by the number of news programs on radio in the early thirties. Of course this reaction could have been encouraged by the increasing amount of advertising revenue going to radio
coupled with the depression. Nevertheless, pressure from the publishers association was applied on the three major news wire services. They stopped service to all radio stations in 1933 and even stipulated that newspaper-owned stations could not use the wire service information. The networks immediately began to set up their own news-gathering services. Then the publishers association urged its members to eliminate program information from the newspapers. This brought about a compromise by which the Radio-Press Bureau was created on March 1, 1934, to provide news for a maximum of two daily, five minute news bulletin periods, no bulletin to exceed thirty words in length. At the 1934 Institute, Hans Kaltenborn condemned this agreement. Nothing published in the newspapers could be broadcast until about six hours after it had been printed. Although the networks followed this agreement, individual stations in many instances soon worked out better arrangements with local newspapers. The Radio-Press Bureau eventually had to loosen the restrictions somewhat in order to get enough station subscriptions to cover operating costs.
Educational Broadcasting

This period of educational broadcasting was probably the most frustrating for those who were involved. Everybody would immediately agree that radio was a tremendously good medium for education but no one could agree on how to go about using it in education. While there was no central organization for the defense of educational stations, the federal government and the FRC literally turned their backs on pleas for special consideration to educational stations. The struggle of educational stations for survival and the efforts to become a part of the educational system were the prime problems of educational broadcasting.

The NCER, discussed at the end of the previous chapter, was composed of a representative from each of the nine national educational organizations with Joy Elmer Morgan, editor of the Journal of the National Education Association, as chairman. The purpose of NCER was:

To secure to the people of the United States the use of radio for educational purposes by protecting the rights of educational broadcasting, by promoting and coordinating experiments in the use of radio in school and adult education, by maintaining a service bureau to assist educational stations in securing licenses and in other technical procedures, by exchange of information through a weekly bulletin, and by serving as a clearing house for the encouragement of research in education by radio.
During this period NCER was most active and influential through its service bureau activities which are discussed later in this chapter, and in its research activities which were conducted by Tracy F. Tyler. The weekly bulletin and other coordinating efforts were also most helpful in providing information and encouragement to the struggling educational broadcaster. In 1932, NCER established a radio listeners' group but lack of sufficient funds resulted in the dissolution of the group. NCER also distributed a limited number of radio scripts to educational stations and investigated possibilities of establishing an extensive program exchange but found the technical difficulties too great to overcome at the time. Some of the problems of this program exchange were explained by T.M. Beaird at the 1932 Institute and will be discussed later in this chapter. The Payne Fund financed the activities of this organization for its first five years.

Throughout this period there was a continuing effort by some educators and broadcasters to find ways by which commercial broadcasters could provide sufficient time, facilities, and production expertise to satisfy educational needs. Probably one of the best references to network program of real educational value up to 1942 is a book written by
Carroll Atkinson which briefly describes over 40 program series carried by the networks. While there are many reports of cooperation between individual stations and educational institutions, the effort on the national level was undertaken mainly by NACRE and its director, Levering Tyson. The organization of NACRE was covered in the previous chapter.

NACRE was attempting to: (1) assemble and disseminate facts about radio in education, and (2) induce qualified educators and authorities in various fields to devise radio programs that would be notable contributions to educational broadcasting. NACRE held annual meetings from 1931 through 1935. These meetings brought together authorities in the field to discuss major problems in educational broadcasting. In addition, the standing committees of NACRE reported progress since the last meeting. Standing committees were identified with a particular subject-matter area in which they pursued means of developing programs of high quality for networks and stations. There were about fourteen active committees reporting each year. All these matters were published in annual reports entitled Radio and Education. Some of the best discussions of the social and educational implications of radio are found in these annual reports.
The education department of NBC was organized in 1930 with John Elwood, vice-president and education director until he resigned in 1932. At that time, Franklin Dunham became network education director and Judith Waller assumed the newly created position of education director of NBC, Central Division while Arthur S. Garbett took the new post of education director, Pacific Coast Division. Waller has been noted before as very active in educational programming when she was station manager of independent WMAQ in Chicago.

CBS, with only one network to consider, maintained its network education department in New York where Frederic A. Willis was director to 1935. Edward R. Murrow assumed that position from 1935 to 1937. The Mutual network had no separate official for educational programs since they did not generate programming from a central authority but merely coordinated programs of member stations.

Although the activities of national networks produced some excellent informational series, the grand experiment to cooperate with educators for the production of educational programs was failing. Perhaps the best judge of this was a disillusioned Levering Tyson in a report to NACRE in 1937. He concluded that it was useless at that time to attempt systematic education by national networks at hours which were
necessary to reach large adult audiences. He reported the problems of scheduling for "You and Your Government" a series of programs presented on NBC. Several unforeseen shifts in time nullified the program's effect. He stated: "Educational broadcasting has become the poor relation of commercial broadcasting and the pauperization of the former has increased in direct proportion to the growing affluence of the latter."^20

In the fall of 1934, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, expressed the view of many educators in a speech on "Radio and Public Policy":

If I may take educational broadcasting as an illustration, the charges that can be substantiated are these: the claims of minorities have been disregarded, the best hours have been given to advertising programs, the hours assigned to education have been shifted without notice, censorship has been imposed, experimentation has been almost non-existent, and the financial support of educational broadcasting has been limited and erratic.

One cannot escape the impression that broadcasters have used so-called educational programs either for political reasons—to show how public spirited they are—or as stop gaps in the absence of paying material. This has resulted not only in the frequent change of hours but also in the donation of the poorest hours. It is natural, particularly in times like these, that the best hours should be sold; they bring the best prices. But the hours that are the best are best because most people are not free at other times. The finest educational programs in the world will not diffuse much education, if the people who want education are occupied
earning a living while the programs are on the air. If radio is to perform its educational function under private management the stations must guarantee time, and good time.21

We will note this attitude reflected in the Institute speeches later in this chapter.

While cooperative efforts for network broadcasts were not particularly successful, cooperation on a local level was much better. The basic problems of scheduling, techniques of presentation, and finances were always coming up but frequently they were overcome. One of the best examples of cooperative effort in the early Thirties was WMAQ in Chicago, managed by Judith Waller, and the University of Chicago. Yet in 1934, the president of the University of Chicago was able to make the above quoted statement about the general situation.

Meanwhile, the plight of educational stations began to improve only near the end of this period. The effects of the Depression on school budgets were beginning to soften, but little beyond hope could be indicated by the end of 1935. Levering Tyson summed it up in this manner:

In many cases, lack of support within the institution itself, chiefly a failure to realize what really was impending, to say nothing of the rigor of conditions imposed from the outside, were responsible for abandonment of the idea. There is not a single instance on record, however, of an educational institution abandoning
broadcasting because it believed it could not be made useful. And those institutions which have survived feel more strongly than ever that, given adequate financial support, which would enable them to do a good program job, thoroughly sound and valuable educational results can be obtained. 22

There are ample statistics to indicate the high mortality rate of educational stations. Of the 201 licenses issued to educational institutions since 1921, only 34 remained active by the end of 1935 with over 82 percent of the 201 licensees having remained active for less than 2 years. From the beginning of 1928 to the end of 1935, nine new licenses were issued while sixty-two were lost. 23 Later studies were to explain this rapid mortality on grounds of lack of funds for proper equipment, lack of talent for maintaining program schedules, and lack of interest in radio on the part of college and university officials. 24

During these years of struggle to maintain an operating station, schools were also trying to determine how to use radio to present educational material. Each new program was an experiment in the unknown. Not only the method of presentation but the method of testing the effectiveness of the presentation had to be explored. Perhaps the best chronical of these school station activities is found in the yearbooks of the Institute. Some of the more prominent
school station activities were reported from the Ohio State University, University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois, University of Iowa and Iowa State College. In mid-1934, W. I. Griffith of Iowa State College, summarized the advances of educational stations during the previous five years. He conducted a survey of the then-operating stations and found that relatively large sums of money had been spent on equipment improvements, frequency, power, and time assignments were usually somewhat improved; techniques of presentation and listener appeal were tremendously improved, as well as quality of content; and, finally, the stations had learned to promote themselves and their programs.

Federal Government

"The writer has not discovered an adjective that will describe accurately the regrettable situation which has since developed, for broadcasting has become a political football in Washington." These words of Levering Tyson in 1937 indicate the involvement of the federal government in the broadcasting picture in the early Thirties. Tyson believed a change in the basic philosophy of commercial broadcasting leaders occurred after broadcasting was injected into politics following the debates on the Radio Act of 1927.
The FRC's first order of business was to reduce the tremendous interference produced by too many stations using too few frequencies and the Commission put 109 stations off the air while changing the frequency assignments and hours of operation of many other stations. In spite of the often-reported interest of Congress to protect educational involvement in broadcasting, the FRC was not providing any preferential consideration for educational stations. In 1930, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the decision of an appellate court which upheld the FRC decision to reduce the New York municipal station, WNYC, to low power and part-time operation. The FRC had asserted in its decision that city government ownership did not give a station any special standing with regard to the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Further, clear indication of this attitude is found later in this chapter in the comments of FRC Commissioner Harold Lafount at the 1931 Institute and also the comments of Joy Elmer Morgan at this same Institute. Commissioner Ira Robinson was an outspoken critic of this FRC attitude but he was alone in his defense of educational interests.

One of the main functions of NCER was to establish a service bureau in Washington designed to advise and protect
educational stations. This bureau was established in early February 1931, with Armstrong Perry in charge of its activities located at the National Press Club in Washington. Perry also maintained his position as specialist in education by radio in the U.S. Office of Education. As mentioned in the previous chapter, a resolution of the organizational meeting was to ask for legislation reserving 15 percent of the broadcast channels for educational stations. This immediately put NCER in disfavor with commercial broadcasters but also notified educators and educational broadcasters that they had a friend in Washington.

For the next five years NCER was able to influence many decisions of the FRC simply by notifying educators of proposed rules of the FRC and representing the educational stations at the hearings on these rules. Quick action came on the 15 percent reservation proposal as Senator Fess introduced a bill in the Senate on January 8, 1931, which asked for this concession. Many were concerned that it came too early to gather sufficient support. "The opposition is not to the percentage, but to the principle" said John H. MacCracken, representative of the American Council on Education.
Although the Fess bill was not reported out of committee in 1931, it was considered quite influential in promoting the passage of the Couzzens-Dill resolution in January 1931, which called for an investigation of advertising and educational activities in broadcasting. The Fess bill was again reintroduced in 1932 and 1933 but did not succeed in getting out of committee.

The Depression had changed the political situation considerably and much proposed legislation was awaiting the wishes of the new President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the fall of 1933, Roosevelt appointed an inter-departmental committee under the chairmanship of Secretary of Commerce Daniel C. Roper to make a study of the entire communications situation in this country. The results of this study were reported to the President in early 1934 and President Roosevelt addressed a special message to Congress on February 26, 1934, requesting formation of the Federal Communications Commission and consolidation of communications control.

In the spring of 1934, NCER called a national meeting to review radio activities. "The First National Conference on the Use of Radio as a Cultural Agency" was held on May 7-8, 1934. The discussions at this conference resulted in
an eight-point declaration on the fundamental principles which should underlie American radio policy. This declaration was presented to the U.S. House of Representatives committee holding hearings on the Communications Act of 1934. Also, during the hearings, proposals were submitted to allocate portions of the broadcast channels to specified types of interests including education. None of these proposals were included in the Act which was signed into law on June 30, 1934, but it specified that the FCC should hold public hearings on the validity of the various allocation proposals and report its findings to Congress by February 1, 1935.

The FCC held hearing in October and November of 1934 regarding these proposals and found neither educators nor NCER were absolutely convinced that fixed allocations would be necessary:

The Committee [NCER] and its supporters thus argued for the principle of the extension of educational control, but did not argue for a specific plan of putting that principle into practice. Ewbank suggested that the Commission study the best means of increasing the facilities held by educational agencies, and earmark certain channels which would be reserved for such a purpose. Pending the development of educational forces able and desirous of using such channels, they might be used by commercial stations.

The representatives of the Committee had ten hours in which to present their case out of a total of some twenty-four days devoted to the hearings. The remainder
of the time was used in hearing radio representatives, spokesmen for labor and religion, and many educators not associated with the Committee.

The bulk of this testimony was against providing any fixed percentage of facilities to educational agencies. All the representatives of the commercially controlled stations argued against such a measure. Many educators, including John W. Studebaker, the new Federal Commissioner of Education, felt that education was not yet prepared to use additional facilities, and should proceed cautiously. Other educators testified to successful cooperation with commercial broadcasters. Even Horace L. Lohnes, attorney for the NCER, stated that while education should have a larger role in broadcasting, the fixed percentage plan would in his opinion have grave disadvantages.31

Accordingly, the FCC reported to Congress on January 22, 1935: "That at this time no fixed percentage of radio broadcast facilities be allocated by statute to particular types or kinds of non-profit radio programs or to persons identified with particular types or kinds of non-profit activities."32 However, the FCC proposed to hold a national conference at an early date to provide for cooperative efforts between broadcasters and non-profit organizations. In its statement to Congress the FCC indicated that the commercial broadcaster had a more important part to play in the educational program of the country than has, as yet, been found:

The Commission decided that the law should be kept flexible that no feasible plan for allocations had been presented, and that on the whole a definite change in the control of broadcasting was apparently not desired by
the majority of non-profit organizations. The Commission thought that their interests might be "better served by the use of existing facilities." 33

Subsequently, the FCC quickly followed through on its plan to hold a national conference and on May 15, 1935, the various groups interested in educational broadcasting met in Washington and instituted the Federal Radio Education Committee under the chairmanship of John W. Studebaker, U.S. Commissioner of Education. Also at this conference A.G. Crane, president of the University of Wyoming and representative of NCER, presented "A Plan for an American System of Radio Broadcasting to Serve the Welfare of the American People." Crane had described this plan to the Institute for Education by Radio just eight days previously as follows:

The National Committee on Education by Radio, concluding four years of study and investigation, recommends to the President, the Congress, and to the People of the United States a plan for an American system of radio broadcasting to serve the welfare of the American people.

The people of the United States shall establish a broadcasting system to supplement but not to supplant the present private system, and to make available to American listeners programs free from advertising and presenting entertainment and information to promote public welfare. Such supplemental public system should meet as far as practicable the following specifications:

First. -- The management of such public broadcasting systems, including the determination of program policies, shall be vested in a series of boards--national, regional, and state--with suitable powers to insure service to both national and local needs. These boards should be non-partisan, the members carefully selected from leaders
active in fields of public welfare, such as agriculture, labor, music, drama, schools, religion, science, medicine, law, the arts, and other civic interests. It is suggested that appointments to the national board and to the regional board be made by the President of the United States, confirmed by the United States Senate, and to the state boards by the respective governors, in all cases the appointments to be from lists of eligible persons nominated by the supreme courts of the several states.

Second.--The system shall be available for public business, for public forums, for adult education, for broadcasts to schools, for public service by non-profit welfare agencies, and for other general welfare broadcasters.

Third.--Non-profit welfare stations shall be assured the right of affiliation with the Federal system.

Fourth.--The system shall ultimately be extended to provide satisfactory coverage of the continental United States, including remote rural sections as well as more densely populated urban areas.

Fifth.--The provision of funds and the allocation of suitable broadcasting channels necessary for the effective operation of the system shall be made by the Federal government.

Sixth.--Recordings of programs of general significance shall be made and shall be available for broadcasting from non-profit stations.

Seventh.--A continuous program of research shall be maintained by the public boards to study the desires of the people, the preparation of programs, the techniques of broadcasting, and the results of the broadcasts.34

The Institute

So, for the first time in the history of American Education, the leaders in educational broadcasting gathered in Columbus during June, 1930 to talk about what education could do for radio and what radio could do for education.35
Planning

The Institute for Education by Radio was the culmination of an idea first mentioned in 1929 by Ben Darrow, then the state of Ohio's director of educational broadcasting, during a discussion of the Ohio School of the Air with W.W. Charters, director of Ohio State University's Bureau of Educational Research. Darrow had alluded to an international meeting of those interested in educational broadcasting. Charters liked the idea and formed a committee to consider such a meeting. The committee consisted of Charters, Darrow, Cline M. Koon, assistant director of the Ohio School of the Air, Robert C. Higgy, director of Ohio State University's radio station WEAO, and Edgar Dale, assistant to Charters in the Bureau of Educational Research.

The Payne Fund contributed an amount of money to the Bureau of Educational Research in 1929 for the development of the radio unit within the Bureau. Charters decided the main effort of the radio unit would be to establish an institute for two reasons: "One was to clarify the objectives of education by radio. The other was to collect techniques by which it would be possible for people [involved in education by radio] to improve themselves [in the application of education by radio]." Thus, Mrs. Frances Payne Bolton
and W.W. Charters are considered co-founders of the Institute.

The printed program for the first Institute listed four Institute objectives.

1. To provide the leaders in educational broadcasting with an opportunity to become acquainted with each other.
2. To pool existing information about the problems of educational broadcasting.
3. Through publication of the proceedings, to make this information available for general use.
4. To develop a program for cooperative fact finding and research.

At the 1950 Institute, Charters was recalling those objectives and explaining the thinking behind them. He identified four functions of the Institute which were intended to satisfy basic needs found in 1930:

In the beginning we had an idea--in that first session, the second and I think the third--that it might be possible for us through the Institute to collect in one center all the pieces of research that were being done in radio education over the United States to be made available for distribution to those who might be interested in using them.40

The content summary of this chapter will report a system that was organized in 1931 for collecting and distributing research information.

A second function of the Institute was to provide a common meeting ground for both educational and commercial broadcasters where each could benefit from the ideas and
attitudes expressed by the other. One of the major problems of this period was the disagreement between commercial broadcasters and educators regarding allocation of broadcast frequencies. Another area where much discussion was needed between the two parties was the presentation of educational materials to mass audiences. It was hoped that the Institute would provide the opportunity and environment for frank discussion of these problems so that educators and commercial broadcasters would work cooperatively toward solutions. The content summary of this chapter reports some of the discussion on these problems.

A third function of the Institute was to build a morale among the relatively few people who were trying to bring education to the microphone. In the Twenties and Thirties, many educators were very skeptical of the worth of broadcasting while the majority of commercial broadcasters had little incentive to concern themselves with this field. So it was felt that such a gathering would provide a psychological boost to the pioneers in this field.

The fourth function of the Institute was to encourage an international exchange of ideas on educational broadcasting. Since other countries were also involved in similar
problems of communicating educational material by radio, a discussion of approaches, attitudes, and techniques could be mutually beneficial.

So with these basic ideas in mind, W.W. Charters set about the task of organizing a conference that was to last thirty-six years. Throughout the life of the Institute, administrative details for pre-planning activities were developed and refined as needed but Charters mentioned five basic administrative policies which guided all planning: (1) keep informed on current issues and problems and include them in the program; (2) keep the vision broad, both geographically and culturally; (3) specialize in techniques of operation; (4) contribute to the assembly and consolidation of research work in the field; (5) provide a friendly atmosphere for the discussion and exchange of ideas.

Regarding the first of the above policies, a post mortem was instituted. This consisted of a letter sent to each registrant about two weeks after the close of the Institute each year. Comments and suggestions on speakers and content of the previous and next Institute were requested.

Another means of pursuing the first two administrative policies above was the gradual increase in the number of people involved in planning the program. Charters
appointed the program committee each year and acted as chairman. Charters and Armstrong Perry were the Program Committee for 1930. In 1931, Charters recruited a bright young man who headed the radio division of the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University, F. Hillis Lumley. Lumley was assistant director to Charters through 1934 when he was killed in a tragic accident. Three additional consultants, all from Ohio State University, were added in 1932 and remained on the Program Committee through 1937. During this first period the Program Committee consisted of members of the Ohio State University faculty and staff which made it a somewhat in-bred group that could not provide the ideal national scope in planning. However, this group did have sufficient connections with leaders in other parts of the country to present a representative program of important issues. Of course, we must exempt the 1935 Institute from this comment since it was actually a combination of two annual conferences. Therefore, the planning combined the interests of both groups.

Regarding the third administrative policy which Charters identified, it is interesting to note that in 1931, Charters had a conversation with Levering Tyson, director of NACRE, in which Tyson expressed concern about the possible
duplication of activities and efforts between NACRE and the Institute. Both men agreed that the Institute "should deal with research and the techniques of building educational programs..." while NACRE's interest would be concentrated primarily on policies in educational broadcasting.

When the 1935 Institute combined with the annual assembly of NACRE, the forward contained in the program that year emphasized this point by stating that the Institute is devoted to the study of the techniques of educational broadcasting with activities confined to reporting new developments within its area and discussion of their significance by the technical authorities within the fields.

As a general rule the technique aspects of broadcasting were emphasized but the objectives of the Institute, referred to previously, would certainly not allow the Institute to be confined to techniques. As we will see in the content summary of this chapter, many discussions of a general policy nature were conducted at the Institute. As will be further noted in the content summary of this chapter, the fourth policy contributing to consolidation of research activities was a major concern of the Institute. The 1931 Institute research committee, realizing the opportunity of
such consolidation at that time, set up a system of reporting research and the remaining Institutes of this period devoted an increasing amount of attention to this activity.

The fifth policy regarding the creation of a friendly atmosphere for exchange of ideas was pursued in a negative fashion in the beginning. Charters' attitude on this matter was: "The fundamental formula for staging a successful party is to invite nice people and let them entertain themselves." Perhaps that was the formula but planning for the guidance of activities was considered throughout the life of the Institute to promote the friendly atmosphere. In 1930 and 1931, the late afternoon and the entire evening of everyday were free of programmed activities so that social intercourse could occur. An afternoon tea was scheduled in 1931, with sports activities available in 1932. Also the more comfortable facilities of the University Laboratory School were used for meetings in 1932. Further comment on program changes is covered in the next section of this chapter.

Financial information for this period is indeed sparse. The Payne Fund appears to have supplied a total additional $2,500 to its original $2,500 grant. Records
indicate that Ohio State University contributed $1,000 to the 1930 Institute and $500 each to the 1931 and 1932 Institutes. $1,000 was contributed by the Ohio State Department of Education to the 1930 Institute. Expenses were kept to a minimum by allowing little promotion and less honoraria. Some obvious expenses such as printing costs for programs and yearbook plus phone and travel expenses necessary to set up the Institute were absorbed by various accounts not found in the remaining records of the Institute.

The program of these first years urged all those attending to register but there was no fee charged to participants. All meetings were free and open to the public. The first fees came in 1935 when $1.50 was charged for the banquet.

The Program

The first Institute extended over a ten day period from June 3, 1930 to July 3, 1930, with morning and afternoon sessions. All meetings were held on the Ohio State University campus with two sessions arranged and conducted by the National Education Association. There was no single theme to the conference as subject matter covered various aspects of educational broadcasting. The proceedings were
published in a volume entitled *Education On The Air* and sold at $3.00 per copy. One thousand of these copies were printed and all but fifty were sold by 1933.  

During this first period, the arrangements of the program for the Institute underwent several changes in an attempt to find the most workable method. The program formats, Appendix III, Table 5, reflect the various changes. The ten day Institute of 1930 was reduced to a three day period by 1933 and remained that length until 1941. The 1933 Institute started on a Thursday but returned to its previous Monday beginning in the following year. The first week of May was established after trying June for the first three years. No reasons for this change were found recorded, but it may have been that June was too close to final exam time for many educators. The first Institute established a workshop format with meetings held in the morning and afternoon until 3:00 p.m. Charters claimed this was the "grand-daddy" of the workshop idea. All were general sessions until 1932 when the first evening session of the Institute introduced four concurrent round-table discussions.  

The 1934 Institute saw the introduction of the practice of playing recordings of selected broadcasts from the
previous season. There was no indication of selection procedure but a note in the printed program stated that any Institute participant was welcome to submit a recording. No awards were given and the stated purpose of the "exhibition" was to: (1) allow the Institute participants to hear programs which they would not otherwise hear, and (2) permit critical analysis by participants for the benefit of originators.

This practice was the fore-runner of the Ohio State Awards which officially began at the 1937 Institute. Actually, the Saturday morning meeting of the 1933 Institute scheduled the playings of three school radio recordings with subsequent analysis and discussion. The program invited others to bring recordings for similar analysis. The 1934 Institute expanded the listed recordings to nineteen and limited selections to the 1933-34 season. Presumably these recordings were played but no critique was mentioned in the program or in the yearbook. The 1935 Institute reserved the later portion of a morning session for a "Technique Clinic" at which selected recordings of programs, submitted by any broadcast station would be played and critiqued. The yearbook did not reproduce the scripts of these programs but identified eleven separate programs and printed the remarks of the critics to these individual programs.
Two format precedents introduced in 1935 were: (1) A banquet with a special guest speaker was held and a fee in the form of a ticket purchase was charged. (2) The activities were moved off campus, with conference headquarters established at a downtown hotel and all meeting held across the street in the State Office Building.

The Association of College and University Broadcast Stations (ACUBS) held its first national conference in conjunction with the First Annual Institute. During this period there were few national organizations directly involved in broadcasting. Not until later years did these organizations form, many of them being born as special interests groups of the Institute, and hold meetings in conjunction with the Institute.

The total attendance figures did not fluctuate noticeably until 1935 when NACRE combined its fifth conference with the Institute. Since this was the last official conference of NACRE, its membership and followers were introduced to the Institute at a time when continuation of their efforts would encourage identifying with the Institute. The 1935 attendance more than doubled with considerable increase in commercial station representation as well as significant
increases in national, regional, and local organization representation. Attendance figures indicate an upward trend in total attendance as well as national representation from this point on. It can be seen that the trend until 1935 was not particularly encouraging. Almost half of the participants represented colleges and universities and in 1934, over half of the participants originated from the home state of Ohio, as indicated in Appendix I, Table 2.

As noted in the Planning section of this chapter, one of the objectives listed in the 1930 program involved the publication of the annual proceedings of the Institute. The proceedings were published each year in hard-bound books under the title Education On The Air. All formal presentations, speeches, and discussions, were included in the book except a few minor presentations.

In a recent conversation with I. Keith Tyler, Institute director, he indicated copies of speeches plus stenographic records of the discussion were compiled, speeches were verified by speakers, and Josephine H. MacLatchy edited the volumes. Tyler noted that occasional deletions were necessary if verification was not received from speakers. On several occasions material was included in the proceedings
which was not formally read at the Institute. This was confined to research papers or scripts which were distributed at the Institute. The format of the book presented major speeches, with more universal themes, in the front of the book and progressed to the more specific themes in the back of the book. There was no relationship with the chronological order of presentation at the Institute.

The 1935 proceedings, just as the Institute, was a combination of the NACRE publication Radio and Education, and Education On The Air. Both titles were carried on the volume with both Levering Tyson and Josephine MacLatchy identified as editors and the University of Chicago Press was the printer. All other volumes of Education On The Air were printed by the Ohio State University Press.

Until 1940, copies of the proceedings cost $3.00 each. Both the 1930 and 1931 volumes of Education On The Air were listed among the top twenty starred books of the sixty best educational books for their respective years.

Content Summary

In the Planning section of this chapter the emphasis on techniques of broadcasting was identified as a primary
concern of the Institute. Therefore, a large portion of each Institute during this period was concerned with various methods of using radio in education. The Institute also proved to be an opportune occasion for the discussion of some of the crucial problems regarding the role of radio broadcasting in education. We will concentrate on some of these problems later in this chapter. However, many important developments in educational broadcasting were discussed at the Institute which cannot be thoroughly analyzed in this paper but will be mentioned to allow a perspective of the Institute's activities.

The first two Institutes concentrated more on reporting the status and activities of educational broadcasting than on the research and specific techniques. This seems to be a very logical and necessary emphasis since few knew what others in the field were doing. In addition, there was little in the way of research and techniques to report. The Institute and its parent organization, the Bureau of Educational Research, were leaders in promoting research by reporting the activities of others in the field. By the time of the Fourth Institute in 1933, more research was being pursued and means of encouraging and reporting this research had been established. F.H. Lumley reported the
Institute's activities in this area at the 1933 Institute.

There were quite a number of persons present at the meeting of the Second Annual Institute for Education by Radio [1931] who were interested in research. These persons agreed, at a series of special meetings, that it would be helpful to let each other know what was being done and also to make this information available to other persons starting research studies. It was intended that all persons engaged in radio research be asked to join this co-operative group and describe their projects. Under the direction of Mr. Charters a reporting form was worked out. This form included blanks for a description of purpose, method, and progress made in the study up to the time of the report. The details are given in Research Problems in Radio Education, a pamphlet published by the National Advisory Council. [NACRE] At the present time persons connected with twelve institutions have reported research projects. These reports have been mimeographed by the Bureau of Educational Research and distributed to all members of the co-operating group, and to other research workers who requested them. A summary of the results obtained by these research workers will be published as an appendix to the proceedings of this year's Institute.

The appendix noted above, covered fifty-four pages in the 1933 yearbook. The 1934 and 1935 yearbooks also contained extensive reports on research activity. The majority of these reports were not oral presentations at the Institute. Thus, the yearbook itself was a major method of disseminating research information.

Discussion of the techniques of educational broadcasting included the "How We Do It" type of report concerning: (1) various types of individual program series, (2) program service to various types of audiences, such as
children and farmers, (3) the program activities at individual educational institutions, and (4) the uses of various elements of a program such as script preparation and microphone technique. Although the majority of these presentations reported educational institution activity, each Institute had several presentations regarding programs originated and presented by commercial stations or networks.

As noted earlier in this chapter, one of the intentions of the Institute was to provide a common meeting ground for both commercial and educational broadcasters. The very first Institute gave evidence that some frank but controversial discussions of disagreements between commercial and educational broadcasters would be held at these meetings. The 1930 Institute heard John Elwood, vice-president and education director of NBC state that radio came into our lives primarily as a means of entertainment and educators should recognize the importance of that fact. The educator must be listener oriented:

The average human being would like to be well educated, and would be, if it were not for the effort involved in getting the education and the humiliation of admitting he does not have it already. We know, of course, that there is a group of considerable proportions which eagerly seeks information, which is highly desirous of self-improvement, and which is proud to be identified with the activity of receiving an education. But this
group is small. It consists in the main of what have sometimes been referred to as the "little group of serious thinkers." There is an inhibition in most of the rest of us toward receiving instruction labeled as such. We like to feel that we know it all, anyway. 59

Elwood said that educators must bring showmanship to their programs:

A leading writer has stated that "informing, in order to be popularly received, must be sugar-coated." There is undoubtedly much truth in that statement, especially if we are considering a large proportion of those reached through a medium of universal distribution. 60

This statement was a matter of particular annoyance to many educators for the next ten years. Perhaps this was a bit of a harsh way to put it, but many educational broadcasters were saying much the same thing. Five days later, P. O. Davis, general manager of educational radio station WAPI, in Birmingham, Alabama, was explaining the educational radio operation in the state of Alabama. It was his observation that a great many educators insist on doing broadcasting from their own standpoint rather than from that of the listener:

They must remember that they are broadcasting to serve the listener, and if they do not catch and hold his attention they are cluttering up the air and giving nothing in return. 61

Reports on educational broadcasting in other countries were more numerous in 1930 and 1932 than other years. The Canadian and British activities were most frequently reported.
Many of the expressed concerns of the pioneer broadcasters, commercial as well as educational, regarded problems of a mass communications system which must always be watched. Pertinent statements in this area of concern will be noted throughout this paper not only as a reflection of the calibre of discussion held at the Institutes but also to provide a perspective on these problems for today. One such consideration is the political import of broadcasting.

Hans V. Kaltenborn spoke at the 1932 Institute on "Radio and Political Campaigns," concentrating his essay about foreign practices on the German and Russian systems. He was critical of any government controlled system because of its tendency to restrict the flow of information. He reported that Germany allows very little, other than official government opinion, and Russia make no pretense at objectivity. He was enthusiastic about the American system's ability to bring political considerations to the public. He noted however, great advantage of the incumbent office holder:

Mr. Hoover has a tremendous advantage this summer in the campaign. If you will recall, William Howard Taft had to deliver speeches in thirty states, an enormous physical effort. Mr. Hoover will sit in the refrigerated offices in Washington and will read a speech that has been carefully revised for him by his experts in English and in politics. This will be carried over a national
hook-up and will not cost Mr. Hoover or the Republican party a cent. It is not a campaign speech; it is a discussion of the important issues that confront us by the President of the United States. Of course, when the President goes out on the stump he becomes a candidate and the party pays for his radio time. When the Democratic candidate wants to discuss the issues, he will have to pay. That is one way in which radio, politically speaking, favors those in office more than those out of office, but it is not nearly so bad in that respect as it is in every country.

This is certainly early recognition of a problem that still plagues broadcasting.

Several speeches at the 1935 Institute considered radio's influence on politics. William Hard, NBC political analyst, delivered a commentary on "The Microphone in Politics." He used instances of the failure of early predictions of radio's power for good to emphasize that radio is merely an instrument of the human mentality and is primarily neutral. He was concerned that a maximum of competition be maintained for an adequate hearing of both persons and policies in politics. Thus, he suggested a limitation be placed on the number of stations which could be owned by one person. He referred to the number of newspaper-owned stations and questioned whether the neutral function which radio performs could be adequately fulfilled by a business which bases its policies on editorial conviction and is dedicated to propaganda activity. Mr. Hard was speaking several years before
the Mayflower editorial case and broadcasters were assumed to operate generally on a neutral basis. Although broadcasters still operate much more on the basis of a relative neutrality than newspapers, this argument against newspaper ownership is very weak in the light of more recent encouragement by the FCC that broadcasters should editorialize. The current opposition to newspaper ownership is based on concentration of control.

Mr. Hard also identified the problem of purchasing political air time. He recognized that the party with the most money could purchase more access to the public and even pre-empt others, particularly the small parties. He suggested that a certain amount of free time be made available to all political parties during a presidential campaign with the free time favoring the financially weaker parties. Then allow the remainder of broadcast time to be purchased. Thus the stronger parties would be favored on the purchased time. Congress is presently considering some equitable means of limiting campaign spending. The present concern is linked closely to the problem of the financially strong candidates' purchase of broadcast time.

In a coast-to-coast network broadcast from California,
Robert A. Millikan, president of NACRE, addressed the Institute on the educational role of radio to create an intelligent electorate. He indicated the four major agencies for creating this more intelligent electorate as: (1) the secondary school, (2) the church, (3) newspapers, and (4) radio. These four agencies should, at every opportunity, promote the following two basic ideas, he concluded: (1) An insufficiently informed person should not act until he has the correct information which experts can give him; (2) He should vote for the government representative who appoints capable men to responsible positions.64

Stanley High, NBC news commentator, referred to "The Radio of the Future" as maintaining three particulars: (1) freedom, (2) competitiveness, and (3) entertainment programs as basic content. He identified the most significant contemporary political development in American life as the increased inarticulateness on political issues of the American public. A free radio would serve to make opinion but not be the servant of any particular opinions.65

High's idea of a free radio is a simple solution fraught with problems. Broadcasting's many-sided presentations tend to confuse the public on issues while basic
sources of information are limited so that broadcasting, via
the networks, could be the servant of a particular opinion.

These examples indicate that the Institute was not
insulating itself from the problems of commercial broad­
casters or discouraging the discussion of the role of radio
in society.

Television was mentioned by Armstrong Perry at the
1930 Institute. As early as the 1931 Institute, Mr.
William Parker, executive of Western Television Corporation,
uргed the Institute audience to consider the use of tele­
vision for teaching. After his speech, C.M. Jansky, Jr., of
Jansky and Bailey consulting engineers, disputed his in­
ference that television would be widely used in the near
future. The subject was again considered at the 1934 In­
stitute when E.B. Kurtz, head of the University of Iowa
Electrical Engineering Department, described some experi­
mental work at that school. He indicated that Purdue and
Kansas State also had experimental station licenses. In
1935, Levering Tyson quoted RCA's Henry Norton to the effect
that practical use of television was still several years
away.

The question of financing the station operation was a
major concern during these Depression years. While the lack of money was a standard answer for less ambitious and extensive programming than commercial stations, there was an element of docile acceptance of the situation:

After all is said and done, we might summarize the whole situation by saying that in many cases we are reluctant to ask for additional money, even though we know we will get it, because of the pertinent question of the hour which seems to be, when we are speaking of this infant radio, "Where do we go from here?" 70

That was T.M. Beaird, executive secretary of ACUBS at the 1932 Institute. Joseph Wright had opened the session with a statement that commercial stations were unjustified in accusing educational broadcasters of poor production because they did not spend great amounts of money:

This impression concerning educational stations does not take into consideration the fact that educational stations pay nothing for talent, and in most cases not even a charge is made against the radio operating funds for salaries.71

Neither of these gentlemen were denying that financing was a problem but both were questioning the need for large sums of money. Wright was attempting to refute the commercial station opinion that quality is impossible without the expenditure of large sums of money. However, this argument was evading the problem and E.A. Corbett, director of extension, University of Alberta, Canada, questioned this attitude
at the 1934 Institute:

I am surprised that so many educational broadcasters speak with pride of having gone on the air for years without some form of remuneration for faculty members. Is this not one reason why educational broadcasting is so mediocre at the present time? We in the field have been unable to insist upon adequate adaptation of techniques whereby the audience might be held because we operate on the basis of gratuitous service. And professors continue to broadcast in academic ways, failing to hold the audience because they have not spent the time to figure out how to do the task satisfactorily.72

Judith Waller and Armstrong Perry identified school administrators as the chief hurdle to more effective and wide use of broadcasting which included financing to provide this wide use.73 An example of administrative reticence had been demonstrated at the 1930 Institute when W.T. Middlebrook, comptroller of the University of Minnesota, explained the tremendous economy of providing some agricultural services by radio. He then stated:

My own belief is that we can justify now a redistribution of present funds which will give adequate support to the radio station, but I do not advocate it, for the reason that a gradual expansion of this activity based upon a thorough understanding of its possibilities is the far safer method to pursue.74

We can best summarize the situation by recognizing that the man with the purse (an administrator) was not sufficiently convinced of the investment value of broadcasting and that educational station operators were not sufficiently
persuasive. Perhaps the element of acceptance was a reflection of discouragement.

Major Issues

Broadcasting was still an infant with new programming and technical innovations bursting into practice almost daily. The designation of a role for broadcasting in education was a matter which could not be settled conclusively because the potential of broadcasting itself was only beginning to be realized. However, the exploration of various functions which radio could perform in education was a matter of great discussion during these formative years. A major issue concerned the proper organization of effort to explore these functions.

A second major issue during this period was the question of ownership of station facilities. Should educational institutions operate their own stations or depend upon commercial operations? A corollary to this question, and also discussed as part of this major issue, was whether there should be some protection of educational stations against the influx and control by commercial interests. This protection took the form of reserved frequency space.
Radio's Function in Education

The major issue under consideration was how radio could be used to improve public education in the United States. A few pages back, Robert Millikan identified radio as one major means of progressing to an adequately informed electorate. That was only one aspect of the very broad field of public education. The use of broadcasting in education is a matter of continual concern, being revised and adapted to the ever-changing conditions of society. A review of the various ideas proposed for the approach to this problem will prove helpful in understanding the present system and its operation in education.

The general approach to this problem during this period could be divided into two basic attitudes: (1) Radio should be adapted to use in the existing educational system and as a supplement to that system. (2) As the educational values of radio are found, the methods and systems of education should be adapted to make full use of radio.

The primary spokesman for this latter view was Levering Tyson, field representative of the American Association for the Advancement of Adult Education. His previous position as head of continuing education at Columbia University had given him the opportunity to consider general adult
education as well as the regular in-school education. As mentioned at the end of Chapter I, he made an extensive study of college and university broadcasting before assuming directorship of NACRE in late 1929. Tyson had the distinction of being the opening speaker of the first Institute and he took this opportunity to suggest the tremendous revolution in education which radio could bring about if hasty decisions were avoided.

One of the grave dangers connected with radio broadcasting in education is that it will not be taken seriously. Because of the enormous financial, social, technical, and organizational problems which face the investigator as soon as he begins peering around, he is prone to be overwhelmed and to take the easiest way out--an early decision that radio broadcasting in education can be merely a supplement to regularly organized and smoothly functioning systems of education. Although we know little about the future of radio in education, we need not turn our faces away from its possibilities. If a group such as this makes up its collective mind at this stage of the game that broadcasting is going to be merely a supplement to systems of education which even now are being seriously examined, investigated, and criticized by those who are engaged in its various processes, it is an indication that one of the great advantages accruing to the American public by reason of this important and useful scientific discovery and development is indefinitely postponed.75

He then referred to the educational change after stating that radio had placed music and world events at the finger-tips of the public:
The radio, as a modern wonder, has unlimbered the mind and has thrown the intellect into the limbo of freedom of choice. The educational world has recognized this, if it has not, must recognize it and must see that this freedom have ample interpretation. Wherever representatives of the educational world congregate today there is discussion of possible change in old processes or of the manufacture of new means. In my humble opinion this is responsible for a large part of the universal questioning of old educational customs and habits which grew up over so many decades, and which has resulted in the widespread study of almost everything that until just a short time ago we had come to take almost for granted in our educational life. The field is now wide open again. Useless formalism in education is breaking down. The public and the educators are certain that education means more than it formerly did in the school, the college, or the university. I believe sincerely that in the past decade, along with the reawakening of the adult public as indicated by the interest in what is known as adult education, radio broadcasting has been a powerful factor—more influential than is commonly supposed.76

Unfortunately, the scope of change which Tyson was supporting is, even now, only beginning to be implemented. As shall be suggested throughout this paper, radio broke the lock-step thought about education but was never able to be more than a little-used supplement. Radio paved the way for television and, only with recent applications like "Sesame Street," is television beginning to bring about that revolution in education.

Another factor which blunted Tyson's suggestions about education was his approach to accomplishing the goal. He was identified with commercial broadcast interests in the issue
of station ownership and many educators were opposed to this approach. This matter will be discussed later in this chapter.

At the 1931 Institute, Tyson encouraged community groups to become involved in developing radio for education, but he again warned that one of the gravest mistakes would be to set rigid rules under which the progress of invention and innovation would be seriously retarded. His remarks were aimed specifically at in-school programming since he noted that with almost every local school district in the nation having different educational needs and desires there seemed to be little hope for a national system of educational programming and not much encouragement for state systems. He called for help from each school district or community. Each should have a group of qualified people study the problems of radio and education and express a community opinion. Although he admitted that organizing this community involvement would be a long and arduous task, he thought this the only way of making radio beneficial to the educational systems of this country. As will be noted in the next chapter, this approach to determining uses of radio was to be pursued in the next period. However, Tyson was not discouraged about national programs for education:
Are we not overlooking the biggest field of all for radio, not by using it for ordinary processes of education, until it is proved efficacious, but by employing it to bring men of the highest intelligence, character, and purpose before possible audiences of many millions in the country as a whole and before corresponding audiences in smaller communities? We know definitely this is something we can do with this new thing called radio. This is one achievement admitted by all. Why not work on that, and meanwhile study systematically to discover what else, if anything, is permanently possible?77

Two years later, Tyson opened the 1933 Institute with a comparatively subdued statement:

Perhaps it is best there is sharp divergence of opinion. So I am stating only what I believe to be a fact; namely that unanimity of thinking about broadcasting in America is absent in the educational area. And I repeat that so long as we cannot agree as to objectives there is little use trying to agree on the administrative of something which we now do not have, and there is little promise we shall have for a long, long time to come.78

He proposed that some central administration machinery would be necessary for a series of national programs on subjects of assured general public interest, that qualified personnel could be engaged and that the benefits in research, and development of interest would be very great.

The following year found Judith Waller, educational director for NBC's Central Division, expressing disappointment with the progress of radio education in the previous five years. She also felt that a national program was the first effort necessary to enhance progress in this field but
she went much further than Tyson had suggested when she asked for a national university-of-the-air where all the best teachers, lessons and information could be used to create relevant and effective programs. 79

During this period, in-school program activities were conducted over a broad range of subjects and situations. Many of these programs were experimental in concept and not intended to revise educational systems, but were intended to discover the best means for presenting educational content via radio. The Institute heard many reports on such programs.

At the first Institute in 1930, W.W. Charters spoke on radio's contribution to elementary and secondary schools concentrating on the instructional service of radio. He stated that radio's contributions would have to be determined in the future rather than claimed on a basis on past accomplishments. Radio in education--in the classroom--was then a novelty and little could be determined about effectiveness until it became stabilized practice. Four handicaps to broadcast education were identified as: (1) synchronization of schedules, (2) timeliness of content, (3) utilization in the classroom, (4) limitations of the lecture method. He mentioned that areas where radio seemed most promising were in music education, and study of foreign language. He
concluded with the thought that radio may prove most useful in developing interest in contradistinction to imparting information.\textsuperscript{80} This idea of developing interest or motivating rather than direct instruction is an approach which was to receive more support as further experiments showed the weakness of educational radio. We may consider Tyson's call for a national program series an attempt at motivational programming rather than direct instruction.

The spectre of automation and involuntary standardization with replacement of the classroom teacher by a "black box" provided an unspoken but strong resistance from educational areas. In 1931, William J. Cooper, U.S. Commissioner of Education, spoke on "Educational Functions of Radio." He first wished to dispel some misunderstandings which he felt were retarding the use of radio in the classroom. 

(1) Radio will supplement but will never displace the classroom teacher. (2) Education is to be achieved and not given to one which therefore requires active involvement while radio tends toward passive acceptance. (3) All children are different and any one program will affect each child in a different way and to a different degree. He also indicated that the Office of Education was attempting to gather and
systematize information so inquiries about radio activities could be answered.

The 1933 Institute heard A.G. Crane, president of the University of Wyoming, report on the first comprehensive and authoritative survey of institutions involved in educational broadcasting. The survey recommended an administrative organization consisting of a division of radio broadcasting directly under the president as an all-institutional activity cutting across all college lines. Regarding programming, Crane commented:

From the experience of 47 college and university stations it appears that 48 per cent of broadcasting time has been devoted to entertainment, 20 per cent to farm and home information, 23 per cent to general information, and 8 per cent to formal instruction. The experiment of giving formal college courses by radio, and of awarding suitable college credit, seems to have proved unsuccessful. In the realm of entertainment it had become increasingly evident that the most acceptable program will include entertainment features that are not available to the general commercial broadcasting companies, such as special school events, sports, drama, lectures, and those events in which appear students or faculty whose personal reputations or connections contribute special interests.

Crane suggested that broadcasts to public schools (elementary and secondary) was an area where educational stations could probably make the greatest contribution. He concluded that national broadcasting which, he agreed, was
only touched upon in the survey report remained an all-important question to college administrative officers. He explained that financial support necessary for advancement of the individual stations was not available on a local level but that interest and concern derived from national programming might assist local financial efforts.

Our present day efforts at national programming both in public radio and public television have been defended on the basis of strengthening the local station so that it may function better on a local level.

The 1935 Institute heard reports of the general situation with Philip Loucks, managing director of NAB, briefly recalling the many ways in which commercial broadcasters have attempted to find the fullest possible use of radio as an educational medium:

They have followed the objective that education by radio must be interesting and unbiased as well as democratic in its concept and supplementary in its purpose. They are co-operating and are willing to continue to co-operate with educators. While they have found some disagreement among educators with respect to radio in education, they have found that there is also general agreement among them that more adequate programs could be developed through closer co-operation.83

To attract and hold large audiences was one of the criteria which he assumed as he suggested a cooperative venture to establish a laboratory production center where new techniques
could be devised and tested.

Anning S. Prall, chairman of the FCC, was not discouraged by the slow progress of the past years. He felt that for too many years education was considered to be something only in the schools but now education must be a lifelong process and radio was a means of breaking with the tradition of the three R's and the printed symbol.84

Perhaps the most important information came from A. G. Crane when he presented the outline of a plan for national public broadcasting. That outline was included at the end of the background portion of this chapter. As in previous years, he referred to the need for a national service in terms of motivation:

The same conditions which lulled the citizens of the nation into allowing this wonder of the century to be devoted to selling goods also made it necessary to sell broadcasting to the colleges. Clear, convincing demonstrations of the value of broadcasting to American culture and government can still sell this instrument to both the universities and to the public.85

In many ways this plan was similar to our present Public Broadcasting Act. However, the vision and motivation of educators in 1935 was indeed different than those of 1967. Mr. Randall of the Chicago Civic Broadcast Bureau reflected much of the basic indecision among educators with his response to this plan:
The way to get improvement in broadcasting conditions in this century is not to make a cut-and-dried plan for some system and then try and get everybody to agree on it; that is impossible. I hope the improvement we need in American broadcasting will not have to wait until we can get an agreement on this plan or any other plan. We in Illinois may want our broadcasting conducted in one way, and they in Wyoming another way. The idea that broadcasting has to be uniform all over the country is false. The only respect in which the Federal government has to meddle in broadcasting is to assign certain channels for the use of certain regions and see that other regions do not interfere. When that is done, each state can organize and take care of its own requirements, have the broadcasting it wants, and arrange the kind of financial support it wants. I hope intelligent experimentation of this kind will not be delayed by fruitless efforts to make any rigid plan for a national system of broadcasting and to get everybody to agree upon it.

Ownership of Station Facilities

This issue had been debated since 1927 when the FRC began limiting the number of stations which could operate. Chapter I of this paper indicated the formation of two organizations, NACRE and NCER, that took opposite views on this question. An important corollary to the question was the matter of educational reservations. As indicated in Chapter I, many educational institutions were losing their stations licenses and it soon became evident that commercial stations would occupy nearly all available frequency allocations unless the federal government reserved some allocations to the use of educational institutions only. The creation of
the Federal Communications Commission with its promise of more consideration to educational needs in radio was the hopeful sign at the end of this period. However, a disappointment to many was the January 1935, decision by the newly-formed FCC that no educational reservation were necessary.

In its report to Congress, the FCC concluded that "there is no need for a change in the existing law [inasmuch as] the interests of the non-profit organizations would be better served by giving educators access to costly and efficient equipment and access to an established audience." Thus, the FCC settled an argument which plagued broadcasters throughout this first period of development.

The arguments of this question involve the philosophy of broadcasting which must continually be reviewed because they challenge the ability of private enterprise to serve the public needs. The Fairness Doctrine and CATV are only two of the current controversies which involve this philosophy. A review of the arguments from 1930 to 1935 follows.

Levering Tyson, director of NACRE, which advocated seeking time for educational programs on commercial stations, opened the first Institute in 1930 by stating his belief that
no one present would deny the best system for educational broadcasting was by means of stations "owned, supported, and operated by duly recognized educational institutions." He then challenged the possibility of achieving such a system in the near future. The full effect of the Depression was being experienced at this time and, as quoted earlier in this chapter, Tyson felt the difficulties of building radio would force administrations to cut back on development, thus postponing indefinitely the great advantages of radio to the American public.

Referring to a study of radio at educational institutions, he analyzed the stages of development of educational stations concluding that very few of the stations are in any position to discover the ingredients of a good educational broadcast since most time must be spent in building the facilities and winning the support of the administration. He indicated that only commercial broadcasters have the resources at present, in funds and talent, to provide highly effective educational programs. The discovery of the solution of radio's function in education would take "more time than any of us realizes at present." and untold millions of dollars. The logical conclusion seemed to Tyson to be that
educators must concentrate on discovering the ingredients of good educational programs and seek facilities and talent, where needed, from commercial broadcasters. He did not venture a guess as to the particular responsibilities or prerogatives of the two parties but pleaded for a combination of the two vast sources of power for making educational broadcasting eminently successful in this country. Different words were used but relatively the same plea was to be made by FCC chairman, Anning Prall, six years later at the 1935 Institute. 89

Tyson did not see this method as the ultimately approved form of radio education but felt it to be the only alternative to the use of radio merely as a supplementary toy in the educational system. Tyson's personal attempts at cooperative programming on commercial stations proved a failure as was noted in his embittered comments on this matter quoted in the background of this chapter. His warnings about the results of this failure of a cooperative effort also proved to be very close to the truth. More on this matter is mentioned in the summary of this chapter.

In the discussion at the end of Tyson's speech, Mr. Pierce, a representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System,
indicated that commercial radio stations and both networks were ready to cooperate to the fullest extent:

When educators or anyone else can find out how to present educational matter in a way which will hold an audience, and not only hold it but attract it, week after week, then you will find that the commercial broadcasting companies are entirely willing to turn over facilities for the purpose of presenting educational programs.90

But for the slight technicality of mentioning that the audiences must be of substantial size, Pierce accurately characterized the attitude of the great majority of commercial broadcasters. Although it must be recognized that the Depression was in full effect at this time and many broadcast stations were barely surviving, it is strange that Pierce's outspoken statement reflected no feeling of obligation to the public.

About mid-way through the Institute, the subject was again broached when W.T. Middlebrook, comptroller of the University of Minnesota, spoke. He noted that he approached the subject from the business side in educational administration. He recalled the beginning of broadcast activities in the School of Electrical Engineering, in 1920, and the establishment of the first commercial station for the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul in 1922. The University
even discontinued regular operation of its own station for several months before it was realized that the commercial station could not meet the full needs of the University. WLB, the university station, resumed regular broadcasting while continuing to broadcast an hour long program over the commercial station until the fall of 1927. The end of that cooperative program was reported by Middlebrook:

We attempted to tell the farmers of our state through a commercial station how to prepare a certain product. The product was being supplied at a higher cost by one of the backers of the commercial station. We were told that the information was prejudicial to the interests of the station. It was not prejudicial to the public interest. We, therefore discontinued broadcasting through this medium.91

In 1928, the FRC, allowed the establishment of another high-powered commercial station in St. Paul, but assigned WLB, two other educational stations and a commercial station to a single poorer frequency on which all four had to divide operating hours according to past time used. This put the educational operators at a disadvantage since they had not filled their previous program schedules with inexpensive phonograph programs as the commercial station had done. If WLB did not have a worthwhile educational program it simply did not broadcast anything. However, Middlebrook said:
"If it is worth $5,000 to have the firm name mentioned a couple of times in fifteen minutes it must be a fair medium of communication...it is perfectly clear to me that institutions like mine should broadcast." He then referred to several questions which every educational broadcast station must answer and concluded that the related educational institutions must be actuated by one or, more likely, by both of these motives—a desire to extend its present off-campus service or a desire to furnish to its constituents, the people of the state in the case of state institutions, information of its activities which will promote a better understanding of its work and further its public support. Either and both motives, in my opinion, justify the existence of an educational station.

He determined that the educational station can command a natural audience:

The University of Minnesota gave instruction last year to more than twenty-six thousand people. It has an alumni and former student body of fifty thousand. The families of these, the public-school system, the professional groups, and the agricultural group added to the student and alumni groups provide a potential radio audience unsurpassed in the state.

Finally he indicated that the very nature of the commercial system does not allow the educational institution adequate freedom in the choice of program material or program time to accomplish the goals which it has. He also stated that lack of power and favorable frequency assignment, which is the
present plight of educational stations, will be overcome when these stations prove their worth as a good educational medium. He called for cooperation among all broadcasters but warned that

none should willingly relinquish their stations and barter away for temporary advantage this new uncensored medium of communicating knowledge so long as its possibilities remain so little known.95

Admittedly speaking from the business attitude, Middlebrook demonstrated that the University's self-interest conflicted with the commercial interests and that neither interest was particularly altruistic.

Mr. William Hedges then stepped to the podium. In addition to being the president of the three-year old National Association of Broadcasters, he was also the president of WMAQ in Chicago, a very active broadcaster of educational programs. He used the profit incentive and competition as reasons for American superiority in service over European broadcast systems but had to admit upon questioning that his only measure of that superiority was the number of receivers sold. He explained the federal license to broadcast presupposes some benefit to the broadcaster and sponsorship is the only way to pay for this service to the public. He indicated that he knew of no statistical audience
measurement but "the fact that radio broadcasting has proved worthwhile to advertisers is pretty good proof that the public is being well served by broadcasting." 96

Middlebrook had indicated in the previous speech that advertiser use assumes listener use. Now Hedges was going one step further in suggesting that advertiser use assumes good service to the listener. I question this latter assumption but broadcasters have been defending their service on these grounds for many years. It may be that audience is attracted because the listening activity is the least offensive alternative at that particular time. Hedges pointed out the opinion of educators was shortsighted if they insist that no sponsor should be identified on a classroom broadcast when every article used in the classroom is sponsor or maker identified. He warned of dangers of federal or state controlled educational stations leading to standardization of education and political control for propaganda purposes such as the control that could be exercised by a politically appointed state superintendent of schools. He indicated the great expense of broadcasting would involve further tax burden on the public if universities got involved in it. He also suggested that a nationwide network of stations
owned separately by the top universities in each area of the country would cause problems:

These institutions realize the value of radio in keeping contact with the alumni, who contributes funds for university development.97

He ended with a plea that educators support commercial sponsorship of educational programs and support preparation of such programs by appointing committees to work with and advise commercial sponsors. In the discussion with the audience that followed the speeches, the comments suggested that there was not strong objection to commercial sponsorship of educational programs and that several instances of good cooperation between commercial stations and educational institutions were in effect.

During the discussion Mr. Coleman, an industry representative from the RCA Victor Company, voiced the most cogent defense of the separate educational stations concept with this analogy:

I do not believe there is one here who will question the educational value of a program just because it is sponsored by a commercial station. The commercial station in its relation to the college station somewhat resembles the commercial printer and the university press. There are certain types of books which the commercial house will not touch and which the university press publishes because it thinks it is a contribution and should be preserved. The real danger, as I see it, is that the commercial station is in business for the
money it makes. As the overhead goes up, other prices must go up. It is, therefore, the responsibility of educational institutions to safeguard their own stations.98

There was some discussion of the need to reserve the evening hours from 7 to 10 p.m. for commercial sponsorship of large audience programs. Hedges explained that these hours were the most important to sponsors and stations because the largest listening audiences were available during this time. This question of preferred hours was to arise sharply in the following year's Institute.

On the final day of the first Institute, Judge Ira Robinson, commissioner on the Federal Radio Commission, stated that commercial broadcasting with its blatant advertising messages was unacceptable to the nurturing of good educational programming.

In another speech that afternoon, Judge Robinson recalled Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover's plea to Congress to face the monopoly threat and administer by principles of our public utilities-- the Congressional compromise and the resultant near monopoly by RCA. He warned that educational broadcasters must maintain their own stations. However, he was careful to note that his was an unpopular opinion on the FRC and in no way reflected the opinions of
other commissioners. This is verified by Commissioner
Harold Lafount's speech at the 1931 Institute. Robinson
advised educators to go to Washington in force and lobby
for help. W.W. Charters remarked:

The educator has one psychological difficulty; he is
impressed with the fact that he ought not to mix into
politics or go after things from legislatures. He needs
a farsighted friend to look after him in matters of
these kinds.99

Robinson recognized this problem and commended the establish­
ment of NCER with its Washington representative to defend
educational interests but suggested that more action along
these lines was necessary.

The opening session of the 1931 Institute contained
one of the most volatile speeches of the entire conference
as Joy Elmer Morgan, chairman of the NCER, voiced objection
to the increasing number of educational license losses:

The practice of squeezing these stations off the air
ran something like this. First, they would be given the
less desireable frequencies, the more desireable being
assigned to the commercial and monopoly groups. Second,
they would be required to divide their time with some
commercial interest. Third, they would be required to
give a larger share of their time to the commercial in­
terest. Fourth, they would be required to meet some new
regulation involving costly equipment--often a regulation
essentially right in itself but applied with such sudden­
ness as not to allow time for adjustment in the educa­
tional budget. Fifth, the educational station would be
required to spend on trips to Washington for hearings
before the Federal Radio Commission and on lawyers' fees
the money which should have gone into developing personnel and programs.100

Morgan then proceeded to castigate Harold A. Lafount, member of the FRC, for a report which he issued supporting the commercial broadcasters' contention that there is plenty of time available on commercial stations for educational programming. His main objection was that the report did not consider any difference in the value of certain hours of the broadcast day. As noted earlier, Hedges had indicated that evening hours were much more valuable.

The following speaker in this first morning session was FRC Commissioner Harold Lafount who spoke on the "Contributions of the Federal Radio Commission." The main contribution to which he alluded concerned the encouragement which the FRC had given to commercial stations to broadcast educational programs: "Which, I may say, has directly led to the notable increase in the number of hours of educational programs undertaken by approximately every broadcasting station in the United States."101 He reminded the audience that the FRC had never cancelled the license of an educational institution but that all such deletions (47 since May 1927) had been by virtue of the voluntary assignment or surrender of the license. He suggested the reason for the
majority of these voluntary releases was because the institutions saw that commercial stations could provide ample time for broadcasting all the educational programs these institutions desired to provide. Although this conclusion may have been applicable to some of the deleted stations, it hardly seems likely that the majority of stations, caught in the squeeze mentioned by Morgan earlier, released their licenses for such a simple and unproved reason. Lafount then quoted from the same report referred to earlier by Morgan and concluded since only one-third of the available time was being used by educational stations, why should more time or frequencies be made available to them. His concluding opinion was:

With all of the stations of the United States devoting at present 10 percent or better of their total time to educational broadcastings, [sic] and a real possibility of this percentage increasing, I believe the public will be much better served than it can possibly be by confining education exclusively to a percentage of the whole number of existing stations.102

During the sometimes heated discussion which followed, Lafount admitted that the FRC does not recognize a difference in the values of some hours as compared to others. On another point, Morgan's response summarized it as follows:
If I understand you, you said that under the law you have no power to give to stations any preference as to wave-lengths. The gentlemen on the Commission who passed that law take a different view. They have told me personally that they had in that law originally a clause favoring educational stations. They took that clause out with the distinct understanding that under the clause, "of interest, convenience, and necessity" the Commission would give preference to educational stations.103

Lafount did not reply directly to this remark, but on several other answers indicated the FRC position that the application of an educational institution cannot be given any preference over any commercial application. However, he had stated in his speech that the FRC was sympathetic to education since it had encouraged commercial broadcasters to carry educational programs. That encouragement resulted in approximately 3,457 hours of educational programs broadcast on commercial stations in the month of January 1931 alone. This compared very favorable with the 1,225 total hours in which educational licensees were on the air.

Lafount made the distinction between education and educationally sponsored radio stations. He did not appear to consider it necessary for educational institutions to own any of the precious radio frequencies. As opposed to allocating a percentage of frequencies to educational broadcasting Lafount made this suggestion:
My own scheme would be to require commercial stations to broadcast programs arranged by either the government or the state or the city in which they are located as one of the licensing conditions. The government would decide whether the nation, the state, or the city should have that time. Would it not be better to have one hour or two hours at a particular time over the 613 stations in the United States than over the number of stations that you may put on fifteen percent of the channels?  

He explained the dilemma of the FRC with this illustration:

An order of the Commission requires that a station allocated full time shall operate twelve hours per day. You are operating two days out of the six, if Sunday is eliminated. An applicant from Spokane, Washington, about 90 miles from your station asks, "do you think it is in the public interest to operate two out of six days of the week and charge that facility to the state of Washington? If it is not, we who are operating 16 hours a day ask for that frequency which is better than the one we now use." This comes from a commercial station.... Your station has or will shortly close down for a period of 90 days, during which time there will be no broadcasting on that frequency in the Northwest. What can we say to this man who under the law must appear exactly the same to the Commission as the president of your university?

The following morning Armstrong Perry, U.S. Office of Education radio specialist, reiterated Morgan's statement that the U.S. Congress had assumed the FRC would protect educational broadcasters. Perry was the director of the service bureau established by NCER in Washington to assist educational broadcasters in contacts with the FRC. The activities of this bureau are mentioned in the background to this chapter. As mentioned in Chapter I, Perry had been
concerned with educational uses of radio since 1921. His first statement asserted that the Radio Act of 1927 ignored the fact that public education is a function of the individual states and not of the federal government. He reiterated the concern of various congressmen that education be protected by the Radio Act and the understanding that the FRC would protect educational interests. He then explained the steps in the downfall of educational interests. First, the FRC agreed that the primary function of radio was to entertain and then the FRC accepted the most logical way to finance this entertainment service to the public was through advertising. Next, it was agreed that only a small minority were interested in education by radio and a short step from that was to recognize that commercial stations could quite adequately serve this small minority by offering an occasional program. This put the FRC in the following situation:

The Federal Radio Commission maintains that its hands are tied by the law so that it is powerless to protect broadcasting stations owned by states or by institutions chartered by states. It maintains that if a commercial concern applies for facilities used by a state educational station and insists on a hearing, that the hearing must be granted and that the state station must appear as a respondent, regardless of the expense involved, if it wishes to protect its rights. No matter how many times it may be attacked in the course of a year, the state station, supported by tax money and operated for the public benefit, must go to the expense of employing
attorneys and sending witnesses to the hearings in Washington. In February, 1931, applications of commercial broadcasters who wished to use radio channels for their own profit involved the rights of 28 educational stations, about half of the total number of such stations still on the air. In March, 27 educational stations were affected by similar applications.106

It also allowed for the following actions:

[The manager of a] station used its power of censorship with such outrageous effrontery that a state university discontinued its co-operation with the station. And an official of the Federal Radio Commission, yielding to this man's plea that his station was rendering indispensable educational service, recommended that he be granted an increase of 40,000 watts in the power of his station, while the Commission denied to a high school in the state the right to use two watts of power to broadcast interesting events at the school to the parents and taxpayers within the district.107

He opined that the FRC, perhaps because of big business pressure which could not be resisted easily, had accepted the rationale that educational stations need not be protected:

The one alternative suggestion emanating from the Commission is the same that is urged by the commercial broadcasters; namely, that commercial stations shall be required, in return for the privileges granted to them, to give a certain amount of time each day to educational programs. When asked who would determine what hours should be given to education, a member of the Commission who has been most active in arguing for this arrangement said: "Well, of course, the commercial stations would have to have the hours that they could sell to advertisers." In short, the commercial broadcasters and the majority of the Commission deny the legal right of the states, which are responsible for public education, to have any control of any broadcasting channels, and advocate that education by radio shall be given in hours which have no value for the commercial broadcaster and advertiser.108
Perry summed it up with the thought that control was the basic problem. Did they want public education by radio to be under the control of private industry whose basic intent is financial profit? His speech was an unusual expose' of the U.S. Congress and the FRC acquiescence to commercial broadcast interests.

Three days later, on the morning of the last day of the Institute, Judith Waller, manager of WMAQ, in Chicago, objected to the 15 percent reservation of frequencies for educational institutions. She based this objection on the fact that educational stations were not making good use of the approximately 10 percent of broadcast facilities which they controlled at that time. She said the programs on educational stations consisted of recitals by music students, phonograph records, commercial programs of all kinds, news flashes, children's hours, and the likes, the same type of program presented by the majority of our commercial stations. There were one or two exceptions, of course, but the majority of these stations devote five or ten minutes to a talk by some professor and claim they are devoting a majority of time disseminating education.109

She felt that when educators make exemplary use of present facilities more would be made available to them. She mentioned some of the excellent results that WMAQ had had with educational programs and then commented:
The educators persist in feeling that if they are dependent upon the commercial broadcasters, their chance of giving the public the best there is in knowledge is decidedly slim; that as more and more demands are made by advertisers for time on the air, less and less time will be set aside for education. I am convinced that there is no truth in this belief.

In the discussion period Miss Waller admitted that WMAQ had not yet made a profit from radio operations. Mr. Tracy Tyler of NCER, summed up the reaction of many:

I do not think educators need be afraid of commercial stations thwarting freedom of speech. If a commercial station, however, operates at a loss over a period of years, eventually its stockholders are going to demand that what caused them to operate at a loss be discontinued and the station put on a paying basis. That means a certain type of program will be censored. If all stations should be as high-minded as WMAQ is with Miss Waller in charge, there is no reason for worry.

As noted in Chapter I, Miss Waller was a strong advocate of educational broadcasting and pioneered educational programs in Chicago in 1926. When NBC purchased WMAQ in 1932, Miss Waller was made educational director of the NBC Central Division and continued to develop educational radio programs. Her attitude on reservations seems somewhat short-sighted in retrospect but indicates that even some knowledgeable and sincere friends of educational broadcasting were against frequency reservation. Many educators themselves were not convinced of the soundness of such reservations.
At the 1932 meeting, Hans V. Kaltenborn was asked by Armstrong Perry if we should permit commercial stations to control publicly owned stations or should channels be reserved for public purposes. Kaltenborn was at that time employed by CBS as news commentator and political analyst. He replied:

I have thought that the Radio Commission has not been sufficiently generous or farseeing enough regarding educational broadcasting. I think educational stations should have been permitted to retain their wave-lengths in many instances, even if all the allotted time were not used and even if the broadcasts did not measure up to entertainment value. Fundamentally, education has a definite right on the air; I hope to see it always retain that right, but I would not go so far as to say the 15 percent of all the wave-lengths should definitely be allotted to educational stations. I think that arbitrary, excessive, and unnecessary. The chains are becoming increasingly generous with educational authorities. The problem of education on the air can be worked out more effectively by cooperating with the existing stations than by an antagonistic attitude.

A group discussion on "Commercial Stations and Education" pointed up the following problems. Many commercial stations carry some educational programs but shift the scheduled time of these programs when they are able to sell such time to advertisers. Educational programs are considered very low audience attractions and detrimental to the size of the audience for programs adjacent to them. Newspapers do not carry sufficient information on radio programs, including
educational programs, to allow the public to tune to particu-
lar programs. Commercial stations feel they are carrying
more educational programs than the public wants and event-
ually, as advertisers will be found for all operating hours,
the stations will have to decide if they will sacrifice tan-
gible sales for educational programs. Broadcasters do feel
an obligation to provide educational programs and have con-
tributed programs as well as time to education. 113

Little discussion on the matter of educational reserva-
vations took place again until the 1935 Institute. The Fed-
eral Communications Commission had taken office and had re-
commended to Congress that no educational reservations were
needed at this time.

Mr. Crane, president of the University of Wyoming,
commended FCC Chairman Anning Prall's considerable breadth
of view on educational radio:

But the problem which puzzles me is, if broadcasting is
to be complete with all the independence and all the
freedom and all the safeguards, how can this freedom be
maintained if it is dependent solely upon the good-will
of commercial broadcasters who are necessarily and in-
evitable dependent upon advertising?114

Prall indicated that he did not know the answer but
the solution would come from a strong interest and involve-
ment by educators in a cooperative effort with commercial
broadcasters. Kaltenborn interjected that the educator must depend upon a broad policy expressed by the FCC. Several comments were made by others in the audience indicating that educators feel the final decision on educational material to be broadcast should be made by the experts in the program content area—educators. Several broadcasters in the audience argued that the broadcaster must continue to make the final decision based on listener reaction.

That afternoon, Judith Waller explained why she felt a radio station operated by an educational institution was not acceptable. Her argument involved the need to compete with commercial broadcasters for an audience and therefore the requirement for selling time to finance the quality of programming needed. This situation would put the educational broadcaster on the same economic basis as the commercial broadcaster. Since the commercial broadcaster has shown his willingness to provide sufficient time for educational programs which can hold an audience there is no need for educationally operated stations. 115

Kaltenborn suggested, in the discussion period, that some of the expense for quality programs might be reduced by a system of recording and distributing to many stations the
best educational programs. This would allow for spreading costs over several station budgets and also increase the audience for a program.

Mr. Griffith, president of the NAEB, remarked that he had suggested just such a system at the 1930 Institute, and was told that was not the way to do it. He further commented that he still believed that "something of this sort is possible." 116

In the same session, Herman G. James, president of the University of South Dakota, made a plea for reservation of some frequencies to educational institutions. His reasoning followed the line of limited access as he indicated that freedom of speech was not a possibility when only a few would be able to operate stations. Since there was no way to solve this dilemma absolutely then we must look toward some license holders who, by their very nature are less influenced with selfish motive than others. Educational institutions, in fact and theory, fit into this category. To what extent these reserved channels are used and how effectively cannot be pertinent to the question but merely the fact that the least corruptible institution of the society be allowed to hold a place for access of ideas to the public. 117
In the discussion period after this speech, Mr. Miller, director of broadcasting at the University of Chicago, stated that his experience with WMAQ and the NBC network indicated educational programs would be given more complete autonomy by commercial stations than would be allowed by state legislatures or university administrators if those programs were carried on a university owned station. Mr. Bartlett of Syracuse University, suggested that the "blue pencil" type of script censorship is no problem but that the program director decision not to allow a person to broadcast is a very insidious type of censorship because it is so difficult to prove. The broadcaster is given the responsibility to make this type of judgement and, indeed, he must be given this responsibility.

Mr. Brackett of the University of South Dakota, suggested that any single broadcast on a subject is, of necessity, a one-sided view. If a network presents a program on a controversial issue, how is it to be answered? There must be some equal and opposing presentation. Censorship is a real problem here because that same network cannot present adequately the opposing view nor will it attempt to do such.
The following day A.G. Crane, president of University of Wyoming, took the last shot in the educational reservation battle:

The present American system of broadcasting is an almost incredible absurdity for a country that stakes its existence upon universal suffrage, upon the general intelligence of its citizens, upon the spread of reliable information, upon the attitudes and judgments of all the people, and then consigns a means of general communication exclusively to private interests, making public use for general welfare subordinate and incidental. The absurdity becomes more absurd when we deal with a limited resource belonging to all of us and save none of this natural resource for our own general use. The absurdity passes comprehension when we not only give up our public birthright but tax ourselves to support commissions, to protect private monopoly in the use and control of what belongs to the nation. The absurdity becomes tragic when the vital values of radio communication to a democracy are considered. Culture in the broadest sense, entertainment of the most wholesome kind, information vital to public welfare, teamwork to make government by the people effective—all these are in the gift of broadcasting, but each must now await the pleasure of the advertiser. Great public agencies interested solely in American welfare must plead before a Federal Commission beseeching a small part in the air for public use not dependent upon the gratuity of advertising; The scene would be humorous if it were not tragic.119

Period Summary

Institute

If the objectives and functions of the Institute as identified in the Planning section of this chapter are
analyzed it is seen that the concept of an interchange of ideas between experts in the field was the basis for the success of the Institute. The encouragement of research, and international exchange plus development of broadcasting techniques, and other objectives and functions listed, were all goals to be accomplished from this interchange.

In 1930, there were several special broadcasting interest groups which can be identified:

1. NACRE--A group of educators interested in developing educational programs for commercial stations.

2. NCER--A group of educators interested in establishing an outlet (station facilities) for good educational programs.

3. ACUBS--A group of educational radio station operators.

4. NEA--Representing the bulk of educators, who did not feel that educational radio was worth the price to develop it.

5. NAB--The industry representatives for commercial stations and networks.

7. FRC--The Federal agency responsible for the development of broadcasting in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The Institute was the only structure in which all the interests could join together in an effort to find their common good. There were two important qualities of the Institute which allowed this meeting of diverse interests: (1) The Institute was not identified with any specific interest, policy, or opinion regarding education by radio. (2) The expressed purpose of the Institute was to discuss the various ideas of these special interest groups as well as other opinions so that the ideas would be shared by all and would have the benefit of combination with other ideas.

This was termed a crossfertilization process and necessitated an atmosphere in which truth and right were sought rather than merely a defense of one's position. Such an atmosphere could be encouraged only with the understanding that the Institute would remain neutral and take no position nor express any opinion on any policy or interest. In later years, this quality was to be challenged by some Institute participants who wanted formal resolutions voted upon at the Institute.
The discussion of major issues came closest to argument at the 1931 Institute when Morgan and Lafount spoke from the same platform. Although speeches were intense at many other times there was little immediate challenge of the ideas from the audience. These major speeches were a means of presenting the ideas of leaders in the field. These leaders represented the opinion of some special interest and their job was to express the opinion of that group. Of course, it was also the opinion of the individual in most cases.

The idea of the Institute was not a debating society where one defended his opinion; however, people came to these Institutes with opinions and listened to other opinions as well as expressing their own. The idea was to find out what others were thinking and why. The round-table discussions initiated in 1932 provided a structure in which more people expressed themselves. Presumably the smaller, less formal grouping of these session encouraged such expression.

In these early years, the Institute was the leader in gathering and distributing information on research in the field. This was accomplished through the cooperative research group established at the 1932 Institute. Both
NACRE and NCER were active in collecting information and encouraging research as well as performing research projects, but both also belonged to the cooperative research group of the Institute and contributed extensively to that group's coordinating activities.

The concentration on techniques and activities in the field during this first period contributed to the identification of the Institute as a participating activity in which all those attending could benefit in a practical sense. A review of the topics discussed at the Institute indicates a wide range of material covering most activities in the educational broadcasting field.

Major spokesmen for various interest groups, such as Lafount, Perry, Morgan, Tyson, Crane, Cooper, and Dunham were strong participants at the Institute. Although commercial stations were well represented, the only weakness in representation was from commercial networks. The networks always had representation but they were not the top spokesmen. Although the attendance was relatively small, the publication of the major discussion in Education On The Air increased the dissemination of information substantially.
During the particularly trying period of the great Depression, the Institute had survived because it served a vital need in the broadcast field. It was needed even more during the next period as cooperative efforts with commercial stations proved to be more difficult than most had anticipated.

**Issues**

In 1929 educational broadcasting was floundering in the vast sea of change which encompassed the radio field. This tremendous means of communicating information and knowledge was becoming primarily a home vaudeville show. The Depression froze the public impression of radio as free entertainment, and the only entertainment for many in this period of empty pockets.

Some few educators were becoming alarmed by the developments. A few top-level meetings clearly indicated the problems: (1) very little factual information was available on educational broadcasting, and (2) hardly a trace of organization or unity was found on the question of educational broadcasting.122

At this point, the Institute opened its doors to educators and broadcasters with a ten day workshop on
educational broadcasting. Its purpose was not to defend any institution or any approach to educational broadcasting but merely to seek the truth by separating fact from fiction. This would be accomplished by bringing experts together to discuss the problems and exchange information for mutual benefit. 123

One of the major issues was to determine radio's function in education and Levering Tyson opened the first Institute with a warning that a hasty assignment of radio's function would be disastrous. Tyson was an annual contributor to the Institute proceedings. As executive director of NACRE, he had the benefit of that organization's efforts plus his own considerable talents for thought and analysis. His speech was both prophetic and preceptive. Perhaps he envisioned a radio university of the air or maybe some adult education courses which would challenge the educational process of that day. He definitely did not wish to see educational radio become merely a supplement to the existing educational system.

Tyson felt that radio exposed some of the worst methods of education 124 and thought to use radio to change these methods. Basically, he said there was so much to learn yet
about how to use radio in education that we must not waste our limited time and more limited budgets on station facilities but must devote all resources to experimentation with program content, form, and audience reaction. As if to emphasize this point, his analysis of university station development presented a clear picture of the struggle which is all too familiar to educational broadcasters today. This is another indication that the changes which Tyson envisioned have barely been started forty years later.

More directly, on the matter of what type of program service should be rendered by an educational station, W.W. Charters suggested that motivation (developing interest in subject areas) may be the most effective use of radio. W.T. Middlebrook felt that adult education and extension services as well as publicity and promotion of the institution itself were justifiable and probable areas of service. Charter's suggestion of using radio to develop interest in instructional areas rather than imparting information was somewhat endorsed by Tyson in the following year when he suggested concentration on the presentation of distinctive people to the public rather than ordinary processes of education.
The educators were finding that the class lecture could not simply be repeated in front of a microphone for a radio audience because the audience would usually find it uninteresting. Therefore, they were looking for motivational materials and content to make the program interesting. Commercial broadcasters seemed to think that the problem could be pinpointed in three words—lack of showmanship. The statement by John Elwood in 1930 that information must be sugar-coated was perhaps a bit blunt but as accurate as the many other description of the problem concerning presentation of educational materials.

In 1933, Tyson suggested a limited number of subjects which had proved to be of popular interest could be the basis of a national program series. He had been dealing with possibilities of network programs for some time before this suggestion. However, he now was considering the national program to be at least a partial solution to the lack of unity regarding objectives of radio education. He recognized that the sharply divergent attitudes within educational circles about objectives was delaying progress toward a useful educational radio service. Perhaps he thought a national program of high quality would be acceptable to all and a
starting point for unified action. Arthur G. Crane, reported that the national program was an untested but very important concern of college administrators.\textsuperscript{132} The remark was made in connection with difficult financial conditions which radio was experiencing and appeared to indicate the need for an outstanding program series to sell radio education to the general public.

Judith Waller called for a national university-of-the-air in adult education at the 1934 Institute\textsuperscript{133} and Philip Loucks followed in 1935 with the suggestion of a national production center and laboratory in which to develop and test new programs, concepts, and techniques.\textsuperscript{134} But the most comprehensive and sweeping plan for national action was presented by Arthur G. Crane at the 1935 Institute when the NCER plan for a national public broadcast system was proposed. Basically, a system of stations would be established by federal fiat and controlled by federal, regional, and state boards. These non-profit, non-commercial stations would develop and provide educational and other public interest programming for each other and all other non-profit stations who wished to carry such programs.\textsuperscript{135} Although certain similarities can be found in our present federally
sponsored program, The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and its radio arm, National Public Radio; the major conditions of the NCER plan appeared to place more restrictions on programming and certainly provide for more non-local control of all station policies.

The financial situation of educational broadcasting received some consideration at the Institute. Considering how much the savings factor was used to promote educational television in later years, it is surprising that more comment on this factor was not found at the Institute discussions.

On the other end of the financial spectrum was how much educational broadcasting was costing and was that enough money to allow it to do the job. Middlebrook seemed to be most enthusiastic about the worth of broadcasting, but he was much less interested in backing his enthusiasm with money. He felt a gradual increase in support as the uses of broadcasting were better understood would be the best approach. Hedges warned that the cost of broadcasting would be an added tax burden. In 1932, Joseph Wright and other educational broadcasters indicated that, although the funds were limited, they were sufficient to provide the desired amount and quality of educational programs needed at
that time. T.M. Beaird reinforced this opinion in that same Institute when he remarked that vision was the most important factor needed and financial resources would be found to support vision. But A.G. Crane was most concerned about financing a national program when he spoke at the 1933 Institute. He felt that educational administrations were most interested in a national program set up but that financial resources to demonstrate the worth of such programming were not forthcoming. In 1934, Judith Waller blamed the lack of funds on a lack of interest by educators. She felt that the curtailment of funds was a big problem in educational broadcasting. Canadian broadcaster, E.A. Corbett was surprised at the attitude of educational broadcasters that they were doing well with limited funds. He intimated that the attitude should be that they were not doing well because of limited funds. Indeed, it did seem that educational broadcasters had resigned themselves to limited financing and their vision had thus been limited by this factor. Levering Tyson referred to the lack of funds which had allowed broadcasters little time for anything but the struggle to survive. In this 1935 speech, he also indicated that the situation which had caused a lack of funds in education was
The most intense discussion revolved around the disagreement between educational and commercial broadcasters regarding the need and protection of educational stations. As referred to in the 1930 exchange between Robinson and Charters, educators were not equipped to lobby for federal favor while commercial interests used this practice strongly.\textsuperscript{140} Even if, according to Joy Morgan, Congress specifically understood that the FRC would give preference to educational stations;\textsuperscript{141} the application of the law by the FRC, which was not protected against political pressure, had the approval of Congress and clearly was supported by the Supreme Court. The major contention that educational station licensees should be given preference over commercial licensees was not a required interpretation of the law according to a Supreme Court decision of 1930.\textsuperscript{142}

The speeches at the 1931 Institute revealed the problem in most of its detail. The arguments for commercial broadcasters took the following line of thought. The commercial interests and the FRC stated no objection to the operation of educational stations as long as they provided a service to the public in the form of programs. The quality
and educational aspect of those programs were not considered. They must defend their licenses against any claims the same way (by coming to Washington with attorneys for a hearing) and with the same qualifications (number of hours the station programs) as any commercial licensee. The request for reservations was absurd since educational stations were not using the time they already had. In addition, commercial broadcasters were willing and able to provide all the time needed if the programs would attract and hold a sizable audience.

The educational broadcasters countered that commercial stations would only provide the least popular hours which were not sponsored, and that educational institutions could not meet the financial demands necessary to present a large number of programs of quality and content acceptable to education but refused to lower their objectives in programming to the level of commercial content. Also there was the objection of control and censorship by commercial stations. An example of the commercial broadcaster's thinking was clearly demonstrated at the 1930 Institute when W. Hedges, President of NAB, referred to advertiser acceptance as proof that the public was being well served.
Then he ended his speech with the plea that educators work with commercial sponsors to bring educational programs to the air. Hedges gave no indication that educators should work with stations or networks but with sponsors! This industry-wide acceptance of this advertiser-controlled situation made many educators doubt the ability of commercial stations to serve education.

The request for educational reservations was based on the need to protect a place for the slower moving educational interests so that they could eventually develop programs and reach an audience without regard to the financial return. 151

However, one aspect of the reservation problem which was not clearly discussed was the responsibility of the commercial broadcaster if educational reservations were established. Commissioner Lafount's statement at the 1931 Institute 152 was the only statement which clearly indicates that commercial stations would be released from their responsibility to provide educational programming. As indicated at the end of the background of this chapter, most educators were not convinced that a system of reservations on a fixed percentage basis was defensible. 153 By the time of the 1934
hearings held by the FCC, the principle that education should be allowed adequate use of radio facilities as the uses were developed was a strong opinion of educators. However, the means of accomplishing this use of facilities was still a matter of debate.
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CHAPTER III

THE GROWTH YEARS, 1936 - 1944

Background

The majority of change and stabilization for this period in broadcasting occurred prior to the war years--1942 through 1945. This period witnessed industry expansion in revenue and influence. Brisk activity by the FCC to curb monopoly was seen as well as movement toward program regulation and emphasis on informational and cultural programs. Educational broadcasting activities settled down to consolidation and unification of forces plus improvement in programming techniques.

Commercial Broadcasting

Most of the major methods of operation in commercial radio broadcasting had been developed by 1936 with expansion and stabilization the prime areas of activity in the period after 1936. From 1936 to 1941 there was an increase of over
7,000,000 radio homes to roughly 77 percent of all homes in the United States.\(^1\) In addition, there was a 320 percent increase in automobile radios providing a total of about 8,000,000 radio equipped autos. The number of radio stations, which had remained at about 600 during the previous period, increased as the effects of the Depression eased, and by July 1, 1941, 897 AM stations were operating.\(^2\) During this period the big change in station situation was to be found in the increase of operating power which is most important in extending coverage and dominance in a particular market. The number of 50,000 watt stations doubled by the end of 1941, while about 120 additional stations moved from 1,000 watts to 5,000 watts. Most of this movement occurred in the stations which had been operating for some time while the majority of the 260 new stations operated at 250 watts power or less.\(^3\) Also, the great majority of the more powerful stations were affiliated with CBS or NBC Red or Blue networks. Mutual had twice as many affiliates as any one of the other three networks, but most of these were the less powerful stations in markets which supported four or more stations.

During the war years slight advances took place in all the above conditions. By the end of 1945, radio homes
had increased to about 34,000,000. The number of operating stations rose to about 940 while power increases were granted to only a few. Lack of electronic equipment and materials was the major problem which limited advancement in these areas. By 1937, television claimed seventeen experimental stations, and the FCC set standards for commercial operation by July 1941. Five stations were granted commercial licenses by December 1941, when the war stopped further advancement.

The FCC investigation of network practices, which started in 1938, culminated in a set of "Chain Broadcasting Regulations" in 1941, which received the approval of the Supreme Court in 1943. The most tangible outcome of these regulations was the sale of NBC's Blue network to Edward Noble, a candy manufacturer. The network continued to be called the Blue Network until 1945 when the name was changed to the American Broadcasting Company. Another outcome of these regulations was the relaxation of the restrictive terms of affiliation contracts. This allowed stations to accept some programming from other network organizations. MBS was the benefactor of this ruling, and its expansion allowed the establishment of a network organization and a
Radio revenues from advertising rose tremendously during this period with income more than doubled from 1935 to 1941 at $180,000,000 and then almost doubled again through the war years to $310,000,000 in 1945. During the period to 1941, national spot advertising rose substantially to account for about 25 percent of all revenue. A main portion of this increase could be attributed to a substantial increase in spot announcements on the local stations rather than sponsorship of programs. Network programming allowed almost no participating sponsorship. This practice continued through 1945 with revenues being accumulated from three sources in the following approximate percentages: Network (45%), Local (30%), National Spot (25%). The large increase in revenues during the war years can be attributed to the excess profit tax imposed by the federal government which encouraged advertisers to spend their profits in advertising. Coupled with this was a shortage of newsprint in the print media.

Although most large advertisers had no product to sell, advertising agencies convinced them that "institutional" advertising, to keep their names before the public, would enhance sales after the war. Many large companies
spent huge sums of money in good-will type programming rather than paying it to the government. Although the government was aware of this tactic, there was a dependency upon radio and advertisers to motivate people in the war effort so no action was taken to prevent this drain on taxes. Perhaps this was considered a good investment at the time since commercial radio developed some outstanding public service programs with advertiser money.\textsuperscript{8}

As the industry grew and became more influential the cries of monopoly and criticism of programming became more frequent. However, most of these disturbances were nullified by the organized effort of the NAB, and the feeling by government representatives that the majority of the public was content with the entertainment programming and would oppose any change in the situation. So there was relatively little opposition to industry expansion and accumulation of wealth. In the previous chapter the press-radio war was mentioned which was relatively settled by 1936. In 1937, music became the center of controversy as ASCAP announced that its license fees would be increased from 2 1/8 to 5 percent of station revenues in the next contract period beginning January 1, 1940. The NAB was authorized to set
up a competitive licensing agency and organized Broadcast Music Inc., (BMI) in 1939. For a time during 1941, stations were confined to playing only public domain music as all resisted the ASCAP contract. About this time the Justice Department began to investigate ASCAP activities, so this added pressure contributed to ASCAP's willingness to settle for substantially less than its original demand. But BMI continued to grow providing ASCAP with considerable competition in more recent years.

In 1938, the American Federation of Musicians, headed by James C. Petrillo, forced stations to maintain a quota of musicians as staff members based on station revenues. The Department of Justice declared such contracts illegal since they required networks to refuse program service to stations which did not abide by the quota system. Even without contracts after 1940, the AFM was able to pressure broadcast stations into maintaining staffs of musicians until Congress amended the Communications Act in 1946 specifically outlawing such threats to broadcast stations.

Although no specific session of the Institute concentrated on either the ASCAP or musicians union dispute, Gladstone Murray of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation,
reminded the 1937 Institute that radio must accept the responsibility for support of the arts; for sustaining musicians, composers, authors, and artists, because the introduction of radio had caused drastic changes in these fields.

During this period there was a considerable increase in the amount of network-originated programming. This was particularly evident during the daytime hours where soap operas were poured out at a 75-hour-per-week average during 1939-40. Along with ten hours per week of children's adventure serials, this comprised more than half of all network daytime programming.

The European situation in the late Thirties provided a real life drama which radio communicated more quickly than other news media. Therefore, news programming rose significantly and each network gave birth to a stable of "name" news commentators.

In local radio, participating programs featuring recorded music made their bid for a dominance which they have maintained to this day. During the war there was a clear increase in human interest programming while the trend of replacing live music with recorded music was almost complete. Interview programs and quiz programs saw some increase also
with the local stations using a man-on-the-street format quite frequently. During the war, "ad lib" programs of this type were removed from the air at the suggestion of the government for security reasons. 11

Educational Broadcasting

The year 1936 was the point at which the fortunes of educational broadcasters seemed to improve, according to Harold Hill. 12 The National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB), which was the official voice of the majority of educational broadcast stations, was not particularly enthusiastic about the creation of a Federal Radio Education Committee by the FCC. Erik Barnouw commented about this committee:

Which in turn appointed subcommittees which made studies and began issuing pamphlets about the possibilities of co-operative broadcasting. The activity went on for years. To some it seemed that educators had been skillfully shunted into busy-work. 13

In mid-1936, a committee of the NAEB met to draw up a set of goals. The most important project on the educational broadcasters' minds was to establish a central organization and headquarters to coordinate the activities of the various individual educational stations. Such services as a script and program exchange, duplicating recordings, conducting
surveys, and development of a speakers' bureau could be handled by a central unit. Such a central headquarters was still several years from accomplishment but the demand for it was clearly seen in 1936. The main problem, as usual, was financial. At the time NACRE came forward with a $500 grant to purchase a disc recorder for the NAEB. This recorder was equipped with a shipping case by which it was transported from station to station so that the best programs could be recorded and distributed to other educational stations. W.I. Griffith of Iowa State College, was trying to set up a relay system for recorded program exchange between midwestern stations while Carl Menzer of the University of Iowa was trying to develop short wave transmission as a direct relay system. The NAEB Newsletter was started in 1936 and issued with some degree of regularity by executive secretary, Harold Engel. This was certainly responsible for improvement in exchange of ideas and information.

The NCER, which had been operating for its first five years on a $200,000 grant from the Payne Fund, had to make some operating changes in 1936 to adapt to the changing conditions of educational broadcasting. The NCER had been most active in promoting maintenance of separate educational
broadcasting facilities and encouraging establishment of more such facilities. The 1935 actions of the FCC influenced the members to consider more cooperative efforts with commercial stations. The Payne Fund approved additional funds but they were considerably reduced from the previous grant. The Service Bureau in Washington was discontinued, and the offices of the NCER were moved from Washington to New York. The bulletin Education by Radio was continued, as were various activities in which the organization could encourage educational broadcasting by being spokesman for educational organizations, and coordinator of research and program improvement.

The plan which A.G. Crane had presented to the FCC in 1935 and outlined in the previous chapter was altered somewhat. The first point of that plan was the establishment of a number of national, regional, and state boards or councils to prepare programs to be broadcast on federally owned stations. Neither the FCC nor the commercial broadcaster was disposed to consider favorably a national government broadcast operation. This part of the plan was dropped in 1936 in lieu of the councils being agencies which would broadcast from the available commercial and educational stations. Activities to organize a council in Texas were
pursued, and a more ambitious regional council, The Rocky Mountain Council, was conceived and developed in 1937-38. On December 23, 1939, this Council produced and presented its first program. With fifteen radio stations soon carrying the broadcasts of this Council, it met considerable success and proved that the council plan of the NCER would work.

The idea of training teachers in the use of radio began to be accepted practice in this period. In the fall of 1935, the Ohio Radio Workshop, an intensive training program, was started at Ohio University by Meredith Page, former program director of WOR. The success of this workshop spread quickly and, soon afterwards, the Federal Radio Project established workshops in Washington, D.C., and cooperatively with New York University in its Manhattan experiment. Soon workshops were started at several universities throughout the country. The number of colleges and universities offering radio instruction increased tremendously by 1940.

The encouragement of the FCC was beginning to bear fruit as both educators and commercial broadcasters worked toward improving educational programming. The various educational and broadcast organizations of the nation worked
with the American Council on Education to hold national conferences on educational broadcasting in 1936 at Washington, D.C., and 1937 in Chicago. Both of these conferences had more representation on a national and international level than any conference before.  

The 1938 NAEB convention in Lexington, Kentucky, heard Maurice M. Jansky, radio consultant explain that many educational stations would be required to change frequencies because of the recently ratified North American Regional Broadcast Agreement. He said this would be a good opportunity to get a better frequency and more power, and also encouraged the investigation of FM allocations. The FCC held further hearings on the ultra-high frequency band and FM broadcasting in March 1940, and reserved five of the forty FM channels for educational non-commercial stations. In February 1941, WBOE, licensed by the Cleveland Board of Education, changed from AM to one of these reserved FM channels. They had been experimenting with this type of transmission for over two years.

The war called a halt to physical expansion but there was much talk about preparing to enter the FM field after the war. Chairman of the FCC James L. Fly, in a speech before
the executive committee of the Federal Radio Education Committee in September 1943, urged educators to be prepared to use the channel allocations which have been reserved. He had delivered a similar message to the Institute audience in May 1943. Subsequently, the NAEB requested ten additional channels to be reserved. This request was sent to John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of Education, who forwarded it to the FCC. After hearings in October 1944, the FCC responded by reserving twenty out of the 100 FM channels designated in early 1945.

At Purdue University, the September 1942 NAEB convention formalized a script exchange service under Nat Erwin of WILL, University of Illinois. This was the start of the National Educational Radio Tape Network which continued to operate from the University of Illinois until 1969 when it was moved to the NAEB headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Federal Government

The FCC, as the official representatives of federal authority in the broadcasting field, quickly established its interest in promoting education by radio. The Federal Radio Education Committee, established in May 1935, began to encourage cooperative efforts between educators and commercial
broadcasters.

The FCC was continually under pressure from Congress whose members did not seem to be satisfied with anything the FCC was doing. During the first seven years of its existence, eleven different resolutions were introduced in the House and Senate to subject it to formal investigation. This was, perhaps, the normal plight of such an agency, but it certainly did not help the FCC to achieve the many tasks demanded of it by the tremendously expanding communications industry. Nevertheless, the FCC devised ways of keeping the worst excesses from developing. With only one formal penalty at its disposal, removal of the license, the FCC was confined to using this penalty only in most extreme cases. But the time and expense of a formal hearing in Washington was a definite penalty to the broadcaster. The threat of such a hearing became known as regulation by the raised eyebrow.

After many years of castigation by Congress for not protecting the industry against monopolization, the FCC authorized an investigation of network practices on March 18, 1938. This investigation continued through 1940 and led to the "FCC Report on Chain Broadcasting" in May 1941, with specific restrictive network regulations. These regulations were vigorously challenged in court until the U.S.
Supreme Court issued the famous Felix Frankfurter opinion on May 10, 1943, upholding the legality of the regulations.  

During the majority of this network investigation, James L. Fly was the chairman of the FCC who carried through the investigation to the end in spite of the frequent and, sometimes, venomous attacks of the broadcast industry. No less than five resolutions to investigate the FCC were introduced in Congress during this period as various Senators and Representatives expressed the tremendous lobbying pressures that the broadcasting industry could muster.

In 1939, the Mayflower Broadcasting Corporation contested the license of WAAB in Boston on grounds that the license carried personal editorials for causes and candidates he favored. The result of the investigation by the FCC was known as the Mayflower Decision which indicated "the public interest can never be served by a dedication of any broadcasting facility to the licensee's own partisan ends.... A broadcaster cannot be an advocate." For the next eight years, this opinion by the Commission was to be under constant attack by broadcasters.

Although the Federal Radio Education Committee was attempting to promote cooperation between educators and
commercial broadcasters, they did not receive funds to conduct much needed studies until 1938. These studies covered a four to five year period\(^34\) so that the most effective impact of this committee was not felt until 1940 and beyond.

The U.S. Office of Education was active during these years primarily in consolidation and distribution of information. Commissioner of Education, John W. Studebaker reported his analysis of activities at the 1937 Institute:

The responsibility of the Federal government for educational broadcasting falls within at least three areas: to safeguard the use of radio frequencies to insure the maximum of public service; to use radio to acquaint the public with the work of the government; and to keep the public posted concerning the services it should expect of radio, and to persuade and assist broadcasters to provide those services.\(^35\)

Pursuing this principle, Commissioner Studebaker appealed to the FCC on June 15, 1936 "that a minimum of three megacycles be reserved for the exclusive use of local school systems for services in addition to those which they could normally expect commercial radio stations to perform."\(^36\) On January 27, 1938, the FCC formally reserved twenty-five channels in the ultra-high frequency band for non-profit organizations.\(^37\) These frequencies were not yet sufficiently explored for immediate use but the reservations precedent had been set. It wasn't until 1945, when twenty channels of the FM band
were reserved, that educators had a useful and practical course of action.

Under its responsibility to use radio to acquaint the public with the work of the government, the Office of Education secured emergency funds to launch the Federal Radio Project which was responsible for production of several network series of highest quality. This project also established a radio script exchange and conducted a number of teacher workshops.

The Institute

Planning

A manual of procedure for conducting the Institute was found to contain information updating the procedure through 1939. Other material indicated that this procedure was followed throughout the remaining years of this period and much of the following period. This manual provided the following schedule of activities which explains how various planning policies were pursued.

1. Immediately after the Institute, mail out requests for reactions from all participants who registered. This is the "post mortem" letter.
2. Two to four weeks after the Institute, hold a Planning Committee meeting to analyze the past Institute.

3. Six months before the Institute, send questionnaire forms out for suggestions for speakers and topics.

4. Five months before the Institute, the Planning Committee should meet again to plan the tentative program (specifically speakers, topics and format).

5. At least four months before the Institute, major speakers should be invited. No honorarium is paid except in unusual circumstances. If such is required, it will be computed at pullman train fare plus $10 per day for every day away from home.

6. About five weeks before the Institute send a reminder to speakers about the date when a manuscript of the speech is due. Also include a reminder that the maximum time for speeches is twenty minutes. Whenever necessary, a request for a picture should be included.

The manual also noted that pictures and copies of speeches should be sent to the New York Times and Broadcasting whenever possible. Another entry indicated that about 3,000 preliminary program announcements were sent out in 1936 and 4,000 were sent in each of the years 1937, 1938,
During these years three types of concurrent meetings were used: (1) Work-Study, (2) Special Problems, and (3) Round-Table Discussions. A basic approach to planning these meetings was developed which was recorded in the following manner:

1. The chairman selected by the committee is responsible for all arrangements of that particular meeting.

2. Secure topics and resource people in advance and indicate to resource people specifically what you want and when you expect it from them.

3. A maximum of six resource people should be used for any single session meeting.

4. The chairman should prepare a very brief statement of problems to be covered in the meeting.

5. A secretary is to be selected who will keep a detailed summary of the meeting.

6. A three minute summary of contributions of the group is to be prepared for presentation to the entire Institute on the final day.

From 1938 through 1944 the official program announced the purpose of the Institute in the following fashion:
Its purpose is to provide an annual meeting for joint discussion by broadcasters and educators of the problems of educational broadcasting. The program is devoted chiefly to a consideration of techniques of education by radio. The Institute passes no resolutions.44

The 1941 program added "civic leaders" as a group to the wording after "joint discussion," while the 1943 program added "program policies" after "techniques." Until 1938, no announced purpose of the Institute had been printed in the program since the first Institute in 1930. No records of committee discussion were found so I can only speculate that some concern over the function of the Institute had been expressed. This was the first official statement regarding resolutions and thus, there is an assumption that some people wanted to see the Institute become more active in expressing opinions as a group. The next chapter will find this matter discussed more thoroughly.

The five administrative policies, discussed in Chapter II, which governed all planning, continued to be implemented in the following manner.

The first policy of keeping informed on current issues and problems as well as the second policy of keeping a broad geographic and cultural scope were pursued through the feedback from each year's participants. The feedback was accomplished by the post mortem letter and other contacts which
are indicated above in the discussion of the manual. Explicit records of the post mortem letter were not found except for the years 1941, 1942, and 1943. Compilations of responses prepared for the Program Committees of those years showed the great majority of criticism concerned the operation of the Institute rather than the material presented. Only occasional suggestions of different topics were found while there were many compliments on the relevancy of topics discussed. This type of response would indicate that current issues of a broad scope were being discussed. There was no indication in the records concerning how geographically representative the responses to the post mortem were. However, the attendance figures give us some idea of possible representation. These figures indicate a gradual rise in state representation but very little international representation. Of course, the most active countries in developing radio were also those most involved in the war. It must be noted that, even with the tremendous jump in attendance in 1944, over half of the participants came from the home state of Ohio. Perhaps the travel restrictions may have affected the 1944 Institute, but this same phenomena occurred in 1934, 1939, and 1948 which were the only other
years in that era analyzed on this criterion. Therefore, I would consider the scope of representation on a geographical basis somewhat weak in the Southwest and far Western United States.

The composition of the Program Committee itself provided another gauge for accomplishment of these first two policies since the breadth of representation expanded somewhat during this period. In 1936, I. Keith Tyler, of the Bureau of Educational Research replaced the deceased F. Hillis Lumley as secretary of the Institute and was moved to the new position of executive secretary in 1939. The Program Committee remained composed entirely of university faculty and staff until Karl Berns, assistant secretary for field services of the Ohio Education Association was appointed in 1939.

For the 1940 Institute an innovation on the Program Committee occurred with the inclusion of the program directors of two local commercial stations. This practice continued for every Institute through 1951 with representation varying from two to four stations. The 1942 Institute initiated the long and prosperous directorship of I. Keith Tyler, while W.W. Charters retired to the background as honorary director,
a position he retained until his death on March 8, 1952.

It appears that in early years, although Charters was in complete control, he depended upon active participation from members of the Program Committee for implementation of plans. The several changes in the 1939 Program Committee marked the beginning of a changing function for the committee itself from total participation to activity as an advisory board. This allowed the final decisions and implementations to remain in the hands of the officers, Charters, Tyler, and Ralls.

The third of the administrative policies, concentrating on the techniques of broadcasting, was followed very thoroughly. It was probably the single most valuable function of the Institute in this period.

Almost as important was the contribution which the Institute made in the field of research consolidation. The years 1939, 1943, and 1944 were strong in this area, while 1936, 1938, and 1942 were weak on this fourth policy aim.

The fifth policy, that of providing a friendly atmosphere for exchange of ideas, seemed to be quite successful according to the response received from participants at the 1941, 1942, and 1943 Institutes. Apparently, it was
found most convenient to hold the evening concurrent discussion group meetings downtown at a hotel. This occurred for the 1936, 1937, and 1938 Institutes. However, as the concurrent meeting idea expanded, so did the number of meetings held downtown as opposed to the campus. By 1941 the entire Institute was held in a downtown hotel. In 1940, when the majority of meetings were held at the downtown hotel, a registration fee was initiated.

The financial situation of the Institute must be considered quite respectable with regard to the amount and importance of the activity during this period. Although records are not complete, enough information is available to ascertain a close approximation of the financial situation. Through half of this period no registration was charged but when the Institute was moved off the campus a registration fee was necessary to offset the additional expenses of hotel accommodations for meeting rooms. Records indicate that the years 1939 through 1944 showed a profit of over $1,200. The total loss on conducting the exhibition during those years was about $20. The loss on the Annual Dinner totaled about $190. Over the years 1940 through 1944, the Payne Fund contributed $1,000 while various departments and funds of the
Ohio State University contributed another $2,000. If the contributions are removed and the 1940 profits carried forward, the Institute can be seen to have run $1,350 short of supporting its activities with the fee charges. By 1944 the fees amounted to $4.00 for registration and $2.75 for the Annual Dinner.

The Program

Throughout this period the Institute was held each year in the first week of May with an expansion from three to four days in 1942. The location of the Institute meetings gradually shifted from the campus to a downtown hotel with the shift completed by the 1941 Institute.

Format changes occurred every year but most were minor accommodations to facilitate a smoother and more convenient operation. A major trend was the increase in concurrent small group sessions with resultant decrease in the major speaker general sessions. The round-table discussions were re-established in 1936 and a group of concurrent special-problems sessions were also instituted. In 1938, two additional sessions were converted to concurrent work-study meetings.
A format change in the 1937 Institute was the initiation of the American Exhibition of Recordings of Educational Radio Programs. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the forerunner of this exhibition began at the 1934 Institute. W.W. Charters' introduction to the 1937 exhibit explains the situation:

About three years ago, the idea occurred to us that it might be worth while to have recordings of excellent educational programs broadcast, either from the educational stations or commercial stations, submitted to a board of expert judges for appraisal. So that we might have examples of the best recordings and the best programs, we asked the advice of Miss Waller and several other experienced broadcasters, and discussed with them the possibility of such an undertaking. We prepared the rules which they deemed necessary for the guidance of such an evaluation. During the next year we had some correspondence with the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, but did not get the matter under actual operation. Last autumn we sent out our publicity materials and in response received ninety-five records, representing all classes of educational broadcasts.54

This American Exhibition continued to grow in volume and prestige with each succeeding year. The 1938 Institute initiated an audition room where all the recordings submitted that year could be heard on request throughout the days of the Institute.

In addition to the Institute activities, a practice of many related organizations was to hold some meetings as
a group while attending the Institute. Therefore, a number of allied group meetings began to occupy the time before and after the Institute as well as lunch periods during the Institute. Both the NAB and NAEB were granted Special Interest meeting periods within the Institute itself while all other groups had to arrange plans around the Institute sessions. The 1940 Institute, which first started holding the majority of its meetings in the hotel, also listed, in the printed program, the meetings which were being held by affiliated groups. The activities of other groups were extensive by 1944. Fourteen groups had one or more separate meetings in conjunction with the Institute that year.

In 1937 the program invited informal exhibits from any organization who wished it. The exchange of materials (pamphlets and brochures, etc.) was also encouraged by provision of display space for such materials, and a notice of such availability placed in the program.

The program for the 1941 Institute changed typography considerably presenting a booklet which had about one-third larger pages. Much more information about the activities and resource people at each session including the general session was noted. Both the Work-Study meetings and the
Special Interest meetings listed the various topics to be discussed and all participants which had indicated they would attend. This appeared to be a method of combating the inevitable problem of retaining a friendly, casual atmosphere while the attendance was increasing rapidly.

An initiation meeting for newcomers was started in 1941. This introduction to the Institute was presented the evening before the opening session. In 1942, and thereafter, this activity was changed to an informal tea held in the late afternoon before the opening session which occurred that evening. In 1942, a press room was provided for the working press who covered the Institute. A wire service and other accommodations were also provided.

Another innovation was the demonstration of network programs by actually presenting them in general sessions of the Institute. These sessions demonstrated popular radio discussion programs of the day. Even the network moderators of these programs conducted the session at the Institute so the techniques of the program were observed while the content was also a matter of importance to the members. The symposium technique was used as was the reaction panel idea. The technique of handling the presentation of information in an
interesting fashion was being demonstrated in addition to the content of the session itself.

During this period a count was recorded of the attendance at various concurrent meetings. A record of how this count was made was not found but it could be no more than a close approximation since it was not uncommon for members to visit several meetings during the course of one session.

Over the five year period from 1940 through 1944, some basic trends can be detected in the attendance figures. The second day of the Work-Study sessions usually witnessed a slight reduction in attendance. The Work-Study meetings usually attracted more people than either Special Interest or Round-Table discussions. In the five years, no concurrent group meeting attracted more than 19 percent of the total registration except for the Arch Obler Round-Table on Dramatic Programs in 1941, which polled 36 percent of the registration. This is not to be confused with the general session of the following year in which Obler and Norman Corwin discussed dramatic programs. The former was actually a combination of three Round-Tables and cannot be considered typical of the Institute. Relatively few topics were carried for five years on a concurrent meeting basis. Most of those
that were, seemed to decline in popularity in succeeding years. However, "Religious Broadcasting" managed to gain, probably because of the war. "The Negro in Radio" increased in popularity after its introduction in 1941, while "Agriculture and Homemaking" decreased through 1942 but regained interest in 1943 and 1944. Again the war might have affected this interest.

The general attendance figures for this period were definitely increasing every year with the average attendance for this period amounting to 530. The years 1939, 1941, and 1942 saw the greatest increases, almost 100 per year over the previous year until 1944. There was a definite question whether the 1944 Institute should be held. The program of the 1944 Institute expressed the problem thusly:

It was no easy decision to hold the Fifteenth Institute for Education by Radio in the midst of a critical war situation. The problem was raised in the final Institute session last year, the Director pointing out the probable difficulties and the burden that such a conference would throw upon public transportation. The members voted unanimously that the 1944 conference should be held, if possible, because of the importance of the Institute in enabling radio to do a significant job in total war. In a letter sent to Institute members during the summer, the problem was again raised and the difficulties cited. Again the response was overwhelming in declaring the essential nature of the Institute in the war situation.
There was also an indication that several other conferences, which normally would be held individually, were cancelled because of the war thus meetings were arranged in conjunction with the Institute. The total attendance rose 430 which was the biggest jump in the Institute history. The Institute had "arrived," so to speak, as representatives of thirty-nine states and two foreign countries indicated, by their attendance, the importance of the Institute. The one break in the long Institute history of consecutive annual meetings occurred in 1945. A situation similar to the 1944 problem had to be faced for the 1945 Institute. Although the transportation difficulties remained, the war situation had changed sufficiently so that an Institute was not considered to be necessary. Since the 1944 Institute, the invasion of Europe had succeeded and defeat of Hitler was assured. If the Institute had been held in 1945 it quite likely would have been in session when the surrender of Germany was announced.

The records of publication of Education On The Air during this period and the next period were partial and difficult to interpret in a cumulative way. On an average, about seventy-five complimentary copies were sent out each
year. Available records indicate approximately 600 copies were printed each year with about 800 in 1942 and 1,000 in 1943 and 1944. An inventory count in 1956 showed the following number of books still available: 1936--62, 1937--72, 1938--51, 1939--16, 1940-1944--0. The policy through 1939 was to charge $3.00 per copy. In 1940 a registration fee of $3.00 was required but this included a copy of the yearbook. 1941-43, found the registration fee raised to $3.50 but allowed participants to pay $2.00 if they specifically requested not to receive the yearbook. In 1944 a $4.00 registration fee was imposed with a $2.50 charge for registration without the yearbook.

Content Summary

Although the FCC made a stronger effort than the FRC had in enforcing public service programming on the commercial stations, the quality and effectiveness of such programs was not a concern. As a result, the networks and local stations encouraged production of more interesting and stimulating programs but provided very little initiative in developing effective educational programming. The educator had to learn the business of radio showmanship, and Institute
sessions on techniques became the primary source of this information. Although the networks contributed some notable examples of good discussion programs; and, in later years, during the war, provided some extraordinary instances of motivational drama; educators were seeking local programming capability for both in-school and adult education.

C.L. Menser of NBC voiced the immediate problems of broadcast education when he presented a demonstration of contrasts in techniques for education on the last day of the 1936 Institute. He urged the audience to search out better ways of presenting, by radio, material which was to be used in education. He emphasized: (1) Single person talks should be much more concerned with the personality of the speaker as reflected through the voice. (2) Contrast in vocal qualities is very important to the dialogue program where two or three people are involved at the microphone. (3) Music and sound effects must be used more in all types of presentations. (4) The dramatization is the most difficult but also the most effective means of presenting information.

W.W. Charters emphasized the need and tendency toward specialization in various areas of educational broadcasting while a report on the British system urged specialization and
teacher cooperation. Levering Tyson also noted an encouraging trend toward recognizing a distinction between the problems of school broadcasting and general adult education.

The 1937 Institute noted the emergence of the instructional workshop as a matter of national discussion and experimentation. This method of training people for broadcasting reflected the need for specialization, and the Institute devoted several sessions to functions and activities of workshops.

An innovation of the 1937 Institute was the designation of awards for outstanding educational broadcasts. As will be discussed later, the judges were very disappointed in the quality of programs submitted to this first annual event. Of the ninety-five separate programs, totaling thirty-nine hours of broadcast time, which were submitted, only two programs received first awards and only seven other programs were given honorable mention.

The following year, the quality of programs improved considerably and a normal compliment of awards were given in the various categories. The Ohio State Awards, as it later came to be known, continues today to be one of the premiere program competitions in the country.
S.E. Frost Jr., of NACRE, gave a brief preview of a book he was preparing for publication, and his statement called forth a response from educational broadcasters which indicated a strong determination to survive commercial interest pressure. In a historical account of educational stations from 1921 through 1936, Frost reminded the Institute that the great majority of educational station failures were due to lack of interest and lack of adequate financial resources rather than any government animosity or commercial pressure. He then spoke of the thirty-eight remaining educational stations as examples of the function of educational stations:

Such stations are finding they are not competitors of commercial stations, but necessary and indispensable parts of the American broadcast structure, doing a work that commercial stations, because of the very fact that they are commercial, are unable to do.70

In the discussion following Frost's speech, Mr. Evans, of NCER, pointed out that problems of educational stations emanated largely from a philosophy of broadcasting developed and endorsed by the federal government. This philosophy was one of commercial competition in which educational functions were merely being tolerated rather than accepted and encouraged. Frost recognized that the American system of
broadcasting was accepted as a commercial venture since the early Twenties.

That afternoon, Harold B. McCarty, president of NAEB, reiterated the need for educational stations. Comparing radio frequencies to other natural resources, he recalled the American tendency to allow exploitation and squandering of all our natural resources: "Public good and private gain just do not go hand in hand indefinitely." He cautioned that if American broadcasting is to develop in the public interest, it must have a sanctuary free of interference from the profit motive:

We have, then these reasons for championing the cause of the educational broadcasting stations: First, the experience of the past demonstrates the wisdom of preventing unlimited exploitation of public resources; second, we must provide for perfect freedom of educational communications; third, there is no guaranty of adequate time and permanence for education over commercial stations; and fourth, educational stations contribute definite social values resulting from the training of personnel and the cultivation of critical tastes.71

The 1939 Institute initiated the practice of demonstrating the technique of network discussion programs by actually producing the programs before the audience at the Institute.

Several new topics which had not been discussed in formal session before were introduced in 1941. Children's
programs, women's organizations and a session on "Radio in Negro Education" were the more prominent new topics.

At the 1943 Institute, FCC Chairman, James L. Fly expressed satisfaction with radio's activity during the war. He noted that educational programs were reflecting the demand of listeners for showmanship techniques and commercial radio was realizing the demand of listeners for understanding. He expressed more faith in the educational effect of all broadcasting than any effect of specialized radio, and concluded with the suggestion that educators plan now for the use of the new technical innovations of TV and FM after the war. 72

The general session of the 1944 Institute mainly considered problems of a post-war society without direct reference to how radio could help solve these problems. Agricultural broadcasting had always been strongly represented at the Institute with several presentations and discussions. Many educational institutions initiated and supported stations on the basis of agricultural extension services to the state.

During the 1944 Institute, an organizational meeting of the National Association of Radio Farm Directors was held.
This organization was born through the special interest meetings of the Institute.

Major Issues

The major issues of the previous period were somewhat altered after 1935, and the search for radio's functions in education became more focused as the Second World War approached. The issue of station operation by educational institutions was cooled considerably by the FCC edict of 1935. With only forty-two educational stations remaining in operation by 1935, and a further reduction to thirty-eight by the end of 1936, attention was focused on education through commercial stations. Radio as a cultural and informational agency became the issue of importance. As the war approached and news became more important, the handling of information was a hot issue. Although many session of the Institute continued to explore methods of instructional broadcasting to the schools, general adult education by cultural and informational programming was the major concern of this period. Discussion of this issue was relatively broad in the early years of this period. As we shall see, it started with a definition of Educational Broadcasting.
A number of experiments had demonstrated that instructional programs had a limited audience appeal which the commercial stations were not interested in programming. How could educational presentations by popularized sufficiently without losing their function as education? The adult home audience for which Levering Tyson had been aiming so long was now the target of more concentrated concern by educational broadcasters. After a reassessment of education for the masses, the 1938 Institute began to show signs of the problem most prominent through 1945—the role of radio as an agency of information.

The responsibility for an informed electorate which Millikan had identified at the 1935 Institute began to find a response in both educational and commercial broadcasters.

Radio's Educational Function

The first general session of the 1936 Institute found W.W. Charters attempting to define an educational program. A task which, he readily admitted, was unable to be accomplished at a recent meeting of the Federal Radio Education Committee. In 1932, Charters had proposed a definition which he now wanted to change only slightly. Instead of a program
which purposes (sic) to raise standards, he would substitute "one which raises" so that the definition would read, "An educational program is one which raises standards of taste, increases the range of valuable information or stimulates audiences to undertake worthwhile activities." He further explained this definition by stating that the identification of an educational program does not involve consideration of the origin of that program but of the quality of the program:

Certain recreational programs may be more educative than so-called educational ones because they represent high types of artistry. Excellent programs are always educational.75

The reaction panel consisted of four experienced workers in the field of educational broadcasting. Carl Menzer, State University of Iowa, and Cline Koon, U.S. Office of Education, indicated that any definition must include the fact that the intention or purpose of the program must be to educate. S. Howard Evans, of NCER, interpreted Charters definition as an acceptance of the principles that we must judge a program on its use by the listener rather than on its intention by the broadcaster. If the result of the reception by the listener is what is usually accepted as an educational experience, then the program is educational.
However, he suggested that some provision for the protection of the auspices and control of educational programs would have to be made in the interest of the listener. He explained the necessity of this provision arose from the fact that radio does not separate the programs from the source of their support; thus advertising and education are intermingled. He suggested that the appointment of the Federal Radio Education Committee was based on this problem of the handling of control of educational programs. Charters agreed that some social control would be necessary in educational programming.

Mr. Lester W. Parker of the National Council of Teachers of English was the most eloquent dissenter of the definition. He did not think that merely giving information was education nor that quality was any measure for education. Indeed, by whose standards should the program be judged, he asked. He agreed that most educators believe education and recreation often overlap, but felt it was going too far to assume that a recreational program is educational if its quality is excellent. An educational program must be defined in terms of kind as well as quality, and that commonly accepted standards as to what is or is not educational can be applied:
It seems fairly certain that educational uses of broad-casting will be found, not in the field of stereotyped or formal instruction, but in those wider areas of education which are as broad as life itself.

I certainly am not pleading for a limitation of the scope of education--by radio or otherwise--but I am protesting against the use of the term "educational" in connection with broadcasting to designate things which are not otherwise accepted as educational. I doubt if we can make mere information or entertainment educational, however accurate or excellent it may be, just by calling it so when it is broadcast.76

The majority of those in the audience who responded with statements, agreed with Charters that education is anything that causes improvement in an individual and that is a matter of individual personal response. A.G. Crane, of NCER, would have the term educational changed to "socially valuable" as a more proper description of what educational broadcasters are attempting to accomplish.

That evening at a discussion of educational broad-casting from commercial stations, Mr. Miller of the University of Chicago, stated that the ultimate educational goal through radio was stimulation of interest in a general field, and the final test of a good educational broadcast was whether it had stirred someone to further investigation of the subject presented. Mr. Bartlett, of Syracuse University mentioned the importance of timeliness in developing interest of the audience, and referred to current events programs or comment
on the day's happenings as the most popular programs.\(^7^7\)

The Institute was considering the much broader spectrum of adult or mass education on a cultural and informational level. Charters had advised back in 1930 that the major use of radio may be found in developing interest rather than imparting information. Now it appeared that you could develop interest by imparting information; for news programs were definitely developing public interest, although the information might have been of questionable educational value. However, concern for this type of broadcast was definitely shown when an entire day of the 1936 Institute was devoted to techniques of script writing with two of the six clinics being conducted by network newsmen, Edward R. Murrow and Hans V. Kaltenborn.

Philo M. Buck of the University of Wisconsin, reminded the audience of the dangers of abundance and competition. He recalled a recent statement of a network official:

His conclusion was that when programs are thus listened to hour after hour, they leave little trace on the memory. Indeed, one can go further and say that a long continued series of programs, unassorted as they are, and "ballyhooed" by irrelevancies, cannot fail to have a demoralizing effect--sometimes not unlike intellectual indigestion. People must be trained.\(^7^8\)

He stated that radio is not best suited to give detailed
information but has a unique advantage in the private intimacy of its voice. Radio is the art of informal conversation.

In 1931, William Cooper had cited the tendency toward passive acceptance of radio content, and Gladstone Murray of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation again referred to this tendency to passivity in 1937. The earlier discussion revolved around a dependance on the response of the listener; and now, there was the suggestion that the response might be one of forgetting. Perhaps this is not as bad as no response; but certainly, if any educational value accrued, it would be subliminal and impossible to assess or control. However, Murray suggested that a hopeful sign of combating this tendency was the organization of discussion groups and debating societies related to series of talks on subjects of current interest. As if in response to this movement, the Institute held demonstrations of all the major network discussion programs in the next several years.

Levering Tyson contributed his annual opinions to the effect that study and experimentation in the uses of radio for education had been meager in the past five years. However, he found great encouragement in the fact that an
important distinction was beginning to be made between the problems of school broadcasting and the problems of general education. He felt that both areas were important fields of exploration but had to be approached separately.  

Gladstone Murray opened the 1937 Institute with some comments on radio and national culture. He described the measure of culture as the degree in which the individual is capable of practicing the art of harmonious living by understanding where to acquire knowledge and how to weld it into balanced proportions. This also demands of the individual that he is "able to appraise values and to apply, both to the functions of citizenship and to individual conduct, a sense of proportion." He believed that the universality and intimacy of radio could develop this level of cultured citizenship, but it would take long term planning and an effort by both commercial and educational stations. Basically, he was calling for the quality in programming on commercial stations which Charters had referred to in his speech of the previous year. As mentioned earlier, he wanted debating societies and discussion groups to be set up in local communities in response to active radio discussion. However, his confidence in radio's ability to generate this cultural
citizenship was based on some type of active regulation:

Our principal endeavor should be to provide active discussion to make broadcasting the free forum of national opinion. This task should not be left to the caprices of some commercial enterprise; it should be regulated.83

The banquet speaker, U.S. Commissioner of Education, John W. Studebaker, gave Murray and the audience some hope that the federal government would lean toward more cultural and educational responsibilities from commercial broadcasters. Broadcasting magazine reprinted the entire speech with the headline "Studebaker sees government's duty including operation of stations, keeping commercial stations on toes."84 Looking expansively at the role of radio, Studebaker believed it would effect the scope and progress and education with results as revolutionary as those caused by the printing press. Perhaps he was envisioning the same potential for radio that Levering Tyson had in 1931. Then he turned to the future responsibilities of the federal government. He saw no reason why the network system which allows for quality programs to sell a product should be denied for promoting information, education, and culture. He saw the future educational needs demanding the more widespread use of broadcasting:
The future undoubtedly will bring increasingly critical examination of the performance of the radio industry with special reference to its service in behalf of the people's "interest, convenience, and necessity." Without question, also, the public will increasingly feel that the broadcasting industry is not properly fulfilling its obligation to the people's "interest, convenience, and necessity," in direct proportion as educational broadcasting finds it necessary to continue to take its chances in the confusion and irregularities of an unsystematic, uncoordinated scheme of rampant individualism of networks and stations. At present, we face a situation in which there is no planned program that guarantees certainty of sustained coverage for those programs designated to spread knowledge and create social understanding.

As long as it is generally understood that the airways belong to the people and the right to use them can be taken away by the people's agency of government as easily as the right is given, we may expect careful consideration of the meaning of "public interest, convenience, and necessity" by the broadcasters and the general public alike. I consider it one of the responsibilities of government to keep that sense of ownership fresh and clear in the minds of the people. That is one of the positive methods of exemplifying the principle that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."85

Undoubtedly, this stirred some deep thought in commercial broadcasting circles.

The report of the three judges of the First American Exhibition of Recordings of Educational Radio Programs indicated not only the problems of educational programs but also the frank criticism which could be expected of this exhibition in the future. A portion of that report stated:
After listening carefully, and by no means unsympathetically, we are forced to a conclusion that the general standard of educational broadcasting, as represented by the recordings submitted, is regrettably inadequate.

The limitations of the programs entered in this contest may illustrate certain limitations of radio as an educational instrument, or they may illustrate only the inability of those who use radio for educational purposes to realize its full possibilities. If the inadequacies of these programs lie in the limitations of radio, then further experiment is indicated to discover what type of educational broadcast, both in content and in method, has fewest limitations. If the fault lies in lack of skill on the part of the broadcaster, there is much work ahead for workshops in developing new techniques. It is suggested that in doing so, experimenters employ factors in learning far beyond those implied in "showmanship." The laws of learning have changed but little from the beginning of time.... What broadcasters call showmanship, and what educators have long called interest, is only one of these principles.86

In the opening session of the 1938 Institute, Boyd Bode, professor of education at Ohio State University countered the statement that the public is becoming better informed with the observation that the public is being "swamped" with information but not enlightenment. He said this comes about because the cultural heritage upon which we base our beliefs has become a collection of absolutes which add up to contradictory beliefs. As an example, the ideas of individual freedom, justice, and property rights all could be carried to the point of neutralizing each other. Therefore, the various arguments on any subject could appeal to some
element of our tradition and merely, at best, neutralize the audience. Bode suggested the necessity of approaching the whole question of informing the public from a different direction and with a different purpose. He continued that the American public must first of all realize that, in spite of the tremendous extension of education, we have lost our sense of direction. Then we must have some indication of the direction we must go if we are to remain a democratic people in an interdependent world. He then added:

The emphasis for democracy in a modern world, it seems to me, is on the extension of common interests, common concerns, common purposes among men, and the implication of democracy in the twentieth century is that that is the proper test for progress.87

Finally, he suggested the way that radio could approach the problem was to point out the contradictions in our cultural heritage which lead to this loss of direction. Perhaps radio could identify contradiction so that the audience could understand the choices in any particular argument.

Following the presentation, a panel of six educators and broadcasters discussed the problem. The discussion soon centered on the point of how far radio should go in prescribing. Bode insisted that merely presenting the various arguments on an issue was not enough; that the various arguments all call upon our cultural heritage and tradition
for support. Since we support a contradictory heritage, the various arguments will only paralyze and neutralize the public. Bode argued that the reasons behind the contradiction and neutralization must be pointed out. The consensus seemed to be that radio might try to stimulate an intellectual reaction rather than an emotional reaction to problems.

Two suggested ways of presentation would be the round-table discussion and the commentary by an individual who presented the issues dispassionately and clearly. In a speech two days later, Robert Stephan, radio editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, mentioned that forums or panel discussions have been shown to be a lively way to provide some popular education by radio. However, he felt that dramatic stories were the best way to reach the general public:

The Chicago Round Table has been successful in reaching the upper strata of intelligence with its programs. America's Town Meeting goes deeper into the mass audience. Education, however, has not yet built a forum which will reach the lower twenty million of the one hundred thirty million potential dialers in this country--and these twenty million listeners are the ones that need radio in education the most.88

He also felt more specific needs of education could be satisfied by short wave broadcasting and the use of recordings.

The 1939 Institute took the opportunity of demonstrating the technique of the University of Chicago Round-Table
broadcasts by using that format to discuss "The Place of Radio in a Democracy." The three panelists were professors at the University of Chicago. They agreed that a democracy must develop some common loyalties which give the society cohesion, and a democracy must also develop a critical attitude toward these loyalties that keeps them alive and relevant. The discussion revealed that radio's ability to reach many people, over great distances with an emotional content unavailable to print, particularly suited it to developing the loyalties. This is similar to the role asked of radio by Bode in the previous year. However, they noted, in the area of critical attitude, radio like newspapers tended to see controversy as two-sided rather than many-sided and the tendency was to reinforce the status quo. Also there was the tendency of emphasizing the less important things in life with the trivial subject matter of entertainment programming, which consumed the most intense listening periods. There was recognition that radio, as most large institutions, tends to be cautious; and advertisers err on the side of the innocuous and banal. Opinions expressed by audience members indicated that inadequate information was available to determine what the public actually wants in program content; that
experimentation must be allowed; but that the confidence of
the public would be lost if there were any concerted effort
to lead people toward something they did not want.

T.V. Smith closed with a strong plea to educators to
learn how to present ideas, and that broadcasters could teach
educators much in those techniques. I presume that this
was a reference to the still prevalent need to make educa­
tional programs interesting and use more showmanship.

This emphasis on seeing controversy as two-sided and
tendencies to maintain a status quo were major weaknesses of
broadcasting which stirred some comment during this period,
but the war kept this criticism at a minimum. At a round­
table discussion entitled "Handling Controversial Issues" in
1939, Seymour Siegel, director of programs for the New York
Municipal Broadcasting System, started the discussion with
a short speech questioning how freedom of speech on radio is
protected when men such as Reverend Charles Coughlin and Mr.
Cameron are allowed to express their particular belief, but
no rebuttal is immediately allowed. He then advocated less
regulation by the FCC so that broadcasters could allow sev­
eral opinions without the worry of losing their licenses.
He said:
So because of the fact that there has been no formal definition of what constitutes public interest, and because of the fact that broadcasters have had to appear before the Federal Communications Commission with their hats in their hands every six months, and because of the fact that a Nebraska Supreme Court recently ruled that the broadcaster is jointly liable with the speaker for slander and libel, even though, by the way, he may have no control over the matter that is being broadcast, because of these things the broadcasters themselves have adopted a rigid private censorship which has been euphemistically termed editorial selection.90

The discussion included the opinions and experiences of the various networks and some local stations. There was agreement that several inequities do exist which discourage unrestricted speech on the radio, but that broadcasters must continue to attempt to reflect a variety of opinions and allow others time to express their opinions.

A discussion of adult education by radio opened with Lyman Bryson asking two questions: (1) Is an educational radio program one that demands some measurable effort from the listener? (2) Is there any educative effect in an excellently presented radio program regardless of the subject matter provided it is not intrinsically bad? This brought back some of the basic questions discussed in 1936 about determination of educational radio programs.91 Several points of concern about educational programming were brought out in this many-sided discussion. Some participants
commented that there is an appreciation value derived from any program presented excellently whether it be a comedy program or a musical program. All seemed to agree that the educational value would depend upon the effect to the listener but could not agree on what effect was necessary to determine or test the educative value of a program. Bryson suggested that the mere fact that a person appreciated the artistic value in a program indicated some effort on his part. However, he had to be conscious of that artistic value. One participant was not at all convinced of the consciousness necessary to determine that a program had educational value:

Mr. Bryson, is it not true that we are considering the radio as something new, and we still carry over to this new instrument some of the academic values and processes of education which the younger generation does not know? Younger persons who have grown up with the radio, accept the radio and are critical about it; they demand certain things of the radio which we still discuss. We older folks sometimes complain that things go too fast. It is never too fast for the radio-bred generation; they have a radio tempo. They did not get it through any conscious effort. We have a much higher standard of music all through the country in high schools today, for example, because some children have been exposed to good music over the radio.92

This statement is reminiscent of more recent discussions of the effect of television. Several agreed that art on radio should not particularly set an ideal of behavior but should
be a reconstruction of human experience. A good adult education program or program series should affect some change in behavior of the listener. This change may not be measurable but ideally would be demonstrated in some positive action. Referring to the several network discussion programs which were popular at that time the comment indicated that the confusion brought on by the many different points of view on important topics was a temporary detriment which must be endured to attain the more desired cumulative effect of creating a more aware and informed public. A discussion of adult education programs at the 1940 Institute centered around the realization that early efforts in this field had frequently failed because programs were using vocabulary and concepts for college trained listeners rather than reaching for the elementary trained adult. The trend toward dramatizing sociological problems was noted.

The popularity of discussion programs depended upon the use of controversial issues. At a discussion about the handling of controversial issues in the 1940 Institute, several important attitudes were voiced. The standard practice was to not sell time for specific controversial issues although regularly scheduled series of discussion
programs, such as "The People's Platform" and "Town Meeting of the Air," were sponsored. This position was supported by the National Association of Broadcaster's Code. There was some disagreement about the degree of leadership that a station should take in its attempts to clarify the controversial issues. Obviously its control of the choice of issues and the people who will discuss these issues gives the station a very strong voice in the issues themselves.

Ed Kirby, of NAB stated:

In these days when nobody seems to know the right answer, it is not the function of radio to determine which is the right answer and which is the wrong one. Rather radio must be a channel through which the ebb and flow of different ideas are presented.93

George V. Denny, president of "The Town Hall Inc.," went even further by stating that the primary function of forum type of programs was to stimulate thought while dissemination of information was only secondary.94 This recalls again the comment of W.W. Charters at the 1930 Institute when he referred to the possibility that radio's greatest contribution to education might be stimulation of interest in knowledge. It was reported that over sixty stations were conducting public forums or discussions on the air. Several people recommended that a panel of community leaders should be
employed to chose topics and participants for these programs rather than allowing the station management to make all these decisions. There was no suggestion of the lack of adequate representation on such advisory panels for minority groups; but Joseph Miller, director of labor relations of the NAB, did comment that labor unions were being adequately served.95

The next three Institutes devoted major concentration on the War, and education of the public in the war effort. The next portion of this chapter will review that discussion as a special issue. A day before the opening of the 1941 Institute, the FCC released its "Report on Chain Broadcasting," which was to force NBC to sell its Blue network and drastically reduce the requirements allowed in affiliation contracts between networks and individual stations. Although this matter affected commercial stations and networks considerably and was a big issue in the broadcasting world, there was not much discussion of this matter at the Institute. It was too late to include this matter in the 1941 Institute and the War with those larger considerations took precedence at the 1942 Institute.

Near the end of the 1943 Institute, Sir Gerald Campbell, British Minister and special assistant to the
British Ambassador to the U.S., first looked forward to radio after the war:

Today in the United Nations we are dying for one another. Tomorrow we will have to live with one another. Radio will have to help us do that. It is not radio's job to solve all the problems of the world, but radio is uniquely fitted to help to create that atmosphere of understanding without which these problems never become solvable.

We democracies have to develop a set of ideas, a philosophy, that answers the ideologies of the "isms," and then we have to learn how to present that philosophy in a way the grips the mind and heart and muscle of the ordinary man and becomes to him a fighting faith.96

The 1944 Institute considered the return to peace with some warnings to the radio industry.

Tom Carskadon, of ACLU, urged continuing the practice of discussion of controversial issues on unsponsored time only and continue allowing no sale of time for solicitation of membership.97

Lou Frankel, radio editor of Billboard, condemned educational institutions for their failure to contribute to the understanding of labor, race, and international relations; and scolded radio for its dependance on news wires. He noted several examples of race prejudice on the air.98 William Robson, CBS producer, urged an intensive campaign of
education against negro prejudice but stated the main battle must be waged by the local station in its community. 99

The economic change to peace-time operation was a problem that George Denny felt radio could help solve by stimulating public interest. Radio should reach the common man not with facts and figures but with challenges to his self-interest. Lyman Bryson thought radio should explain the mechanisms which will put money in the common man's pocket.

Neil Morrison, of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, wrapped up all the responsibilities of radio in a neat but imposing package when he said radio primarily reflects status quo and emphasizes what is already there. However, it also has a leadership function which requires radio to have a positive attitude. Radio must: (1) interpret, (2) create awareness of postwar problems, (3) aid in clarification of thought, (4) report accurate and balanced information, and (5) build a unified outlook in the community. 101

However, the challenge of the Institute came on the question of how to keep radio free from control by limited private interests.

Clifford Durr, FCC Commissioner, said that radio is
steadily becoming less free as it demonstrates its value as an effective and profitable advertising medium. He pointed to the fact that as advertisers buy more of the limited time available on radio there is less time available for sustaining programs no matter how good they are. He concluded with:

Thus, we have moved from diversification to concentration. We start out with 900 supposedly independent stations; about 600 of these, together using 95 per cent of the nighttime broadcasting power of the entire country, bind themselves by contract to four national networks; the four national networks receive 74 per cent of their revenue from four national industries. Maybe this is the road to a free radio, but I doubt it.102

Edgar Kobak, executive vice-president of the Blue network, puzzled over the question with:

We have to answer such questions as who shall, and who shall not, have access to the air--for discussion--and why. What about the minority groups, religious, educational, cultural? How about the handling of news and news analysis and commentators? Broadcasters--stations and networks--look at these problems in different lights. Who is right? Perhaps under the rules of free enterprise they are all right.

Should networks have an editorial opinion? What do the people want? Have we really tried to find out? Or do we make arbitrary rules and endeavor to make them stick?103

He asked for industry and government cooperation to find the answers and stated that the Blue network had already begun an investigation in this area.

Gilbert Seldes, executive of CBS, asked for a human,
practical, operational approach to freedom on the radio. He suggested that more studies of effects on listeners be made to determine where restriction are needed. If the confidence of the American people in their radio is abused, then there will definitely be more restriction imposed, he said. However, he felt a realistic approach would be to realize that it was perfectly natural for people to wish to control what other people thought. That is why it is dangerous:

The moment you recognize how natural it is for people to want to use radio for their own purposes, you do two things simultaneously--you plan to make radio available to individuals representing all kinds of people, and you set up a minimum of restrictions to see that no one uses radio to destroy the good life of others.104

The war had forced broadcasters to forget their individual interests and strive for a common goal. At least the Institute discussion had indicated this. With the return to peace it was inevitable that private interests would take precedence, and educational broadcast interests would face commercial broadcast interests across the debating table.

Radio's Function in the War Effort

During World War I, the infant radio industry was commandeered by the U.S. Navy and all stations not used directly in the war effort were closed. As the Second World War approached, broadcasters were well aware of the
possibility of a federal government take-over. However, the function of radio had changed drastically since 1917 moving from the activity as a communications link between ships at sea and shore to an entertainment and information agency for the public. Hitler was demonstrating the government controlled value of this link to the public, and some serious consideration was being given to the possibility of a closely controlled radio system within the U.S. Although there was no visible move toward direct control, broadcasters must have realized that this possibility was always available if the industry did not perform well for the war effort under private control. The seriousness of the war, the responsibility of the broadcaster, the lack of men and materials were factors in the decisions and actions of broadcasters. The freedom allowed to radio imposed tremendous pressures on station operators as they made decisions in entirely uncharted areas of communication. As FCC Commissioner, James L. Fly suggested:

"Radio is threading its way through the first war with no signposts, no precedents, no helpful experience from other wars standing as guide to the future."

The radio-press dispute of 1934 forced broadcasters to realize how vulnerable and how important their news function was. However, they did not seem to be sufficiently
strong at that time to move forward in this field so they managed to side-step the issue. H.V. Kaltenborn condemned the compromise agreement with the news wire services while radio moved slowly toward more independance. Although a strong core of outspoken news commentators developed with the acquiescence of the networks, the ambivilence of the networks and stations regarding responsibility for news remained for some time. A.A. Schechter, NBC director of news, stated at the 1940 Institute:

All news scripts of the National Broadcasting Company--both commentary and spot-news broadcasts--are based on press-association wires. Remember, we are not in the news business; we are in the entertainment field. Moreover, since news runs only six per cent of our total time on the air, offices and news bureaus throughout the world are not justified. It is cheaper to buy news already organized than to gather it ourselves, although in Europe and in Washington we do a lot of our own gathering.107

Yet, when later questioned about the advisability of reporting accidents and fires because the crowds hamper police and firemen activities, Schechter stated that the station must make decisions on this since the police and firemen are not judges of news value. It would therefore, seem that stations would have to make news judgments based on entertainment values. Schechter indicated that the most important news was about the war in Europe and that all this news was censored at the
source. Some in the audience questioned whether the censorship was being identified clearly enough and Schechter stated that a mention on every newscast would get boring and monotonous but that several indicators of censorship were used. He felt the audience was well aware of censorship and took it for granted.

With the ever-widening war in Europe, the 1940 Institute began to give more attention to broadcasting activity related to a war situation. Guy Hickok, of the International Division of NBC, explained the short wave foreign broadcast activities of NBC since their 1936 inception. A demonstration of a network discussion program "The People's Platform" argued the question "Are We Victims of Propaganda?" There were discussions about handling controversial issues and news broadcasting which were previously reviewed. The question periods after presentations indicated that most participants were opposed to involvement in the War and preferred not to consider the possibility of going to war. The typical term used was "dragged" into the War. However, by the time of the 1941 Institute, the attitude had changed perceptibly.

The first general session of the 1941 Institute was a demonstration of "America's Town Meeting of the Air"
discussing "Radio in the Present Crisis." The moderator, George V. Denny, opened the discussion by identifying the crisis: "The United States is preparing for war. If or how soon we become a participating factor in the war is a question."108

Clifton Utley, director of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and a well-known commentator, asserted that American radio's chief function would be to build morale. He further stated:

You may object that this would be propaganda. So it may be. But I answer: Unless radio does this, those who at present control it will be swept away and others will take charge, for radio is too potent a force to be allowed to go unused in the field where it can make its greatest contributions to national defense.109

In the question period following the discussion, Robert Landry, radio editor of Variety newspaper and a renowned critic of radio, indicated the broadcaster needs more definite word from the federal government to make any positive moves to encourage civilian morale. Utley supported this position stating that the period of democratic discussion is drawing to an end; and if the government didn't make a definite decision, the public might follow any idea which was decisive and any person who was decisive.
Ed Kirby, former public relations director of NAB and then employed in the Office of the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, declared that the twofold purpose of radio was to keep the nation informed, and inspire loyalty to the country and the armed forces. He also mentioned the need to curtail the use of radio to those who objected to our democratic principles.

It appeared that broadcasters were now much more interested in supporting the government and saw the progress of the war as a serious threat to our democratic society. There would be no need for a government imposition of strict guidelines or control because the broadcasters were ready and willing to curtail some of the democratic processes of discussion and criticism in an effort to prepare the nation for war. A voice would be heard only occasionally during the next few years to speak out against some injustices caused by the war effort.

Roger Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union condemned the timidity of radio and lack of diversity in viewpoints with the words:

It is a matter of common observation that radio programs do not give us a fair chance to hear the views of organized labor, or the complaints of our great Negro minority that they are not getting fair treatment in the armed forces or defense industries, or claims of
unfair treatment by our vast foreign-born population. Not commonly does radio give voice to the criticism of those opposed to the powerful economic interests here and abroad who use the war for their own private ends.

This was the exception rather than the rule as broadcasters tried to find ways of furthering the war effort. Some people wanted more organized effort from the industry while others felt that more direction from the federal government was needed. At the 1942 Institute, Edward Bernays, noted publicist and author of Speak Up for Democracy, demanded that the broadcast industry create a board of experts in psychology, radio programming, communications, and public opinion to map an approach to be taken by all radio in programming for morale. This pattern should include a balance of escapism, of war information, and criticism. Robert Landry stated that the war of ideas was being ignored and concluded:

I should like to see the establishment of adventure-some footloose combat teams of trained experts, assigned to answer specific, different enemy attacks on public opinion. I do not think this war of ideas can be won singlehanded by Ralph Ingersoll and Rex Stout.

The discussion after these short speeches concentrated on indicating that the government should provide more integrated information, looking to the reasons behind the various facts.
and figures, so that the people will have a purpose and reason for sacrifice.

That evening a special interest section meeting discussed "Radio and Wartime Morale" to a gathering of about 125 members. Lyman Bryson, CBS educational director, opined that radio was not sufficiently scientific nor deliberate in its approach to propaganda for morale, but that they ought not merely take it for granted that anger and hate were the emotions to be aroused to put the country in a fighting mood. Sherman Dryer, radio director of "University of Chicago Round-Table," felt the job for radio was in clarifying issues and problems in war. He urged a master strategy with specialists in ideas and issues to direct radio's approach. Victor Sholis, Clear Channel Broadcasting Service director, believed this master strategy should come from the federal government. Carl Friedrich, Harvard University, suggested the NAB and the four networks set up strategy teams to concentrate on giving direction to the programming in terms of its impact on the public morale.

The next morning, the Institute reached the core of the problem when it began earnest discussion of the emotional impact of radio. The session considered "Radio Drama in
Wartime with such heated and controversial discussion that Time magazine devoted a full column report to the proceedings. Norman Corwin, distinguished radio dramatist, hurled a challenge and indictment at the assembly:

Now there is a desperate necessity to explain this war to the people. They are confused. They are earnest. They want to fight, and they want to be sure what they are fighting for and what they are fighting against.

He chided the members for the quibbling of the last two days since they didn't seem to realize that this was a war that we could have lost. The answer was shockingly obvious, he said, for it was to tell the people the truth. He declared there have been terrible atrocities committed by the enemy and yet we seemed to be fighting labor, government, and industry more than the enemy within and without.

Arch Obler, renowned dramatist, stepped to the speakers podium and started by stating the problem as: "Reaching the people dramatically with the issues attendant to winning the war." Radio drama had to be emotionalized to bring the message of hate and hope which the public was demanding. It had to be written to groups of audiences rather than one mass audience. He closed with the warning that too much then was better than too little too late.
In the discussion period that followed, Corwin's plea for immediate action to tell the true story and Obler's insistence on promoting hate of the enemy were the prime targets. Most people agreed with both speakers but seemed to skirt the issue of what kind of hate was being referred to. Finally, discussion leader, H.B. McCarty, turned to Stephan Fry, of the BBC, and directly asked him about this doctrine of hatered. Fry explained that the BBC made no attempt to promote hate, and the British public does not hate. "They are grimly determined not to be pushed around—not to have any dictator take away their way of life—but that is not the same thing [as hate]." Then Fry asked whether this hate was to be personalized against Japanese or German as a person, or was it a hate of an idea. Obler's answer:

The sort of hate I was talking about was a hatred of ideas and theses, not a hatred of the individual German or other Axis soldier.

Yet I think, perhaps, one can lean over backwards on that worrying too much about hating the individual. Of course, one must start with the reason for hate: the horror inherent in the Nazi-planned future, the extermination for generations to come of even human hope if the Fascists win. We must tell that, of course, in a very simple and concrete way, and out of that will come individual hatred.
Corwin also clarified his position in answer to Fry with:

The logical conclusion of my theory of teaching people the truth is that if they understand the nature of Fascism and the idea they are fighting, they will automatically hate it. The people who hate Fascism most are those who understand it best.

Mr. Fry has said that the British Broadcasting Corporation has attempted to reflect public opinion. I am inclined to think that that is an error of strategy and policy. Any instrument which reflects light does not originate it. I think it is the function of radio to originate light.119

At the last general session, concerned with religious broadcasting, the reaction to Arch Obler's speech on the use of hate was apparent from the beginning. Msgr. Edward Flanagan indicated that such hate would put us in the same category as the enemy smeared with the same moral filth. Walter Van Kirk, of the Federal Council of Churches, agreed with Flanagan that we would lose the peace in this direction. He listed five duties of religious broadcasts in wartime: (1) to make real to our people the power of the sword of the Spirit, a power which is being dramatized in Norway, Germany, and the Lowlands; (2) to broaden the base of understanding and good will between religious and racial groups; (3) to make articulate the gospel of hope in a dispairing world; (4) to promote intelligent discussion of the bases of a just and lasting peace; and (5) to exercise a pastoral function with the whole nation as its parish.120
It was obvious that the broadcasting industry was not sufficiently unified in goals or methods to be the strong positive force in the war. However, it cannot be concluded that the networks and stations were acting irresponsibly. Many people believed that too much unity could lead to easier manipulation by special interests, and the result would be a propaganda machine not interested in the truth but interested simply in affecting the public toward certain war goals. Diversity of opinion and freedom to express opinion was a fiercely defended principle. The 1943 Institute heard William B. Miller, manager of public services and war programs for NBC, present a revealing picture of network problems and attitudes. Referring to the period just prior to Pearl Harbor he said:

Everyone wanted to talk on the topics of the day—on intervention versus isolation, on Land-Lease or not to lease or land. This desire to talk was as rampant among members of Congress as it was among distinguished citizens and in many organizations, representative or not. It was an extremely difficult period for national broadcasting. Tempers were uneven. Emotions were high. Good judgement was rare. If on any day in this period our network or any other had had the temerity to indicate it was planning for war, the America First Committee and other isolation-minded committees would have had our scalps on top of the flagpole in front of the Capitol at Washington before the sun had set. During the controversy the National Broadcasting Company and the network facilities for which it then was responsible maintained a balance of discussion on the question of isolation.
versus intervention which added to 81 speakers for isolation, talking for 26 hours and 38 minutes, and 80 speakers for intervention talking for 26 hours and 7 minutes—a difference of 31 minutes. Twenty-six speakers spoke for Lend-Lease while 27 were heard opposing it. The bulk of the time assigned was between the hours of six and eleven at night, which tends to dispute some charges that prime time is seldom available for important political features.121

Soon after the beginning of the war the news directors of NBC and CBS issued memoranda to all news personnel:

Both stressed the necessity for caution, the need for military and civilian morale, the dangers of competitive actions by commentators, the need for sorting out the fallacies and ridiculous claims in enemy propaganda. Both urged announcers to use matter-of-fact tones in reading even the most sensational news, pointing out the tremendous force of the spoken word, warning against giving figures on the sailings of merchant or naval vessels, troop movements, assembly centers or embarkations of war material, the identity of vessels attacked by the enemy, or any other military data. Urgent warnings were issued against taking telephone requests for announcements, no matter what their source, and indiscriminately using the words flash or bulletin. The use of sirens for sound effects on any broadcasting program, dramatic or otherwise, was banned. Unauthorized persons were restricted in their movements about the studios, particularly in the master control rooms, newsrooms and studios.122

Within weeks after these memoranda the Office of Censorship issued a wartime code of practice for broadcasting:

The Government order included the request for the elimination of ad lib. programs, such as "The Man on the Street." Detailed weather broadcasts were banned.... But mark this: Compliance with that code was put in terms permitting voluntary rather than mandatory action, and this was America under arms.
By April 20, 1942, largely through the work and suggestions of the Advertising Council, working with the Office of Facts and Figures, a plan of co-ordination was completed. The Network Allocation Plan, for that is its name, prevents the overselling of governmental wartime messages by irritating repetition and needless duplication—a situation the Government had now come to recognize.123

Several other activities were mentioned by Miller to indicate the many ways in which radio was performing responsibly for the war effort. He emphasized that a policy of flexibility and adaptability was being evolved rather than a strict wartime strategy.

The next morning Edgar Kobak, executive vice-president of the Blue network, said we should not worry about the morale of people because the American people's morale was excellent. We should sell the war in much the same way that we sell a product.

FCC Commissioner, Ray Wakefield was first to respond to Kobak's speech. He encouraged cooperative effort with the government and then cautioned against possible translation of Kobak's idea of selling war into selling hate. He referred to Stephan Fry's reply to that argument in the previous year and said:
I do not want to overemphasize caution against an emotional appeal or to be misunderstood as arguing against an emotional approach. I am not a psychologist, but to me courage, determination, love of country, spirit, and alertness do fall in the field of emotions. It seems to me then an appeal to those emotions which can accompany understanding is certainly called for in this effort. Appeal to the blinding, the obscuring emotions, I think, is not desirable.124

Lawrence J. Heller, president of station WINX, Washington, D.C., did not like the idea of "selling." He felt radio had to present "truthful reporting of all that happens on the military fronts, the government's needs in the people's wartime living, and an opportunity for discussion and freedom of expression."125 He also suggested that the local station should reduce the dimensions of this vast war to the understandable local effect. This would have been a fine idea if the local stations were sufficiently aware of the "local effect." In many cases the lack of trained news people and the difficulty of presenting a full picture of events due to censorship made the task impossible.

Back in 1941, Erik Severeid asked what information about the war should be given to the public if America went to war. He related the tremendous chaos which occurred in France when the public was told nothing.126 It was generally agreed that the objectivity needed was related not only to
information but to how that information was presented. There was no doubt that some censorship of military information would be necessary but the real concern of most broadcasters was that the censorship not extend beyond necessity so that the public would lose confidence in the news reports.

Earlier in this Institute, Clifton Utley had predicted that the radio industry would take a more mature and serious approach to news presentations and analysis, moving away from the practice of presenting the tragedies of the world after the manner of a glorified sporting event.

The 1942 Institute found Morgan Beatty, Military Analyst of the Blue network, claiming no trouble in getting information or being told what not to say. However, he questioned three situations that were happening: (1) the negative reaction to propaganda when it can very effectively support the basic ideas of our government; (2) the confusion over "isms" and the unnecessary fears about communism; (3) where does criticism end and tearing down government begin? Are we playing into the hands of Nazi tactics by creating national disunity?

Kaltenborn provided some opinions on the subject such as his belief that those who had consistently opposed the
policies of our national government had no right to voice that opposition at that time. He doubted that more than 10 percent of what was considered secret was actually in that category and felt that the extreme caution being used was merely keeping many facts from the American public which might help morale. Finally, he felt that the right to criticize was essential to our democracy but informed criticism was necessary.

The criticism of censorship continued at the next Institute in 1943 although this practice was almost accepted by newsmen as a necessary evil. W.R. Willis, CBS former Tokyo correspondent, and Carrol Alcott, station WLW's far-eastern observer, both objected to the government practice of withholding war news for an undue length of time. They referred to the first and famous Tokyo air raid and to the sinking of the Yorktown aircraft carrier. Colonel Kirby and Lt. Commander Reichner, radio chiefs of the War Department and Navy Department respectively, defended this policy on the basis of military security. Cesar Searchinger, NBC historical commentator objected to the lack of coordination on news releases within the Armed Forces as well as the difficulty in getting background news which appears to have
no military significance. This was particularly disturbing to Searchinger when the practice of the British seemed so much more efficient and informative. The discussion brought out the fact that both Willis and Alcott were most disturbed with the suspicion that much withholding of news was not based on military security reasons but other reasons such as psychological, morale, and covering the blunders of various military personnel.

Period Summary

Institute

One of the more visible accomplishments of the Institute during this period was in the matter of attendance which increased almost four times to an average of 530 per Institute. It is also noted that the number of representatives from commercial stations increased considerably from 1940 through 1944 and the number of network broadcasts from the Institute also increased. Perhaps inclusion of local commercial broadcasters on the Program Committee since 1940 could account for more interest from the commercial broadcasters. During the early years of this period, the Institute moved toward more small group concurrent
meetings in which more specialized topics could be discussed. Charters noted this desire from participants when he spoke at the 1936 Institute. From these small group discussions at the Institute came the larger special interest groups which established an identity separate from the Institute.

The Junior Town Meeting was a product of the Institute in 1944. The yearly meetings of the Agricultural Broadcasting work-study group led to the formation of the National Association of Radio Farm Directors which held its organizational meeting at the 1944 Institute. The Association for Education by Radio was formed by a committee chosen at the 1941 Institute. A rough draft of the educational portion of the NAB code was prepared at the NAB section meeting during the 1939 Institute. The work-study group on Religious Broadcasts formed the Association of Religious Broadcasters at the 1944 Institute. A list of the organizations which held meetings in conjunction with the Institutes indicates the scope of interest generated by the Institute. The usual process for the introduction of new areas seemed to be through scheduling at a round-table discussion. These were the least structured of the concurrent meetings and more open to innovations. The radio workshop and high school radio instruction were introduced this way in 1936. "Handling Controversial
"Issues" was a new topic in 1938. Although radio's contribution to religion was discussed in 1932, it did not appear again until as a work-study meeting in 1940. Television and FM were mentioned intermittently since 1931 with a display of FM receivers available for listening purposes at the 1940 Institute. Women's broadcasts and women's organizations received attention in 1941 as well as a round-table about "Radio in Negro Education."

Perhaps the most notable of the services provided by the Institute was the American Exhibition of Recordings of Educational Programs. The potential of such a service was limited only by the selection of programs exhibited. Although the prestige of the awards provided the reward for submitting recordings, the benefit which the Institute intended was the example of such programs in instructing others about techniques. The publicity and recognition came for the awards but the intention was demonstration. In later years, as the awards took on greater prominence there would be a question as to why so many awards were given. By that time the original purpose of the awards was submerged along with their original usefulness.

Since 1938 the printed program stated that the
Institute passed no resolutions. That statement expressed the position that the Institute was neutral ground where honest discussion could take place without the possibility of a vote on an issue or an endorsement of an opinion by the majority. The object was to seek the truth rather than win an argument. Unfortunately, this posture became more difficult in succeeding years as the Institute acquired more prestige and a participant might find his unguarded words bannered in a headline of the next morning's paper. The Institute policy on the yearbook was to verify all material with the speaker before printing, but a reporter was under no such obligation. An example of honest, frank, discussion arose in the Corwin-Obler "hate" session in 1942. The text of the speeches and the recorded discussion threw an entirely different light on the subject than the news reports.

The trade magazine of the broadcasting industry, Broadcasting, reflected the growing prestige and importance of the Institute by increased coverage of the major sessions. From 1940 through 1944 at least one major story was carried on each Institute.

NCER's publication Education By Radio, reporting on the achievements of educational radio in 1941 said: "The
annual Institute for Education by Radio at Ohio State University has come to be recognized as the common meeting ground for educators and commercial broadcasters from every part of the country. "140

However, the most convincing proof of the prestige of the Institute was demonstrated by the vote to hold an Institute in 1944 in spite of the travel restriction and then the tremendous attendance at that 1944 Institute.

Nevertheless, one disturbing factor had been introduced and would gain momentum in succeeding years. In 1942, Time magazine reported the Institute as "broadcastings biggest bull session" which served mainly as an occasion for bestowing honors, discussing knacks and know-how and airing pet peeves. 141 There was certainly an element of truth to this description but it did not include the many constructive activities and earnest discussions which comprised another element of the Institute. The question of the changing function of the Institute was to be heatedly discussed in the following period.

This period saw the Institute move from discussion of the effects of radio programs to an analysis of radio activities for the war effort. The war presented a focal point
upon which all broadcasters could maintain a common interest. However, the end of the war initiated a period in which commercial and educational interests gradually drifted further apart and the Institute was faced with the problem of how versatile it could be and still remain attractive and important to both commercial and educational interests.

**Issues**

Creation of the FCC and the FREC had not solved any basic educational broadcasting problems. However, they had settled a major clash among educational broadcast interests. Educators went back to the basic question of how to use radio to extend education to the public. But the situation was quite different than 1930 when this problem was first discussed. In 1936, the pre-occupation with survival of educational stations and the reluctance to be identified with commercial radio had softened if not disappeared. Many experiments had revealed the large amount of cooperative work involved in school broadcasting and the limitations which would take years to overcome. Such limitations included: (1) scheduling difficulties due to variety of class meeting schedules, (2) resistance to the threat of loss of local autonomy in subject matter, and (3) resistance to the
threat of replacing teachers with radio.\textsuperscript{142}

With only a handful of educational stations remaining,\textsuperscript{143} educators had to find some way of sending educational materials to the public through commercial stations. Thus, the approach to general adult education was the concern of most general sessions during this period. Levering Tyson noted the distinction between general education and school education which necessitated separate approaches.\textsuperscript{144}

The 1936 Institute discussion determined that an educational program, in its broadest sense, is one which stimulates a person to pursue some socially valuable activity. Although it was felt that the greatest uses of broadcasting would be found not in formal education but in areas which are as broad as life itself, the protection and control of such programming was an important factor to consider.\textsuperscript{145} It would be most difficult to determine accurately the reaction of the audience so the basis for judging educational programs must include some consideration of the intention of the broadcaster. In the area of stimulation, current events and news commentaries were reported to be one of the most popular informational programs\textsuperscript{146} but some cautioned that simply because a program is an information dispenser does not qualify it as educational.\textsuperscript{147}
These arguments are familiar ground that educators have been debating for many years and continue to debate today. But the discussion did tend to focus on the more immediate and important problems: (1) What audience reactions can we anticipate and/or investigate? (2) What subject matter and what conditions of presentation of subject matter can be determined to be educational? The audience reactions reported at the Institute discussions were those that resulted from the presentation of a great amount of material without direction regarding the value of such material. This resulted in trivial and important, useful and destructive material being presented in large amounts indiscriminately.

Philo Buck reminded the 1936 Institute of the demoralizing effect of too much indiscriminate information, while Cooper in 1931 and Murray in 1937 warned that the tendency toward passive acceptance and forgetting was another probable audience reaction. Bode said the audience was being neutralized.

The solutions to this audience apathy centered around the unique ability of radio to acquire the trust of the audience through its intimacy. Reaching audiences with emotional content unavailable to print was a strength that
had to be developed for educational purposes. Regulated direction was the concept that these discussion tended to indicate. Radio's educational function should be to promote common interests and develop common loyalties pointing out contradictions in social concepts to enable citizens to gain some direction and acquire a sense of proportion. However, it was urged that an intellectual rather than an emotional reaction should be the objective in spite of the fact that the emotional impact was radio's greatest weapon. The most practical suggestion for implementing this objective was proposed by Canadian broadcaster, Gladstone Murray when he suggested formation of local discussion and debate groups to work in conjunction with national radio discussion programs. Another consideration was the degree of direction that broadcasters could or should impose upon the audience. Discussion indicated that most felt radio could not force the audience very much into directions not already accepted but that some leadership in emphasizing directions was a responsibility.

Finally, referring to the second important problem of educational programs, subject matter and presentation, it wasn't until 1939 that general discussion included the built in limitations of commercial radio. As Bartlett had pointed
out in 1935 the blue pencil is a visible censorship which can be combated. However, the concept of omission is the most treacherous and difficult to detect. Some broad generalities such as reinforcing the "status quo" and caution by the sponsors resulting in innocuous and banal material were noted. Seeing controversial topics as only two-sided and allowing sponsored opinions to be aired without rebuttle were more glaring errors of neutrality. But the legal aspects of controversial discussion on the air plus the Mayflower Decision did not allow for much direction by broadcasters so the objective of an open forum function seemed ideally right and practically limited to popular opinions and opinions of the wealthy. This resulted in little opposition until the war was won at which time the concerns of minorities were voiced.

The war years at the Institute proved most interesting as patriots, public relations experts and moralists vied for their particular brand of war-winning propaganda. The Institute had gradually devoted more time to the problems of all broadcasters rather than those of education since the commercial stations had to be depended upon for general educational programming. By 1941 the discussion centered
around what radio could do for the war effort. Two functions were easily seen to be: (1) keep the nation informed, and (2) inspire loyalty and maintain morale. Although there was some objection expressed to the censorship policies during the war, the majority of the discussion concerned the morale problem. The effort to maintain some free discussion and normalcy was supplemented by the calls for psychological propaganda even to the extremes of selling hate. Under the circumstances of the advancing war the discussion on propaganda was relatively mild and the moderate opinions seemed to prevail. Miller's comments on network activities in the war demonstrated the many efforts to adapt and protect a relatively free broadcast system during the national emergency. The discussion about promoting hate resulted in some sharp and critical comment. It revealed exactly what both Obler and Corwin were being asked to do throughout the war. As demonstrated by the discussion, there is a narrow line between hating an idea and hating the people who represent that idea. It was a distinction which made an important difference for the advancement of the society after the war and deserved even more discussion than received at the Institute. Sir Gerald Campbell reminded
the Institute audience of this matter again in 1943 and by 1944 the discussion began to concentrate on turning the public toward peace and the function of a peace-time radio industry. The control that the advertiser wielded over programming before the war was a spectre that disturbed Commissioner Durr considerably and he warned of problems in this area. Edgar Kobak also expressed concern identifying a particular problem which was to plague broadcasters even to the present—access to the airwaves. This vast and complicated problem of access had been one of the arguments education presented in favor of reservations. It was considered with regard to discussion programs and the control of such public forums at the 1940 Institute.

During the war there had been no disagreement with the idea of removing access from certain political groups as indicated by statements at the 1940 Institute. Present day actions by the FCC regarding diversity of ownership and the Fairness Doctrine are all part of this problem of providing access to the airwaves for deserving opinion and ideas.
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CHAPTER IV

THE GOOD YEARS, 1946 - 1953

Background

This was a period of tremendous activity in the industry. The established network organizations expanded while new entrepreneurs struggled to stay alive. Overpopulation in radio and onrushing television led many to bankruptcy, but those that survived could see a good future for both radio and television. Changes were most apparent in programming as radio adapted to television and television looked for its image.

Commercial Broadcasting

By June 30, 1945, there were about 955 AM radio stations on the air,\(^1\) the great majority of which were making a very good profit. A fourth network company, American Broadcasting Company, had come into existence and a fifth network, Liberty Broadcasting System, organized in
1946 primarily to provide re-creations of baseball games, supplied a limited program service to some 300 stations in 1949. However, the inroads of television and the declining economy resulted in cessation of The Liberty Network in 1951. The broadcasting business seemed a good investment to many people after the war with the improved technology developed during the war allowing the operation of more stations on directional antenna patterns and daytime only status. By the end of 1948, the number of AM stations had increased to 1900 with 2453 on the air by June 30, 1953. Additional room in the spectrum space had been made available when the FCC reduced the required minimum distance between any two stations on the same AM frequency, and also authorized the use of some clear channels for additional daytime only stations. In addition, frequency modulation broadcasting was finally authorized for commercial operation and assigned to a band of frequencies. July 1, 1953 found 580 commercial FM stations in operation with more than 450 of these owned by AM licensees. Although they started as independently programmed operations it was soon evident that advertisers were not interested in purchasing time on FM outlets, so, many FM stations cut costs by duplicating, simultaneously,
the AM programs. The FCC was not particularly adverse to this duplication since they felt this would be the fastest way to introduce the better signal of FM to the public.

The television station growth was much slower during this period primarily because of the tremendous initial investment, about $1,500,000, and the "Freeze." By October 1948, when the FCC called a halt to all further TV channel assignments, 117 TV stations had been authorized. Although only about thirty were actually operating, the remaining authorized stations were allowed to continue building and begin operation. The FCC did not begin accepting applications again until July 1, 1952, when tremendous activity resulted in an increase from 108 to 349 operating stations by the end of 1953.

The production of radio receivers was extremely high after the war, but about 80 percent of all home radios were AM only and all of the 25,000,000 auto radios were AM only. The industry had, in effect, assured the second-class status of radio service for the next twenty years by this move.

There were probably not more than 8,000,000 homes capable of receiving FM signals by the end of this period. TV homes grew at a slower rate partially because of the
approximate $500 cost of a receiver. In 1948 there were not more than 1,000,000 TV homes. This figure increased to just over 27,000,000 homes by the end of 1953.9

The network situation remained relatively stable during this period. In 1948, CBS made a celebrated talent raid on NBC, buying away many of NBC's top radio stars. Thus CBS gained top position in popularity and sales while NBC remained a close second, ABC brought up a poor third, and MBS was a very weak fourth.

DuMont was a television organization which had pioneered in the development of TV and tried to build up a television network. Unfortunately, the tremendous capital investment to compete with the three established networks was not available, particularly at this time when the return was negligible, so DuMont ceased operation in 1955. But ABC, CBS, and NBC all encouraged their radio affiliates to build TV stations. Successful radio operations were financing TV development.

Broadcasting continued to gather increasing revenues throughout this period, but the distribution of that revenue plus the investment in television caused many headaches for station operators. Radio networks hit a peak of $141,000,000
in 1948, and then started the descent as network accounts began to switch to television. The local radio stations as a group were continually getting more money, but this was divided among many more stations so that, by the end of 1952, the $363,000,000 from national spot and local sales was divided among almost three times as many stations. All FM and a majority of the new AM stations operated at a loss. 10

From the first year of TV network operation (1948-49) until the end of this period, the revenues jumped from about $25,000,000 to over 430,000,000; 11 but probably not more than half of the TV stations were operating at a profit by the end of 1953.

Evening network radio programming changed considerably during this period, as television began to take the audience away; but daytime programming changed very little. The press conference type of program became a very popular way of providing public affairs programming. "Meet the Press," introduced in the fall of 1945, was the prime example. In 1947-48, disc jockey programs were carried by networks for the first time. 12 Variety and musical programs decreased tremendously as thriller dramatic programs increased. Quiz programs were used a good deal between 1946 and 1950 but decreased after
that on evening radio. Daytime quiz and human interest programs replaced the gradual decrease in women's daytime serials.

The local radio situation changed because of the tremendous influx of new stations which had no network affiliation. These stations provided recorded music shows of one type or another virtually 100 percent of the time, except for newscasts and recorded religious programs. The affiliated stations continued to present the variety which the network could send but filled some of the blank evening hours with recorded music also.

As networks experimented with television programming, they learned that all radio shows do not make good TV shows. Television programming was in the experimental stage locally, with networks becoming more sophisticated in their evening fare by the end of 1953.

Educational Broadcasting

"As of December 6, 1945, six FM educational stations had been licensed by the FCC, nine others had been granted construction permits, and there were 25 applications pending before the Commission."13 The FCC was interested in seeing some clear guidance and organization among educational
stations, so the matter of establishing a central headquarters for the NAEB was actively encouraged.

The NAEB continued to participate in the clear-channel hearings before the FCC which were completed in January 1948. No decision was to come of this matter for some time since Congress instructed the FCC to withhold its decision pending hearings on a Senate bill, introduced by Edwin Johnson, which called for clear-channel breakdown and limitation of power to 50,000 watts.

By April 1948, the NAEB membership totaled seventy institutions, but the majority of the American educational institutions displayed an alarming apathy concerning television. Would this be another case of too little too late as it had been in radio? The NAEB called a special meeting at the Institute in 1948, to hear C.M. Jansky propose a plan for educational TV reservations in the VHF spectrum. The FCC hearings in television allocations in late June 1948, heard Carl Menzer represent NAEB. The cost of installation and operation of a TV station seemed to be the significant factor in the lack of enthusiasm of educators. The FCC chairman, Wayne Coy, issued two separate invitations for educators to come before the FCC at its hearings in September 1948, to ask for reservations. The response was not good
but fortunately the FCC found many other problems which had to be solved before any decisions could be made. Accordingly, a freeze on all further TV assignments was invoked. While the FCC investigated VHF, color and allocation tables; American education was given its chance to organize its forces. No one knew how long the freeze would last and no one officially expected it to last three and one-half years, so the NAEB and other educational organizations moved with a sense of desperation. The NAEB convention in 1948, marked the beginning of more aggressive activity by educational broadcasters.  

The October 1948 NAEB convention re-elected Richard Hull as president, thus, according to Billboard, endorsing the progressive element in the association. Plans were approved to start an FM transcription network with eventual live interconnection. A little-publicized fact was that the FCC had approved the use of low power (10 watts) for educational FM reservations so that many school systems could initiate broadcasting for a relatively inexpensive amount of money and expand gradually into higher power operation. The NAEB encouraged all universities to get into FM broadcasting, pointing out that recent considerations had
been entertained by the FCC to discontinue a portion of the reserved FM frequencies. The first ten watt license was granted to KMUW at the University of Wichita in May 1949.

Wilbur Schramm, dean of Communications at the University of Illinois, received funds from the Rockefeller Foundation and organized the First Allerton Conference. This conference held at Allerton Park on the University of Illinois campus June 29 to July 12, 1949 brought together thirty top experts in educational broadcasting for a two week conference on future goals, philosophy, and policies of educational broadcasting. Richard Hull, president of NAEB, later said of this conference:

Here, finally, these men began to develop a real synthesis of purpose and to spell out a practical working philosophy which could be widely understood and supported. Here too, many of the individuals who subsequently fought for educational television channel reservations and became key figures in the educational television movement, met each other for the first time. The functional plans for a nation-wide educational radio broadcasting network were developed at this seminar, and later these same concepts provided the basis for a nation-wide educational television network and program center.

The FCC released its proposed allocation plan for television on July 11, 1949, and did not include any reservations for educational broadcasting. In August, the NAEB filed its petition for reservation of ten channels in the
VHF spectrum. Ohio State University president, Howard Bevis, and Institute director, I. Keith Tyler, secured supporting petitions from the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the Association of State University Presidents, and the National University Extension Association. The U.S. Office of Education also filed a petition asking that VHF as well as UHF frequencies be reserved for education. The National Education Association joined in that petition.

In October 1950, the U.S. Office of Education and the NAEB called a joint meeting to reconcile the goals and procedures of the various organizations interested in educational television. This resulted in the formation of the Joint Committee on Educational Television (JCET) which was later formalized under the auspices of the American Council on Education, to represent all educational organizations for the television allocations. The group voted unanimously to request reservations based upon a concept of a combination of non-profit as well as non-commercial educational television broadcasting stations. Later, this concept was overruled by Telford Taylor, attorney for JCET, and the FCC Commissioner, Freida Hennock, who shared the belief that
inclusion of the non-profit concept would "muddy" education's appeal before the FCC, as well as complicate future relations with business, industry, labor, and philanthropic foundations. The non-profit concept would have allowed educational stations to carry advertising in order to pay for the station operation. Many educational interests could not see how educational television could develop adequately, with its tremendous costs, without some income from operations. Perhaps the opposition to this request remembered the unmerciful attacks which Senator Dill had made in the Wagner-Hatfield bill in 1934. That bill had a provision for allowing the sale of advertising to make an educational station self-supporting. The provision was a major weakness which allowed for the defeat of the bill.

In 1949, renewed efforts were made to find funds to establish an NAEB central headquarters. A central headquarters had first been formally proposed in 1936 but lack of funds had frustrated all attempts to create the headquarters. Although the grant requests in 1949 failed again, another goal of the NAEB, a program exchange, was beginning to take form in spite of lack of funds. The development of the magnetic tape recorder at the end of World War II had
substantially increased the feasibility of such a program exchange.

Seymour Siegal, director of WNYC, started what was later to be dubbed "The Bicycle Network" by recording and distributing to twenty-two NAEB member stations the 1949 "Herald Tribune Forum." By May 1950, Siegal was able to report that the network would soon be able to provide four hours of programs per day to stations. At the NAEB convention, October 1950, Wilbur Schramm proposed a plan whereby the NAEB tape network could be located at the University of Illinois and be supported by a series of special grants plus the contribution of personnel and housing from the University of Illinois.

In 1950 and early 1951, the NAEB officers and board of directors concerned themselves with problems of finance and strategy. Several conversations with C. Scott Fletcher, president of the newly created Fund for Adult Education (FAE), led to a number of significant events in 1951 and 1952. The FAE provided financial support for the JCET. The FCC announced hearings on a new allocation plan which included 209 VHF and UHF channels for educational television. The 1951 Institute heard NAEB announce the reception of an
FAE grant for a large scale radio program development project which was supervised by William Harley of WHA, University of Wisconsin, while Dallas Symthe, of the University of Illinois started a monitoring study of commercial television. WOI-TV, Iowa State University, received an FAE grant and began experimental educational television production for national distribution. A Kellogg Foundation grant established the NAEB headquarters at the University of Illinois, put the radio tape network on a professional basis, and initiated a series of institutes and seminars which were to supply much of the personnel for educational television development. Under the direction of Ralph Steetle, the JCET planned, coordinated, and directed the FCC presentation which included 838 petitions on behalf of educational television reservations.

The Sixth Report and Order, the FCC decision on television allocations, was issued on April 14, 1952; and education had scored a tremendous victory for 80 VHF and 162 UHF channels were reserved for educational non-commercial use. Kansas State College applied for the first channel in July 1952, but financial difficulties prevented the College from building a station. KUHT, jointly licensed to the University
of Houston and the Houston Board of Education, went on the air as the first non-commercial educational station licensee on May 12, 1953. 29

**Federal Government**

The war was over and a re-evaluation of government regulation of broadcasting seemed desirable. Radio stations had fared very well during the war, and many allocations for frequencies were on file. A vast amount of knowledge about signal propagation and frequency space had been developed. Television and frequency modulation broadcasting were ready to go. In the social sphere, broadcasting had proved that it could govern itself with some responsibility, but expanding competition threatened a return to the pre-war abuses of its public service responsibility.

On June 27, 1945, the FCC allocated the 88 to 108 megacycle band to FM, reserving the first twenty channels (88 to 92 megacycles) to educational non-commercial purposes. The Commission followed shortly with an assignment of thirteen television channels to the VHF spectrum area. Paul Porter took the chairmanship of the FCC in late December 1944, and supported Clifford Durr's idea that minimum program standards should be established for reference when
licensees come up for renewal of their station licenses. Charles Seipman, formerly with the British Broadcasting Corporation, was brought in to direct a study to determine such criteria of programming. The result of the study was a publication issued in March 1946, entitled "Public Service Responsibility of Broadcast Licensees." The "Blue Book," as it was more popularly known, raised immediate reaction from Congress and the broadcasting industry. The main charge was that it constituted censorship and was therefore in violation of Section 326 of the Communications Act. The standards enunciated in the Blue Book were used in designing a new application form for license renewal in 1946 which required applicants to state how much broadcast time was devoted to the following program categories: entertainment, religious, agricultural, educational, news, discussion, talks, and miscellaneous programs. The FCC withheld license renewals and held public hearings in some cases but no license was taken from a licensee on the basis of the Blue Book. Walter Emery, who was chief of the Renewals and Revocation Section of the FCC during this period, noted conflicting attitudes in Congress and the Commission regarding the Blue Book and said:
This cleavage militated against any real, effective application of the program criteria which the Commission had enunciated, and engendered a kind of frustration and impuissance which, except for a few cases, made the approval of renewal applications pretty much of an automatic process.33

The Mayflower Decision in 1941, which prohibited broadcast licensees from editorializing, was widely criticized but not vehemently challenged during the war years. However, with the FCC emphasis on public service programming after the war, the broadcasters began to object more strenuously to this decision. Another factor which may have contributed to a re-evaluation was the fact that over twice as many stations were now broadcasting as there were at the time of the decision in 1941. The Commission held public hearings in March and April of 1948, and issues a new report on June 1, 1949, allowing the broadcaster to editorialize providing he offers adequate opportunities for opposing points of view.34

This ruling was modified somewhat in 1950 and the case involved a frequent speaker at the Institute, Morris S. Novik. He was manager of WLIB when, in January 1950, the station broadcast a series of editorial programs advocating Congressional enactment of a national Fair Employment Practice Act. However, no programs presenting an opposing
point of view were broadcast. Novik informed the FCC that he had received several hundred letters upholding the stations editorial position but had received no requests for time for presentation of a reply to the editorials. In a letter to the station in April 1950, the FCC indicated that it is not enough for a station to be willing to make time available for opposing views, but if it editorialized, it has an affirmative duty to seek out and encourage the broadcasting of opposing views. The modification was the interpretation that the broadcaster must seek out an opposing view if he intends to editorialize. This interpretation remained in effect until July 1959, when station WNOE-TV was told that it had the affirmative duty to "aid and encourage" the opposing views.35

1948 was also the year in which the future of television was affected by two decisions. The Supreme Court handed down its decision requiring the giant film organizations to split-up their production-distribution operation from their exhibition operation. The monopolizing control of the film industry by five Hollywood production companies was thus weakened tremendously and the resistance to the inroads of television was broken. The divorce proceedings
did not start until 1950 and were completed by 1954.

Meanwhile, the FCC imposed a freeze on all further television assignments in late 1948, in order to investigate the allocations problems and consider color television. These investigations and hearings lasted three and one-half years with the final fixed table of allocations, in UHF as well as VHF bands, being issued in the Sixth Report and Order in April 1952. A highlight of this order was the reservations of 242 channel assignments for educational non-commercial licensees. Frieda B. Hennock, the first woman to serve as a commissioner on the FCC, was the champion of educational reservations. In this respect, she reflected the concern and enthusiasm for educational broadcasting of Clifford Durr, whom she replaced.

The Institute Planning

The task of serving the many-faceted needs of educational broadcasting within the objectives of the Institute became increasingly difficult. Institute objectives, functions, and planning policies, as discussed in Chapter II, were sufficiently precise to serve the needs of broadcasters
during the previous two periods; but the expansion in both the number and diversity of activities in the broadcasting industry challenged the ability of the Institute to maintain its functions. At the conclusion of the previous chapter it was noted that the war had narrowed and unified educational and commercial interests sufficiently so that the Institute could satisfy the needs of both groups. However, that theme and crisis was now past and post war education was not at all as compelling an interest to satisfy the needs and desires of Institute participants. The attendance had increased from 562 at the last pre war meeting (1941) to 1207 at the first post war meeting (1946). Therefore, the diversity of interests to be served, the demand for prestigious speakers and relevant topics, plus the difficulty of gaining accurate feedback were problems for the Program Committee. The minutes of several Program Committee meetings during this period were found which indicate the problems and the reasons behind some activities of the Institute.

A Program Committee meeting in December 1946 opened with I. Keith Tyler explaining the Institute's responsibility:

The Institute takes the responsibility for developing the programs of the general sessions, but the programs of the group meetings (work-study groups, section meetings and round-tables) are developed either by the chairman
whom we may invite, or an organization invited by the Institute (e.g., the Religious Radio Association). The group meetings are set up to serve specialized interests, and the Director [Tyler] feels it unavoidable that many group meetings are held simultaneously. If the number of smaller meetings were reduced, the consequent attendance at each meeting would be much larger, informality of the meetings would perhaps be lost, and, as an added complication, the hotel has a very limited number of large meeting rooms.38

One more consequence of the reduction of the smaller group meetings would be the reduction in the number of topics plus the specificity of topics.

Another problem concerning the basic functions of the Institute was the question of whether the Institute should consider resolutions. This matter was discussed at the end of the last chapter and again commanded attention early in this period. The 1947 Institute held a pre-Institute press conference which received a good reaction from the thirty-five working newsmen attending. The press was asked for suggestions on how to improve the Institute and gave the following four basic ideas: (1) Change points of emphasis in topics. (2) Allow resolutions to be considered. Poll the participants on this idea. (3) Provide a summary of the conference within the few weeks because concurrent sessions don't allow for adequate coverage. (4) Don't try to cover so much material and possibly cut-down on concurrent
meetings. No records indicate whether a summary of the Institute was prepared for the press (suggestion #3) but the remaining years of this period found The Journal of the AER carrying an extensive summary of each Institute in the issue following each Institute. This summary was always authored by an Institute official.

Regarding the matter of resolutions (suggestion #2), the Institute staff moved quickly to pursue this suggestion. After the 1947 Institute, 700 cards were sent out with the post mortem letters on August 15, 1947. The cards contained three propositions on which the members were to vote. Results were as follows:

1. No resolutions should be considered or voted on by the Institute as a whole. Sections and groups may "resolve" if they like (this is the present situation) . . . . 85 votes

2. Let's have resolutions on matters on which the Institute members are generally in agreement, but avoid issues in which our group is in sharp disagreement. 57 votes

3. Let's have resolutions about any important issues of concern to educational broadcasting regardless of any conflict or controversy that may result . . . . 120 votes

The main objection to resolutions was the fact that it might
eliminate the principle of a common meeting ground for dis-
cussion. The Institute program for the 1948 Institute
added the following two paragraphs as an explanation of its
resistence to resolutions:

The Institute for Education by Radio is an annual
educational conference for the sole benefit of those
attending. It provides an opportunity for expression
of varied viewpoints on controversial matters relating
to broadcasting. It seeks to stimulate thinking and
discussion. It encourages the exchange of ideas and
techniques. Its only purpose is to further the develop-
ment of all types of educational radio programs.
Consistent with its educational character, The Insti-
tute for Education by Radio does not pass resolutions
nor attempt to influence legislation or practice. It
operates on the belief that open-minded consideration
of problems and practices by those concerned with broad-
casting will lead to solutions and improvements. It
welcomes all who have a stake in radio--broadcasters,
civic leaders, educators and other interested citizens.

Except for the addition of television, this statement remained
substantially the same for eleven years until the 1959 In-
stitute. When the Program Committee met again in December
1948, I. Keith Tyler, Institute director, re-emphasized the
purpose of the Institute by explaining that, unlike a con-
vention, the Institute does not accomplish any business but
is a place where people come to talk over their special
interests and problems. Tyler again reiterated this posi-
tion in an opening statement of the 1951 Institute first
general session.
Meanwhile, after the 1948 Institute, plans had been initiated to expand the Program Committee so that representatives of various organizations could be included. Thus, the first meeting of the National Advisory Committee (the name given to this expanded Program Committee) included a representative from each of the following organizations:

At the first meeting on December 11, 1948, in Columbus, Ohio, the Committee was given a copy of the results of a Billboard survey which had been published in that newspaper's July 31, 1948, issue. The survey, in the form of a questionnaire reported the following:

(1) Would you like to see the Institute continued?
   Yes. . . . . . 215
   No. . . . . . 4
   Indifferent. . . 5

   The main reason for continuing was--only place educational and radio people get together.

(2) Do you believe the Institute should continue to operate as it has in the past or should it be changed?
Change. ... 142
No Change. ... 47

The four most frequently suggested changes:

More education and commercial cooperation. ... 35
Better basic planning. ... ... ... ... ... ... 34
Too many events simultaneously. ... ... ... ... 28
Closer to actualities of commercial radio. ... 28

(3) Do you think the Institute should be concerned only with the problems of educational radio and television?
   Yes. ... ... ... ... 99
   No. ... ... ... 109

(4) Should the Institute devote itself primarily to programming with educational broadcasting one of the phases discussed?
   Yes. ... ... ... 103
   No. ... ... ... 90

30 of the "no" responses stated the Institute should concern itself with all angles of broadcasting (Hence 133 want to go beyond mere "educational broadcasting")

(6) Should the Institute continue to program many sessions at the same time?
   No. ... ... ... 132
   Yes. ... ... ... 84

(8) Do you believe the broadcasting industry should work in close cooperation with the sponsors of the Institute?
   Yes. ... ... ... 177
   No. ... ... ... 12

Should the NAB for example, work in conjunction with the Ohio State University in setting up the Institute?
   Yes. ... ... ... 174
   No. ... ... ... 29
45 "yes" and 28 "no" responses expressed fear of NAB domination.

The data from questions 5 and 7 were not reported. Question 5 asked if other major problems of the industry should be included. Question 7 asked if the time of the year that the Institute is held is right.45

The discussion by the Committee indicated that the survey was prepared and circulated without any authority or participation from Institute representatives to the great majority of the 1068 registrants of the 1948 Institute.

A Committee member pointed out that question 2 is slanted because the Institute should obviously change continually. Several members felt that the number of concurrent meetings (question 6) was a problem and a weakness but the "cure" of cutting out and combining seemed worse than the ailment. Tyler summed up the trends indicated by the survey as: (1) The Institute is a place for educators and commercial broadcasters to get together for discussion. (2) The Institute should be continued. (3) Planning of meetings should be done in close cooperation with the industry. (4) The number of simultaneous meetings should be reduced. Tyler also commented that the formation of this committee (National Advisory Committee) should be a good solution to the implication in question 8, that the broadcast industry
should be more involved in the planning of the Institute. It was then agreed that the National Advisory Committee would be a permanent planning committee with names of Committee members published so that each member could receive suggestions and feedback for future Institutes.

The majority of this meeting was concerned with choosing topics and people for the next Institute. After some discussion and objections it was agreed that the only immediate relief for the scheduling of so many special interest meetings concurrently was to shorten the duration of each meeting and schedule two meeting periods in each afternoon. This was accomplished at the 1949 Institute. 46 Tyler had explained that some groups meet on two different days during the Institute and this is based on the attendance at previous meetings of this group plus the desires of the chairman and members of that group.

Tyler referred to the drop in attendance of commercial stations and network representatives. An NAB representative indicated that cooperation from commercial broadcasters was becoming more difficult to attain since, in the past, they had been asked to come to the Institute to explain something they had done only to be criticized by
educators for having done it. Tyler explained that last year's attempt to avoid this hostility was negated by the unfortunate approach of one speaker in the opening session. The reference was to commercial broadcaster, Ted Cott's chiding of educators which will be discussed in the content summary of this chapter. Others agreed that this was a problem of the Institute and one person mentioned, in addition, the commercial broadcasters' dislike of being approached by organization representatives for free time on the air and other favors. Another Committee member verified that some people take advantage of the Institute to carry on business which should not be conducted at the Institute.

The Committee felt that chairmen for general sessions should be chosen for skill to moderate a group rather than knowledge in the field, and one moderator should be given the job of handling the discussion at all general meetings. Kenneth Bartlett served as discussion leader at all the general sessions of the 1949-50-51-52 Institutes. During this and another meeting held on February 5, 1949, the Committee emphasized the need to include more discussion on television than occurred at the 1948 Institute.

As suggested in the previous year, a meeting of the National Advisory Committee was held on May 19, 1949, the
day after the close of the 1949 Institute.

The Committee discussed the address given the preceding afternoon by Edgar Kobak in which he evaluated the Institute. Among other things, he urged inclusion of top-level people in broadcasting and education among those planning the 1950 conference, and that a real effort be made to attract top-level people to the conference. The Committee recognized the helpfulness of the suggestions made by Mr. Kobak but felt that the choice of personnel for the planning committee must be based upon their ability to do a good job of planning and their willingness to devote necessary time to the committee.

Mr. Richards, [NAB] suggested that the Committee hold a meeting in New York to which top broadcasters and top educators would be invited to talk over the 1950 Institute. The committee agreed with the suggestion and chose the tentative dates of May 24 or 25. The main purpose of the meeting would be to ask these people for suggestions in building a program that would attract policy-makers and program people in both radio and education. Mrs. Hester [National Organizations] urged that a date for the meeting be set and announced immediately to the press. After discussion, it was agreed that it would be preferable not to publicize this meeting.47

It was agreed that Judge Miller, president of the NAB, would be contacted to invite all these "top-level" people. However, the New York meeting never materialized because of schedule difficulties. 48 Although the Committee discussed possibilities of adding new members, it was finally decided that others should be used as consultants; but that the organizational representation should remain the same. Therefore, the only changes within the Committee should be in the persons representing the organizations on the Committee.
Miss Frieda Hennock, newly appointed commissioner of the FCC had been introduced at the 1949 Institute dinner. The Committee reaction to Commissioner Hennock was that she seemed very interested in educational radio; but it appeared that she needed much educating if she was to be effective in that capacity. She did not know much about educational broadcasting and its needs but she learned quickly for Commissioner Hennock later became the outspoken leader in the successful effort for educational television reservations.

The matter of discussion at the Institute commanded much attention, as the Committee tried to suggest ways of allowing more time for discussion and yet eliminate the irresponsible and irrelevant discussion. It was agreed that small group session chairmen should be encouraged to plan less time for formal presentations and more time for open discussion, while the general sessions should continue to be moderated by Kenneth Bartlett, who handled the discussion at the 1949 general session in excellent fashion.

The meeting of the Committee after the 1950 Institute discussed possibilities of interesting topics for college presidents and school superintendents, for there was a need to attract more representation from these top educators.
There was a shortage of top broadcasters attending also. It was felt that the freeze, plus financial difficulties of television expense, were keeping broadcasters at their desks. Richards suggested the new NAB code would probably be formulated and Tyler wondered if the Institute could get involved with the committee formulating the code. Richards also suggested a change of dates of the Institute so it would not conflict with the NAB convention, and changing the name of the Institute to include television. The name change was accomplished for the next (1951) Institute.

The possibility of the FCC conducting a hearing at the Institute was discussed as was a general session on broadcasting and national elections. Several other possible group meetings were suggested and finally the date of October 13, 1959, was set for the next meeting. No further records of meetings for this period were found.

The representation on this committee covered just about every important broadcast related activity. However, elementary, secondary, and higher education were not represented except through educator-broadcasters. With all the deliberations about representation and the recognized need to attract the school administrator it seemed to me to be a
grave oversight on the part of the Advisory Committee. M.S. Novik represented the Miscellaneous Institute Constituency and was conspicuous by his absence from every meeting. The three years that this committee operated during this period, there were few personnel changes.

In a personal conversation with I. Keith Tyler in 1966, he indicated that there was a period when the National Advisory Committee was not called together formally because they did not feel it was needed. Professor Tyler did not remember the exact years but he presumed that 1952-53-54, was that period, since no records of any Committee activities or acknowledgements were found. Tyler also indicated that Committee people were in touch with him and performed liaison tasks for the Institute during those years.

The financial situation remained fairly stable throughout this period. Actually, for the size and importance of the Institute, it operated on a very low budget. At the beginning of 1946, there was $1,033 in the bank and at the end of 1953 the bank balance was $2,256.51. However, a closer look at the financial statements located in Appendix II, indicates that the Institute was losing money each year after 1949 except 1953 when it would have shown a slight
loss except for outside contributions and a reduction on yearbook costs. Actually the yearbook lost money almost every year. The Institute budget accounted for only the stenographer and editor costs. The majority of the printing costs were covered by the sale of the books.

The general registration fee of $5.00 was raised to $6.00 in 1949 and to $7.00 in 1952. The annual Institute Dinner was raised from $3.50 to $4.00 in 1951. Although several other minor adjustments in special group registration were made, the bulk of the revenue came from the general registration fee.

Program

Several changes occurred in the schedule of the program during this period. From 1949 through 1953 the Institute was held from Thursday through Sunday. Previously, it had been scheduled from Friday through Monday. A 1943 post mortem suggestion had made the point that such a schedule would allow the working man to be back home at his job on Monday morning.

The round-table meetings, which had been situated, for several years, in the morning of the last day of the Institute, were dropped and a second round of special
interest meetings replaced them in 1947. The number of concurrent meetings was only reduced by three during this period but the scheduling of two sets of meetings each afternoon allowed participants to attend six small-group meetings instead of four during the Institute, as was discussed in the Planning section of this chapter.

With the increasing number of entries in the American Exhibition of Educational Radio Programs, the job of judging became more complicated. In 1946-47-48, a panel of judges in New York judged the national network entries while the usual three-man panel in Columbus, Ohio continued to handle station, regional network, and organization entries. In 1949 the Columbus-judged programs were distributed to various panels created specifically for this judging throughout the U.S. Each panel judged all programs in a single class thus allowing for fourteen judging centers in addition to New York. Also, New York began judging television programs in 1949. The 1951 Exhibition dropped the New York judging center and eliminated national network programs because it was felt that other organizations, such as the Peabody Awards, were judging national programs. However, in 1952 the national network programs were again being judged without any apparent explanation for the reversal. These
programs were distributed to the fourteen judging centers rather than New York. In 1952, all classifications of television programs were judged by a committee in Columbus, Ohio. The basic changes were completed in 1954 when the television programs were distributed to various judging centers.

The practice by allied groups of holding meetings in conjunction with the Institute increased to the point of filling all the waking hours surrounding the Institute activities. In 1948, a high of twenty-one separate groups held at least one meeting each.

A table was provided each year for display and distribution of printed matter from the various organizations but there was no indication in the program of any equipment displays during this period. In 1949, a local TV station (WLWC) displayed its remote TV unit while producing a live program of the Institute reception.

The general sessions of the Institute settled into two basic formats: (1) demonstration with a reaction panel and discussion; or (2) single speech presentation of the problems with a reaction panel and discussion. Of course, after the panel discussion the audience was always encouraged to ask questions and express opinions. Occasionally a debate
format was used but this was discouraged because it did not lead to calm, objective discussion. Attendance figures for concurrent meetings indicated the following topics were generally of high interest throughout this period: Radio writing and production, Television writing and production, Minority programming, Children's programming, Educational radio and television stations, School broadcasting, Training and education for broadcasting. Attendance figures also indicated that special interest group meetings attracted more people on the average than work-study group meetings.  

The general attendance figures reached an all-time high in 1946 at 1,207 with a gradual decline to 823 in 1953. The average for the period was 941. The biggest drop came in 1949 when the attendance was down 165 from the previous year. Advertising agencies showed some representation in 1946-47-48, but otherwise the turnout was negligible. College and university representation dropped in 1948 but gradually increased after that. Commercial stations reached a peak in 1948 and then remained steady but somewhat below the peak.  

A look at the distribution provides indications that a wider geographic representation was accomplished in the
later years of this period. A higher total of states and nations were represented in 1952 than any other year. Also, 1953 showed a much smaller percentage of the total attendance coming from the home state of Ohio. Representation from California and Texas was increasing and all other states except New York were holding fairly steady. It could be said that the decrease from the high years of 1946-47-48, and the settling at about 800 showed a decrease more in quantity than quality.

Content Summary

The concern with the United States' expanded responsibility in world affairs after World War II was reflected in considerable attention during this period, to international broadcasting and United Nations activities. Representation on the air of the views of minority groups was always considered at a few sessions each year. Negros, women, labor unions, and children were the most frequent minority groups discussed.

The 1946 Institute found leading representatives of international radio asking for stronger participation by American radio in championing world security, peace, and understanding. Benjamin Cohen, assistant secretary-general
for public information, United Nations, said one immediate need of the United Nations is the help of radio to inform the public about the U.S.  

Arno Huth, author, lecturer, and authority on European radio, suggested a U.N. Broadcasting Union to share in the reconstruction.

Chester Davis, organizing chairman, Famine Emergency Committee, reminded radio of its role to recruit the continued cooperation of the housewife in personal rationing so that we might distribute food to starving Europe.

Harold Urey, Nobel prize winner, distinguished service professor of chemistry at the University of Chicago, stated that atomic secrets should be placed with the United Nations as a move toward preventing World War III. Other panelists discussing the question "The Implications of Atomic Energy" agreed with Urey and called on the radio industry to present the true picture of total destruction which World War III would bring.

All four radio networks originated discussion programs from the Institute during the conference. In addition, the BBC broadcast a trans-atlantic discussion which was demonstrated at the Institute. A total of four hours of network broadcasting reached a considerably larger audience than
reflected in attendance figures. 62

In 1947, CIO secretary-treasurer, James Carey, enumerated several types of discrimination which radio practiced against labor views. Robert Kintner, vice-president of ABC, defended radio while Phil Newsom, radio news editor of United Press wire-service, insisted that labor was getting impartial coverage from U.P. 63

Several of the concurrent group meetings discussed public service program techniques and applications in specific areas. Among the more important discussions were the Childrens Programs group 64 and the Women Programs group. 65 A portion of the childrens programs discussion, which was moderated by Dorothy Gordon of the "New York Times Youth Forums," was carried live over the MBS network.

One of the highlights of the Institute was the speech of Barbara Ward, member of the Board of Governors of the British Broadcasting Corporation and foreign editor of the London Economist. She spoke on "Radio in One World" at the Annual Institute Dinner. Pleading that international broadcasting be taken away from diplomats and made a tool for peace instead of a weapon of war, she stated that this greatest method of mass education must do a better job
because survival of the democratic way of life depends upon it. 66

Luther Evans, Librarian of Congress and chairman, Mass Media Committee for UNESCO, spoke at a general session at the 1948 Institute about the goals of UNESCO and the need for support. 67 At this same session, Charles Thayer, acting chief of the State Department International Broadcast Division, described the objectives and program of The Voice of America. 68

American radio came in for its initial analysis as a 3-man panel blamed the listening public for many ills of radio. Saul Carson, radio critic of the New Republic, blamed the public, which allowed advertising, for the type and number of commercials in radio. Dean Meyers, radio editor of the Columbus Dispatch, said the public's willingness to accept mediocrity is the reason that radio provides mediocrity. Robert Stephan, radio editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, turned the attention back to the broadcaster for burying public service shows in poor time periods. 69

The opening general session found Ted Cott, vice-president and director of programs at WNEW, taking the Institute and educators to task for their attitude about commercial radio. He said the Institute should be a
cheering section for radio instead of a sneering section. Educational radio is an intellectual dictatorship. Then the panel of award winning program experts demonstrated how educational ideas could be presented in an entertaining fashion. This session and another general session on documentary programs both used the method of playing excerpts from programs to demonstrate techniques.

A highlight of the 1949 Institute was Edgar Kobak's challenge to the Institute itself to change its format. Kobak as president of MBS carried a considerable influence in the industry when he had participated in several previous Institutes. He was returning now as a business consultant without the pressure of representing a network and this perhaps allowed him more freedom to express his personal thoughts. It did not noticeably lessen his influence nor the weight of his word in the press. Kobak's topic at the Annual Institute Dinner was "Education at the Crossroads." He opened his relatively short speech with the comment that he is not qualified to address the subject given to him but would rather talk about the Institute of Education by Radio at the Crossroads. He asked for a reassessment of the entire function of the Institute: "I think this Institute, this
conference, needs a searching study and modernization," but remarked that the Institute "is not necessarily at the crossroads, but I think is in a rut." He gave several reasons why he felt the Institute was slipping and made several suggestions of areas to explore for change: "This business of radio and television needs a real program meeting. This [the Institute] is probably the nearest to a top meeting in the entire industry." Broadcasting magazine headlined Kobak's speech and remarked that the Institute had never been subjected to such a heavy barrage of criticism but that it was evident that he spoke the sentiments of many who heard him. Reactions of the Institute Program Committee were noted in the Planning section of this chapter.

The FCC was amply represented by two former members, James L. Fly and Clifford Durr plus the then-chairman Wayne Coy and the newest member of the commission Frieda Hennock.

David Penn, spokesmen for the Voice of America, told a general session on international radio that the "Voice" is the least understood branch of the U.S. State Department's international arm. He said this broadcast service reaches around the world to support and explain American foreign policy and gives a clear first-hand picture of American
democracy in action. 76 George Voscovec, former Prague playwright then with UNESCO mass communications staff in Paris, told what UNESCO is doing in radio around the world. 77

At a general session of the 1950 Institute, Dwight B. Herrick, chief of radio for the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Tokyo, emphasized the important job that radio has in Japan in building a democratic and peace-desirous Japan. He reported greatest success in disseminating information and teaching tenets of democracy. 78 Walter Dorn, of Ohio State University, stressed the need for coordination of policies among U.S. and European countries if an effective cold war is to be waged against the Soviet Union. 79 Dorn was a former special advisor to General Clay in Germany.

The many concurrent section meetings discussed more specific applications of program improvement, Jack W. Lewis of the Rocky Mountain Radio Council said that educators must learn the likes and dislikes of their audience no less than commercial broadcasters if they wished to survive. 80 Seymour Siegel, WNYC director, called for accelerated promotional and audience building activities. 81

The Annual Institute Dinner celebrated the Twentieth Anniversary of the Institute in a featured speech by H.V.
Kaltenborn, Dean of American News Commentators. He assured the gathering that their continued concern for radio broadcasting was justified because radio would survive the television age. He blamed educators for failing to win an audience in radio because they merely put classroom lectures on the air. He cited commercial broadcasters for their pressure to take educational channels away from schools. He accused the public of giving much lip-service and scant support to education and assured the audience that educators and commercial broadcasters would continue to be dissatisfied with each other.  

Three live television programs were shown at the Institute. The hour-long DuMont network program "Court of Current Issues" occupied a general session with the question, "Are We Losing Our Constitutional Freedoms?" The cast consisted of seven distinguished participants headed by Carl Weygant, Chief Justice of the Ohio Supreme Court. A special session observed a health telecast from a local commercial station. The third television program, "The Columbus Town Meeting of the Air," discussed "What is Television Doing to our Children?" Guest panelists were Dorothy Gordon, moderator of "New York Times Youth Forums" and Leon Levine,
director of public affairs programs for CBS.

The 1951 Institute discussed TV programming quite extensively. The Annual Institute Dinner audience heard both Commissioner Walker of the FCC and Benjamine Fine, education editor of the New York Times urge greater selectivity from the audience as well as programmers and request more "worthwhile" programs in prime-time. The discussion became heated when commercial broadcasters in the audience pointed out the need to cater to popular tastes in order to survive. A plea for stern parental guidance in home viewing was voiced by another participant as she objected to the assumption by commercial broadcasters that most people are morons. Commissioner Hennock agreed with commercial broadcasters that television is an expensive business, but she indicated that nobody objects to a profit as long as some of that profit proportionately goes into public service programs.

International affairs were primarily confined to radio operation so the importance of radio to emerging nations and our own use of this means of communication provided some stimulating sessions.

A 1951 session discussed the effectiveness of broadcasting in developing understanding among nations. William
Whyte, Jr., associate editor of *Fortune* magazine, outlined the basic problem of the misunderstanding of America. He said we are considered totally without spiritual or moral purposes—all money and no soul. Foy Kohler, chief, International Broadcasting Division, Department of State, called The Voice of America a tremendously good investment reaching even to Moscow twenty-five percent of the time. The "Voice" could deliver a message to practically the entire population of satellite states within a matter of hours, he said.

Some of the section meetings were fully as interesting and important as the general sessions. The political aspects of television were discussed by a panel of four experts. Edward Ingle, director of radio-TV for the Republican National Committee, stressed the power of television in molding public opinion. He said it would be suicide for a candidate to ignore radio and TV. Kenneth Fry, director of radio-TV for the Democratic National Committee, urged broadcasters to build better political programs as a real public service obligation.

A noteworthy session on TV production featured three of the most celebrated television producers, Ted Mills, chief of TV production, NBC; Worthington Minor and Fred Coe,
managers of program development for CBS-TV and NBC-TV respectively. Minor suggested that quality does not have to be ponderous and pointed out that Shakespeare would not have been acceptable to educators of his day. Mills, declared that educators can help commercial broadcasters by gaining support for quality shows while Coe expressed the belief that commercial broadcasters are already using TV as an indirect educational force.

A general session on "Closed-Circuit Theatre Television--A New Mass Medium" at the 1952 Institute introduced this most useful innovation. Jack Johnson, Federal Civil Defense Administration, revealed its very effective use in training civil defense personnel. E.G. Sherburne, Jr., TV coordinator at the Navy Special Devices Center, presented results of studies of effectiveness by the Navy. Irvin Paul Sulds, New York Theatre-TV consultant sketched progress being made in using closed-circuit TV to present, on theatre screens, events as they happen.

The 1953 Institute emphasized the techniques area more than the previous five Institutes. At the various section meetings there was much emphasis on what should be done and ways and means of doing it with less concern voiced
about who should do it and why. Reports from various universities and public school systems on their activities in television were heard. The section on Adult Education was emphasizing showmanship while another section was demonstrating film integration in educational programs. Frederick Gregg, director of promotional activities for Crosley Broadcasting Corporation, encouraged use of contests and gimmicks as a means of promoting public service shows. Audience surveys should be arranged on a cost-sharing basis with other organizations which want to acquire such information. Tracy Tyler suggested that we must supply teachers with various techniques to teach pupils appreciation and discrimination in viewing and listening habits.

Major Issues

The return to peace-time operations presented the broadcasting industry with new problems. Broadcasting had contributed strongly to maintenance of morale during the war. A large part of this contribution consisted of a public service type of programming such as news reporting, discussion programs on topics of current interest and cultural programs. Most of this programming was not highly popular but was sponsored by organizations which wished to maintain prestige
with the public at a time when no product sales could be made. With the return to peace-time manufacturing and withdrawal of the excess profit tax, such prestige programming disappeared because sponsors wanted more popular entertainment programming. At the same time, the attractive profits of most radio stations during the war years encouraged many others to build and operate stations after the war thus increasing competition for available advertiser dollars.

The FCC had witnessed the impact of public service programming and wished to maintain some of this beneficial impact after the war. The Blue Book and the Second Mayflower decision on editorializing were FCC attempts to promote public service programming.

Television was introduced during this period as a full scale broadcast service. The educational community's response to this situation was crucial to the adequate future development of television in education. An organized effort by educational interests was required or the advantages of VHF frequency space would be lost just as the AM frequency space had been lost in radio in 1934. The broadcast industry emphasized its determination to impose an AM quality in radio broadcasting after the war. This provided
a good example of the consequences for educators who doubted the necessity of acquiring VHF facilities in television.

The major issues then were: (1) the emphasis on the public service responsibility of the broadcaster, and (2) the development of an educational television broadcast service.

**Public Service Responsibility**

This period started with the exploration of a very controversial document in broadcasting history. On March 7, 1946, the FCC released its report on "The Public Service Responsibility of the Broadcast Licensee," more popularly known as the Blue Book. The theme of the Institute for that year was "Radio's Postwar Responsibility," and a prominent speaker in two sessions of the Institute was Clifford J. Durr, commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, and generally conceded to be the driving force behind the Blue Book. Another speaker at the Institute was Charles Siepmann, chief consultant on the Blue Book. During the months since the publication of the Blue Book, Justin Miller, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, had addressed several industry organizations on the evils of the Blue Book. Miller was placed on a symposium panel with Durr
at the Institute and in another session Siepmann was placed opposite Sydney M. Kaye, executive vice-president and general counsel of Broadcast Music Incorporated. The highlight of the Institute was a formal debate on the Blue Book with Durr pitted against Kaye at the Annual Institute Dinner. Broadcasting magazine emphasized this debate in its headline previewing the Institute two weeks prior to the event.

Durr and Miller met at the opening session, a symposium entitled "Has Radio Reconverted? Is Broadcasting Assuming its Postwar Obligations?" Edgar Kobak, president of Mutual Broadcasting System, presided over the symposium with H.B. McCarty, University of Wisconsin radio director; Nathan Straus, president of WMCA, a New York City independent radio station, and Davidson Taylor, CBS vice-president and director of programs; participating on the symposium panel. This list of top executives in the broadcasting field was impressive and their individual speeches voiced the opinions of a large part of the industry. Durr opened the symposium with a review of the tremendous technical advances of the communications industry, and the resulting expansion in materials and financial gain. He suggested that these technical advances, largely instituted during the war, indicated a desire to
withhold the advances prior to the war:

We continue to pay "lip service" to the good American words "progress" and "competition," but were unwilling to let loose the forces they describe lest the new things they would give us might destroy the value of the old things we already had.90

He cautioned that the industry might be returning to that prewar attitude on technical advances and documented this opinion with the industry's lack of desire to promote FM broadcasting and continued emphasis on AM broadcasting. The New York Times headlined a story by Jack Gould in the next day's edition, "Set Maker Blamed in FM Radio Delay."91 Durr turned to the trend in radio programming suggesting that it may also be reverting to the prewar dominance by advertising. He quoted a story in Broadcasting which stated that Justine Miller had, "in a recent speech, branded talk about 'the people owning the air' as a 'lot of hooey and nonsense.'"92 Miller later responded that Broadcasting had misquoted him and that his comment had been something to the effect that "It is nonsense to rely upon such a cliche' as that the people 'own the air' to justify an infringement of freedom of speech of radio."93 Durr indicated that the Blue Book had made allegations of fact to support its belief that certain licensees were not living up to their public responsibilities and these allegations had not been challenged.
He closed with the thought that the FCC was not attempting to provide the ideas and information essential to understanding the world but was attempting "to try to keep open the channels through which these ideas and this information may flow to and be exchanged among the American people."^94

Justine Miller listed some of the accomplishments of radio during the war and the contributions which the industry was making to peace-time conversion. He indicated the broadcasters returning from war duty were acutely conscious of world obligations and would provide a more mature enrichment of programming for radio. He suggested from his experience that most stations were adding to staff with returning veterans rather than firing the newer personnel to make room for the veterans, and emphasized the boost to the economy from the predictable expansion in number of stations. He said the NAB was conducting new clinics to encourage stations to expand their news staffs and provide more complete news coverage. Referring to the postwar obligations of radio, Miller simply pointed out that the American radio is contributing significantly to the free exchange of world information and that this function is vital to future peaceful development. His only reference to the Blue Book came at
this point as he stated the broadcasting industry's determination to fight any encroachment upon freedom of speech, such as "government of the content of our radio programs." He identified this fight to be an obligation of broadcasters. Turning to more of radio's functions he noted that public awareness of the tragic famine emergency was substantially created by radio; that effective advertising can bring the economy and the public to improved standards and reduce the huge public debt. He conceded that not enough was being done in the area of educational broadcasting, but research was being revitalized with commercial broadcaster money, and the NAB was setting up a reorganized research department.

McCarty accused radio of returning to its "pre-war status of almost total disregard for its social opportunities and obligations." He emphasized that, in all his remarks, he was referring not to just commercial radio but educational radio as well. He urged more effort by radio toward furtherance of international understanding by the use of more foreign programs, and financial support and development of international short-wave broadcasting. On a national scope he asked:

What is American radio doing to strengthen the educational foundation of our democracy? What contribution is radio making to the intelligent study and solution of
labor-management problems, to the problem of intergroup relationships, to the rising tide of prejudice and intolerance, to the unresponsiveness, if you please, of our own Congress to the will of the people? What part is radio playing in the solution of problems at the local level?  

He did not see much hope of radio helping to solve our post-war problems because: (1) The industry's vitriolic response to the Blue Book was totally selfish. (2) An official spokesman for the industry publicly stated that radio could not be expected to present programs in the interest of minorities. (3) Continued total concern with giving the public what it wants and no consideration of what it needs. (4) Return to the basic philosophy in programming decisions of "Does it sell?" (5) Concentration of programming in New York and Hollywood. (6) Slow and timid use of FM by educational institutions. (7) Neglect of the programming needs of children.  

Taylor merely announced what CBS program changes were planned and what program ideas were under consideration. Strauss, a commercial broadcaster, agreed with a recent Variety story that stated: "Good taste, development of original radio technique and cognizance of public service programming have gone by the boards." He strongly disagreed with the radio industry's response to the Blue Book. He
felt the Blue Book was "eminently fair" and that broadcasters should welcome such criticism "carrying as it does an assurance of support in rooting out abuses."  

He disagreed with an assumption of the Blue Book that no commercially sponsored program is a public service program stating that such an assumption is just as unwarranted as one that every sustaining program represents real public service. He closed with four specific suggestions. (1) Eliminate the middle commercial in all news programs and all news commentaries which run 15 minutes or less. (2) Initiate a study to determine a limit on length and number of commercial interruptions to provide fair treatment of advertisers, station operators and the listening public. (3) Adopt a policy to exclude certain medical products and certain patent medicine advertising from the air. The indiscriminate advertising in such areas was a menace to the entire broadcasting industry. (4) Recognize that advertising agencies dominate programming and determine, to a certain extent, what is and is not to be aired; then realize that this is a real threat to maintenance of good faith in dealing with the public who may recall broadcast licenses when this faith is lost.

The discussion period allowed some clarification. Durr explained to Strauss that the Blue Book does not assume
that a program ceases to be of public service value because it becomes sponsored. He indicated that the trade journals have drawn this conclusion from a part of the Blue Book which questions the preponderance of sponsored programs. The Blue Book stated that certain types of programs (discussion of controversial issues, educational and religious programs etc.) do not lend themselves to sponsorship. The lack of any sustaining time for such programs literally eliminates them from the air:

The big problem is not what we get on the air, but what we do not get, and we do not get a lot of things we ought to get, merely because too much time is devoted to sponsored programs.104

Strauss stated he saw little to disagree with in Durr's explanation. Taylor later commented that a network sustaining program usually benefits from sponsorship by being accepted on more stations than when programed on a sustaining basis.

Miller explained that his objection to the Blue Book was based on infringement of the right of free speech and free radio because the Blue Book used the Mayflower Case as one of the authorities upon which its assertion of power in the matter of program judgement was based. He then attacked the Mayflower Case decision, and indicated that broadcasters could not risk losing their licenses in order to fight the
decision in court. He also noted that most of the accusations of failure on the part of radio in postwar activities could be leveled against the great majority of human institutions in the country.

Durr admitted that the Mayflower Case did need further clarification. He did not feel a broadcaster should be denied the right of expressing his own opinion on a topic as long as he labelled it as such "and provided also that when he is writing his own editorial page he is very careful to see that the letters to the editors have equal freedom in his column." However, Durr interpreted it as a lack of courage in the industry that no one would risk losing his license to fight the Mayflower Case in court.

Miller had pointed out in his previous statement that the only way to bring it to court was after the broadcaster had "suffered at the hands of the Commission," and the only penalty the FCC had was license revocation. In answer to a question from the audience, Miller agreed with the idea of allowing the FCC to levy fines against broadcasters for infractions of rules. He suggested that a court procedure for punishment even more serious than the fine might also be provided.
These opening speeches of the 1946 Institute assured the audience that broadcasting was back in the highly competitive business of advertising, with programming considered an important but secondary function. Justin Miller had emphasized the benefit to the national economy derived from radio activities, while Durr and McCarty bemoaned the lack of public service programming. Although the majority of criticism centered around the advertising agency control and influence, there were indications that stations were willing victims of this influence. Taylor's reference to difficulties in getting network clearance for sustaining programs and Strauss' comments regarding the difficulty of resisting such influence unless the industry took a united stand are examples of the drawbacks to a competitive, free-enterprise system. Miller's cry to resist government interference seemed a predictable overreaction but Durr's expectation of resistance to the Mayflower Case appeared somewhat naive. The system of fines suggested, was later to be instituted and allowed both the FCC and the broadcaster more ability to achieve justice without the ultimate risk of loss of license.

The Blue Book had only been discussed briefly in this opening session but the session had provided the
background for more direct consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of the Blue Book.

The next scheduled clash over the Blue Book occurred two days later when the Sunday afternoon general session found Sydney Kaye, general counsel of Broadcast Music Incorporated, facing Charles Siepmann, consultant for the FCC who worked on the publication of the Blue Book. This modified radio debate was broadcast over the CBS network as an origination of the program "The People's Platform." The question posed was "Would Government Supervision Improve Radio Programs?"

Lyman Bryson, moderator of "The People's Platform," introduced the program by stating the four criteria which the Blue Book itemized as means of judging the quality of program service relevant to the public interest: (1) Maintenance of a balanced program schedule including network and non-network sustaining programs. (2) Carrying local live programs. (3) Carrying programs devoted to the discussion of public issues. (4) Elimination of advertising excesses. 108

Charles Siepmann presented the following points:

1. These criteria help the radio industry by giving direction.

2. There is no disputing the fact that these criteria
point out four basic, obvious, and present defects which the industry has had time to eliminate.

3. The industry was not able to eliminate defects because it was so totally profit motive based.

4. The public, which invests twenty-six times more money in radio than the industry, is not articulate and united so it must be represented.

5. Since the industry cannot adequately represent the public, and obviously is not serving many minority groups, the government must represent them.

6. Government representation (FCC) is not more than residual control which operates only at default of the industry. It is a trustee of the public which is monitored by the public, the courts, and Congress.

7. The diversity of many more stations, still a long way from accomplishment, would not eliminate need of some government supervision; since the power and influence of radio precludes complete freedom to the play of the marketplace of ideas.

8. An illustration of the concentration of industry control is shown in the fact that one network receives 25 percent of its revenue from four advertisers and 63 percent of its revenue from eight advertising agencies.
Sydney Kaye brought out the following arguments:

1. Radio shows no evidence of big business domination particularly in politics and social issues.

2. American radio improved tremendously in the last twenty years and performed excellently during the war. It should be given more time to develop and adjust to postwar social attitudes.

3. The scarcity factor which seems to be the basis of the concern by the FCC will soon be eliminated as the new stations proliferate. With more stations, the audience will be fragmented therefore allowing radio to program to minority groups.

4. Suggested regulation is highly inefficient since the FCC will be judging qualitative as well as quantitative information and cannot judge as well or better than individual broadcasters located in their own communities. The better judge would be 1,000 stations rather than a four-man majority on a seven-man commission.

5. The argument seems to be that the more powerful a medium is, the more necessary it is to have government control (regulation). How about various print media and motion pictures? When will the government step into regulation of those media?
The above ideas were voiced in the discussion between Kaye and Siepmann and basically reflect different outlooks on government supervision of radio. Kaye said the principle, if allowed, will quickly lead to complete control and Siepmann said that it won't. 109

The annual banquet featured the heralded debate between Commissioner Durr and Sydney Kaye. In addition to the objectives previously stated, Kaye emphasized that qualitative judgements of program service must be made on the basis of public acceptance; and by stating criteria, the FCC is imposing strict guidelines which is too close to absolute control. Broadcasters will follow the guidelines scrupulously rather than risk their entire business to a court challenge.

Durr pointed out that the FCC was merely performing the function for which it was created--to grant and renew licenses in the public interest. All the criteria of the Blue Book had been used in previous decisions but had never been compiled so that the broadcaster would have guidelines for future service. Previous history had demonstrated that some licensees had acquired and retained licenses based primarily on promises which were never kept. The only difference
was that the FCC now expected to enforce those promises. The broadcaster had access to the courts but the public had no means of seeking change except through FCC representation. Durr also questioned the possibility of eliminating the scarcity factor since most FM was owned by AM operators who simulcast rather than programmed separately.

From these three Institute sessions it appeared that the broadcasting industry was throwing up the spectre of government control prematurely. Broadcasters had grown rather content and prosperous during the war but the increased competition from new stations plus the networks' desire for more money to finance television was allowing money to be the overwhelming determinant of programming. The FCC had eliminated the broadcasters' main defense against providing public service programming on a regular basis. That defense was to create criteria to fit the particular broadcaster situation and promise to do better if this did not meet the particular standards of the FCC. The FCC had eliminated the excuse of ignorance of standards and had identified specific requirements which would reduce the profit potential of station operation. However, the concern over government control could be considered very reasonable when
options were contemplated. The FCC had the ultimate power of throwing a broadcaster out of business or it had no power at all. Of course, the FCC had one other means of punishing an errant broadcaster. The broadcaster's cost of explaining his station operation to the FCC in a hearing in Washington could prove to be quite sufficient to deter further questionable activities. But such procedure by the FCC exposed the precedent of judging activities as either acceptable or not acceptable without any clearer indication of degree, since the punishment was either merely an admonition to change or removal of the license. If the broadcaster disagreed with the FCC decision, he would have to put his license in jeopardy to test the case in court. Few broadcasters had the economic security of risking their license to question an FCC decision. The FCC was not inclined to use the license revocation power except in extreme cases, so the broadcaster had relatively little opportunity to seek action from the courts. In effect, the FCC could control by threat of license revocation and the broadcaster would agree to any FCC stipulation since he had no way of causing a court review except license revocation. Miller of the NAB pointed to this situation as the reason for the lack of resistance to the original Mayflower
decision. Although this situation did not operate to the
detriment of the broadcaster, the potential for control by
the FCC was indeed great and the NAB as spokesman for the
broadcaster was only performing its proper function by
keeping people alert to the potential danger of the situation.

The 1947 Institute continued to concentrate on the
Blue Book. However, it was no longer a time for discussion
of the virtues and vices of that report but a time for con­
sidering the practical means of implementing it. The theme
was reported as: "Public Service--How to do It and Keep
Listeners." This included specific suggestions and
techniques for retaining high over-all popularity while
serving the specific public needs. Seven session dealt
directly with the public service issue while three more
considered the problem indirectly.

In a special session just prior to the opening general
session, the MBS network program "Meet the Press" recorded
its first remote origination. For this occasion, Commissioner
Durr was interviewed by Lawrence Spivak, editor of American
Mercury, Edwin James of Broadcasting magazine, George Rosen
of Variety, and Jerry Franken of Billboard. The questions
centered around the function of the FCC in judging program­
ming, and the policy on editorializing. The major points
expressed in this broadcast were:

1. The FCC does not judge individual programs but does consider the over-all program service of a station relative to the promises made at the last license renewal.

2. There was no "pressure" for the Blue Book. The common agreement of all the Commissioners that such a report was needed was a major factor in resisting the pressure against the Blue Book.

3. Commissioner Durr does not feel enough attention is paid to the programming in renewal of station licenses.

4. If the FCC does not fulfill its function to look after the public interest, there is no resort to the courts. However, if the FCC oversteps its power, and especially in the matter of censorship, the courts are available to correct the abuse.

5. The FCC does not have the staff or time to consider the matter of economic consequences of additional stations in any market. 112

Commissioner Durr led the opening session panel on "What Should Be the Criteria for Broadcasting in the Public Interest, Convenience and Necessity?" 113 He said that public interest lies in programming, and all programs are in the
the public interest if honesty and a reasonable amount of intelligence is used in the production. The test is not in popularity but how well it serves the ends of a democratic society. Edward R. Murrow, vice-president and director of Public Affairs for CBS, remarked that American radio served its listeners better than any other country's listeners are served. He said radio must hold a mirror behind the nation and the world to reflect what is there. He also emphasized the hope for increased use of documentaries and opposed editorializing unless sufficient opportunity for opposing views was made available. Robert K. Richards, director of public relations for the NAB, agreed with Durr that all programs are in the public interest generally, but that the interpretation of such a phrase as public interest to specific items depends very much on the individual interpreters. Therefore, the criteria are not very clear or consistent. Charles Siverson, program director, station WHAM, provided several specific criteria for handling and judging public service programs. He summarized with the opinion that "radio has the obligation to view requests for time from community groups with mature statesmanship rather than on the basis of yielding to expediency and surrendering to pressure."
Another broadcast from the Institute on this main topic was an origination of the "University of Chicago Round-Table" which occurred during a general session. The topic for discussion was "The Social Responsibilities of Radio" and the panel consisted of Clarence Moore, program manager of station KOA; Ray C. Wakefield, FCC Commissioner; Barbara Ward, member of the Board of Governors of the British Broadcasting Corporation; and Louis Wirth, University of Chicago professor of sociology and moderator. 115

After definition of the area of social responsibility as entertainment, education, instruction, inspiration and improvement of public taste, Miss Ward observed that two months of travel in the U.S. had convinced her that the Blue Book criticisms of American broadcasting had a great deal of validity. She noted three points of particular weakness which American radio displayed: (1) Sustaining programs got a very poor showing in peak listening hours. (2) There was a very high concentration (over 50 percent of daytime programming) of soap operas on network radio. (3) Avoidance of any comment which might upset anyone in the listening audience.

Commissioner Wakefield emphasized the need for more
experimentation in programming; more initiative and imagination in broadcast operations, since the public could not express likes and dislikes until they were presented with variety.

Moore pointed out that it was broadcasting's advertising acumen which allowed it to acknowledge its responsibilities in the field of social agencies, and that radio should reflect the viewpoints of the community rather than--as the British system tends to do--what radio thinks the community should have. Miss Ward replied that she was under the impression that American radio was giving the public what the advertisers thought the public should have rather than what the public thought it should have.

Wirth concluded the discussion with:

We need it [radio] for mass information, for mass education, and for the ability to discuss fully all shades of opinion openly, so that the people can participate in the heavy responsibilities of living in a mass democracy in our own time.

To do this, we have to prepare all segments of the community, but particularly the radio industry, for the responsibility which it has assumed. And in this nothing will help more, it seems to me, than the proper relationship between the people who pay the bill, the advertisers, and the people who perform the actual responsibilities in the program.
Moore was a program manager for a large commercial radio station. In all his comments, he continually identified the advertiser and broadcaster together which gave the impression that the advertiser was in fact responsible for programming decisions. Wirth's statements above, indicated an expectation of strong public service programming certainly beyond what the industry seemed prepared to give.

The last general session of the 1947 Institute was a symposium considering "Should Radio Have an Editorial Policy?" James L. Fly, attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union and chairman of the FCC in 1940, when the Mayflower decision was made, was to be the first speaker. He was unable to attend but his prepared speech was read. He stated that the scarcity factor in radio requires that a broadcaster not be allowed to use his station to support his partisan ends. The requirement is made to avoid one-sided presentation of attitudes on controversial issues. However, Fly felt that broadcasters should actively support non-controversial matters of public importance.

Rex Howell of station KFXJ, in Colorado, gave instances of his station's support on non-controversial issues, and claimed broadcasters are either misunderstanding the FCC's meaning of "advocate" or are hiding behind it.
Robert Leigh, of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, referred to Llewellyn White's report recommending the FCC allow editorializing providing the broadcaster allows equal time for an answer. Leigh disagreed with this and felt the broadcaster should try to fulfill the much more difficult job of being an umpire and interpreter of controversy. He did state that he felt broadcasters should be free to editorialize if they wished. He reviewed the conclusion of the Commission on Freedom of the Press with the following propositions: (1) Free expression is fundamental to a free, democratic society. (2) The free press clause of the Constitution guarantees free expression against governmental abridgment. (3) Concentration of control of media, which is a continuing trend, limits and abridges free expression; but laws cannot be allowed to prohibit control by the media of the people who use it. (4) An adequate and uncontaminated daily diet of news plus conflicting ideas and arguments on public issues is so essential to the democratic process that it acquires the stature of a citizen's right. This is, therefore, an obligation which the media must meet as a price for their freedom. A free press (broadcasting) must be a responsible or accountable press (broadcasting). (5) Therefore, the major
units of public expression have the main function of setting forth all views held by considerable numbers and reaching across all groups in the community. This includes a specific duty to present significant ideas contrary to their own ideas. This would permit the media to express their own opinions if such were clearly labelled.

Allen Sayler, radio representative of UAW-CIO union organization, referred to the tremendous growth in concentration of economic power since the beginning of World War II:

Twin demands for editorial rights and the creation of property rights in radio channels for owners of broadcast stations are part of a current trend toward concentration of control in the expression of ideas. This trend in the field of expression of ideas reflects the concentration of economic power in the radio broadcasting industry. Reports for 1946 show that five corporation sponsors provide one-fourth of the network billings, and just 10 corporation sponsors supply over one-third of the network billings.118

Although he did not address the legal right of the broadcaster in the matter of editorializing, he did state his belief that editorializing by radio station owners was not in the public interest.

Paul Spearman, former FRC attorney and an attorney involved in the original Mayflower case, denounced the Mayflower decision with the words: "If that wasn't
However, he felt the proper destiny of broadcasting is as a transmitter of intelligence rather than an interpreter of that intelligence. He believed that Congress or the FCC had no legal right to outlaw editorializing, and that the broadcaster ought to editorialize only in extraordinary circumstances because broadcasters would tend strongly to support the dominant powers. He noted that, since the frequencies are public properties, the licensee has no perrogative to express his opinions over any other citizen:

Since it is impossible for all people to air their views by radio, such rights become empty, indeed, if a few out of many millions are permitted to fill the air with editorials in support of their pet ideas.

In discussion with the audience the point was made that if a broadcast station could be considered an institution rather than an individual, free speech would have no legal standing in the matter. Spearman responded that one of his law partners agreed with that position because Congress has the right to put certain limitations on the use of public property. Since the frequencies are public property, it seemed logical to assume that the conduct of the frequency did not involve an individual's right but the public's rights. After relating this position, Spearman
reiterated his fear of any tampering with the concept of free speech. He suggested that if a representative of a substantial group was denied access to express an opinion on a controversial issue, the station action should be considered detrimental to license renewal.

Alan Griffin, Ohio State University, who read Fly's speech to the audience, proposed that the station owner is allowed, as every other citizen, to request time to express his opinion on every other radio station except his own station. Howell's reply was that the broadcaster would therefore be refused equal access with the public to his own station.

Although the arguments expressed on the matter of editorializing and the Blue Book in this chapter may be considered theoretical and academic, this writer feels they are very important to understanding the present situation in broadcasting. Licensees of educational, non-commercial stations are not allowed to editorialize. Commercial broadcasters are allowed to editorialize. The major concern at present is not the broadcasters' abuse of labelled opinion but their alleged abuse of unlabelled presentation of facts, such as documentaries ("Selling of the Pentagon") and
advertising.

Returning to the discussion at the 1947 Institute, it seems that everyone was concerned that the broadcaster assume responsibility for reflecting community opinion and provide leadership in clarifying issues, but no one was very specific as to how editorializing would help fulfill this obligation. Spearman seemed to personify the dilemma when he argued against a law denying editorialization on the grounds of tampering with the free speech concept, but admitted that he saw very little real public value in the practice of editorializing.

At a work-study group meeting on religious broadcasts at the 1948 Institute, Edward Heffron, media director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, contended that the FCC requirement for maintenance of sustaining programs was necessary to allow adequate balance of public service programs. He noted that the great majority of educational and religious programs are dependent upon sustaining time. He also recognized that the majority of broadcasters would provide sustaining time whether the FCC required it or not. He stated that there would always be a few broadcasters who, under economic pressures, would attempt to ignore their responsibilities; but reiterated that the industry itself realized
the FCC power to review program performance was necessary to protect the legitimate broadcaster.

A live broadcast of the "Columbus Town Meeting program considered the question "Should the FCC Have Any Control Over Programs?" Peter Odegard, president of Reed College, noted the NAB had recognized the necessity for the FCC to consider the over-all program service in renewing a license so he was "flabbergasted" at the NAB's response to the Blue Book which merely defined, more specifically, standards that had already been accepted previously. He pointed out that the American Civil Liberties Union, of which he was a member, had endorsed the Blue Book, and the ACLU was a champion of individual free expression.

Theodore Pierson, Washington, D.C., attorney representing radio stations, stated that the question was whether we should have control by government or not. He suggested that the FCC admit evidence for license renewal which would determine the abilities of the station to serve the public interest but that the FCC should stop short of deciding what the listener wants or should hear.

Odegard assured the audience that he would deplore FCC control just as he would resist advertiser, network, or
NAB control. But he insisted that influence by the FCC was a necessary representation of the public.

According to Broadcasting, Brock Chisholm, executive secretary, World Health Interim Committee of the United Nations, drew a rousing ovation with his stimulating rebuke and challenge to irresponsible broadcasters. Chisholm spoke at the annual Institute dinner emphasizing the tremendous attitude change which the next two generations had to accomplish if we were to avoid complete annihilation in a third world war. He said national loyalty was not enough; that we had to have world loyalty. But we could not achieve that until we understood other nations. Radio had a great responsibility to educate to this understanding. He spoke of the power of radio to lead and mislead and the tremendous responsibility of radio to prevent power-hungry spokesmen from within as well as from without:

We cannot afford to have immature, self-centered people, with overweening egos and power complexes, in positions where they will make disastrous trouble for us. It is our responsibility to see that they are not allowed to reach such positions.

More experimental programs and programs which appeal to the rational side of man were the requests of Peter Odegard in his speech at the final session regarding "Serious
Radio in America." He deplored the fact that much of broadcasting has no other purpose or design than to arouse people's emotions. He implored that words be used on radio to build a new civilization and also to conserve the present one in the process and not to tear it down and destroy it.

Harry Skornia, director of Indiana University radio, believed that the pace of innovation and change had to increase if broadcasters were to meet the challenge to understanding needed in the next years. He also noted the need for more promotion of the good programs on radio. Seymour Siegel reiterated the need for more promotion and added that good programs could achieve wider impact if some exchange of program resources were instituted in educational broadcasting.

In 1949 Durr warned educational broadcasters of their particular responsibilities. He said educators must not allow educational programs to become a mere by-product of desires to achieve other objectives. Education must be the direct and only motive. He spoke of the constant threat to free thought and free expression:

In assuming the obligations of educators, do we take the "vow of eternal hostility against all forms of tyranny over the mind of man," or are such vows applicable only to such tyranny in foreign lands? Is orthodoxy of thought the imperative of our time, or must the minds and imagination of people be set free to cope with the new and unorthodox problems with which they are faced?125
In the effort to cooperate with commercial broadcasters he suggested that the educators may concede too much to the entertainment criterion. The big idea needs honesty, simplicity, and guts—not showmanship.

Commissioner Hennock returned to the 1950 Institute to declare that the ills of American broadcasting will not succumb to any quick cure and the doctors must be the broadcasters and educators rather than the FCC. She identified the foremost function of broadcasting as "aid in the development of enlightened public opinion." She stated that educators must get much more involved in broadcasting and make non-commercial interests an integral part of the broadcasting service and system in America.

H. Gordon Hullfish, professor of education at Ohio State University, followed Hennock with the declaration that responsible ownership of communication facilities is a matter of public concern: "Modern communicative instruments will not fully serve democratic ends automatically." Warning against official controls, he reminded his audience that restriction does not always flow from official sources: "We want no Iron Curtain," he said, "Neither do we wish a Town Crier who is free to limit his voice to the service of his special social, politic, or economic interests."
Chairman of the FCC, Paul Walker, reviewed his nineteen years on the FCC in a speech at the annual Institute dinner in 1953. His retirement from the FCC had just been announced officially, a few hours before, by President Eisenhower. He felt that the FCC had "been steering a fairly straight course down the middle of the regulatory road." He held the idea of censorship by the FCC as ridiculous and cited the Blue Book as an accurate report of what was happening in broadcasting in 1946. He said that a great part of the fairness and impartiality which radio enjoys was due to federal regulation. Citing the wholesome benefits of competition both in economics and especially in the field of thought, he lauded FCC efforts in diversification of control so that the competition in the market place of ideas and thought could be maintained.

Educational Television Development

In a feature story in Broadcasting, Bill thompson wrote that the 1948 Institute had planned only one session on TV programming but that a work-study group on National Organizations had hastily scheduled additional speakers to cover this area. Thompson neglected to mention that the Agricultural work-study session also scheduled discussion of
research in television programming. Although the Institute held a special general session on "Television and Education" at the 1946 meeting there was little attitude of urgency or prediction of the tremendous growth which had occurred by 1948. However, this growth did not negate the fact that television was expensive and not commercially profitable as yet. The 1948 Institute heard Nathan Rudich, television editor for New Theatre Arts Magazine, state that the program demands of TV would decentralize theatre from New York City. He also warned educators to start preparation immediately for television use in education.

Mrs. Dorothy Klock, a director at the New York City Board of Education station WNYC, was not impressed with the possibilities of TV. Her experience working with New York TV applications to education indicated:

As an educator in this field, I do not feel there is any great future for television in classroom teaching. There is nothing a television program can do that cannot be done as well by the films. I have watched our young-sters very carefully at television shows and their immediate reaction was, "This isn't as good as movies we have seen back in the visual instruction room at school." She felt that real value to adult education could be found in TV. Some speakers did not agree with Mrs. Klock. All agreed that the expense of television was still a major problem.
The 1949 Institute opened with FCC chairman, Wayne Coy predicting TV dominance within five years as 40 to 50 percent of American homes would possess TV receivers. AM radio would fight to maintain itself with considerable re-adjustment to night-time programming. Coy expressed concern that more educational institutions were not taking advantage of the FM reservations but saw some encouragement in the response to the FCC's low power authorization. He urged educators to start with a ten watt station and build to a more powerful operation. Coy did not specifically encourage educators to get into TV operation. He did note that TV was an expensive operation which was not yet commercially profitable.

Commander Mortimer W. Loewi, director of DuMont TV network, warned of economic implications in continuing to think of television only as an entertainment medium. The competition to give the public free entertainment would begin to display characteristics of a moron including the demand for more and more at less and less. He said television as a motivating force could be the greatest instrument for mass dissemination of information and knowledge since the printing press.
On the next day, Oscar Katz, CBS director of research, cautioned the use of a healthy skepticism toward forecasts of television's future influence on American life. But he believed it would be the greatest mass medium of our time and its universal appeal would dictate that most of the content would be entertainment programming. He chided educational radio for its denial of the importance of showmanship in the medium, and urged that the same mistakes should not be made in television.135 Edgar Dale, Ohio State University audio-visual expert, characterized the showmanship of television as exhibiting things to advantage or skillfully displaying any ideas that we wish. He also emphasized the motivation force of television; since it is personal, concrete, and real. He warned that specificity and concreteness can contribute to distorting the truth just as it is easier to distort with pictures than with words. He felt that television will have a tremendous beneficial effect on education.136 Julien Byran, executive director of the International Film Foundation (educational films), noted that educators have done nothing yet to get involved in television.137

Frieda Hennock, FCC Commissioner, asked if there were
any polls or surveys to indicate what the public wants from TV in educational and entertainment programs. She was told there was not enough information yet. She asked if showmanship was so necessary in TV how were educators to learn it? Former Commissioner Fly replied that the educators should not be expected to learn or supply showmanship for educational programs. He explained that showmanship was the responsibility of the commercial station which broadcasts the educational program. Martin Gosch, an independent television producer, felt that theatre people at universities plus the many theatrical stock companies throughout the country could help educators in the application of showmanship for television. Miss Hennock kept asking how an educational program was to reach the air but the panel did not seem to understand her question. At least the problem of allowing sufficient access to educators was not being answered. In the light of Miss Hennock's later leadership to reserve educational channels, this question seemed rather significant. It was obvious that the commercial and educational representatives on the panel were not even considering the problem. In the Planning section of this chapter the Institute Program Committee was reported to have noted Miss Hennock's need for
information about the educational broadcast problems. This would have indicated Miss Hennock was merely looking for information in her questioning but she may well have been trying to get some statement regarding the commercial commitment to educational programs.

A later session recorded statements from educational broadcasters urging educators to investigate possibilities of operating a TV station. The larger part of the discussion concerned the great costs involved and there were suggestions to start by building a production studio and feeding programs to commercial stations. I. Keith Tyler warned that simply adding sight to sound does not automatically mean more effective learning: "Television is at its best when the televised material involves sight, sound, motion, and contemporaneousness as inescapable elements." He thought the costs would delay TV use as a significant medium in the classroom for several years. However, he stated, that TV offers the greatest immediate potentialities for reaching people in the home with educational materials:

There are great opportunities in the next five years because television stations are not heavily commercial as yet and are grateful for help in programming, because programming is expensive. I think educators will have an opportunity now, through the cooperation of commercial stations, that they may not have later. We ought to
help the local TV broadcasters in this programming job, using this medium to help educate men and women and boys and girls in the home.142

During this entire session there was no mention of the need for reserved channel space or the possibility that all good channels would be occupied by commercial broadcasters before education could get organized adequately to acquire a sufficient proportion of channels. This seems unusual considering the opening session comments by Chairman Coy:

Five years from tonight, most Americans will be getting most of their broadcast information, education and entertainment from television.143

He also indicated the freeze on TV allocations would probably be lifted in three or four months. If that had been accurate it is doubtful that education would have been able to claim more than ten VHF allocations.

But the freeze continued and Commissioner Hennock opened the 1950 Institute with the challenge and warning:

We at the FCC cannot and will not impose from above our own individual ideas of what American broadcasting should be like. If you want it to improve, each of you must come out swinging, and make your impress felt. If you get into television now you may prevent its assuming the same character as our aural broadcasting. You must do it, for nothing is so important to you educators and to our nation.144

Commissioner Walker followed at a session the next day with his support of educational television. He noted
that the FCC expected to hear pleas from ten leading educa
tional organizations soon asking for channel reservations
for educational non-commercial TV stations. He noted his
approval of this action and added that the FCC should in­
vestigate promoting more definite guidelines for educational
programming on commercial stations:

How much educational material has the public a right
to expect of a commercial television system?
Should the government set higher standards of public
service performance?145

Perhaps Walker felt the broadcast industry would not be so
actively opposed to reservations if their own performance
was being challenged.

The following day administrators representing various
educational levels considered the part radio and television
should play in the colleges and schools.146 Louis P. Hoyer,
Philadelphia superintendent of schools, thought television
should be used primarily to supplement and strengthen class­
room instruction. Reach into the homes and teach adults,
concentrating on betterment of society was the plea of J.
Max Bond, noted Negro educator and recently inaugurated
president of Liberia College. Richard Hull, director of
radio and TV at Iowa State College, expressed fear that
educators are giving mere lip service to mass communications
and would not react quickly enough to get sufficient broadcast channels for educational purposes.

In his review of the past twenty years of broadcasting H.V. Kaltenborn was not very enthusiastic about the potential of television in education for the near future. He noted the failure of education in AM and FM radio and referred to the high cost of television as a convincing deterrent. Even in the commercial field the profits would not be noticeable for many years, he said.

U.S. Senator, William S. Benton (Connecticut), opened the first general session of the 1951 Institute on "Television and the Public Interest" with the observation that educators had taken the first step but must continue to provide leadership and learn to be publicists, promoters, and politicians. This first step referred to the unified representation of several educational organization by the Joint Committee on Educational Television at the FCC hearings after which, in March 1951, the FCC tentatively reserved 209 channels for educational television. Benton declared that the issues were too big and important for a single agency such as the FCC to handle. He outlined a proposal to be introduced in the Senate calling for a study of the role the government
should play in developing TV. At this same session Chris J. Witting, general manager of DuMont television network, stated that public interest can best be served by developing programs with a social consciousness, providing for a maximum number of competing program services and finding a way to underwrite the cost of public service programs. He questioned the reservation of channels to educational institutions because it would be wasteful and impractical. He doubted that any such institution had the manpower and experience for sustained TV programming.

Discussion with the audience included questioning what kind of a time limit should be placed on the reserved channels before they are released for use by commercial broadcasters. Novik, New York city broadcast consultant, stated the only definite answer when he proposed a yardstick of "loss of service." He said that it should be the responsibility of the commercial applicant to "establish that the community is actually losing out because it does not have a special kind of service."

At a later session, Robert Saudek, ABC vice-president, was sharply critical of the Joint Committee on Educational Television (JCET) report to the FCC the previous winter.
The report concerned the results of a monitoring study of New York city television programs. Saudek objected to the quantitative statistics presented in a way to make commercial broadcasting look bad. He felt that educational and commercial broadcasting could not be easily compared because they are entirely separate entities with entirely different aims. Another speaker at this session, General Telford Taylor, general counsel for JCET, attributed the interest in educational TV to a deep and widespread dissatisfaction with the present scope and quality of television programs. He said that the underlying feeling is that the narrow economic base of broadcasting does not allow for sufficient quality and scope. Robert Hudson, director of broadcasting at the University of Illinois, rounded out the panel for this session with the observation that education must do its part to bring a complete radio and television program service to the public. We cannot afford to accept only a few worthwhile public service programs by commercial stations in this era of crisis. A "hitch-hiking democracy is not enough."

As usual the annual Institute dinner was a highlight of the conference when Commissioner Hennock warned educators that the fight for educational television had just begun.
She maintained that education must have 500 reservations for a workable nation-wide system rather than the 209 proposed. Then she urged educators to think of the problems of getting on the air and staying on the air. The responsibilities of educators must lead them to investigate both formal and informal teaching potential, gather community resources to build and operate stations, and program for stimulation and entertainment in addition to information and education. She said that educational television will provide the experimental laboratories for commercial television, but cautioned that the immediacy of the reservations problem made it the prime concern at present. There were many session discussing the immediate and long-term planning for use of the educational reservations. Richard Hull of Iowa State College, JCET and NAEB, reminded the audience that JCET had been originally organized on an "ad hoc" basis to unify educational broadcast interests for Washington representation on reservations. However, JCET had been changed to a permanent organizational structure to help all broadcasters provide better educational television service to the public by representing the several national educational organizations before Congress and the FCC.
The 1952 Institute featured television almost exclusively. Appropriately, the major interest was the FCC Sixth Report and Order which was issued only three days prior to the opening general session of the Institute. The report allocated 242 channels to educational television and lifted the freeze on applications.

The NAEB had scheduled Paul Walker, chairman of the FCC as its luncheon speaker. In his first public statement since the report publication Walker warned educators that the channels would not be reserved indefinitely. Commercial broadcasters would continue efforts to reclassify reserved channels if they were not used by educators. He reminded educators that they were still allowed to compete for commercial channels and indicated that commercial stations would not be permitted to abdicate their responsibility for public service and force educational TV to carry the entire burden. The sentence that seemed to ring clear to the majority of the audience was: "I repeat that at the end of one year from the effective date of this report, anyone may request the Commission to change an educational assignment to a commercial assignment."156

Later that day another Commissioner, Hennock,
emphasized that point in two sessions. She said that she would have wished for more channel reservations but this amount gave education the precious opportunity it needed. The fight had only begun and the most important thing was to get applications in for those channels. Ralph Steetle, executive director of JCET, and Seymour Krieger, counsel for JCET, both presented the services and help which JCET might give to potential applicants. Burton Paulu, NAEB secretary and publications editor, suggested means through which production experience might be acquired while George Probst, radio director of the University of Chicago, told of the way in which cooperation of educational and cultural agencies in a community could be gained.

In an evening general session, Hennock again spoke strongly for immediate action. Although not a featured speaker, she reported from the audience that talk of programming sources and the suggested need of eight hours of programming was premature: "If you do not act, it would be a reflection on the Commission to have spent weeks and months on educational television without something to show for it."

John Osborn wrote in Broadcasting that the statements by Hennock, Walker, and others at the 1952 Institute which
warned educators to move quickly on applications left four unanswered questions: (1) How much funds were needed before application, (2) Would rejection of partial commercialization bankrupt ETV, (3) Where was this one-year time limit indicated officially? (4) How can the station cost be estimated before knowing budget. He also referred to Ohio State University's disappointment in receiving a UHF assignment instead of a VHF channel. In that same session Richard Hull, director of WOI-AM-FM-TV, Iowa State College, explained some of the management decisions and operation of the first TV station operated by an educational institution. William Levenson, assistant superintendent of the Cleveland schools, stressed the need of educational TV to offset the teacher shortage. He assured them that he did not mean replacing teachers but giving the opportunity to spread expert teachers to more students.

In the first general session, Dallas Symthe, University of Illinois professor, revealed data on surveys of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles regarding percentages of time devoted to various types of programming by commercial stations. A symposium "Toward Improved Programming" followed with Edward Lamb, president of a five station group, insisting
that competition for an audience will improve programming. He indicated organized viewing groups can have good effects on programs.\textsuperscript{166} Armand Hunter, director of TV development, Michigan State University, suggested that the educators' main job was improvement of present programming. Commercial broadcasters are prevented because of philosophical and economic bases, the FCC cannot force, and the public can't be heard. He went on to indicate two areas in which educators can work: (1) the determination of needs and standards through qualitative research, and (2) the realization of these standards through creative experimentation in program content and form.\textsuperscript{167}

The opening general session of the 1953 Institute dealt with a problem which would become more controversial in later years "The Telecasting of Legislative Hearings." Telford Taylor, general counsel of JCET discussed this matter at the 1951 Institute in relation to the sensational Senate crime hearing which had just concluded. He had noted that the television coverage of the hearings had made the public aware of the potential of the medium; and, in the interest of further such TV coverage, the individual rights of the witnesses had to be carefully protected.\textsuperscript{168}
The three speakers on the 1953 panel agreed that rules of fair play must be devised but could not agree on much else. Dorothy Kenyon, attorney and member of the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, expressed concern that there be some protection for the rights of persons appearing before these investigative committees. She claimed that witnesses are forced into the defensive posture of proving they are not guilty. Sometimes hearings are conducted like a trial although they are not trials. Extending these hearings to television would magnify these errors considerably and further condemn witnesses. Congress must adopt a code of fair play before television could tell the truth in such hearings. 169

M.S. Novik, radio-television consultant for several unions, disagreed with Miss Kenyon. He was against waiting for Congress to move as he expressed his conviction that television has a right and duty to cover these legislative hearings. He indicated that it is necessary to report what is there as long as the responsibility for providing comprehensive non-partisan coverage is fulfilled. 170

Although Edward Stanley, NBC public affairs and education director, called for a Congressional code, he also did
not think it should be the position of television to wait for this code. He asked that the full prerogatives of the press be applied to television. He cited TV reporting of U.N. sessions as an example of use in which it did not interfere with the orderly function of that body. 171

Speaking on "The Opportunities of Education Through the Mass Media," Earl J. McGrath, U.S. Commissioner of Education, expressed approval of the administration of educational television. His address was read by Ward Stewart, assistant commissioner of education, when illness prevented McGrath from attending the Institute. McGrath pointed to the crisis in the dwindling number of qualified teachers and the impressive progress made in adopting mass media to education. He also noted the tremendous ability of television to dramatize problems in our society. The school problem is an acute one which needs the immediate attention of the American public. He reported that 25 of the 242 reserved channels had been applied for to date but expected at least twenty-five more applications by the June 2 deadline. Referring to the possibilities which the FCC had previously indicated, of opening these reserved channels for commercial applications, he stated that it is very important to hold these channels
for a year or two longer while communities become aware of the full significance and potentialities of educational television.172

Ralph Steetle, executive director of JCET, expressed confidence at this session that the FCC would extend the June 2 deadline so that educators would have sufficient time to develop a significant educational television service across the nation. He hailed the past year as remarkable in the annals of education and cited the support of the nation's press in the fight of educators for TV. He also saluted the many commercial broadcasters who had aided the cause.173

The closing general session of the Institute discussed "Supporting Educational Television." Erik Isgrig, director of advertising for Zenith Radio Corporation, explained how subscription TV could finance an educational station. He said that all the research and development are finished. All that is needed is FCC approval of subscription TV and a special FCC ruling in school use of subscription TV under their non-commercial franchise. He indicated that only a few hours of subscription television programming a day could make educational television completely self-supporting without imposing additional burdens on the taxpayer.174
Voluntary contributions from the community with a small amount of tax funds should support ETV. This was the opinion of George Craig, attorney and member of the board of Metropolitan Pittsburgh Educational Television station. Craig explained the plan for building a Pittsburgh ETV station. The contributions of three foundations will build the station and tax funds will be used only for operating purposes limited to programs designed for tax-supported institutions. He felt that voluntary contributions would be forthcoming when the citizens realized what ETV could do for them. 175

Larry Walker, vice-president and general manager of WBT and WBTV, told of his experience organizing local ETV. His station contributed $5,000 to a state committee to investigate ETV while the NBC outlet in Charlotte contributed land and tower space for the proposed ETV station. Walker stated that commercial television cannot do all of the public service programming needed in a community but they can give invaluable assistance with their experience. 176

Edgar Dale, professor of education at Ohio State University, indicated his preference for tax-supported ETV because some important ideas cannot be communicated at a
profit. If we want to call some of the educational tunes, we must pay taxes for our piper, he said.177

Educational television had become a reality during this period. Although the fight for reservations had been won, the struggle to finance such stations was only starting. The equally difficult challenges of public service programming on commercial television were yet to be met.

Period Summary

Institute

As mentioned in the Planning section of this chapter, the Institute was challenged to serve the increasingly diverse interests of a fast growing industry. After a year's hiatus (1945) due to travel restriction, the Institute once again sent invitations to commercial and educational interests to come to Columbus, Ohio. It might be speculated that the year break would tend to reduce attendance in the following year but the 1946 Institute recorded the highest attendance in the Institute's history as 1,207 registered.178 The structural and operational difficulties of the Institute were: (1) In an attempt to serve the various special interests, concurrent small group meetings proliferated so that too
many activities were happening simultaneously. This was alleviated somewhat by reducing the length of each meeting thus allowing the scheduling of fewer meetings simultaneously. However, the shorter duration of each meeting tended to reduce the discussion so chairmen were urged to reduce formal presentations and increase discussion. (2) Irresponsible and irrelevant discussion at general meetings was reducing effectiveness of meetings and interest of participants. A capable moderator was used at all general meetings thus improving the flow of ideas and maintenance of continuity. It was evident from the Planning section of this chapter that the Institute attempted to interest commercial broadcasters in attending and participating. However, national network representation dropped considerably after the 1946 Institute and commercial station representation took consistently sharp drops in attendance each year from 1947 to 1952. Ted Cott enunciated some commercial broadcaster feelings at the 1948 Institute which basically indicated that they were being constantly attacked and he questioned what good they received since they always had to be on the defensive. Unfortunately, there was not a great deal the Institute could do about this matter except to
avoid controversial topics. That solution would be worse than the problem. Saul Carson in an article for the *New Republic* suggested that the networks had evidently decided in advance to boycott the 1947 Institute. 184

At the 1949 Institute, Edgar Kobak listed the symptoms of an ailing Institute as: (1) losing the interest of networks and radio stations; (2) not attracting the top leaders in broadcasting; (3) too many people come here to heckle and sell their own ideas instead of working toward the common goal of improving educational broadcasting; (4) too many people are overly sensitive about criticism.

His suggestions for modernizing the Institute were: (1) consider moving the location of the Institute to different cities; (2) include the Advertising Council, the FCC and showmen on your Advisory Committee; (3) study the possibility of merger with other institutes and universities; (4) put more emphasis on how to do things; (5) make the Institute primarily a program meeting. Kobak closed with the recognition that the Institute "is probably the nearest to a top meeting in the entire industry." 185

The Institute was considered by many, the most important national meeting for educational and public service
broadcasting. Some representatives were concerned with its continued welfare while others tried to reduce its influence by such things as boycotts. The lack of top network representatives as speakers was evident but the FCC and other public organization plus some excellent commercial station operators provided interesting and challenging ideas. All the FCC commissioners who spoke at the Institute during this period made some comment classifying the Institute as an important meeting of national significance and prominence.

However, Kobak's speech and the National Advisory Committee meetings did emphasize some problems. Although the National Advisory Committee attempted to set up a meeting in New York to get advice and cooperation of top broadcast officials for the 1950 Institute, schedule problems interfered and such a meeting was not held. The 1952-53 Institutes did not even have a formal meeting of the National Advisory Committee. Although there was a good amount of criticism against commercial station practices, there were also many constructive suggestions in the concurrent group meetings. The general sessions considered controversial topics which generated heated debate but the commercial broadcasters defended themselves fairly well as
reported in the content summary of this chapter. The very nature of the Institute and its function to discuss educational and public service programming would put the commercial broadcasters on the defensive because this was an area where the broadcasters could never completely satisfy.

The Ohio State Awards, which grew in stature every year, was one way in which the commercial stations could be publicly congratulated for good programs. The networks were always very interested in this portion of the Institute and the trade press publicized the winners extensively. It is quite possible that fewer commercial broadcasters would have attended if it had not been for these awards.

I. Keith Tyler, as director of the Institute, strongly resisted any considerations of resolutions. As discussed in the Planning section of this chapter, Tyler felt that the very foundation and function of the Institute would be destroyed by such activity and he made this quite clear in his statements.

The basic functions of the Institute as discussed in Chapter II\textsuperscript{187} were being challenged by the changing needs in broadcasting and by the changing dimensions of the Institute itself. The Institute was just too big to satisfy
the various needs of the specialized interest groups within broadcasting. Yet it was the only national meeting of stature which had some ability to play a neutral role and bring together the various factions of broadcasting. During this period the Institute enjoyed national prominence and provided a unique service to the broadcast industry. The expanding industry was finding difficulty in adequately satisfying its needs at any single broad-based conference.

By the end of this period the lines of opposition had been drawn. Some felt that after an initial peak of popularity, the Institute had settled into an optimum functioning group. Others felt that the pattern of decline indicated a need for drastic change. The Institute leaders would not accept change of basic principles.

Issues

The major FCC actions during this period which affected both commercial and educational broadcasters appeared like bookends to the period—the Blue Book on one end and the Sixth Report and Order on the other end. The Blue Book generated the major discussion and debate of the period since it reflected two basic principles of the American system of broadcasting: (1) the right of free speech, and (2) the right
of public service. The 1946 Institute revealed the broadcasters' argument against FCC control on the basis of free speech infringement while the FCC argued against advertiser and special interest control on the basis of public interest and public ownership. The preliminary analysis of the arguments presented at the 1946 Institute indicated that the Blue Book identified a potential threat to free speech through advertiser and special interest control. The introduction of the Blue Book also highlighted the potential threat to free speech through FCC control. The threat from advertiser and special interests appeared to this writer to be more emminent since it had already demonstrated some limitations on free speech. However, a discussion of the Mayflower decision and the continuing FCC policy on editorializing at the 1947 Institute introduced other considerations. Fly and Howell suggested that broadcasters were misinterpreting the Mayflower decision by applying it to non-controversial issues. Leigh and Spearman expressed the opinions that the FCC should not be allowed to prevent editorializing but the broadcaster should be positively responsible for providing balanced discussion on controversial issues of public importance. Both Leigh and Spearman expressed ambivalent
feelings about the use of editorial power by the broadcaster indicating that it should be used only in unusual circumstances if at all. Misuse of this power should be considered detrimental to license renewal, they said. However, they declared the more important principle was that a government agency (FCC) should not be allowed to qualify free speech in broadcasting by preventing the broadcaster from editorializing.

In effect, they were supporting the action of the Blue Book which suggested some positive responsibilities for broadcasters but considered the negative action of the Mayflower decision as censorship. Leigh and Spearman exemplified the spirit of discussion for which the Institute was continually striving when they recognized valid arguments of opposition while placing their opinions in juxtaposition to those arguments.

At that point, it seemed clear that the main objection to the Blue Book was the association in spirit as well as justification with the Mayflower decision. Official FCC clarification of the editorializing policy did seem to this writer to be a long overdue necessity. Perhaps discussion at the Institute encouraged the FCC action of
holding public hearings on this policy in March and April 1948. Subsequently, the FCC changed its editorial policy to allow editorializing as of June 1, 1949.\textsuperscript{191}

Nevertheless, this did not resolve the more basic problem of FCC program control. The fact that the broadcaster could be called to account at license renewal time remained a somewhat hollow gesture since the FCC could do nothing but remove the license or warn the broadcaster. A vindictive FCC could tie itself up in numerous court cases by removing licenses for such violation while a sensitive and careful FCC could tie itself up in frustration by merely warning the few broadcasters which it had time to handle in hearings. This problem seemed rather obvious to this writer at the 1946 discussion and yet the only time a solution was considered was once when a member of the audience suggested it.\textsuperscript{192} Not until 1960 did the FCC receive authority to levy fines on licensees\textsuperscript{193} and this method of punishment has been used frequently since that time.

Another area in which the Institute discussion may shed light on present broadcast problems is in the consideration of what positive public service responsibilities broadcasting should accept. The arguments at the 1947 Institute\textsuperscript{194}
revealed a desire by all speakers except commercial broadcasters for more and better public service programs. The few commercial broadcast spokesmen indicated that such programs were being presented adequately. However, Edward Murrow said that broadcasting should report the world as it is to the public and hoped for increased use of documentary programs. 195

Several speakers referred to the urgency for informing the American public to a better understanding of national and international responsibilities. 196 The discussion centered around the need to inform the public of the tremendous change in U.S. responsibility in the world and to make the public more aware of the United Nation activities. The words of Chisholm regarding the potential weapon which radio could become for power-hungry spokesmen 197 are quite similar to the words of Robert Millikan at the 1935 Institute when he warned against the emotional harangues of the sincere demagogue. 198 Commissioner Hennock's plea at the 1950 Institute for an enlightened public opinion 199 echoed the call of several speakers in the previous Institutes.

By 1953, when Commissioner Walker reviewed his nineteen years on the FCC, the Blue Book was part of past history.
Many, including Walker, said it served its purpose by highlighting broadcast abuses and promoting a public service attitude in broadcasting. Some might consider the Blue Book a failure because it never resulted in a license revocation. Walker credited federal regulation with the fairness and impartiality which broadcasting was providing.

Although the cost factor was a serious drawback to enthusiastic support of television by educators, it is surprising that more encouragement was not found in the major speeches of the 1948-49 Institutes. FCC Chariman Coy, had received little response to his two requests for educator reaction to reservations in television at the 1948 FCC hearings. In late 1948 the FCC approved 10 watt FM for educational operation and some institutions probably used this activity to postpone further consideration of the more speculative and expensive television medium. Discussion at the 1948 Institute was sparse and confined mostly to cost considerations. Chariman Coy spoke at the 1949 Institute and urged educators to take advantage of the 10 watt FM opportunity but he did not encourage television operation. A factor in this emphasis may have been the recent consideration by the FCC to discontinue some FM reservations because
of non-use and the demands for television frequency space. The NAEB was also encouraging applications for 10 watt stations.

A proposed allocation plan for television was released by the FCC in July 1949 and no educational reservations were included. Institute Director, I. Keith Tyler was a leader in organizing the initial educator response for educational reservations. The 1950 Institute opened with a warning by Commissioner Hennock that the FCC would not protect educators in spite of themselves. They must fight for reservations. NAEB President Hull feared that educators would lose the reservation battle because they moved too slowly. However, the JCET organized educator response which resulted in a revised allocation plan in March 1951 allowing reserved channels. The 1951 Institute heard some commercial broadcasters' objections to these reservations but generally the meetings were occupied with discussion of cost and methods of use for television at educational institutions. There was discussion of a time limit on reservations, after which they would be available to commercial interests. Hennock identified the immediate need to occupy the reserved channels.
The 1952 Institute heard Commissioner Walker warn that the final 242 allocations, which had been officially reserved only three days before the opening session of the Institute, would not be held indefinitely and that educators must move quickly to occupy these channels. Walker mentioned a one year limit on absolute reservation but this was apparently an unofficial encouragement to educational institutions to move quickly into television.
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CHAPTER V

THE DECLINE, 1954 - 1965

Background

This period could be considered the age of television as networks battled for the mass audience; color TV, all-channel receivers, and CATV were introduced. Educational TV made comparatively slow but steady progress. More organized action and development of unified goals led to increased political pressure resulting in some needed federal financial assistance for ETV. The TV quiz scandals and radio payola problems in commercial broadcasting dimmed broadcasting's image while the Midwest Program of Airbourne Television Instruction (MPATI) experiment in ETV boosted the image.

Commercial Broadcasting

The trends established in the last period were continued during this period. Television expanded at a very fast rate. Radio completed its change of image from the
family entertainment medium to the individual's companion. Radio's problems were brought about primarily by the tremendous increase in the number of competing stations. From June 1953 to June 1965, the FCC reported an increase of 1,670 AM stations plus 763 commercial FM stations for a grand total of 5,368 commercial radio stations on the air by July 1965.¹

Of course, the television competition for the audience attention and the advertisers' dollar was another basic problem to radio. Total radio time sales took its first drop in 1954 and then a very slight drop from the previous year in 1961. Otherwise, each year found increased revenue in radio but the total number of stations sharing the increase expanded faster than the revenue so that approximately one-third of all AM radio stations were reported to be operating at a loss through the years 1956 to 1959. An average of about $125,000 revenue per station was reported for 1958² with the great majority of the revenue going to the larger stations while the vast number of smaller station received little. Total billings for radio almost doubled from $477,000,000 in 1953 to $827,000,000 in 1965.³ Local and national non-network time sales advanced steadily during
this period but national radio network sales continued a
decline started in 1949 to a low of $35,000,000 in 1960.
Since then the trend had slowly climbed upward to revenues
of $44,500,000 in 1965.\(^4\) The portability and economy of
radio receivers contributed to the continuing increase in
radio homes as the population increased. By the end of
1965 about 55,200,000 homes (98 percent) were equipped with
radio plus the many "pocket" portables and over 40,000,000
auto radios.

The four national radio networks were shorn of their
prime time programs and the revenues accompanying them by
television. The winter of 1955-56 saw only thirty-five
hours of sponsored evening programs per week\(^5\) with most of
these disappearing in the next few years. Network daytime
programming lasted a few years longer but by 1960 CBS was
the only network still offering some serial dramas. Net­
works tried to re-shuffle their schedules in an effort to
keep audiences and affiliates but the only new program con­
cept developed was NBC's "monitor," a mixture of disc re­
corded music and short talk spots ranging from comedy mono­
logues to news. Network service, by 1964-65, was limited
primarily to headline type news and short talk features with
little more than two hours per day of programming from each network.

As the local station was forced to do more and more if its own programming, it turned to the disc-jockey type of format:

By the late 1950s probably 80 to 90 percent of all radio stations were filling most of their program time with recorded music, interrupted at intervals by short capsule news summaries either taken from network lines or provided by the station itself.6

The individuality or image of the station was determined primarily by the type of music played, so such terms as "good music," "top 40," and "Country and Western," were used to describe the stations. Some stations featured other types of program materials and developed formats around all-talk, all-news, sports and ethnic programming. The idea was to capture a substantial minority audience with a consistent, identifiable sound. In the previous chapter of this paper, Sydney Kaye is reported to have noted at the 1946 Institute that minority audiences would be served as a result of the increase in operating radio stations.7

Television captured the mass audience, the advertisers, and the talent replacing radio in the living room as the family entertainment medium. Operating commercial television
stations rose from 349 on January 1, 1954 to 598 on January 1, 1966. Educational television stations increased from 2 to 105 during this same period. Total billings, before commissions, rose every year with the figure of $1,673,700,000 in 1965 being over four times as much earned in 1953. The majority of the 1965 revenue came from national non-network (spot) and network billings while local station sales accounted for less than one-fifth of the total billings.

Television stations had problems also. The majority of the revenue accrued to the little over 100 stations in the top twenty-five markets, allowing the remainder to be divided among almost 500 stations. The stations which had the most financial trouble were the: (1) non-network affiliated stations, (2) UHF stations, and (3) small market stations. The UHF problem has plagued broadcasters since the FCC introduced the allocation plan in 1952. The allocation plan had established rules about power and antenna height that were intended to give both VHF and UHF stations essential equality in coverage. However, not enough was known about propagation characteristics of the ultra-high frequencies, so the early UHF stations had the disadvantage
of poorer coverage as well as limited set reception ability:

Of the approximately 190 UHF commercial television stations that had gone on the air between 1952 and 1965, only about half were still in operation in January 1965.12

The all-channel tuner requirement imposed in manufacturers has helped UHF development, but the coverage disadvantage makes UHF stations less valuable.

After the spring of 1955, Dumont gave up its network activities, CBS and NBC had primary affiliates in most of the important markets; while ABC, helped by its merger with United Paramount Theatres, established a secure network operation but provided relatively slight competition for NBC and CBS. The competitive situation improved in later years, but ABC still remained the weakest of the three commercial operations.

Major trends in network programming during this period included increased use of: (1) longer individual programs, (2) programs recorded on film as compared to live programs, (3) specials, (4) theatrical motion pictures, (5) sports events on the weekends.13

Local programming had generally been confined to news programs, a daily women's show, and daily children's show. Some stations included courtroom dramas and interview
programs, but usually these were weekly features or special programs. These locally produced programs amounted to about sixteen hours weekly in 1965 which was about the same amount of time devoted to locally produced programs back in 1953. The difference is seen in the increase from an average of 80 hours per week of on-air activity by stations in 1953 compared to about 120 hours per week in 1965. The additional 40 hours of air time had been taken primarily (35 hours) by network programs. This network programming increase had occurred primarily in the daytime hours.

The development of color programming was relatively slow because of the great expense involved for the public. RCA received the official FCC approval of its color system in December 1953. Since 1954 NBC had provided a substantial number of color programs each week but CBS and ABC were slow to provide this more expensive programming because of the limited number of color receivers in the homes. In early 1965 NBC, encouraged by the report of nearly 3,000,000 color-set homes and ratings which gave color programs a substantially larger audience, announced that the great majority of its programs in the fall of 1965 would be in color. This prompted CBS and ABC to hurriedly convert their programming to color also.
The substantial amount of color network programming encouraged the public demand for color sets and resulted in a tremendous increase in color television set purchases. The all-channel law, which became effective in April 1964, necessitated the inclusion of a UHF tuner in all TV set shipped across the state border. Thus the purchase of color sets automatically included the purchase of the UHF tuner and provided a much larger potential audience for UHF stations.

**Educational Broadcasting**

The progress of educational broadcasting during this period is largely traced through the growth of the NAEB, the profession and service organization of educational broadcasters.

One of the big problems to plague the radio tape network's operation had begun to occur. Member stations were submitting more programs for distribution than could be handled by the limited amount of duplication equipment. This meant delays and, in some cases, poor quality duplications. The expanding network was to fight this problem throughout the entire period mainly because of lack of sufficient high-quality tape duplicators.
However, in other areas the NAEB managed to raise funds for crucial activities. In 1954 the Fund for Adult Education provided grants to support scholarships, two workshops in television, and the services of a full-time TV engineer. In 1954 FCC Commissioner Robert E. Lee, questioned how long the FCC should hold reservations for education but FCC chairman George McConnaughey was non-committal on the situation. 168 of the 242 reserved channels were in the UHF band and therefore it was questionable whether the investment in such a channel was worth it when so few TV sets were equipped to receive such a station. The financial situation was preventing many UHF reservations from being activated also and by the end of 1954 only seven non-commercial TV stations were on the air.

The NAEB was very active in 1955 providing workshops and summer training sessions in television. Fifteen stations were given funds to produce radio program series on the theme "America in the Twentieth Century."

In 1956 the Association for Education by Radio Television petitioned for merger with the NAEB due to financial difficulties. The merger was completed and the AERT Journal was continued as the NAEB Journal. NAEB executive secretary,
Harry Skornia remarked that several conferences which he attended in 1956 indicated that educators were becoming more interested in educational broadcasting "as possible means of meeting the increased enrollment problems and the problems of shortages of space and instructional staff." The activities of the NAEB professional services, funded after mid-1956 mainly by Ford Foundation grants, consisted of engineering and management consultant services to stations; seminars to upgrade personnel; continuance of the placement service and scholarship program; and assistance in organizing workshops. The radio tape network continued to expand its offerings with foreign programs.

The NAEB sponsored a five-day seminar on research in educational broadcasting in December 1957, at the Ohio State University. This was the result of a tremendously expanding interest in more explicit information on the proper use of ETV and radio. The recommendations of that seminar were:

1. Develop a broad plan of educational radio and television research through NAEB.

2. Implement the plan through a full-time research director and a research committee.

3. Use trained research personnel to carry out the program.
4. Maximize the total research potential in each research case by developing a clear statement of goals.

5. Use the results of this seminar through the NAEB for whatever purposes it might best serve the interests of research and education.

6. Adhere to the highest standards of both social responsibility and research technique.19

Through its professional association, NAEB, educational broadcasting had gained a measure of respect and recognition by 1958 from both commercial broadcasters and education.

In May 1958, the NAEB and the U.S. Office of Education jointly held a conference in Washington, D.C., to discuss the state of educational television and related media. Marshall McLuhan warned that TV must not be considered merely as another visual aid, but looked at as new art forms which can become direct objects of study. Others at the conference sounded similar sentiments so educators and broadcasters began to re-examine TV's role in education.

Hint of an all-channel receiver law to relieve some inequities in UHF assignments was first found in a speech made by Commissioner Frederick Ford at the 1959 IERT. The same year saw the arrival of the Learning Resources Institute,
IMPATI (airborne television) and the burgeoning of learning machines.

Congress continued to battle over bills to give direct federal aid to ETV while a seminar at the University of Wisconsin in July 1960 was convened to set up a concrete plan for a national live educational radio network.

There was much discussion of merger between the NETRC (National Educational Television and Radio Center) and the NAEB during 1960, but it was apparently felt that better development of both radio and television would result from maintaining separate operations. On September 1, 1960, the NAEB opened an office in Washington, D.C., and 1960 also saw the NAEB operate with its first full-time paid president and vice-president. Harry Skornia, who had been chief executive officer of the NAEB for the past seven years, asked to be relieved of his duties so that he might teach and write.

In November 1960, William Harley, president of NAEB, called for a seminar to study and evaluate the NAEB and gave his views on what the purpose of the NAEB convention should be:

Among other things, he suggested that it ought to (1) advance the general aims of the association, (2) chart new courses, (3) provide a "reverberation" chamber, (4) reaffirm the individual in his choice of a career in
educational broadcasting, (5) provide recognition of opportunities for the individual, (6) afford a rich and useful learning experience, (7) demonstrate the cohesion and strength of the organization, and (8) be conducive to congeniality and comradeship.

A study of the needs for television channel allocation in education, which started in 1959 was completed in 1962. The study reported that by 1973 a minimum of 97 VHF and 825 UHF channels would be needed. The study also produced a table of allocations which allowed 48 VHF and 698 UHF channels. In addition there was the successful demonstration of low-power, inexpensive transmission of superior TV signals for short distances in the 2500 to 2690 megacycle band of frequencies. This would allow an economical signal distribution for TV.

In late 1963 the NAEB was reorganized into four semi-autonomous divisions: (1) radio stations, (2) television stations, (3) instruction, and (4) individual members. This move was aimed at making NAEB a more professional organization in which educators, educational administrators, and representatives from the sciences, humanities, and other disciplines would have more voice in forming policies of the NAEB. Thus the latter divisions, instruction and individual members, provided this opportunity.
On September 11, 1963, the Chicago Educational Television Association became the first recipient of an FCC construction permit to build an ETV station with matching funds obtained under the ETV Facilities Act. Four other matching funds grants under this act followed soon afterwards.

In October 1963, and NAEB study of nation-wide assignments of TV channels, using digital computers, was published which identified 3,219 channel assignments. This was well over twice as many assignments as the FCC had indicated were feasible in its allocation plan. The NAEB asked for an FCC study and recommended that the new plan be followed in future channel grants. The FCC issued the plan and asked for comments. At the time of issuance it noted that: (1) the additional channels were largely put in places that didn't matter, and nearly 500 unwarranted commercial channels were added to inflate the over-all numbers; (2) it was loaded in favor of educators; (3) it utilized too small a mileage flexibility for transmitter siting. These comments were answered by the NAEB; but a later conference agreed that, even though the NAEB plan was an improvement over the FCC plan, it still fell far short of the immediate and foreseeable needs
of education; lending further importance to the urgent need for the recommended Commission study.24

The NETRC announced in August 1963, that it was withdrawing it support to radio affiliates to devote full energies to television. This primarily affected the eight FM educational stations along the east coast which formed the Eastern Educational Network. Representatives of these stations met in Washington, D.C., and organized the Educational Communications System project under the auspices of NAEB and financed by the U.S. Office of Education. This project was an attempt to interconnect educational institutions with a live radio network.

In March 1964, the NAEB issued a report opposing the request of MPATI for expansion and regularization of standard TV channels for airborne instruction. This formal opposition came only after much consideration and study (MPATI had originally requested this move from the FCC in January 1963) with the conclusion that there was more loss than gain to such a move.

The revision of the copyright law which had been discussed since 1962 continued to be a problem through 1965. This required continual watching and frequent review of new
opinions by government and industry. Educators felt that they had good freedom of use by the old copyright law but that revision was needed and was inevitable. Any revision was bound to impose new restrictions but these must reasonably allow the present use without undue financial hardship on educational broadcasters.

While CATV operations were extending the resources of educational TV in 1962, it began to be apparent by 1964 that such operations could well work to the detriment of ETV by replacing the need for local ETV service. As such, the NAEB filed comments with the FCC expressing concern that CATV not be used as a substitute for local ETV service.

Federal Government

The broadcast problems which occupied the major attention of the federal government involved movement against monopoly tendencies, program control, and censorship, and establishment of UHF and CATV services.

The usual misunderstandings between the FCC and Congress were in evidence as the FCC proposed to charge a fee to broadcasters for any license change. This proposal was submitted in early February 1954, and the Senate Interstate
and Foreign Commerce Committee promptly told the FCC that such changes in procedure should be resolved by Congress and not by the FCC. It apparently made little difference that Congress had passed the Independent Officers Appropriation Act of 1952, authorizing to agencies such as the FCC the authority to prescribe fees for services.  

UHF was becoming a problem:

Complaints from a number of UHF grantees had influenced Senator John Bricker, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, to introduce a bill which would give the FCC blanket regulatory authority over networks, similar to that which it has traditionally exercised over individual radio and television stations.

Although this bill did not reach the status of law, it influenced the initiation of a study of network operations in 1956. The multiple ownership rules of the FCC were amended in 1954 to limit control by one group or interest to seven AM, seven FM, and seven TV stations, of which only five VHF stations were allowed. This rule was declared invalid in 1955 by the U.S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, but on appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the FCC authority to limit the number of stations to which one ownership could hold license.

FM stations were authorized to operate subsidiary communication services by the method of multiplexing in 1955.
This provided FM operators with a means of earning an income to offset the operating loss which broadcast FM usually accrued. The 1957 Annual Report of the FCC indicated an increase in FM licenses for the first time in nine years.

Television allocations were the center of much controversy and pressure during these years. By mid-1957, three ETV allocations had been converted to commercial use but the FCC was indicating that no immediate move to change most ETV reservations was being considered. The problems of UHF were occupying much of the FCC attention in 1957. In an effort to make UHF competitive with VHF, the maximum transmitter power was raised, deintermixture was initiated and "booster" stations were being considered. The intense rivalry for acquisition of broadcasting facilities during the years 1954-58 was tremendous:

Applicants for television spent hundred of thousands of dollars in competitive proceedings. With some channels being sought valued at as high as ten million dollars each, enormous pressures of an extrajudicial character were brought to bear on Congress, the White House and the FCC to influence decisions in highly controversial cases.28

While the FCC continued to wrestle with the UHF problems and disavowed any jurisdiction over CATV in 1958, the U.S. Senate approved the Magnuson bill which called for
1,000,000 per state for establishment or improvement of ETV facilities. However, the House failed to take action on this bill. The Hill-Elliot bill was passed by Congress in 1958 and became known as the National Defense Education Act. Administered by the Office of Education, Title VII of this act provided funds for research and experimentation concerning the use of TV in instruction.

The year 1959 started with turmoil as the quiz scandals were just coming to public attention. Also, in early February, FCC chairman, John C. Doerfer appeared before the House Committee on Legislative Oversight to answer charges made against him and several other commissioners of "official misconduct, undue fraternization with the broadcast industry, and fraud against the government." February 18, 1959, the FCC ruled that Lar Daly, a fringe candidate of Chicago mayoral election, was entitled to equal time on four local TV stations due to news film shown of incumbent mayor Richard Daley. In September 1959, Congress amended the Communications Act to provide for exemption from provisions of Section 315 for a "bona fide" news program.

The House of Legislative Oversight Committee investigated the problem of "payola" in 1960 and amended Section
317 of the Communications Act to outlaw payola practices. The FCC continued its concern over program control and changed its rules to provide for fines and short-term licenses. While the Senate was passing the Magnuson bill again in 1961, President Kennedy asked Congress to extend the National Defense Education Act for three more years. Later in 1961, the extension of two years was approved. The House of Representatives was holding hearings on four ETV bills in March 1961. All these bills provided for federal aid to educational TV. Finally, the congressional debate over these bills came to an end with the passage of Public Law 87-447, the Educational Television Facilities Act. President Kennedy signed it into effect on May 1, 1962, as an amendment of Title III of the Communications Act of 1934. This law included the basic elements of both the original Magnuson and Roberts bills and provided:

(1) over-all appropriation of $32,000,000 through matching grants, (2) limit of $1,000,000 per state, (3) five-year time limit on construction, (4) grants administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and (5) inclusion of a "no federal control" clause.

Another important law which was passed in 1962 was the all-channel receiver law. This provided that all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce must be
equipped to receive all eighty-two channels, thus providing a guarantee in future years that UHF operators would have a better opportunity to compete with VHF stations. Although many felt that a ten-year period would have to pass before the effects of this legislation would be translated into actual majority ownership of UHF tuners, they did not consider the sudden increase in purchase of color receivers after 1965. The law went into effect April 30, 1964.

The FCC gave more attention to the programming service of commercial television in 1962 with two of the six license renewal denials based on programming considerations. That was the year of the much publicized local inquiries into programming culminated by the public hearings in the Chicago and Omaha markets.

In December 1962, the FCC put a freeze on further FM allocations while studying a new table of assignments and lifted that freeze in July 1963, with a new table of assignments. Concurrently, by Report and Order, the FCC established a new class of ETV service on channels in the 2500-2690 megacycle frequency bands which provided thirty-one low-power channels enabling a central transmitter to send out different signals simultaneously to scattered local schools and other reception points.
During the summer of 1964, identical bills proposing complete revision of the copyright laws were introduced into the Senate and House. These bills proposed to take away much of the protection against copyright fees which educational institutions enjoyed. The revision of the copyright law was much more involved than many had anticipated and Congress is, at this writing, still trying to make equitable adjustments so that a new law may be enacted.

On March 19, 1965, the FCC proposed rules by which the television networks would be limited in the amount of prime-time programming which they could produce, own, or in which they could have a proprietary interest. This was popularly termed the "fifty-fifty" rule, referring to amount of limitation that the FCC wished to impose. Various considerations postponed the processing of this proposed rule and eventually the proposal was abandoned.

The rise of Mutual Funds organizations alerted the FCC to the problems of multiple holdings by large investment firms in broadcast operations. Investigations into this matter commenced in September 1964. Also, regarding multiple ownership, the FCC initiated a policy in December 1964, that it would designate for hearing any application to acquire a
VHF station in the top fifty markets by a party already having one or more such stations or by a new party to acquire more than one such station.  

On June 3, 1965, the FCC issued a revised table of UHF channel allocations. This system of allocations, using electronic computer, assigned about 500 commercial channels and 500 educational allocations but did not make any allocations for cities of less than 25,000 people. It was tentatively decided to reserve channels 70-83 for lower power stations in communities of less than 25,000 people when the need was demonstrated. Less than a month later, on June 30, 1965, the FCC concluded its deliberations on the request of MPATI for more channels. The Commission refused further channel grants and suggested that MPATI convert the use of the "fixed service" 2500-2690 television channel availability.

The Institute

Planning

Some major changes in the structure of the Institute were inaugurated during this period in an effort to adapt to the needs of the industry. But the demand for the Institute and its unique functions declined as educators established
their own television stations and concentrated their efforts on development within the educational system. The NAEB became more active in representing educators on a continuing basis in Washington and New York. Communications between educators and broadcasters had been established, and continuing exchange among educational broadcasters was maintained. The Institute finally succumbed to the changing times and accepted the role of a program exhibition and critique meeting in 1966.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the 1954 Institute was arranged by the Institute staff, but 1955 was to be the twenty-fifth meeting of the Institute which called for special plans. Institute director, I. Keith Tyler, contacted representatives of various national organizations which had been associated with the Institute for years. He arranged a meeting at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City for October 30, 1954. In addition to Tyler, the following people attended: Gertrude Broderick (AERT), Harold E. Hill (NAEB), Basil Thorton (BBC), Natalie Flatow (Girl Scouts of America), Luella Hoskins (Association of Junior Leagues), John Bachman (Union Theological Seminary), Edward G. Sherburne, Jr. (Consultant), and Judith C. Waller (NBC).40
A summary of the program planned for the Institute on that day was as follows:

The group was emphatic in believing that this meeting should break away from the customary form and use the occasion for a review of the 25 years of educational broadcasting but particularly to set guide lines for the future....

Each day would be developed according to the following pattern:

1) A plenary session in which three or four outstanding speakers would present the three or four different aspects of the problem, each consuming 15 or 20 minutes. This would be followed by a panel discussion among the same speakers involving a consideration of the inter-relationships among their topics;

2) The second period of the morning would involve three or four divisional sections, each in charge of one of the three principal speakers. Here the Institute members would have an opportunity through questioning to bring out more detailed implications of the viewpoints presented in the plenary session. Each divisional section would have several able resource people, in addition to the speaker assigned to it.

3) The third period of the day would be devoted to small discussion groups giving everyone an opportunity to deal with the implications of the material and to clarify his thinking on these problems. Each group would have assigned resource persons.

4) The final session in the evening of each day would constitute a reporting session in which there would be brought together the thinking of the entire conference.

The Planning Committee emphasized the importance of securing the outstanding thinkers and speakers available whether they came from the United States or Abroad. This will require substantial funds. Each speaker should be required to attend the entire conference so that he would be available throughout for consultation. He should be paid enough so that he would devote a considerable length of time to careful preparation of his written paper.
It was also suggested that a bibliography be prepared dealing with each phase of the Conference so that conference participants could engage in advance preparation to ensure more mature and meaningful deliberation.41

Some weeks later a proposed budget for this ambitious program was drafted as follows:42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>$30,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for 12 speakers at $1,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for 26 major resource people at $500</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense for speakers and resource people</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Banquet</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Honored Guests</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Talent and Arrangements</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Publicity</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenotype Reports</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Service</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Yearbook Distribution</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity Service, Press Room</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Salary--6 months at $800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense, Director and Manager to Arrange Program</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference to the financial situation of the Institute43 indicates that an additional $40,000 would have to be acquired above normal income. This was a drastic departure from the
usual structure since the work-study and special-interest section meetings would be eliminated. No honoraria had been paid to any speaker at the Institute since the first two years of the Institute. This was a very impressive plan but totally beyond the scope of the Institute organization primarily because of the financial investment. This writer feels that such a program might have given both educational and public service interests a tremendous fund of ideas and challenge to bring about television advances earlier than occurred. However, the only crises which could raise funds to support such a venture was the education crisis, but the program was not centered on that crises. More lead time was also needed to explore funding possibilities as well as speaker commitments.

The primary change for the 1955 Institute was the selection of twenty-six people who received recognition awards at the Anniversary Dinner as having given outstanding service to educational broadcasting for the past quarter century. These people are identified in the Content Summary of this chapter.

The 1956 Institute Advisory Committee was informally constituted by Tyler. Since no funds were available to bring the group together at one meeting, some of the members met
at the NAEB conference in Chicago and others assisted with ideas and contacts individually.\textsuperscript{44} No record of the deliberations at the NAEB conference or other information of planning was found in the search of records. The 1956 Advisory Committee contained twelve people, in addition to officers of the Institute, of which only three had served on the Committee before. There was definitely "new blood" on this Committee including those who did not represent any large constituency of the Institute. The concept of organizational representation which governed the Advisory Committees of the last period, as mentioned in Chapter IV, was not as strong a factor in the Committees of this period.\textsuperscript{45}

The 1956 program format changed considerably and followed the suggestions made by the 1955 Advisory Committee, although on a much smaller scale. No honoraria were paid, following the tradition of the Institute. Five speakers with basic presentations occupied four plenary sessions with three periods of small group discussion and a final session summarizing the discussion.\textsuperscript{46} This writer felt the format resulted in one of the best discussion of this period and no explanation was found for the return to the previous format in the following year.
The 1957 and 1958 Advisory Committees were composed of the same people as the 1956 Committee except for a few additions and an occasional deletion. The Committees were divided fairly evenly between commercial and educational broadcast orientation.

A post mortem letter was sent to all participants of the 1957 Institute with responses discussed and considered at the Advisory Committee meeting held in Columbus on November 7, 1957. The reactions of the respondents were generally quite favorable. A common complaint about the Institute was that the sessions had tended to become too elementary. The Institute veterans felt there should be an opportunity for advanced level discussion of various problems. The suggestion that topics be divided into a section for beginners and a section for advanced was dismissed, since there were too many complaints about conflicting meetings under the present system. The suggestion was also made that consultation rooms be set up with authorities on hand to discuss advanced level problems. This was not implemented at the 1958 Institute but was established at the 1959 Institute.
There was discussion about the whole week being too heavily scheduled and it was felt that the concurrent clinics on Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning would be sufficient. A similar plan had been tried in the 1957 Institute and seemed to be successful. This would allow more time for informal mixing and more time to view prize-winning TV programs. The Committee felt that these programs should be more readily available and scheduled showings should be announced with a room reserved for these showings. Coffee could be served and more encouragement and promotion for the prominent programs could be shown. The 1958 Institute did provide a free afternoon on Wednesday but no scheduled showing of programs were introduced. As in the past, a selected group of prize-winning programs were available for viewing on request.

The Committee approved the practice of allowing equipment manufacturers to provide exhibits of their equipment. It was indicated that the Institute would receive revenue from these exhibits in 1958. The placement service, which had been provided at the 1957 Institute, was felt to be not worth the trouble. There was also comment that speeches and panels of experts discussing questions should be discouraged at clinics because it did not allow time for proper
As always, a large portion of the discussion of the Committee meeting was concerned with the major topics to be presented at the Institute and the people who would be able to present the material.

There was a considerable change in personnel on the Advisory Committee for the 1959 Institute as five people were dropped, nine people were added, and eight were continued from the previous year. New representation was given to Television Digest, U.S. Office of Education, NBC, a Washington attorney, and DAVI, while NETRC, CBS, and the Council of National Organizations were not represented as in past years.

The first meeting of this Committee was in Columbus, Ohio on November 20, 1958. Tyler opened the meeting with a review of the trends of the Institute. He noted that the attendance had taken a downward trend but seemed to be leveling off at about 600. The Committee felt that these attendance trends might indicate that the Institute was gradually dying because it was no longer serving a vital function. Possible causes of decreasing attendance were identified as:
1. Attendance of many new people means a "watering down" of content which the veterans find repetitive and boring after many years.

2. Several groups have split off to form their own meetings. Also, the NAEB has grown in size and diversity of its interests.

3. "Great Issues" no longer seem to be presented in challenging fashion with some feelings that this is caused by the Institute failing to "take a stand" on such controversial matters.

4. The Institute may be spreading itself too thin by being too diversified with no depth.

5. The big-name, top-talent people are no longer on the program.

6. Many allied groups meeting before, concurrently, and after compete for attendance and energy.

7. The advance program comes out too late and in skeleton form, thus not revealing the array of names and talent which attract attendance.

8. Financial support of the University has dwindled.

On the other hand, the positive and unique values of the Institute were listed as follows:
1. It attracts both commercial and non-commercial broadcasters.

2. It brings together many diverse interests in educational and public service broadcasting, making cross-fertilization of ideas possible.

3. It initiates newcomers into the field, revealing broad issues and challenging problems. It fosters their acquaintance with kindred folk from all parts of the country.

4. It presents broad issues of broadcasting and mass communication including new challenges from the frontiers of thinking and development.

5. It has been a continuing conference through the years while most other conferences and organizations have faded away.

This discussion focused the Committee's thoughts on how to revitalize the Institute. It was felt that the unique indispensable element in the Institute was the presentation of broad issues cutting across the various interests in broadcasting. If important big name people can be secured to deal with these issues, and program information is given out well in advance; sufficient interest could be engendered to increase attendance.
The problem of finances was reviewed noting the halt in the yearbook printing in 1953, and the steady reduction in administrative support funds. At one time, both W.W. Charters, as director, and I, Keith Tyler, as executive secretary, were paid a stipend for these positions on a year-round basis. Later, Tyler was director on a year-round basis with two full-time secretaries for this and other responsibilities. He also had a part-time assistant, a yearbook editor, and ample travel and incidental funds. At present (1958), Tyler was on a three-quarter contract, had one secretary, and a part-time assistant, and travel money was small being paid mostly from Institute income.

The Committee agreed that the Institute was at a crossroad; that the Ohio State University should decide whether to support the enterprise adequately so as to attract representative attendance in good numbers, or drop the Institute before it dwindles in both size and importance. The support should include re-instituting the yearbook because it is invaluable as the only continuing record in educational broadcasting, and would be an inducement to top-quality speakers. Hull and Mason drafted a resolution which was approved at the next meeting of the Committee on December 9, 1958; and which was sent to the university President, Novice
Fawcett, and the Board of Trustees of the university. The resolution was as follows:

WHEREAS, The Institute for Education by Radio-Television for 28 years has had outstanding influence in the broad field of educational and public-service broadcasting; and

WHEREAS, the leadership and activities of the Institute are of inestimable value for the advancement of educational and commercial broadcasting in its various phases; and

WHEREAS, this enterprise has extended the eminence and prestige of The Ohio State University throughout the world in broadcasting and educational circles; and

WHEREAS, The Ohio State University numbers among its graduates and holders of advanced degrees, many of the most distinguished leaders in the broadcasting industry; and

WHEREAS, the following and influence of the Institute have been gradually diminishing due both to changing conditions and to decreased support by the University; and

WHEREAS, the Institute appears to be at a cross-roads between a strengthened and vigorous leadership on the one hand, or a steady loss of effectiveness, on the other; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Advisory Committee recommends to the President and the Board of Trustees that substantial additional funds be provided to support the Institute for Education by Radio-Television so that it may meet changing conditions and occupy a place of even greater leadership, service and prestige.52

Enclosed with this resolution was a request for $8,500 to pay a professional executive secretary; $4,000 for the printing of a yearbook; and $2,000 for travel expenses in arranging the program over a five month period.

The response from President Fawcett, received in April 1959 was a $250 travel fund, and $2,400 for the 1959
yearbook. This allowed a 1959 yearbook printing, but did not meet the real problem of developing new force and vigor for the Institute. President Fawcett also was reported to have assigned a three man committee to study the Institute's problems and report to him. Recent interviews with both I. Keith Tyler and Richard Hull revealed no further information on this review committee. Neither gentlemen recalled any such committee.

The annual program exhibition, formally started in 1937, was discussed at some length in the November 20 meeting. The exhibition, which was called the Ohio State Awards, continued to grow, with radio entries holding their own surprisingly well after initial losses to television. The exhibition returned a small profit after entry fees were split with judging centers and administrative costs were paid. There was general approval of the suggestion that more promotion of these exhibitions and awards should be attempted. Specific ideas were:

1. Regular screenings and auditions should be scheduled of top prize winners each day.

2. Awards should be announced at special Institute session with much highlighting and suspense.
3. An all-day Awards Festival might be held the final day of the Institute similar to some of the international film festivals. If clearances could be obtained the "kines" might be broadcast by WOSU-TV and the audio recordings by WOSU. The Festival would conclude with an outstanding Awards Dinner.

4. Institute session could be built around certain issues which had been dealt with by programs entered in the Exhibition. Producers and writers of these programs would discuss their problems and procedures with the programs played as illustrations. (Similar to the closing general sessions of the Institutes in 1957 and 1958.)

Some of these suggestions were used in the 1959 Institute. Each general session ended with the announcement of the winners selected classes of programs so that the announcements were portioned out over the entire conference. The final full day of the conference was entitled "Awards Day" and culminated with an Awards Festival Dinner. The closing general session on the next morning followed suggestion number four above.

The problem of involving newcomers and veterans of the Institute was discussed with two suggestions formulated:
(1) An opening session should be set up for newcomers with exciting people as headliners and a panel of experienced veterans as resource people. Elementary orientation material would be presented and the panel would answer questions.

(2) Veterans should be stationed in special rooms as consultants with advanced scheduling. Various areas of interest would be covered and the consultants would be listed in the program. This idea was suggested at the previous year's Advisory Committee meeting but not established until the 1959 Institute. The newcomers session was also started at the 1959 Institute.

To improve the small group meetings it was suggested that each group be built around one or two prepared papers. The yearbook would be an outlet for such papers. Several people would be assigned as discussants or interrogators to involve the audience. These discussants would be listed in the program, thus enabling them to come on expense accounts. This would avoid much "how we do it" accounts resulting from the present chairman-panel pattern and would allow more time for pertinent discussion from the floor.

A second meeting of the Advisory Committee was held in Columbus, Ohio on December 9, 1958. Several members who
had not been present at the first meeting expressed views on the Institute as follows:

1. Four days is too long for a convention.
2. Broad general conventions are giving way to specialized ones.
3. The unique role of the Institute is the consideration of significant philosophy for broadcasting.
4. The Institute must focus on big issues of common concern to many specialties.
5. The Institute needs smaller number of competing meetings so attendance at each is larger.
6. The Institute needs to get top speakers.

M.S. Novik proposed a format for the Institute to incorporate some of these suggestions:

**First Day.** Special sessions for newcomers; meetings of affiliated groups; institute reception. Evening can be formal opening general session with Chamberlain.

**Second Day.** Panel with Federal Communications Commission with another general session on a big issue for afternoon and the dinner on an important issue in the evening.

**Third Day.** Devote to special interest groups, workshops, and clinics and headline it as "Awards Day." Winners in various classifications of Exhibition should be announced consecutively at General Sessions and lunches with climax at Award Dinner the third day. This strings out anticipation and builds up both interest and attendance. With this format the big issues for busy
old-timers would be concentrated into a full day and an evening with special interests and newcomers handled before and after and Award Day being a climax.56

The meeting then turned to the business of choosing issues for the Institute. Vincent Wasilewski, invited as a consultant representing NAB, identified sixteen areas of interest to broadcasters. The recorded discussion concerning possible speakers and topics indicated that the plan presented by the Committee was followed without much change.

The majority of the 1960 Advisory Committee felt that an evaluation of the Ohio State Awards and Exhibition should be made to find better methods of handling the judging and the presentation of awards.57 Spreading the award announcements over the entire period of the conference did not work well in 1959. Most members felt that the program was excellent with the spirit and vigor shown by Institute participants to be the best in ten years. Other strengths of the 1959 Institute that were mentioned were: (1) excellent "name" speakers, specifically Frank Stanton, David Suskind, and Paul L. Chamberlain; (2) success of the newcomers session; (3) use of the electronic medium to bring a luncheon telephone interview with Senator Magnuson and Representative Harris; (4) good press coverage; (5) excellent closing
session dealing with program award winners; and (6) improved interest of commercial broadcasters because of the emphasis of the Institute on common elements between educational and commercial broadcasting.

Some weaknesses mentioned were: (1) need for earlier program preparation for advance promotion; (2) too many rather heavy general sessions with general Institute content over-emphasizing instructional broadcasting; (3) speakers were too lengthy and repetitious and thus discouraged the audience questions; (4) small attendance at closing session necessitating the movement to an earlier place in the program; (5) scope of the Institute should be broader to include school administrators; (6) the commercial exhibits should be more functional rather than just a display of equipment; and (7) the continuing complaint of too little time for informal contracts between participants.

Tyler reminded the Committee that the 1960 Institute was the Thirtieth Anniversary meeting presenting an opportunity for special emphasis, and asked for suggestions for the 1960 Institute.

George Heinemann noted that the University needed to be emphasized more at the annual meeting and suggested
holding the 1960 Institute during the spring recess on the Ohio State University campus. He also suggested that a special demonstration and broadcast of award-winning programs be carried by the university station WOSU-TV. Tyler indicated that it was too late to arrange for the change of dates and location for the 1960 Institute but this suggestion would be considered for 1961. Hudson declared that he would rather show excerpts of programs illustrating a theme such as "broadcasting in political campaigns" than merely showing various award-winning programs. It was also suggested to have an entire three-day conference "produced" so that sessions may be presented effectively with proper lighting and settings. Tyler noted that this would cost money but the feeling was expressed that such money might be made available if the request listed specific uses.

The Exhibition Awards program was again discussed and a committee was appointed to review the entire program with primary concern for the 1961 Exhibition since it was already too late to revise much of the 1960 program. The meeting was adjourned after agreement on a second meeting in mid-November in New York City. No record of the minutes of the second meeting were found but correspondence indicates
that it was held November 29 and concentrated on drafting a definite outline of the 1960 Institute. A mimeographed copy of the outline drafted at this meeting indicates that the actual program of the 1960 Institute followed very closely these suggestions.

The Exhibition Awards Committee met in New York City on November 12, 1959. Attending this meeting were: Mrs. Gertrude Broderick, U.S. Office of Education; Richard Groggin, New York University; Luella Hoskins, Association of Junior Leagues; James Robertson, National Educational Television and Radio Center; and I. Keith Tyler. The following recommendations were made and later approved by the Institute Advisory Committee at its November meeting:

1. Change to eight classes in each of the two divisions, radio and television.
2. Ensure that each group of judges includes well-qualified media personnel, as well as subject-matter experts.
3. Grant only one First Award and one Honorable Mention in each class for each group of exhibitors.
4. Enter only one representative program of a given series.
5. Announce awards at one time at session of Institute with simultaneous press release. Mimeographed release to give all winners; session to feature only First Awards.
6. Feature prize-winning programs in a group of simultaneous section meetings. Build these meetings around the programs with producers present to describe and explain.
All of the above recommendations were implemented in the 1960 Institute.

John Dunlop, director of international exchange, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, had approached Tyler in July 1960 with the suggestion of making the major Awards presentation a dressy, well-produced session which might be carried on network television. Dunlop attended the Advisory Committee meeting of November 29 and received support to pursue the matter further with CBC. Another meeting of the Advisory Committee on December 15, 1960, reported that NBC assigned Arnold Rabin to produce the program. NBC was to pay salary and transportation for Rabin but released several producers from the payroll, including Rabin, effective March 1, 1961. CBS and ABC were reported to have shared the remaining expenses of Rabin. Clifton Fadiman hosted the half-hour program which was carried live by WOSU-TV, Ohio State's station and taped for replay on April 30, 1961, on the CBC network and NET educational television network. The breakdown of estimated production costs indicated outside sources contributing $5,544.00 and Ohio State University absorbing $3,880.00 in cost.59

Inquiries of I. Keith Tyler, Richard Hull, Martha Haueisen and Dean C. Cannon, confirm that Advisory Committee
planning meetings were held during the next five years but no written minutes of these meetings were able to be located. The printed programs lists the Committee each year and indicates that I. Keith Tyler retired as director after the 1962 Institute. Richard B. Hull, assumed the duties and responsibility of arranging the Institute program from that point.

Program

During this period the annual programs demonstrated the following general trends. 

1. The Institute covered a four day period from 1954 through 1961, was reduced to a three day conference in 1962-63-64 and a two day affair in 1965.

2. A heavy schedule of concurrent meetings continued to be programmed until a noticeable reduction in 1960 and abolishent in 1963. The tendency after 1955 was to devote less time to concurrent sessions and hold more general sessions.

3. The dates of the Institute gradually moved from mid-April to early June.

4. All Institutes from 1955 through 1963 established a theme around which the majority of the conference topics
were related.

The program formats of 1954 and 1955 were almost identical to 1953 but the 1956 program presented the most dramatic format change in the Institute's history. As indicated in the Planning section of this chapter, the Program Committee for the 1955 Institute had envisioned concentration on each of the three days to a different aspect of the central theme of the Institute for the year. This would eliminate the variety of divergent topics and also eliminate all the concurrent meetings. Although these ideas were not carried through in 1955, the 1956 Institute accomplished much of the basic plan. The only similarities to the traditional format were the opening afternoon reception and the retention of two sessions of concurrent meetings. These concurrent sessions were referred to as clinic rather than work-study or special interest meetings. The official program introduced the changes with the following statement:

_A Thoughtful Search_. To begin the second quarter century of its existence, the Institute format is being drastically revised to facilitate intensive and searching discussion of the role of serious broadcasting in today's world. The heart of the conference consists of small and intimate discussion groups which will engage in a thoughtful examination of the various aspects of the central problem. Plenary sessions will highlight some of the factors involved and raise significant questions.
Institute members will be assigned to these discussion groups on the basis of their registrations.

A series of clinics to provide opportunity for participants to bring themselves up to date on latest developments in their own fields of activity, will be another feature of the Institute. These will cover the major types of activity in which Institute members engage.

There were six general session compared to the previously established three general sessions. The fifteen discussion groups, each had a chairman, discussion leader, recorder and resource people. The closing general session consisted of a summary of the discussions of the fifteen separate groups plus a reaction to this summary by a broadcaster and an educator. A comment in the "conference notes" of the program about the theme of the Institute (quoted above) was an innovation in 1956 which continued through the 1963 Institute. Also the 1956 Institute offered a tape recording service through which a recording of any and all major speeches could be purchased. This practice was continued through 1962. The last three Institutes were also reported to have been recorded but no notice of such was found in the programs. Unfortunately these recordings were not preserved.

The 1957 Institute did not concentrate on such an integrated single topic for all general sessions but used
each session for a different aspect of a general issue. The fifteen organized discussion groups on the theme were not used in 1957 or thereafter. The 1958 Institute followed the same general pattern as 1957.

The 1959 Institute made several changes in line with the Advisory Committee analysis reported in the Planning section of this chapter. A "Newcomers Session" was inaugurated to acquaint these people with the process of activity at the Institute and encourage their response. This also served to bring these people up to date on the basic concepts of the area to be discussed so that the watering down of discussion did not happen. A broad issue involving most interests in broadcasting was chosen and several top industry representatives were featured as speakers. A consulting service of veteran experts of the Institute was available to all who wished to discuss specific problems. The concurrent meetings were reduced considerably and emphasized programming concepts. These changes were continued in the 1960 Institute.

A special documentary film and stage program was the highlight of the 1961 Institute. This program reported in the previous section of this chapter was telecast as an acknowledgement of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Ohio
State Awards. An awards cocktail party was provided before the Institute dinner and the documentary program took place after the dinner. The program awards were announced at the end of the special program.

The 1962 Institute dropped three full sessions eliminating the "Newcomers Session" and changing the traditional Institute reception to a cocktail party provided by the commercial network organizations. The keynote speech occurred at the fourth session rather than the first general session as had been the tradition. The Ohio State awards were again announced in segments but all the top awards were announced at the annual Institute dinner. A new feature was the use of the hotel's closed circuit TV system to program selections of award winning programs at hours when no official meetings were occurring. This system transmitted to 265 rooms in the hotel. The remaining three annual Institutes carried no concurrent sessions.

During this entire period the American Council for Better Broadcasts held its annual meetings in conjunction with the Institute. The NAEB also held various committee meetings at the Institute. However, the meetings of allied groups gradually decreased from a high of ten different
groups in 1956 to two in 1962.

Throughout this period there was a gradual decline in attendance. No definite organization contributed significantly to this trend but all had some part. Although the number of states represented at the Institute remained relatively high, no particular state could be found reducing attendance at a greater rate than others. A look at the attendance chart, Appendix I, Table 1, for this period shows a large drop of 131 in the 1954 Institute total attendance and then a significant drop of 81 for the 1955 Institute. However, from 1955 through 1959 the attendance remained relatively steady. 1960 showed another substantial drop with this trend continuing through 1965. Although each year during this period, one group or another showed a definite unusual fluctuation in attendance, the 1958 Institute showed four groups in this category. Three took a sudden dip downward (Colleges and Universities, Local and Regional Organizations, and National Organizations), while the Educational Stations group had a dramatic increase. This writer feels that the subject matter of the Institute for 1958 (Broadcasting: First Aid in the Educational Crisis), was largely responsible for those fluctuations and could be considered
to be responsible for most of the fluctuation throughout this period. No consistent pattern was discerned for these fluctuations. During the relatively stable years of 1955 through 1959 the attendance ratio of 6 to 1 in favor of educational interests was maintained.

During the last seven years of this period more emphasis was placed on the Ohio State Awards than previously. Various means of presenting the awards were tried. Also the programming aspects of broadcasting were being emphasized in conjunction with the awards. On May 2, 1966 a letter was sent to many individuals who had participated in recent Institute activities. An excerpt from that letter stated:

After several years of study and careful consideration, the IERT National Advisory Committee has recommended that the Institute devote its major effort toward making the OHIO STATE AWARDS the most comprehensive evaluation possible of educational-informational programming in broadcasting and other forms of electronic program distribution, developing from time to time those supporting activities which directly relate to programming and the changing technology of electronic communication.

Therefore, following this recommendation, our spring activity this year will be a public recognition dinner for entrants and winners in the 1966 OHIO STATE AWARDS at the Sheraton Columbus Motor Hotel at 7 p.m., May 19, 1966. A list of winning programs will be released to news media at 6 p.m. Dinner Speaker will be Lawrence Laurent, radio-TV critic for the Washington Post.
Content Summary

All except the 1954 and 1964 Institutes during this period each identified a theme about which all general sessions were concerned. Some major considerations of this period were: (1) the survival and adaptation of the radio service, (2) involvement in international broadcasting, and (3) the development of an educational television service. Above all these considerations was one basic concern to which the Institute addressed itself—determination of the best ways in which broadcasting could serve the ends of world social advancement. This writer has termed that theme as the development of a social conscience for broadcasting.

Although records of the speeches and discussion during this period are not complete, the majority of major speeches for the general session at all Institutes except 1958 and 1964 were available plus the press reports on activities at all the Institutes. There was more discussion about the Institute itself during this period probably because the attendance and prestige of the Institute were declining. Much of this discussion was reported in the previous section of the chapter concerned with planning the Institute. A committee chaired by Judith Waller and composed of Robert
Hudson, Allen Miller, and M.S. Novik chose twenty-six people who received special "25th Anniversary Awards" at the 1955 Institute. These people must have contributed to the field of educational broadcasting throughout most of the quarter of a century and must also be currently active or just recently retired:

The committee in drawing up further criteria of selection decided first that the magnitude of the contribution of the recipient should be widely known and recognized.

Secondly, that the variety of ways in which each individual had contributed to educational broadcasting throughout the years must also be considered.

And lastly, we gave perhaps more consideration to those primarily engaged in educational broadcasting per se—as their particular contributions have pointed the way to the young people coming into the field.65

The individuals receiving the special 25th anniversary awards were: Kenneth Bartlett, vice-president and dean of public relations, Syracuse University; Lyman Bryson, professor of education, Columbus University, and counselor on public affairs for the Columbia Broadcasting System; Franklin Dunham, chief of radio-television, U.S. Office of Education; Dorothy Gordon, originator and moderator, New York Times Youth Forums; Robert B. Hudson, program coordinator, Educational Television Radio Center; Richard B. Hull, director of radio-television, Iowa State College; George Jennings, director of radio and television, Chicago Public Schools;
R.S. Lambert, supervisor of school broadcasts, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; Kathleen N. Lardie, manager of WDTR, and director of radio-television, Detroit Public Schools; William B. Levenson, deputy superintendent of Cleveland Public Schools and director of WBOE; Leon Levine, director, Office of Radio-Television, Columbia University; Harold B. McCarty, professor and director, division of radio-television education, University of Wisconsin, and executive director, Wisconsin State Radio Council; Eleanor McClatchy, owner and president, McClatchy Broadcasting Co., and McClatchy Newspapers; Adrian F. Michaelis, head of radio division, Public Relations Department, Standard Oil Company of California; Allen Miller, director of information services and general manager, KWSC, State College of Washington; Edward R. Murrow, reporter and news analyst, Columbia Broadcasting System; M.S. Novik, New York radio and television consultant; William S. Paley, chairman of the board, Columbia Broadcasting System; Robert Saudek, director of TV-Radio Workshop, Ford Foundation; Frank E. Schooley, director of university broadcasting and manager of WILL-AM-FM-TV, University of Illinois, and president of NAEB; Seymour N. Siegel, director of communications, City of New York, Charles A. Siepmann, professor of education and chairman of department
of communications, New York University; Mary Somerville, comptroller of talks, BBC, London; I. Keith Tyler, professor of education, Ohio State University, and director of the Institute; Paul A. Walker, Washington, D.C., attorney and former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; and Judith Waller, director of public affairs and education National Broadcasting Company. Every one of the twenty-six people honored for their service to educational broadcasting had been active as major speakers at past Institutes. In addition FCC Commissioner Freida Hennock received a special citation from the Institute for her outstanding contributions to the development of educational broadcasting. I. Keith Tyler had also been awarded special citations earlier in the Institute by the National Citizens Committee for Educational Television and Alpha Epsilon Rho, a national honorary fraternity in broadcasting.

Regarding radio's need to adapt its service, Carl George, station manager of WGAR, Cleveland, told the 1954 Institute that radio forms part of the daily living pattern of people and moves from background to foreground and back again throughout the day. People are mobile and multiple--attentive, he said, which allows radio to be the companion
where television cannot go. At a pre-conference session of the 1955 Institute, Leon Levine, director of the Office of Radio-TV, Columbia University, stated that radio's new look would involve specialized audiences and individual listening rather than group listening. Rolf Meyersohn, University of Chicago, noted in his 1957 speech that people use radio extensively, but do not realize how much it has become part of their lives as a utility rather than a conscious entertainment. He concluded his speech with the philosophy which was to dictate radio's future programming concept:

Audiences like to keep their sets tuned to a station so long as it presents what they want—which tends to be more or less constant. Music listeners don't want soap operas, soap opera listeners don't want ball games. Why should a station turn the dial every hour, so to speak, when the listeners can turn theirs just as well—and do? In theory, at least, there ought to be more stations, each with its own and distinguishing identity, competing not for the same tiny fraction of the audience, but, as an aggregate, for the combined fractions that make up the special interest groups in this country.

Louis Hausman, vice-president of CBS radio, tried to convince the audience that the greatest attractions in radio were still the individual programs and that CBS was maintaining these programs. He noted that the cost per thousand listener was very economical and continuous advertising was
necessary for selling products so he felt that such programs would continue to be profitable to radio. Hausman referred to the daytime serials (soap operas) in his analysis as examples of the type of programming which CBS network radio would continue to program.

M.S. Novik, radio consultant, declared that the trend was toward recorded music in order to make money by cutting programming costs, while Joseph Csida noted the introduction of the 33 1/3 RPM "long playing" record almost simultaneously with the 45 RPM record catapulted the phonograph record business into a new era of prosperity and provided the radio industry with all the free programming it could use. Further comments about radio are found in the major issue discussion following this section.

International broadcasting, which was primarily presented by the officials of the U.S. Information Agency and its radio branch, Voice of America, and foreign broadcasting were discussed at all Institutes except 1958, 1962, and 1965. Theodore C. Streibert, director of USIA and the Voice of America explained the radio activities of the USIA to the 1954 Institute. He commended the NAEB for its development of program exchange with foreign countries. The 1955
Institute heard Eugene King, program manager of the Voice of America (VOA), declare that Soviet Russia spends more money (over three billion) to try to jam VOA broadcasts than VOA spends (sixteen million) in sending the broadcasts. He said the VOA broadcasts still get through in thirty-eight languages beamed over seventy-five transmitters. King returned to the 1956 Institute after a visit to Russia and, once again emphasized that the VOA programs were breaking through the Russian interference activities. Burton Paulu, manager of University of Minnesota's KVOM, and former Fulbright research scholar with the BBC said:

There is no evidence that the BBC, after 30 years of conscious effort, has been able to develop any consistently higher standards of discrimination among British listeners and viewers than has been attained in the United States with a competitive system of broadcasting. He described the British system and noted that the government support allows the BBC to provide a larger proportion of programs for minority groups while not overlooking the interests of the majority audiences.

Henry Cassirer, head of television for UNESCO, Paris, reported to the 1956 Institute that the high cost of TV receivers has required that a great portion of TV viewing in Europe is done where groups of people gather rather than, as in the U.S., in the relative privacy of the home. Perhaps
most of the Institute audience could easily remember the early TV days in the U.S., when most reception took place at the local corner saloon. Cassirer also reminded the audience that most Europeans don't have a choice of programs simply because there is only one channel and one national network that can be received.  

The 1959 Institute heard a UNESCO official explain the difficulties of getting a film and TV program exchange started between countries and suggested that the U.S. was not very active in encouraging international exchange.  

Also during this session a State Department official described activities to get a program exchange operating with Russia. He said it had not started yet because Russia is delaying agreement and use. Jerry Danzig, NBC, and Ralph Steetle, JCET, told of their trips to Russia. In the discussion period it was brought out quite clearly that Russia used radio and television to promote the Communist ideology and would not allow anything on the air which did not promote Communism.  

Andrew Stewart, chairman, Board of Broadcast Governors for the Canadian broadcast system, explained some of the provisions which Canada had made for educational and cultural broadcasting to the 1961 Institute audience.
The FCC gave strong encouragement to development of ETV. Chairman of the FCC, George McConnaughey, declared to the 1955 Institute that "our very survival depends on our educational system." He explained that security, the main concern of Americans, is achieved by developing the ability to adapt to changes thus developing our minds to stay ahead of others. He stated that television and radio were the best media by which education could be imparted and that a minimum amount of regulation would provide the maximum amount of opportunity to develop means of using these media in education. David D. Henry, executive chancellor of New York University, also emphasized the need for brain power, and urged the Institute to concentrate on instructional uses of television. He said radio had proved its worth and only needed implementation while television must yet be tested for its best uses. He emphasized the teacher shortage as did the Very Reverend Celestin J. Steiner, University of Detroit president, in a previous speech. Steiner stated that there was no way to meet the swelling enrollments with conventional teaching methods, and suggested that closed circuit television would provide at least part of the answer to the inevitable teacher shortage. Robert G. Gessner, chairman of the
Department of Motion Pictures, New York University, supported Steiner's suggestion enthusiastically the next day at a group discussion on closed circuit television (CCTV) when he said, "The use of closed circuit television for education and training is the most exciting classroom innovation since the discovery of the blackboard." 86

A pre-conference session audience of the 1957 Institute heard Ralph Steetle present an overview of activities in instructional television. He expressed delight at the attitude of most educators who have accepted the need for television in instruction, and have moved courageously to experiment with it. He noted some unwarranted fears about its effects, and emphasized that television redeployed teachers rather than replacing them. 87

Hideya Kumata, Communications Research Center, Michigan State University, reported that generally TV teaching has been found to be as effective as face-to-face teaching. However, he noted that some studies have shown that students with higher aptitudes learned better from face-to-face teaching. He deplored the scarcity of research in instructional TV and was even more disturbed because most of the research being done was a duplication of previous studies.
The effects on student attitudes and values was an area he suggested for new research.

Later in the Institute, Burton Paulu, radio-TV director of the University of Minnesota, said that the history of the world was at a crucial stage which provided the biggest challenge yet to education. He noted that educational broadcasting should not be judged on the standards or values of commercial broadcasting.

We in educational broadcasting are doing an educational job; the results should be judged accordingly. We are interested in disseminating information and inducing attitudinal changes. We want our audiences to be as large as possible; judged by educational standards, they often are enormous. But our important criterion is educational impact.89

He also called for cooperation between commercial and educational broadcasters and then reminded the educators that it was even more important to achieve cooperation within the university operation. Jurisdictional and budgetary disputes as well as other inter-university differences will more quickly ruin educational broadcasting advancement than any other factor, he said.

The 1958 Institute was devoted to exploring broadcast uses in education. Joseph Kanner, chief of the Audio-Visual Applications Office, U.S. Army, described advances made by
the Army since TV was introduced in 1949. He noted that a man with no previous experience in the field could teach most of the training courses after two hours of rehearsal and the use of a teleprompter. Two administrators asserted that the most valuable asset of TV was that it allowed a wider curriculum offering.90

John White, general manager of WQED, Pittsburgh's ETV station, was discussing the community ETV station when he suggested that ETV stations will be operating on more than one channel within ten years. He said there are thousands of UHF channels that are not being used and he saw no reason why educational broadcasters should not use them. He declared that ETV must be a force in the community if it was to earn the support of that community. To be a force the station had to be willing to be bold and face issues.

This includes the religious and the political as well as social and philosophical, for unless we provide an honest and completely free arena for debate; unless we take advantage in the public interest of the peculiar freedom which is ours, we will never be this force.91

Jerome Reeves, general manager of KDKA-TV, praised the activities of WQED and listed five fallacies which WQED had overcome to be successful: (1) that all television must be entertaining; (2) that education is not entertaining;
(3) that educational television should not compete with commercial television; (4) that commercial television with its public service time will provide ample opportunity for cultural offerings; and (5) that people will not support an educational station.

Telford Taylor, member of the counseling firm serving JCET, delivered the keynote address agreeing with John White's position that educational broadcasting should deal with controversy. However, Taylor felt that the station should play the role of referee or umpire rather than that of advocate. He said that the request, "Let him be heard" often requires courage to follow and that the broadcaster must have that courage.

With other speakers on the panel agreeing, Edgar Dale, professor in the Bureau of Educational Research, at Ohio State University, re-emphasized that TV is not a threat to any teacher but is a threat to ignorance. TV will not replace the teacher but will help him do a better job.

Paul Chamberlain, manager of marketing for General Electric's Technical Products Operation, told the 1959 Institute that significant economies would result in a system of TV stations serving grade schools throughout an entire
area of many school districts. The economy plus the more efficient use of teaching talents would solve many of the problems facing public schools. To demonstrate his point, he used a hypothetical system in Central New York state. Using four transmitters telecasting from Syracuse on four different channels and serving a six-country area, with 452 schools in 92 school districts, he estimated complete system cost, including land, buildings, and equipment at about $28,700 per district. The total public school enrollment of 178,000 would mean $14.81 per pupil. The annual operating cost would come to $8.42 per pupil, about 2 percent of the $493 annual cost per pupil at that time. For this money, Chamberlain estimated an average of one-third of the school day for each pupil in grades one through twelve would be taught by television. He admitted that one of the big problems would be the centralization factor which would remove a portion of the local control from school districts. In the discussion period the point was brought out that the centralization problem was the biggest problem and had been for the past fifty years.

FCC Commissioner Frederick Ford gave some background information on the development of the TV allocation plan in
order to explain the problem which the FCC was facing at that time (1959). Ford presented the following factors of the problem: (1) An adequate nation-wide television service depended upon the use of many more channels than the twelve VHF allocations, and thus necessitated use of the UHF allocations. (2) The public does not have receivers which can receive the UHF channels therefore attempts to establish UHF stations have been a failure. (3) The particularly pressing educational needs in the country emphasized the need for a solution which would allow for quick adaptation since most educational reservations were located in the UHF band and all the best VHF allocations had already been activated.

Ford suggested that the major action needed at that time was a requirement that all receivers manufactured have the ability to receive all UHF channels as well as the twelve VHF channels. He noted that the FCC does not have the power to impose this requirement but that Congress would have to pass a law to this effect. The change-over period, so that a substantial portion of the public could receive UHF channels, would be eight to ten years beyond the initiation of the law. However, in the meantime, the FCC was studying several other
plans for re-allocation of channels, all of which could be instituted without too great a change if the public had the all-channel receivers. 96

Chamberlain's idea of multiple-channel uses by one production studio for education is an extension of White's suggestion of the previous year. This analysis by Chamberlain received favorable reaction from the audience and the panel with some qualifications. One person noted that Chamberlain's emphasis had been on the financial savings gained from this approach while educators were trying to emphasize better education at a time in our history when such improvement in education was so necessary. This was a legitimate criticism which in no way negated the basic plan. However, this writer found Chamberlain making direct reference to the savings in teacher salaries that this plan could effect. Such reference had been known to scare some educators because it had a very negative effective on teachers who thought TV would replace them. Perhaps the reference to the positive aspects of providing better education was related to avoiding the negative aspects of teacher replacement.

The thought of a wired nation by means of CATV was given no thought in these discussions probably because it was still a remote possibility and a more massive financial
investment than other means. Ford had mentioned closed-circuit TV merely as a supplement system to the basic over-the-air service. This writer believes the development of CATV was an answer to the lack of development of the UHF channels. Technically, CATV, with its versatility and expansion potential, is the better answer; but the social consequences of CATV still remain a very big concern.

The hardware manufacturers, Chamberlain for General Electric, and in 1961, John Burns, president of RCA, continued to explore the large system concept. Burns proposed a nationwide ETV network as part of the $2.5$ billion dollar project which would involve: (1) an additional 150 ETV stations, (2) branching closed-circuit systems for all schools in the U.S., (3) studios and TV tape centers for originating CCTV programs, and (4) TV receivers for all school classrooms. Burns declared that this would allow: (1) a stronger union of teaching, broadcasting, and graphic arts; (2) establishment of libraries of tapes and films by outstanding teachers; and (3) development of state, region, and nation-wide ETV systems.

Burns recognized the massive job of raising the money for this project which was 13 percent of the annual education
budget and suggested that the NAEB should establish a prominent national committee to organize the plans for this project. 97

Some funds were forthcoming as the Educational Television Facilities Act was passed into law and signed by President Kennedy, one day prior to the opening of the 1962 Institute. The opening session featured a speech by Ivan Nestingen, undersecretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, explaining the function of the Act and how it would be applied. Hyman Goldin, chief of the division of research and education of the FCC, also spoke pledging full cooperation and support to education in the implementation of the Act. Referring to the days in 1950 and 1951 when the FCC was considering possibilities of educational reservations, Goldin said, "It was Dr. Keith Tyler and other leaders associated with this Institute who supplied the drive and rationale that carried the day." 98

Major Issues

Development of a Social Conscience

The 1954 Institute heard Harold E. Fellows, president of NARTB, challenge educational and commercial broadcasters
to understand each other's problems better and work together to develop the techniques for selling the biggest idea to the public which was peace among men. In an effort to explain the commercial plight, he noted that the greatest single problem for commercial broadcasters was economic survival, and suggested that only profitable stations could afford to serve the educational interests of the public. He also remarked that without profitable operations, broadcasting would have to subsidized by the government, and control would evolve to the party in power at any particular time. This attempt at explaining the commercial concern with profit as a public service seemed to this writer to be stretching rationalization to the limit. However, as noted earlier, the financial position of many radio stations was not healthy.

In an earlier session, Carl George, Cleveland radio station manager, emphasized that radio should reflect the thinking and activity of the community and be open to use by any responsible opinion. However, he said that radio would survive by appealing to specialized audiences and by emphasizing fast and dramatic communication of ideas.

In 1955, Davidson Taylor, NBC Public affairs vice-president, informed the Institute of NBC's attempts to
encourage producers to place material of educational and informational value in all programs. This was done by requesting a quarterly report from each producer regarding the kind of material and number of times such material was contained in programs. Taylor reported that the list grew from 74 items in 1951 to 224 items in 1955. George McConnaughey, chairman of the FCC noted that the emphasis on scientific education has created a lag in purposeful advancement and more emphasis on the liberal arts is necessary.

As noted previously in this chapter, the 1956 Institute explored the role of serious broadcasting in today's world, devoting all sessions except two clinic sessions to a comprehensive review of this question. Charles Siepmann, chairman, Department of Communications in Education, New York University, opened his keynote address with the statement that he sees the role of serious broadcasting as an unchanging role which is "the use of a timely and God-given instrument to help us transcend the limitations of our parochial environment and our provincial outlook." He further explained this as making lives larger and fuller; to help the individual see life steadily and whole. He noted the danger in imbalance between wealth and education; that the man with a full stomach,
empty mind, and a hollow heart was dangerous; and broadcast-
ing had to influence the hearts and minds of men. He traced
the tendency toward dominance of conformity and the desire
of many Americans, who were relatively satisfied with life,
to support the status quo. Although he recognized that
there were many things that people feared in the world, he
wondered if it were not merely a preoccupation with the
little things in life. He identified four areas of concen-
tration for broadcasting to consider: (1) Broadcasting must
emphasize that Americans live in one world and they must be
concerned about the entire world rather than simply their
own neighborhood. He referred to Edward Murrow's "See It
Now" broadcasts as the best examples of broadcasting per-
formance in this area. (2) Lack of sufficient leadership
has cost democracy dearly and broadcasting must encourage
leadership through promoting diversity of ideas by carrying
more programs concerned with controversial issues. (3) The
crisis in education requires use of broadcasting not only to
supplement teachers but to substitute for teachers in their
traditional role. Siepmann suggested entirely new concepts
of education should develop from the use of television for
instruction. This idea is quite similar to the suggestions
made by Levering Tyson concerning radio in 1931. This was not a very popular idea with teachers and Ralph Steetle emphasized redeployment of teachers rather than substitution when he spoke at the 1957 Institute. (4) Since broadcasting is a reflection of ourselves, it will either encourage conformity by emphasizing the common man or make excellence the focus of our lives by emphasizing individuality. 104

Harold D. Lasswell, professor of law and political science, Yale University, did not address himself directly to the role of broadcasting but outlined some major trends in American life which broadcasting should influence. He noted the uncertain leadership in the United States brought on by a bewildering array of factions and pressure groups. Because of this lack of clear lines of leadership or responsibility, the average American feels impotent in any public field and turns inward to his home and family. Lasswell indicated that this contributes to conformity which is encouraged by most institutions. He suggested the use of broadcasting to show people the broad evolution of mankind so that people might grasp a perspective of their position and be able to relate to the broader public activities. 105
Henry Cassirer, UNESCO's television representative in Paris, pointed out that the solution of social and cultural problems of society was not one of the major intents of radio when it evolved. However, television is just beginning in many countries and the demonstrated impact of this medium has convinced many that the use of this medium in the solution of social and cultural problems is a primary desire, he said:

To join those who are strange and distant, to link the minds and knowledge of specialists and laymen, to broaden the scope of everyone's experience, and to permit millions to share in the fruits of what we fondly call man's culture appears to me to be the greatest inherent purpose of television. Only this purpose can determine the place and form of what in America is called serious broadcasting.106

He closed with the thought that television has the great ability to bring understanding to what has been foreign, to link opposites, and bring the fragments of life together.

The participants of the Institute were divided into fifteen separate discussion groups which convened on three occasions during the conference to discuss the implications for broadcasters. Presentations on economics and education were also included for consideration.

Ralph Steetle summarized the deliberations of the various discussion groups. A major area of discussion, he
said, concerned how the broadcaster can replace apathy with awareness and the formation and control of public opinion in relation to broadcasting. Steetle listed the conclusions of the discussion as follows:

1. The broadcaster should encourage the practice of thinking rather than the practice of confirming what is already believed. He should be careful to equip the individual with sufficient information so that the individual may make his own decisions. He should emphasize programming which allows the audience to do its own editorializing rather than trying to mold opinion.

2. Programming should inform, motivate, and give a sense of direction to the audience by encouraging personal involvement and responsibility. The broadcaster should present new ideas in spite of controversy by taking the risk to produce what he senses is right.

3. Better determination of the needs of the audience is necessary and then program to definite problems rather than so generalized a concept that the application by the individual is not understood. Involve various community organizations in assisting with the promotion of these programs plus follow-up when advantageous.
Steetle ended his comments with the note that the discussions reflected a recognition that serious broadcasting can

- develop wisdom, understanding, and judgement;
- awaken latent interest;
- emphasize moral and spiritual values;
- improve levels of taste and appreciation;
- inform the public on issues;
- present problems involving human relationships;
- train in vocational competence;
- contribute to health and safety;
- and interpret community activities, groups, and agencies.107

The discussion and speeches resulted in some concrete ideas but the broad general principles which Siepmann called the unchanging role of broadcasting were in abundance. The closing session of the Institute included speeches on the implications of these principles to both educators and broadcasters. Richard Pack, vice-president in charge of programming, Westinghouse Broadcasting Company, spoke to the commercial broadcaster situation. He recognized that some hostility still remained between educators and commercial broadcasters which must be eliminated by concentrating on cooperative contributions to the total programming concept. He pointed out that educators can learn from commercial broadcasters effective techniques for presenting ideas in stimulating and exciting fashion. Commercial broadcasters can learn from educators a greater respect for content and
point of view. He urged the Institute audience not to forget radio as seems to have been done in the discussion at the Institute and in the industry itself. He felt many of the goals that had been discussed would need radio perhaps even more than television. He noted that culture and education cannot be doled out in little "bits" inserted into entertainment programs. Referring to the NBC activity explained by Davidson Taylor at the 1955 Institute, he praised its intent but deplored the results in programming because there was no continuity or continuation. As an example, he suggested that the increased interest in classical music came about only because such music was played on radio continually. "We must develop a sense of the importance of stimulating continued interest." Although Pack's criticism of the NBC concept was applicable, this writer feels the "bits" were better than nothing and certainly introduced ideas and culture to many who would not otherwise received this introduction. What would be interesting to explore was the attitude of the audience to the interruption of the entertainment with a cultural bit. Was this placing the cultural material in a proper position for pleasant reception? I think not.
This question again arose at the 1959 Institute when Parker Wheatley, director of public affairs, KMOX, St. Louis, asked that large advertising agencies encourage more educational and cultural themes in dramatic programs and encourage more use of cultural materials in small portions in other programs. Pack who was on the panel with Wheatley responded:

My point is I think there is a great danger in trying to educate by putting a little area in the middle of something else. I don't believe you can educate me by anything to any extent, if you overinsert little goodies here and there. I don't think much would be gained by putting ten seconds of anybody on Red Skelton to promote education. Let's use educational programs, special programs, special events, news programs, sustaining commercials, whatever ETV, whatever we will to present positively in sufficient depth and with sufficient content to make a point, and let's not go into the little tidbits and goodies to try to sugarcoat our basic points of view and our basic objectives.

Pack continued his analysis for the commercial broadcaster at the 1956 Institute by referring to the success of a program which uses Bergen Evans as host and main program personality. Evans was a professor at Northwestern University. Pack suggested there is a large number of excellent communicators in the teaching ranks and broadcasters should find much talent there. He also noted that ETV has served as a sort of farm system for commercial television. He closed with the thought that commercial broadcasters could teach educators more about promotion and handling sponsors.
Edgar Dale, professor, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, addressed the implications for the educator. He defined five areas of emphasis. Educators had to: (1) identify goals of programs more specifically and define responses expected from the audience; (2) develop more interaction in adult education with broadcasting being only part of the total educational experience--quizzes in the broadcast, organized discussion groups, and use of the newspaper for pre and post broadcast activities were suggested examples of developing interaction; (3) follow broadcasts with action to stimulate the use of knowledge and application of ideas--Dale suggested discussion of controversial issues on the air related to school or community or even other broadcasts was one means of follow-up; (4) avoid specialized vocabularies and express ideas with the intent that they will be understood by the average listener--he assured that it was not a matter of talking down to the audience but a matter of clear expression of ideas in simple words rather than complex words; (5) develop discriminating audiences who ask for and appreciate better programs--he suggested that more emphasis on qualitative audience research rather than the quantitative research now conducted, would determine more ways of developing critical audiences.
This writer found that very stimulating and helpful directions were given to the Institute participants at this Institute. The ideas and ideals were expressed with force but the difference from other Institutes was that the direction for action was more clearly delineated by the summary and implications expressed at the final session. Edgar Dale's final suggestion of developing a discriminating audience seemed to be more important than any other single suggestion because it would allow for the development of the other suggestions in keeping with the desired goals. For instance, the major speeches asked for development of individuality, involvement, and leadership. The discussion groups determined that programs should motivate people to think, be concerned and involved. The implications for broadcasters and educators were identified as providing a sense of continuity and developing interaction and follow-up activities. All of these actions and qualities require acceptance by an audience and that audience must be discriminating to accept. Perhaps that discriminating audience was not what was needed but was the goal of all broadcast activities enunciated at the Institute. One nagging thought of this writer is that Dale asked for the discriminating
audience but neglected to suggest to this gathering of educators and broadcasters that some school courses in understanding the broadcast medium should be an absolute necessity of every high school in the country. Perhaps the audience was not enthusiastic about developing a discriminating audience because it seemed a hopeless task after the report of the previous year in which Burton Paulu declared that the long term attempt by the BBC to gradually raise radio listener standards had shown no visible differences from the uncoordinated and unintentional listener discrimination standards of the U.S.112

Pack's plea not to forget radio found some response at the 1957 Institute when Rolf Meyersohn, research director, Center for the Study of Leisure, University of Chicago, spoke on what is known about audiences. The lack of knowledge about audiences was one of the main points brought out at the 1956 Institute. Meyersohn pointed out that radio had lost its glamour, fan loyalty, and interest to television. Television had taken radio's earlier function and radio had to find a new function. He noted that studies had shown that people still use radio but don't consciously realize how much they are using it because, instead of an entertainment center, radio is now a convenient and pleasant help
throughout the day. He emphasized that television needs the mass audience but radio does not and radio is changing to specialized programming in order to serve a segment of the audience.113

The keynote address which opened the 1959 Institute was delivered by Frank Stanton, president of CBS, who discussed broadcasting's social responsibility. He concentrated on the problems of television exclusively as he attempted to place the development and progress of that medium in perspective. He noted that the country was economically and technically ready for TV but psychologically and socially was not equipped to judge its progress in the proper perspective. Expectations and aspirations for TV were too high both from the vocal public and the critics. He recognized the need for continual criticism in order to keep the newly developing medium on its toes:

But editor, publisher and broadcaster must both expose their audiences to new things and respond to the values that already exist. It is an interplay between the medium and the total society that is involved, with the medium neither dictating nor passively submitting.114

Stanton recognized that the conspicuousness of TV and resultant concern for the shape of its progress is due to the mass appeal of the medium. That same mass appeal limits the
programming ventures into which it can delve. He noted the exposure factor is far greater in TV than other media requiring judgements on audience size and not simply on number of programs or percent of programming. This required more information on audience response (as mentioned in the 1956 Institute) to guard against getting both too far ahead and too far behind audience acceptability. The exposure factor also recalled Pack's comments at the 1956 Institute.¹¹⁵

Meyersohn's comments in 1957 regarding the displacement of the radio function by TV are recalled when this writer notes how many of the concerns about TV impact were once discussed with reference to radio, particularly during the 1945-50 period. Influence and impact on the public are matters to be closely watched no matter when and by which means they are affected.

Stanton drew comparisons to show that the democratization of culture has been enhanced by each new communications innovation and that TV is simply the latest supplement, rather than a replacement, in this democratization.

Stanton's remarks lead this writer to the conclusion that he was asking for judgement and guidance of TV to be considered in relation to other mass media and the influence
of these other media on the public. However, a further consideration which must be made is the influence that one medium has on another medium. Obviously the leading influence would have to be considered TV. This band-wagon effect among the media can be considered a result of reflecting the society rather than leading or molding impressions but it does seem to this writer that the ownership of mass media is somewhat concentrated so that the activities of all mass media must be considered in any evaluation and those activities are very prone to emphasize conformity to the status quo. The 1956 Institute proposed increased discussion of controversial issues as a means of defeating conformity but surely much investigation on the handling of controversial issues was needed to give broadcasters a better analysis of how controversial discussion can accomplish the intended goals. This writer sees little progress in broadcasting's desire to help the public understand the necessity for controversy or develop an attitude of listening to other points of view. Controversy will always be identified with the society's misfits as long as such events as an arrest on drug charges gets a big play at the local station but the dropping of the charges for lack of evidence is not even mentioned. Here is one place--newscasting--where the wants of the public should be totally
ignored and the needs of the public should be the only criteria. However, the newscasts at local TV stations are very crucial rating periods for capturing local prestige and dollars.

Ralph McGill, publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, and 1958 Pulitzer Prize Winner for Editorial Writing, spoke on this point in his keynote speech of the 1960 Institute. He feared that TV newscasts provide an often shallow main appeal thus falling into the tendency of some newspapers which strain for headlines to sell newspapers. His suggestion that the public may wake up the next day to realize they received only part of the story, and a superficial version at that, would reflect the first signs of that discriminating audience that is so necessary to an adequate broadcast service. He warned that censorship could follow the abuse of First Amendment privileges by radio-TV and newspapers. The privileges or freedom guaranteed by the First Amendment carries a strong responsibility for the news media, he said.

David Suskind gave the dinner speech in 1959. Suskind, executive producer and vice-president of Talent Associates, Ltd., called for leadership and responsibility in television
programming. After condemning the majority of prime time television programs, he made several suggestions for revamping the network program situation. Many of these suggestions have since been incorporated into standard practices. The suggestions were as follows:

1. Restrict the number of similar format shows and introduce new faces and new formats into television.

2. Augment the evening schedule with regular programs of information having intellectual appeal.

3. Break through the rigid time barriers carried over from radio (primarily 30 minute programs with an occasional 60 minute show).

4. Schedule more special one-time programs and even try an entire evening devoted to one theme.

5. Use the summer months to experiment with new formats and new talent rather than simply re-run the winter series.

6. Subsidize at least some quality programming in prime time.

7. Focus more program appeal to qualitative audience parameters rather than continually depending merely on total size of audience.
8. Restore Chicago as a program origination center.

9. Avoid neutrality and innocuousness which breeds sterility and eventual death for television.\textsuperscript{117}

Ralph McGill's keynote speech for the 1960 Institute, previously noted, opened the theme of Freedom and Responsibility in Broadcasting. U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee (Wyoming), spoke at a session concerning how freedom and responsibility should be assigned. He said that the development of regulation in broadcasting has followed the usual practice of patching up the old law when it didn't seem to work in the changing society. He felt that such activity was no longer profitable but that a deep and complete study of broadcast regulations, probably by Congress, should be made and the results put into practice. He identified four major concerns of citizens derived from his mail as: (1) the threatening and perhaps irresponsible accumulation of power; (2) the reluctance of anyone to assume the power of naming who has responsibility; (3) the level of programming seems to be sinking lower rather than rising; and (4) the proper and more aggressive responsibilities of the FCC itself. With reference to industry codes of regulation, McGee noted that he had very little confidence in such a system of regulation.\textsuperscript{118}
It might be noted that the FCC had just completed an extensive inquiry into programming procedures and policies but had not yet had time to study the material gathered by the staff.

Less than three months later, on July 27, 1960, the FCC issued its "Report and Statement of Policy Re: Commission en blanc Programming Inquiry." This was an interim report which voiced the Commission's opinion on its regulatory powers over programming and set forth again its views on the responsibilities of broadcast licensees. Returning to the 1960 Institute, FCC Chairman Frederick Ford agreed that codes were not the answer but that they served a constructive purpose. Recognizing that there was some conflict between the principle of no censorship and the FCC's mandate to see that the public interest was served, Ford felt that a recent proposal to require statements of community needs from broadcasters would solve the problem since the FCC would merely have to determine whether the identified needs were actually being handled as the broadcaster had indicated.

Mr. E.K. Hartenbower, chairman of the NAB Television Code Review Board, defended the code as the best solution to program regulation. He noted that the appointment of a Czar
or hasty legislation would only lead to strong industry opposition. Thoughtful, steady improvement, and orderly maturing of television required voluntary code guidance.  

August Heckscher, director of the Twentieth Century Fund, New York, returned to the requirements of discussion, debate, and evaluation as necessary prerequisites to developing leadership. He was addressing the 1961 Institute audience on the Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. "Leadership is the element in the national life which allows us to choose between various objectives, to assign priorities and to focus our efforts."  

Commissioner Ford noted the Report of the President's Commission was designed to encourage informed discussion by the American public. Ford quoted the Report as stating that although television has improved, it can do a still better job of communicating serious ideas so that the public can be better informed. Ford's main criticism of television programming was that time periods in which most serious programming was placed. He also suggested several areas of vital concern which are not being adequately covered by broadcasting:
How many of our citizens understand NATO, SEATO, and the Organization of American States of the issues in disarmament, particularly with respect to inspection in the control of nuclear arms, and its interaction with [sic] national security. Much more is heard and known about the importance of the United Nations as a key goal in our foreign policy. Radio and television both carry extensive coverage of the events that transpire there, but it seems to me that more attention could be given to the activities of this organization as it works toward an open and peaceful world.123

Ford pointed out that the Report had stated that television needed urgent reform in use of its facilities to better serve educational and cultural purposes. He suggested that the Report may inspire broadcasters to systematically present "Goals for Americans" and increase and improve the programming to help the public to informed decisions. He closed with a call for more cooperation in the use of such programs in the curricula of schools.

Louis Hausman, director of the Television Information Office, stated the best way to get such programming on the air was to develop audience discrimination and desire for such programs. Although this had been suggested on many occasions before, Hausman felt that positive encouragement of good programming, such as several organizations were doing at that time, was stimulating achievement for better programming. In contrast, he said that negative criticism
of bad programs, although needed, had a tendency to go too far by suggesting imposed outside controls. Thus a minority group would demand, and sometimes achieve, general censorship affecting all citizenry, of materials that are judged to be harmful within the special standards of that one minority group. Although such censorship is most easily related to racial minorities, it is a censorship which all special interest groups attempt to exercise to some extent in all mass media. This writer feels that the danger of such censorship is primarily measured in the extent to which it is allowed to succeed. Such censorship cannot hope to be eliminated completely but constant surveillance and questioning of attempts to omit material from mass media will protect the public against major problems in this area.

One type of censorship which is not usually associated with the word censorship is the economic censorship imposed by the profit motive. M.S. Novik explained how this was affecting radio through the use of the increasingly popular music and news format that most radio stations were adopting. He said that such formats did not allow for talk and thus much public service programming had been eliminated. Stations were using spot announcements to fulfill their public service
requirements but such announcements could not treat any subject in depth. He called for a joint conference of the FCC and commercial broadcasters to define and assess the proper responsibilities of the broadcaster. 125

M.S. Novik returned to the 1962 Institute to report that the special conference which he had suggested in the previous Institute was being seriously considered by the FCC, and that the NAB convention had endorsed the plan. He warned, however, that some broadcasters wished to confine the conference to the problem of over-population in radio. Novik declared that the only over-population was by unimaginative broadcasters who made promises only to get their licenses. 126 Novik, a New York radio consultant, had been speaking at these yearly Institutes for over fifteen years and had an impressive record of pointing out to the commercial broadcasters where they were falling short of serving the public interest. He reported to the 1965 Institute that "nothing has happened" since the 1960 FCC program inquiry and hearings. This was not quite the case since reports had been issued and some minor changes had been made but certainly these were not even close to the amount of change which he had envisioned in his speeches of 1960 and 1962. Novik said he must now
look to Congress for an evaluation of the program responsibilities and powers of the broadcasters and the FCC and establishment of laws to define public interest in terms of programming.127

The social conscience of broadcasting, the television side, was assailed again at the Institute when Howard K. Smith, ABC commentator addressed the 1963 Institute dinner audience. He recognized the inevitability of the predominant use of TV for light entertainment but felt that a substantial fraction of effort and profits in TV should be devoted to serious programs. He said TV performs a marvelous service in non-controversial, public service programming, but in the realm of information and analysis of issues:

It is in this particular realm, perhaps the most necessary one of the times, that I think television has been disappointing. There's a great deal of unconscientious public affairs programming. That is, perfunctory, very low-budget programs to fill unsaleable hours and to satisfy the FCC. There is much public affairs programs designed really to confuse rather than reveal issues, put in to please the FCC, the issues that are being dealt with and yet, at the same time, to avoid the blast of sectional or a special-interest criticism that might affect commercial markets.128

Smith then launched into the false concept of balanced presentations stating that on many issues there are not two sides. There are many basic truths that the people must
know and which TV tends to avoid or confuse, he said. The necessity of an unbalanced budget and the archaic operation of the U.S. Congress were two such truths which TV wouldn't touch. He noted that radio in the 1940's provided the initiative to bring the American public from isolationism to the acceptance of international considerations. Why couldn't TV do a similar job with the 1960's situation, he asked. Smith suspected that the temper of the times had changed. After two World Wars and a depression, "there was a mood of readiness to plumb the depth of progress. Full reporting and forthright analysis were encouraged and indeed even insisted upon." He then noted that TV had developed in a period of long complacency which started with Senator McCarthy's activities against supposed communist sympathizers, and dissent began to be stifled by fear. Smith said that the next two Presidents, Eisenhower and Kennedy, did not have any touch or feel for the common man, so the spirit of change and challenge did not radiate from Washington with any force. Smith closed with: "I'm afraid, ladies and gentlemen, I have but one uninspired solution to offer and that is 'hell-raising' by as many individuals as will do it."

Richard Heffner, Rutgers University, professor of
communications and public policy, did have some suggestions in his keynote speech of the 1965 Institute. With the theme "Broadcasting: Vitalize or Tranquilize," Heffner asked:

The ultimate question before us is clear: Are we capable of being as concerned with what we transmit as with how we transmit? Will we now so well recognize the importance, the impact of what we as a people communicate to each other and to others elsewhere that we strive--now, not later--to formulate truly meaningful public policy in the field of communications?129

He then noted some basic principles which must be recognized.

1. The role of communications may define the character of society.

2. The amount of freedom of communications among citizens is the measure of the freedom of the society.

3. Maturity of the society is measured by the extent of the expertise with which the citizens use communications.

4. The extent of its citizens' grasp of the importance of communications determines the citizens control of their destiny.

He warned that broadcasting might have been emphasizing the most destructive elements of the American way of life just at a time when our growing outer-directedness, our declining feelings for individualism and privacy, our impersonalization and conformity were at their worst.
He noted the research in motivation and the increasing knowledge of what happens in the minds of human beings. He said that the knowledge could be tremendously helpful to mankind but could also allow for manipulation and control of mankind. Therefore, he again suggested the urgency of the formulation of public policy in communications:

Historically speaking, from time to time in the past we have found this to be true in other crucial areas of our national life: that public good must literally be made to prevail over private interest. So be it now in communications, perhaps even at the cost of governmental controls that are unprecedented but unavoidable.130

He suggested that the American system of majority rule worked in the political sphere but the wisdom sought out in mass cultural democracy was ephemeral, even non-existent. The mass audience did exist and sought diversion rather than uplift; was served well by our commercial system and did not want better programming. But, he said, there were many concurrent audiences which wanted and needed an alternative service to provide better programming for cultural and intellectual improvement. He felt ETV could revolutionize American broadcasting by providing that alternative service, but that present funding would not allow such programming of quality and honesty as was needed. He closed with the idea that public policy had to create and protect an alternative
service, and that subscription television and satellite-to-home transmission were two means which must be explored to provide answers to ETV's destiny as the vital alternative service. "Would that the Ford Foundation and others take up this incredible challenge and opportunity!"

Heffner's proposal for a public policy which recognized the lack of desire or support of cultural programming from the majority audience was somewhat similar to asking for a public policy to recognize houses of prostitution. Nobody will sincerely argue the fact but few wish to publicize this recognition. As Heffner was speaking, a public policy was in the beginning stages of creation, for the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television was being organized.

Period Summary

Institute

There appears to be no direct relationship between the attendance at the Institute and the ceasing of publication of the proceedings of the Institute. There may be an indirect relationship in the loss of an appeal for attracting the top speakers to the Institute. This was suggested at the planning meeting for the 1959 Institute.
During this period, several Planning Committee meetings discussed the problems of the declining attendance and prestige of the Institute.

Educational and commercial interests had specialized and fragmented just as the rest of society had. Groups had been formed to represent the special interests of the various portions of broadcasting. Ironically, many such groups had originally developed from special interest section meetings within the Institute. Some such organizations were: American Council for Better Broadcasts, Junior Town Meeting League, Association for Education by Radio-Television, Joint Committee on Educational Television, National Association of Radio News Directors, National Association of Radio Farm Directors, National Religious Radio Association, and Association of Women Broadcasters.

As these interest groups expanded with their separate conferences, the financial problems of the early 1950's restricted the ability to attend the expanding number of conferences available. The strength of the Institute had been its ability to attract people representing a wide scope of interests within broadcasting and present broad issues with application to all these interests.\textsuperscript{132} In addition,
the various concurrent special-interest meetings had allowed some specialization. The demands of the time required many people to abandon the omnibus-type conference except those who must concern themselves with the broad issues.

The staff people stayed at home or attended conferences in their specific area of interest. That left the considerations of broad issues to upper management in broadcasting, teachers of broadcasting, civic groups interested in broadcasting's effect, and government representatives. In the Attendance Breakdown by Organizations, no organization was particularly affected more than another except in decreasing numbers from all organizations and interests. The involvement of allied groups and continuation of special interest meetings held the attendance relatively steady through 1959 but a severe reduction in special interests meeting after 1959 reflected in total attendance and participation by allied groups.

The 1955 Planning Committee had presented a plan for a type of conference which would have attracted a great majority of the upper management people to whom broad issues were important, but the cost to initiate such a plan discouraged its pursuit. However, a watered down adaptation of this
plan was used in 1956 which provided a change in format to allow for focusing on broad issues. Although the emphasis on one broad issue was carried over in succeeding Institutes while special interest meetings were confined to two sessions, the idea of the discussion groups for the general theme apparently did not find favor as a continuing format innovation.

The big issues which could draw participants from all organizations and also draw the top speakers were not found. The NAEB was growing and handling the biggest issue for educators--development of ETV. The primary problems of the commercial broadcasters were in the area of financing. Perhaps the one issue which could bring all these interests together was government involvement--freedom of speech. When this topic was tried in 1960 it did not succeed because, in the opinion of this writer, it was not programmed in a sufficiently controversial fashion and it did not gather the calibre of speakers in sufficient numbers and with sufficient pre-conference publicity to achieve the re-vitalization spirit.

Kobak had suggested, as far back as 1948, that the Institute should concentrate on programming. The Ohio State Awards had achieved a continual gain in prestige and
competition but the exhibition portion of this program, which was the primary intent of its establishment in 1937, had been almost forgotten.

The Planning Committee for the 1958 Institute noted this problem and the 1959 Committee discussed further emphasis on the Awards. The special television program for the 1961 Awards indicated a strong desire to emphasize this aspect of broadcasting while the remaining Institutes for this period moved toward specialization.

The financial information on the Institute,\textsuperscript{137} indicates that the Institute existed from year to year on its own money. Over the years, the Institute operated in a break-even basis except for the salaries and office expense of the Institute staff. As indicated by the comments at the planning meeting for the 1959 Institute,\textsuperscript{138} such allowable expenses were continually reduced. I. Keith Tyler indicated in a recent interview that the Institute could not hope to keep interest and vitality in the changing world unless at least one person could devote full time year-around to developing the program. Tyler admitted that he had grown frustrated and tired after so many years of shoestring operation and the lack of proper financing had been the final
factor in the decline of the Institute.

Richard Hull, who assumed leadership from Tyler in 1962, pointed out in a recent interview, that Tyler's remarkable ability to bring prestigious speakers to the Institute without honoraria or even expenses probably extended the life of the Institute ten years.

These were the factors involved in the decline of the Institute. When it was clear to Richard Hull and his Advisory Committee that the university was not responding to the financial needs, the most feasible alternative was to discontinue the Institute and concentrate available effort in the Ohio State Awards.

Issues

Howard K. Smith characterized this period as a time of complacency, conformity, and fear when he addressed the 1963 Institute. He identified the beginning of this period with the activities of Senator Joseph McCarthy against communism which was about 1951. The blacklisting in the broadcast industry had started about 1948 but the height of the McCarthy problem surfaced in 1953-54. Smith did not mention the singular feat of Edward Murrow and Fred Friendly
when their "See It Now" broadcasts alerted the public to the threat of McCarthyism. However, the overall effect of broadcasting's reaction to such activities could best be noted in a 1954 comment by radio-TV critic, Jack Gould referring to a blacklist book entitled Red Channels:

With Red Channels the business community in broadcasting simply abdicated its citizenship in as dismal an hour as radio and TV ever had.

Less than two months prior to the above statement, Harold Fellows appeared before the Institute with the warning that a financially weak broadcaster could not be expected to provide the kind of public service which the educators and critics seemed to be expecting. In defense of Fellow's statement this did seem to be a relatively accurate account of the cold hard facts of business but it pointed out one other cold hard fact; that economic sanctions limit the broadcaster's ability and desire to serve the public. The background of this chapter noted the frugal condition of many radio and TV stations. Basically what Smith asked for was more editorializing, more dissent, and more loyal opposition to the conformity and complacency which he found. Fellows, in 1954, looked for cooperation to achieve peace among men. It seemed to be a hollow speech at a time when broadcasting needed courage and leadership.
In 1965 Richard Heffner decried the continuing use of both radio and TV to appeal to the lowest common denominator and suggested that strong public policy must be applied to allow these media to do the job of communicating that they must do if we are to advance as a civilization. He was even willing to compromise the freedom of broadcasting by inviting more government control. However, he had one more palatable solution which was a healthy and viable ETV.

This brings us back to some of the questions and comments of the 1956 Institute where the role of serious broadcasting was discussed. If I may paraphrase Charles Siepmann, he took a broad view of the potential of broadcasting and stated that it must extend our ability to experience, understand, and influence beyond the physical bonds of the space our bodies occupy. This aspect of Siepmann's speech reminded this writer of an analogy once made comparing the world to a huge assembly line. Each worker performed an infinitesimally small chore with endless repetition but was not provided with any understanding of the importance or function of this chore to the final product. The sense of accomplishment, of worth, of contribution, of advancement had been removed from the worker's physical world. He had
to accept these things on faith. So everything depended
upon the leaders who had vision to see beyond the assembly
line to the final product. It also depended upon the ability
of the workers to choose those leaders and know those leaders.
This is where a mass communications medium such as broad­
casting had to operate. The ability to identify leaders,
develop leaders, and provide that all-important link with
the workers was the real responsibility of broadcasting.
Siepmann's man with an empty mind and hollow heart had lost
his purpose, had lost his means of relating to the world and
to his fellow man. However, this man had leisure time to
develop his own purpose, to create meaning for himself based
upon his own little world occupied by his personal physical
experiences. This was a dangerous situation indeed for a
democracy where popular opinion wields so much influence.
It is a condition which will continue to be a problem and
the suggestions for combating this problem will continue
to be important considerations for application to a mass
communications system. Siepmann referred to this condition
as the unchanging facts of society and the conclusions to
the discussion at the Institute\textsuperscript{144} might also be considered
approaches and attitudes which will remain unchanged indefi-
nitely.
This writer noted that the 1956 Institute seemed to set the tone and intent of the Institutes until 1963 when emphasis upon the programming material became the central purpose.

Although the 1956 Institute suggested that the goals of broadcasting should be in-depth and balanced informational programming so that people would make their own decision and draw their own conclusions, the leadership function of broadcasting as opposed to the reflective function was not clearly addressed. Frank Stanton referred to this matter in his 1959 Institute speech. Exposure to new and different things is certainly an unpopular activity for a mass medium but a definite necessity if the 1956 goals were to be achieved. The need for controversy was emphasized in 1956 but the place of editorialization as a part of the leadership function in controversial issues was not clearly enunciated. This writer suggests that such editorialization is a very important responsibility of broadcasters though no expressions of this were discovered throughout this period. The "hell-raising" of Smith in 1963 was as close as any speaker got to this matter.

Mr. Stanton highlighted another problem in broadcasting
when he asked for perspective in judging television progress. That problem was the diversity of opinion which our mass communications media allow. The 1956 Institute decried the conformity in people and answered with a call for controversial discussion. Diversity of media control and appealing to more fragmentized, specialized audiences seems to be the only process by which we can hope to hear the unpopular information which contributes to the adequate decision making capacity of the public. Discussion earlier in this chapter suggested the problems of censorship by omission or commission lead to the conclusion that editorializing is a very important responsibility of the broadcaster. The economic censorship of radio, which M.S. Novik complained about in 1961-62, was predicted in Fellow's warning in 1954. This writer must conclude that if we can't develop more Murrows and Howard Smiths and give them a place in broadcasting, we will be moving into more government control as Richard Heffner suggested in 1965.
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CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Institute was the catalyst for a continuing dialogue between the various factions involved in radio-TV broadcasting from 1930 through 1965. This final chapter will briefly review the Institute's efforts to establish and maintain this function and analyze weaknesses and strengths of these efforts. The major issues discussed at the Institute will also be reviewed in relation to their value for understanding the present structure of broadcasting.

The Institute

The basic objectives of the Institute at its first meeting in 1930 were to:

1. Provide a common meeting ground for educators, educational broadcasters, and commercial broadcasters.

2. Encourage an international exchange of ideas regarding education by radio.
3. Collect and disseminate existing information on the problems of education by radio.

4. Develop a program for cooperative fact finding and research.

5. Build the morale of the relatively few people then interested in education by radio.¹

The program for the last meeting of the Institute in 1965 stated the purpose of the Institute as follows:

The Institute is the common meeting ground for educators and commercial and non-commercial broadcasters. It is a zone of discussion where the joint and special problems and interests of education and electronic communications are formulated and debated.

Although the words changed considerably over the period of thirty-six years, the basic intent—to provide a common meeting ground for the exchange of ideas between the various factions interested in broadcasting—did not change. The Institute emphasized the desire for an exchange of ideas by stating in every program after 1930 that open discussion was one of the chief functions of the Institute.

A conversation in 1932 between Institute director W.W. Charters and Levering Tyson, director of the National Advisory Council for Radio in Education (NACRE), confirmed that the Institute would concentrate on the techniques of
educational broadcasting while NACRE would be concerned with broad policy and organization in educational broadcasting. This distinction was clearly stated in the program for the 1935 joint meeting of the Institute and NACRE.

The first Institute established the image of a working conference where everybody participated in discussions (Charters called it the "granddaddy of the workshop idea") and each meeting involved the entire attendance. But in 1936, the Institute started holding small group, concurrent meetings for specialized interests. Charters noted this change in his 1936 speech to the Institute and explained that growing specialization in broadcasting required such adjustments in the Institute program. As the meetings developed and expanded, the bulk of the discussion and exploration of techniques was conducted in these small group meetings while the general sessions concentrated on broader common problems of policy. The programs for 1938 and later years clearly indicate this emphasis.

By 1938, several of the original objectives were no longer emphasized. The international exchange of ideas was pursued in early Institutes by strong positive actions—R.S. Lambert, from Great Britain, was paid one of the few honoraria to come to the 1930 Institute. He reported on
activities in Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland, and Russia while others reported on Canada and Ireland.

The 1932 Institute carried reports on Great Britain, France, Sweden and Mexico. In other years, reports were confined primarily to activities in Canada and Great Britain. With the approaching war, renewed interest in European activities was reflected as H.V. Kaltenborn and others reported on Germany, Russia and France. Throughout the life of the Institute, activities outside the United States were discussed. For example, Canada was the subject in 1934, Great Britain in 1939, and Egypt, China and Australia in 1946.

The dissemination of information on problems in educational radio was primarily through the printing and distribution of the proceedings, *Education On The Air*. A program for cooperative fact finding and research (objective #4) was devised in 1932 and reported at that Institute. This was carried on for several years but the volume of activity soon exceeded the limits of the Institute's budget and, as reported by Charters at the 1950 Institute, the program was discontinued after about 1939. However, some research was always reported at the Institute and published in the proceedings.
The final objective (building morale) was an on-going activity which the conduct of the Institute itself sought to accomplish. As will be noted later, the morale of educational interests was lifted by the Institute but it is doubtful that many commercial broadcasters received a morale boost. Since most of the original objectives had been assimilated into the normal conduct of the Institute, they were no longer included in the statement of purpose printed in the 1938 program. This was the first statement of purpose since the 1930 statement—one which was included in all programs until 1948 when a new statement was formulated.

The 1938 statement noted that the Institute's purpose was to provide an annual meeting for joint discussion by broadcasters and educators of problems of educational broadcasting. It also noted the Institute's emphasis on techniques of educational radio and that the Institute passed no resolutions. In 1941 "civic leaders" were identified as a third group for which joint discussion was intended; and, in 1943, the statement was expanded further from an emphasis on "techniques of education by radio" to "techniques and program policies of radio broadcasting."
Several organizational changes occurred during these years which helped prepare the Institute for the tremendous attendance increases of the war years. The Planning Committee for the 1940 Institute initiated the practice of including local commercial broadcasters on the Committee. This could have been a factor in the over 100 percent increase in commercial station attendance from 23 in 1939 to 57 at the 1940 Institute. From 1936 to 1941 the location of meetings gradually shifted from the university campus to a downtown hotel. All meetings of the 1941 Institute were held at the Deshler-Wallick Hotel in Columbus. In the same year the printed program was expanded to include about three times as much information as the 1940 program. This was particularly helpful because it gave more details on each concurrent small group meeting. These factors convince this writer that the 1941 Institute completed the development into a national meeting of prominence.

One additional trend that must be considered at this point is the gradual increase in the amount of emphasis given to broad areas of common interest such as the policies and administration of broadcasting. These areas had never been ignored, as the comments on educational reservations
and other major issues in this study indicate; but they were not directly stated in the Institute's statement of purpose until 1943. A review of the program for the years 1940 to 1948 (Appendix III, Table 5) indicates that the move to emphasize broad common issues initiated with the 1942 Institute when the common interest was the war. This emphasis continued throughout the war years (1942-1946) and seemed to satisfy the needs of the time since there was little criticism of the conduct of the Institute during the war years. During this period the press stated that the Institute was one of the most distinguished radio conferences in the nation. Post mortem reaction of participants for 1941, 1942, and 1943 indicated some dissatisfaction with the large number of meetings which were conducted concurrently. Copies of the proceedings sold out very quickly and attendance soared. However, by the end of the war, the Institute leaders had decided that general sessions of the Institute should consider broad common problems rather than more specialized problems to promote more interest, participation, and results from the exchange of ideas by the various interest groups attending the Institute. The Planning Committees felt the continuance of small group special
interest meetings was necessary in order to attract the special interest groups and to facilitate involvement in discussion. But many participants complained about the large number of concurrent meetings which did not allow for attending and participating in the other meetings occurring simultaneously. This also resulted in a very busy schedule which did not allow time for relaxed conversation and reflection. The Institute continued to utilize both kinds of sessions until 1956 when it temporarily replaced that format with one that concentrated on a single topic while confining concurrent meetings to two sessions.

In 1948 the Institute’s statement of purpose was revised again:

[The Institute] provides an opportunity for expression of varied viewpoints on controversial matters relating to broadcasting. It seeks to stimulate thinking and discussion. It encourages the exchange of ideas and techniques. Its only purpose is to further the development of all types of educational radio programs....

The Institute does not pass resolutions or attempt to influence legislation or practice. It operates on the belief that open-minded consideration of problems and practices by those concerned with broadcasting will lead to solutions and improvements.5

This statement was much more stimulating than the 1930 or 1938 statements. It emphasized the importance of discussion of varied viewpoints for mutual benefit and it
explained why no resolutions were allowed. This explanation was in response to the 1947 Institute survey and the 1948 Billboard survey, both of which showed a strong preference by those in attendance for deciding on issues and passing resolutions. The 1948 statement of purpose was repeated with a few inconsequential changes in every program until 1959 when the statement was again modified.

The attendance figures in Appendix I of this dissertation indicate a substantial increase in national network representation during the war years. For example, the 1940 Institute registered the highest network representation to that time with sixteen, but the 1941 Institute more than doubled that amount with thirty-six network representatives registered. However, there was a large drop from fifty-five in 1946 to twenty-one in 1947. This downward trend reached a low of six in 1954 and then stabilized at about twelve through 1965. This writer has concluded that, except for the increases during the war, the number of network representatives was relatively stable throughout the life of the Institute. Commercial station representation did not maintain this stability but decreased steadily. There were other factors involved in these fluctuations since the
relatively steady decrease from 1946 to 1965 suggests loss of interest in the Institute; perhaps this was due to increased interest in conflicting activities. The Planning Committee for the 1951 Institute noted that factors other than the Institute program and activities were largely responsible for the decrease in the attendance of commercial station representatives. Some factors mentioned were the financial drain of television, preoccupation with the television freeze, and reduction of radio station revenue. This writer is inclined to agree that these factors were influential and that an additional factor was the proximity of the NAB annual convention which was usually held within a month of the annual Institutes.

Ted Cott, a commercial broadcaster, opened the 1948 Institute with a stinging rebuke of educators who sneered rather than cheered commercial broadcasters. This writer noted the strong debates about the Blue Book at the 1946-1947 Institutes and concluded Cott's reaction resulted from attitudes expressed at these earlier Institutes. Former ABC network president, Edgar Kobak, noted the continuing gap between the educational and commercial interests. He stated, at the 1949 Institute, that too many people came to
the Institutes to "heckle" and sell their ideas instead of working to improve education by radio and TV. He observed that all participants came to the Institute "with our feelings on our sleeves and we get hurt." Kobak felt the Institute was in a rut and needed re-evaluation and change.

Kobak's suggestions were introduced merely as ideas for consideration. He proposed: (1) separating radio and television sessions, (2) making the program more challenging and attractive to top-level administrators of the commercial and educational fields, (3) moving the location of the meetings to another city, (4) getting the top people from the various special interest organizations, including showmen, to re-evaluate the program of the Institute, (5) operating as though starting a new conference--not revising an old conference, (6) considering merging with institutes or conferences at other universities, (7) concentrating exclusively on programming because broadcasting needed a real program meeting and the Institute emphasized programming problems more than any other broadcast meeting, (8) putting more emphasis on how-to-do things, (9) studying the objectives and finding new ones.
From this list of suggestions it is clear that Kobak felt the Institute needed some significant changes. He appears to have desired to see the Institute produced more like a convention where there is an emphasis on showmanship and entertainment.

The Institute had anticipated one of Kobak's suggestions (suggestion #4) and had included national representation from various organizations on the Planning Committee for the 1949 meeting. Appendix III, Table 6 indicates that eight such people helped plan the 1949 Institute. From suggestions of this National Advisory Committee, the 1949 Institute: (1) assigned a single moderator (Kenneth Bartlett) to handle all general sessions so that irrelevant and irresponsible statements could be kept to a minimum; (2) reduced the length of each concurrent small group meeting and thus reduced the number of meetings conducted during any single period; (3) requested chairmen of the small group meetings to cut down on the number of prepared presentations and to emphasize discussion. These activities continued through later Institutes. The Advisory Committee also suggested a meeting in New York City in order to get advice from key network administrators and other commercial
broadcast-related people. I. Keith Tyler reported that several attempts to arrange the New York meeting failed because of schedule difficulties and the meeting was not held. Although no further explanation was found, this writer believes there must have been some opposition to the meeting from some participants which led to this failure. The minutes of the National Advisory Committee in 1949 indicate that the original suggestion for such a meeting was received with a good amount of enthusiasm by the Advisory Committee.

The 1949, 1950, and 1951 National Advisory Committees each attempted to bring respected and well-known experts in broadcasting and education to the Institute as speakers. This did not meet with much success. The 1949 Institute was addressed by four former and current FCC Commissioners, but few outstanding commercial broadcasters or educators with high reputations were speakers at any of the Institutes from 1949 through 1953. However, the 1951, 1952, and 1953 Institutes emphasized television in education which might be considered of less interest to commercial broadcasters than various commercial applications and uses of television.
At the end of the third period (1953) the following trends could be seen. The Institute had expanded the Program Committee into a National Advisory Committee but the new committee was not yet involved adequately in planning the Institute program. The allied groups which met in conjunction with the Institute (Appendix III, Table 7) had decreased considerably from the 1949 high of twenty-one to eight in 1953. All of the remaining eight were associated with educational interests rather than with commercial interests. Total attendance had shown a steady decline from the high in 1946 but it still remained substantially higher than any of the pre-war years. Colleges and university attendance showed a temporary drop after a high in 1944 but moved upward again in 1951 and 1952 and reached its peak at the 1953 Institute. Attendance by commercially-oriented organizations showed a substantial drop while educationally-oriented organizations remained relatively steady in attendance.

Reviewing these trends and activities, this writer draws the following conclusions: (1) the years 1944, 1946, and 1947 were unusually well attended. But this was not indicative of the attraction of the Institute; it was
indicative of the common interest of broadcasters in a few vital issues which were discussed at these Institutes. The attendance figures were impressive even at the end of this period (1953) but the steady downward trend was of concern. This trend leveled off when the Institute emphasized the theme of educational television in 1952 and 1953. Another downward trend in 1954 and 1955 was halted in 1956 when a specific theme was chosen. The concentration on a specific theme each year was continued through 1963 but attendance began a downward trend again in 1960. The emphasis on one particular theme each year contributed to attracting a stable attendance during the period from 1956 to 1960. But by 1960 the broad general themes, chosen to attract a large cross section of interest groups, were no longer able to generate sufficient interest from these groups. At this point (1960) the Institute should have concentrated on themes that were particularly attractive to one faction or another rather than attempt to attract all factions with the broad general themes which were used. By emphasizing the problems of a different major faction each year, the Institute would have developed new participation, change of spokesmen, and renewed vitality and interest. (2) The Institute tried
to solve the dilemma of the small group concurrent meetings competing with the large general sessions by keeping both. The topics and speakers at general sessions may not have had a broad appeal for the audience. There were some complaints about not getting top spokesmen and not choosing topics of sufficient interest to commercial broadcasters. However, the revised role of the moderator helped facilitate the discussion at these meetings. (3) The Institute attempted to adapt to changing conditions by reducing meeting time conflicts somewhat; by involving representatives of national groups on planning committees; and by attempting to raise the image of the Institute through prestigious main speakers. These attempts failed to stop the gradual decline in attendance. (4) Other factors that were involved in the attendance decline were: (a) proximity to the dates of the NAB national convention, (b) increased activity and growth of the NAEB, (c) the tendency of "spin off" groups of the Institute to establish their own meetings, and (d) increasing problems of diminishing revenue of stations caused by new radio competition and television. These factors continued to affect the attendance in the final period of the Institute (1954-1965). The drop in attendance
became alarming when the number of educational organizations began to decline considerably in 1954 and 1955. This may have been due to the limited appeal of the topics and speakers from those years.

The 1959 Institute Planning Committee suggested that the yearbook publication *Education On The Air* should be re-established primarily because the promise of publication helped attract top speakers. The halt in publication of this yearbook after 1953 was a substantial blow to the fading prestige of the Institute. This writer does not believe it affected the 1954 Institute since correspondence indicated the Institute expected to publish the book at a later date. The 1955 program also stated this expectation.

Although the attendance from 1955 through 1959 remained relatively steady (about 600), there were great fluctuations in the representation from various organizations.

The Planning Committee for the 1959 Institute felt that the objective of the Institute should be to present broad issues of common concern which could be articulated by name speakers in a challenging manner. This form of presentation was pursued in 1959, 1960, and 1961 but it failed to halt the downward trend in attendance. At the
1959 planning meeting it was suggested that the challenging presentations would require the Institute to take a stand on the issues. This was resisted again and the "no resolutions" approach continued to be a trade-mark of the Institute.

The 1959 Institute was programmed so that a major part of the first day was devoted to informing newcomers about the Institute and the issues. The keynote speech on the evening of the first day and all of the second day were devoted to the issues. This was most important for the veterans of the Institute. The third day was devoted to the special interest group meetings and culminated with the presentation of awards at the annual dinner.

The 1960 Planning Committee was reported to be very pleased with the success of the 1959 Institute. Some strengths were: (1) well-known and respected speakers--Frank Stanton, David Susskind, and Paul Chamberlain plus a luncheon telephone interview with Senator Magnuson and Representative Harris; (2) successful newcomers' session; and (3) improved commercial interest because of concentration on common elements of interest to both educational and commercial groups.

Some weaknesses reported were: (1) too many heavy
general sessions with speeches too long, discouraging audience discussion; (2) scope of the Institute was not broad enough to include school administrators; and (3) too little time for informal contacts.

Although no Planning Committee reactions were found with regard to the 1960 Institute, this writer was impressed by the excellent speeches and the name speakers. The speakers included such highly respected leaders as Senator Gale McGee, FCC Commissioner Frederick Ford, Ralph McGill, and Gilbert Seldes. All except McGee were involved in two sessions during the Institute. It would appear that both the 1959 and the 1960 Institutes were excellently programmed and very stimulating but that the 1961 program was less impressive both in name speakers and stimulating presentations. However, the special telecast of the 1961 awards must have been impressive because much effort and talent was devoted to it. It was disappointing to this writer to note that the attendance continued to decline even with three strong Institute programs.

The overriding conclusion one may derive from these events is that the Institute had lost a great amount of its former prestige before 1959 and that the ultimate failure
of the Institute was inevitable. After the 1961 Institute, I. Keith Tyler retired from active participation and Ray J. Stanley assumed the task of organizing the Institute. An indication of Tyler's involvement and personal control of the Institute is reflected in the substantial drop in attendance at the 1962 Institute from 478 to slightly over 300. Although Stanley tried to place the emphasis of the Institute on programming in 1963, it was too late to redeem the fading image of diversity and cooperation which the Institute had established. The Institute was nearly dead at this point; it could have been revived only by more money and more attention to building a new image. The number of sessions was reduced each year from ten in 1961 to four in 1965. The scope of interest and activities similarly declined. Emphasis on educational interests during the last years effectively eliminated commercial interest while not providing enough appeal to dormant educational interests.

If the Institute had established the practice of passing resolutions, the commercial organizations would have been obligated to boycott the Institute. While commercial organizations were a very important part of the Institute they were always outnumbered by educational and
public interest groups, at times by as much as 6 to 1. The complaint of commercial broadcasters that they were damned no matter what they did had considerable truth to it. This writer feels that few commercial broadcasters can satisfy the majority of educational and public interest groups with their broadcast activities. However, this problem was not all one-sided. The commercial broadcasters would not have continued to come if they did not gain something from the Institute. They were frequently praised and immitated when they performed in the public interest. The Ohio State Awards recognized accomplishments of commercial programs. Edgar Kobak noted the problem which was affecting all the participating groups--they were too sensitive to criticism.

The Institute was developing a split personality by appealing to specialized interests with small group meetings while attempting to accomplish cross-fertilization in general sessions. There was certainly some exchange of ideas in the small group sessions but lack of diversity of viewpoints reduced the potential for exchange of ideas. A gradual reduction and combination of small group sessions seemed the most logical approach and would have encouraged more exchange of ideas. The 1956 Institute effectively
reduced the small sessions by scheduling an in-depth investigation of a topic with the entire attendance broken into fifteen discussion groups. This writer believes that the 1956 format provided a valuable concentration in one area that the Institute had lacked. Thorough discussion of a single topic with all participants able to express opinions fit the objectives of the Institute very well, as was noted by the 1959 Planning Committee. But the Institute returned to the basic format of previous years in 1957 and did not emphasize in-depth discussion of a single topic. However, the number of small group meetings was reduced considerably; these meetings occupied only two full sessions rather than four. This satisfied the complaints against too many concurrent meetings. There was also the logical suggestion that the small group sessions were necessary so that participants could attend the Institute on expense accounts. Usually educational institutions provided funds to attend only if the person was active on some panel. The small group meetings gave many more people an opportunity to be active on panels. The failure of the 1959, 1960, and 1961 Institutes to revive attendance indicates that the Institute was dying fast and these meetings only delayed that death
which occurred after the 1961 Institute. Other factors such as scheduling conflicts with the NAB, the expanding service of NAEB, and development of other special interests conferences such as DAVI, all reduced the demand for the Institute. The change in emphasis to a programming conference might have succeeded given time and money. But the change could not occur unless a large financial investment was made to get the top spokesmen in various related fields for an in-depth discussion of specific programming topics. This financial investment was not made.

Issues

The major issues discussed in this dissertation were chosen for their significance in the history of the Institute. However, each issue remains important today: (1) The discussion of the functions of educational broadcasting is applicable to current discussions of public broadcasting. (2) The problems regarding both the ownership of station facilities and the operation of radio during the war reflect basic limitations in the American system of broadcast operation and control. These limitations, such as profit orientation, appeal to the majority, and support of the establishment;
generate current problems of access for minority opinions, balance in presentation of information and other inequities which still must be resolved. (3) The matter of public service responsibility and development of a social conscience refer to functions of the American system which can never be taken for granted.

Regarding the first broad issue noted above, throughout the Institutes, educational broadcasting was discussed in terms of its cultural, informational, and public service potential to the entire public rather than just as a means of formal instruction. Therefore much of the discussion of the use of radio-TV in education is applicable to public broadcasting today. The efforts during the first period (1930-1935) to develop some national programming to convince the public and educators of the potential of radio is applicable to the efforts of National Public Radio (NPR). Levering Tyson never found an adequate laboratory for program innovation. Tyson's efforts through NACRE, to develop several series of programs in various subject matter areas of education were continually frustrated by the insecurity of the time slot which commercial broadcasters would grant. There were no educational networks to carry distinguished
programs to the public on a regular basis. As noted in Chapter II of this dissertation, the need for a national educational network was recognized in the early 1930's. A plan for such a national network, similar to National Public Radio, was presented to the 1935 Institute and eight day later, was proposed to the first meeting of the Federal Radio Education Committee by A.G. Crane, representing the National Committee for Education by Radio. NPR is relatively stable and its promises are kept because the criterion is not "will it sell?" but "is it good?" or "is it accomplishing something worthwhile?" An excellent example of the worth and need for a central network is the coverage of the debate on China in the United Nations in 1971. Although the audience for this kind of program is not large in commercial terms, it is an example of a necessary and spectacular function of a public system. Tyson's vision of using radio to develop new methods for the formal education system depended upon the cooperation of commercial broadcasters because the delivery system (a network of educational stations) would cost "untold millions of dollars." That delivery system, NPR is now available but it has not pursued the instructional potential of radio. However, NAEB is
currently investigating this possibility and this writer is convinced that some methods will be devised and perfected to allow the use of NPR to make radio a potent force in public education and instruction.

The discussion about control and auspices of educational programming in Chapters II and III of this dissertation parallels the recent debates on financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). When Congress passed the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, one of the biggest unsolved problems was determining an adequate and permanent financial structure for CPB. Although Congress was not anxious to provide the permanent financing until it had the opportunity to review the activities of CPB for a few years, it recognized that an annual appropriation from the federal government allowed for political manipulation of CPB activities. Congress, CPB, and the President are still attempting to agree on a means of permanent financial support for CPB.

Another aspect of control by federal authorities concerns the FCC's involvement in the entire field of broadcasting. This involvement is discussed later in this chapter when public service responsibility is considered. This
writer feels that considerations of control should and will be a matter for continual review and concern.

The Institute's discussion regarding effective dissemination of information and the public reaction to various methods of dissemination has much relevance for contemporary broadcasting. The primary discussion, covered in Chapter III, was concerned with the indiscriminate reporting of information and the public's ability to handle this information. The results of this reporting were public apathy caused by neutralization on issues and confusion on values. The Institute was concerned about the divergent views seeking acceptance before World War II. However, the Blue Book controversy discussed in Chapter IV and the comments of Howard K. Smith and others discussed in Chapter V are part of this broad and important area. Smith was concerned about the large amount of public service programming which confused rather than revealed issues. He also condemned the concept of balanced presentations. Public broadcasting has accepted the public's financial support much more directly than educational stations have accepted this support in the past. Therefore, public broadcasting must accept the responsibilities which accompany such support. The comments about
the role of broadcasting in our society made at the Institute refer even more strongly to public broadcasting than to commercial broadcasting.

The second broad issue noted at the beginning of this section is the inherent limitations of the American broadcast system. The discussion reviewed in Chapter II of this dissertation regarding ownership of station facilities is applicable to the continual problem of access. Reflection on the promises and rationales of early commercial broadcasters highlights the natural limitations of a competitive, privately operated, commercially supported system. If it is assumed that the spokesmen for commercial interests were sincere in their desire to serve the educational needs of the public and believed that they could accomplish this with commercial stations, then it can be seen that their reasoning did not account for the demand to continually improve the profit potential and maximize the money-making ability of that station operation. In the debates over frequency allocation from 1930 to 1935 it could be seen that no strong motivation existed in commercial interests to combat the very strong profit motive. A similar situation exists today with the development of CATV. That is a profit oriented and
motivated system which is asking for protection and rights in order to serve the needs of the society. A stronger motivation to serve those needs must be provided before the protection and rights are granted. A long hard look at the discussion from 1930 to 1935 regarding frequency allocations would convince many of the eroding powers that a profit motivated system exerts in public service areas.

The FCC's report to Congress in 1935 noted non-profit organizations would be better served by having access to costly equipment and an established audience than by having control of a broadcast channel. Where will the control of CATV and its costly equipment reside? How certain are we that the business of CATV will not be able to withdraw the required community, educational, and access channels at some future date? Perhaps W.T. Middlebrook's warning regarding frequency reservations for educational stations is applicable also to CATV. He said we should not barter away this medium for temporary advantages so long as its possibilities remain so little known.

The grand radio experiment of World War II was the maintenance of private operation of radio channels during an extreme crisis. This writer believes American radio responded
admirably. The tendency to be cautious and conservative, reflecting the "party line," was neither a weakness nor a strength but simply a basic principle of commercial broadcasting. The greater the threat to the business community, the greater the natural restrictions broadcasters impose on themselves. When NBC news director A.A. Schechter could assure the 1940 Institute that NBC was not in the news business but in the entertainment field, the caution is clearly indicated. He was simply saying that he did not want to take the responsibility for determining news values. He would leave that decision to the various news wire services. His caution was not unfounded when the risk of a government take-over, as happened in World War I, is considered. FCC Commissioner Fly had noted the uncharted field of activity in which broadcasting was operating during the war. However, radio stations and networks did make news judgements during the war. From the discussions at the Institute this writer concludes the greatest contribution of radio was preventing much misleading and emotionally biased information from reaching the air. NBC manager of public service and war programs, William Miller, related some of the problems of NBC and revealed a portion of the
difficulties encountered.

The performance of stations during this crisis is not directly applicable to the lesser crises which are occurring today. But some basic weaknesses or biases of the broadcast system were more clearly delineated in that bigger crisis. The tendency to maintain and enhance the existing powers; the reduction in tolerance of unpopular opinions; the tendency to ignore individual injustices and to sublimate individual rights and freedoms—these all add up to reflecting the society and the opinions of the majority. Perhaps the most important lesson from the war crisis was the realization that access for unpopular opinions could be severely reduced or removed completely.

The third area where the issues discussed at the Institute continue to be important is the public's right to receive responsible service in return for granting broadcasters the use of a limited natural resource. What should the public expect from the broadcaster in service and intentions? An area of strong interest and concern today surrounds the tenets of the Fairness Doctrine. The discussion of the Blue Book at the 1946 and 1947 Institutes revealed some strong links to the current discussions of the Fairness Doctrine.
The Blue Book emphasized the need for a balanced selection of programs. The discussion noted concepts that are applicable today and should be understood in a consideration of the Fairness Doctrine.

The first concept is that the FCC is responsible for representing the public to protect the public interest in the operation of frequencies. Charles Siepmann and Commissioner Durr emphasized this point at the 1946 Institute. Durr said the broadcasters have the courts as a last resort but the public cannot force the broadcasters to operate in their interest except through the FCC.

The second concept is that there must be some check on the FCC's regulatory activity to insure that it is not allowed too much control. Sidney Kaye and Justine Miller noted the challenge to free speech rights which was made in the Blue Book. Kaye suggested that the Blue Book provides a highly inefficient means of judging qualitative standards since a four man majority on a seven man politically appointed commission cannot judge as accurately as 1,000 individual broadcasters in their own communities.

This introduces the third concept which is that the broadcaster will automatically be serving the public's needs
by giving the public what it wants. This concept results from the broadcaster's claim that he can judge better than people outside the community what the community needs. Since only the community itself can challenge that judgement, the broadcaster will appeal to popularity rather than knowledge.

A fourth concept discussed at the 1947 Institute noted that since concentration of control (limitation on diversity) limits and abridges free expression, the limitation of frequency space itself limits free expression. Although there is always an inevitable compromise to complete freedom, those who have more control should also have less freedom. Thus the suggestion was made that a station owner should have access to express opinions on every station except those he owns. This is definitely a limitation on the individual's right to free expression but in reality, this is no greater than the limitations imposed on every other citizen who does not own a station.

Paul Spearman noted another consideration of free speech at the 1947 Institute when he explained that since broadcast frequencies are public property, the use of which Congress has a right to limit, it did seem logical to assume that the use of the frequency did not involve an individual's
right but the public's right. Therefore, he reasoned the individual's right of free speech was not involved.

This writer has concluded that the basic questions raised in the Institute discussions of the Blue Book were: what was the public's rights to balanced presentations of ideas, and how will those rights be attained? The Fairness Doctrine, which resulted from a re-interpretation of the Mayflower case, is an attempt to articulate a means of insuring those rights.

The discussion during the final period of Institute activity (1954-1965) was concerned with the broadcaster's responsibility to the society as a whole. Since the broadcaster's primary responsibility in the public service area was to reflect the society he would have to have a value system which would lead to accurate reflection. The broad problem of developing and maintaining a social conscience in the very sensitive field of broadcasting is not only a matter of continual concern for the public but is an especially important challenge to educators who train future broadcasters.

Harold Fellows, NAB president, reminded the 1954 Institute that this function of broadcasting depended upon
the sound financial condition of the industry. Charles Siepmann characterized this function as extending the consciousness of individuals far beyond their physical surroundings. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, noted the leadership quality required to introduce programs about the new and/or unpopular aspects of life. Howard K. Smith, ABC news analyst, called for more "hell-raising" to stir people from their tendency to complacency and conformity. Richard Heffner pointed to educational television as the potential leader in fulfilling this function of providing accurate reflection with a social conscience.

These are a few of the issues discussed in the thirty-six year history of the Institute which makes it valuable in today's world of broadcasting.

Conclusions

As noted in the introduction to this dissertation, an understanding of the evolution of our present system of broadcasting is necessary for proper analysis and determination of changes in that system. The Institute provided an understanding of the evolution by discussion of major
issues which presented some of the ideas behind the creation of changes in that system.

When broadcasting was a new and uncharted medium, the pioneers had no limits to their imagination regarding what this medium could and should do. Our present day leaders are boxed in by the tradition of habit--by what has been done. This also has had a very strong effect on the public. Years of experience have taught the public what to expect from broadcasting and, thus how it will fit into their life style and pattern. A review of the many possibilities discussed at the Institute tends to break the restrictions of tradition and to remind one of the wider choice of alternatives.

It is regrettable that the publication of the proceedings of the Institute, Education On The Air, was not continued throughout the life of the Institute. Yet a significant and valuable portion of the early deliberations of broadcasters was recorded in the twenty-four volumes of the proceedings. These volumes are an important contribution to the understanding of the perspective and tradition of broadcasting in the United States. The matters of access, control of programming functions of public broadcasting,
and the place of broadcasting in our society are matters of continuing importance and concern today.

The Institute started in 1930 with the idea of bringing all factions of broadcasting together to talk over their problems and explore solutions. The growing specialization and fragmentation of the industry required increasing services and generated new organizations to provide these services. As the new organizations grew and each became more active in expressing the concerns and interests of its group, the demand for communication on an individual basis was replaced by communication between various special interest groups. Thus the demand for the Institute's particular functions of coordination and cooperation through an annual meeting was replaced by year-round communication between the elected representatives of the various groups. However, the Institute had established an image as a sounding board for new and innovative ideas which helped it to continue to draw respectable attendance and notice. This writer believes that the Institute had lost its ability to serve the broad spectrum of special interest groups by 1952 and should have concentrated on more specific topics which would have drawn high interest from several large groups. This
would have reduced the appeal to some special interests and, perhaps, reduced the attendance initially, but would have allowed for more direct exchange of ideas (the cross-fertilization process) among highly motivated participants. The 1956 Institute program concentrated on exploring one subject exclusively and emphasized the cross-fertilization function which this concentration allowed. However, the Institute did not continue the 1956 program format in later years.

Some factors involved in the Institute's decline were: (1) identification with the educational and public service interests which detracted from its ability to provide a truly neutral meeting ground for both educators and commercial broadcasters; (2) demand for more specialized conferences and the development of special interest organizations to meet these demands; (3) demand for action and policy conferences which would reflect the desires and interests of special interests; (4) reduced need for the Institute's coordinating function due to improved communication between the various special interests; (5) increased identification of all education-related groups with the NAEB which had grown tremendously due to its year-round, action-
oriented, representation of these groups.

The Institute provided the stimulation for discussion of the problems of educational and public service broadcasting in the U.S. It brought together the various factions and specialized interests involved in broadcasting and helped to coordinate the development of broadcasting. It is not possible to assess the full extent of the Institute's contribution; but the many years of continued attendance by key leaders in broadcasting, the enthusiastic press coverage, and the many organizations which have grown out of the Institute indicate that the Institute for Education by Radio-Television made important contributions to the evolution of broadcasting.

Since broadcasting continues to evolve with the changing needs of society, a conference similar to the Institute could contribute significantly to its evolution. No annual conference or convention provides broadcasters with the opportunity for discussion and exchange of ideas which the Institute's format encouraged. The concept of bringing together the diverse interests of broadcasting to cooperatively find solutions to mutual problems has been proven feasible by the existence and activity of the
Institute. It is needed as much today as in the past.

Recommendations

This study of the Institute has indicated a need for further investigation and for action. The primary action, as suggested above, would be to establish a conference to achieve the cross-fertilization of ideas and the cooperative solutions to broadcast problems in a manner similar to that which the Institute initiated.

Broadcasting needs a truly neutral forum for discussion of the continuing problems of adapting to social conditions. The development of a social conscience requires the nurturing of an atmosphere of review and regeneration. At present, various philanthropic foundations have identified specific problems and have held conferences to discuss these problems. The Carnegie Commission on Educational Television was probably the most famous of the recent specialized broadcast conferences. These conferences deal with major problems but they cannot identify potential problems and resolve them before they become major problems.

The strongest and most complete recommendations for re-organization of the Institute were made by Edgar Kobak
at the 1949 Institute. Careful consideration of these recommendations would be a good start toward establishing a non-partisan conference for consideration of broadcast problems in our society. With the introduction of CATV and various other non-broadcast means of information dissemination, it would be necessary to consider the scope of this conference. This writer suggests electronic mass communications as the proper broad topic for this conference. If such a conference were established active representation from all major special interest groups would be necessary. A board of directors, composed of a representative from each major special interest group, would maintain control and choose a staff which would be responsible to the directors. Identification with a single institution or individual must be avoided in order to maintain the non-partisan position so important to this conference. For the same reason, no single special interest group should be allowed to sponsor the proposed conference. However, several large non-profit and/or philanthropic organizations might be allowed to co-sponsor the proposed conference. The matter of resolutions must be considered very carefully since the spirit of mutual assistance must be maintained at all
costs. This writer would recommend that such resolutions should be confined to statements of relatively unanimous agreement.

Another consideration for this conference would be the program format. The Institute attempted to educate newcomers to the field of broadcasting by encouraging their attendance and participation. Such activity would not be advisable for this conference since it would lead to repetitious and irrelevant discussion. This writer suggests a program format similar to that of the 1956 Institute in which one topic was presented from various points of view and participants were divided into fifteen discussion groups for more intimate exchange of opinion and ideas.

These are some of the basic considerations which are, as the Institute history has shown, necessary organizational decisions to be made for the success of the proposed conference.

Mr. Kobak also suggested that a high calibre conference devoted exclusively to radio and television programming was needed. Such a conference has not yet been instituted. Such a conference is needed and it is recommended that the annual Ohio State Awards presentation provide the
occasion for such a program conference. The Ohio State Awards continue as a major educational and public service program recognition event and draws representation from the best programmers in the country. The program conference should involve writers, producers, program administrators, and audience researchers in dialogue on the techniques and impact of programming.

There are a number of aspects of the Institute which merit additional study. This dissertation reports an investigation of the Institute for Education by Radio-Television using, as the primary source material, the written records of the Institute. Outside sources, such as various histories of broadcasting, periodicals, and interviews with Richard Hull and I. Keith Tyler were also used. Further study of attitudes about the Institute from those who attended Institutes, and particularly the Planning Committee members may provide additional perspective and insight about the Institute.

The annual Ohio State Awards program competition was not analyzed in this dissertation. Since these awards are all that remain of the Institute at The Ohio State University, a thorough study of their operation and accomplishments
would be beneficial. Such a study might assist considerably in planning a conference on programming such as the one suggested above.

Another study might consider the issues discussed at the Institute in relation to issues discussed at other national broadcast conferences. There were significant discussions on numerous occasions at the Institute. Was the calibre of topics and discussion equalled at other conferences? What were the appeals of other conferences, etc?

This dissertation focused on the major speeches concerned with policy and administration of broadcasting. A major portion of the twenty-four volumes of *Education On The Air* presents information on techniques of broadcasting, experimental activities and results in broadcasting and activities in the organization and administration of various specific broadcast projects. Investigation of this material would provide further valuable historical insight into the evolution of present broadcast practices.

One final area recommended for further investigation is the leadership of broadcasting. For example in the early years of the Institute, Levering Tyson was a leader in attempting to use radio for the greatest educational benefit.
His ideas, as expressed at various yearly Institutes indicate that Tyson had great vision and understanding. A complete study of Levering Tyson's activities and ideas would be very beneficial to the study of educational broadcasting.

The tables of contents of the volumes of *Education On The Air* indicate several other leaders and spokesmen for particular aspects of educational broadcasting. An investigation of these leaders' ideas could provide an excellent biographical contribution to broadcast history.

The Institute for Education by Radio-Television provided the forum for discussion of many important broadcast problems. The record of this discussion as printed in the twenty-four volumes of *Education On The Air* provide a portion of history which has not been recognized adequately in recent writing. This material deserves further investigation and consideration.

This dissertation has explored the activities and accomplishments of the Institute for Education by Radio-Television. It identified some weaknesses and strengths of the Institute and suggested the need for an annual conference similar to the Institute. In addition, discussion on the development of broadcasting spanning thirty-six years was
reviewed and suggestions regarding its value were made.
This dissertation emphasized the resource value for further study of the twenty-four volumes of Education On The Air. Much valuable historical material has yet to be investigated in these volumes and it is hoped that this investigation will be pursued.
CHAPTER VI: FOOTNOTES

These objectives were derived from a combination the stated objectives of the Institute's 1930 program plus the objectives identified by W.W. Charters. Above, Chapter II.

Memo from W.W. Charters to F.H. Lumley, 1932 (Institute files, The Ohio State University).


Minutes of the Program Committee meeting, December 27, 1946 (Institute files, The Ohio State University).


Minutes of the National Advisory Committee meeting, May 8, 1950 (Institute files, The Ohio State University).


APPENDIX I

ATTENDANCE INFORMATION

The attendance information in the following three tables was gathered from four sources:

1. Official registration lists printed in the yearbook Education On The Air for the years 1931, 1934-1940, and 1942.

2. Mimeographed but unpublished copies of the official registration list for the years 1941, 1943-1965. No registration list was found for 1952 and only partial lists were found for 1961, 1962, and 1963.

3. Dittoed copies of organization (Table 1) and state (Table 3) breakdowns in the Institute files for the years 1949 through 1961. These breakdowns were originally compiled for presentation to the national advisory committee when it met to plan the next Institute. The figures for several years were cross checked with the mimeographed registration lists and found to be accurate.

4. A combination of various unpublished reports located in the Institute files at the Ohio State University archives provided the figures reported for the years 1930, 1932 and 1933. Several conflicting reports of the total attendance at the 1930 Institute were made but this writer found the most reliable source to be a typed copy of the total attendance for each of the years 1930 through 1935. The figure from that report was 132.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Stations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Stations a</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Gov'ts and the U.N.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl. and State Gov't Agencies</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Regional Organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. National Networks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National Networks</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Services, Papers and Magazines</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Systems b</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Organizations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Stations</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Stations(^a)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repr. Foreign Gov't and U.N.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't Agencies, Nat'l. and State</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Regional Organizations</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Organizations</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Networks</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Networks, Foreign</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Services, Papers and Magazines</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Systems(^b)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Organizations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Stations</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Stations</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repr. Foreign Gov't and U.N.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl. and State Gov't Agencies</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Regional Organizations</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Organizations</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. National Networks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National Networks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Services, Papers and Mag.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Systems</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (Contd.)

Footnotes

aIncludes only those stations operated by colleges and universities.

bIncludes board of education stations.

cDoes not include the 150 persons who attended some portions of the Institute on the basis of registration with a concurrent convention of the Educational Film Library Association.

dFull registration records not found. This breakdown computed from approximately 90% of the registration list.
### TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF REGISTERED ATTENDANCE
BY STATES AND NATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No special significance is attached to the choice of the above years. The attempt to provide an even distribution of sample years throughout the existence of the Institute was altered somewhat by the availability of reliable figures.*
TABLE 3
TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES AND NATIONS REPRESENTED EACH YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(a)</th>
<th>States(b)</th>
<th>Foreign Nations</th>
<th>Year(a)</th>
<th>States(b)</th>
<th>Foreign Nations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\)No reliable figures were found for the years 1933, 1962 and 1963.

\(b\)Includes Washington D.C. as a separate state.
APPENDIX II

TABLE 4

INCOME AND EXPENSE STATEMENTS: 1939-1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1939(^c)</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1945(^k)</th>
<th>1946</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$...</td>
<td>$821.50</td>
<td>$1098.50</td>
<td>$1274.00</td>
<td>$1356.75</td>
<td>$2386.00</td>
<td>$...</td>
<td>$3988.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>257.25</td>
<td>301.00</td>
<td>434.00</td>
<td>578.00</td>
<td>545.00</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>1669.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>251.00</td>
<td>563.50</td>
<td>468.24</td>
<td>243.05</td>
<td>624.00</td>
<td>722.00</td>
<td>1106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>975.00</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>369.20</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1457.25</td>
<td>$1875.40</td>
<td>$2971.00</td>
<td>$2695.24</td>
<td>$2919.80</td>
<td>$4196.94</td>
<td>$722.00</td>
<td>$6780.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expense:**          |            |       |       |       |       |       |            |       |
| Preconference         | $...       | $...   | $...   | $...   | $...   | $40.00 | $...       | $67.20 |
| Exhibition            | 53.75      | 346.95 | 433.71 | 531.37 | 321.98 | 442.23 | 922.46     | 1135.44 |
| Meals\(^e\)           | 271.10     | 294.50 | 439.56 | 583.83 | 590.50 | 912.70 | ...        | 1854.58 |
| Yearbook\(^f\)        | 335.70     | 215.10 | 822.20 | 386.29 | 297.02 | 475.97 | ...        | 615.22  |
| Yearbook              |            |       |       |       |       |       |            |       |
| Printing              | ...        | ...    | 475.00 | 550.00 | 1000.00 | ...    | ...        | ...    |
| Conference            | 477.61     | 588.94 | 671.75 | 715.77 | 1076.35 | 643.66 | 907.49     |       |
| **Total**             | $1138.16   | $1445.49 | $2367.22 | $2692.26 | $2835.85 | $3614.56 | $922.46    | $4579.93 |

<p>| Profit - Loss         | +$ 319.09  | +$ 429.91 | +$ 603.78 | +$ 2.98 | +$ 83.95 | +$ 582.38 | -$ 200.46  | +$ 2200.07 |
| Adjustments(^g)     | (2.30)     | (37.96)  | (+.63)   |         |         |         |            |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Balance</strong></th>
<th>$ 603.78</th>
<th>$ 604.46</th>
<th>$ 650.45</th>
<th>$1233.46</th>
<th>$1033.00</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$3051.50</td>
<td>$2965.75</td>
<td>$2527.00</td>
<td>$2258.25</td>
<td>$2993.50</td>
<td>$2889.00</td>
<td>$2578.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>1176.00</td>
<td>605.50</td>
<td>441.00</td>
<td>716.00</td>
<td>1260.00</td>
<td>760.00</td>
<td>892.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>2067.50</td>
<td>2180.00</td>
<td>2043.31</td>
<td>1236.00</td>
<td>1533.45</td>
<td>1812.98</td>
<td>1527.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>484.32</td>
<td>859.84</td>
<td>56.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>69.44</td>
<td>79.53</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$6364.44</td>
<td>$5830.78</td>
<td>$5046.62</td>
<td>$4210.25</td>
<td>$6271.27</td>
<td>$6321.82</td>
<td>$5092.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconference</td>
<td>$610.63</td>
<td>$395.76</td>
<td>$983.55</td>
<td>$352.59</td>
<td>$366.50</td>
<td>$116.71</td>
<td>$41.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>1586.86</td>
<td>1340.65</td>
<td>1745.18</td>
<td>836.45</td>
<td>1210.56</td>
<td>1037.29</td>
<td>1123.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>1520.50</td>
<td>863.96</td>
<td>814.08</td>
<td>1136.14</td>
<td>1547.79</td>
<td>1161.88</td>
<td>1435.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearbook</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>1102.40</td>
<td>1120.80</td>
<td>1093.81</td>
<td>1079.82</td>
<td>980.40</td>
<td>241.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>1295.33</td>
<td>1428.36</td>
<td>1418.50</td>
<td>1370.85</td>
<td>2647.96</td>
<td>2610.23</td>
<td>2486.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$5413.32</td>
<td>$5131.13</td>
<td>$6082.11</td>
<td>$4789.84</td>
<td>$6852.63</td>
<td>$5906.51</td>
<td>$5328.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profit - Loss</strong></td>
<td>+$951.12</td>
<td>+$699.65</td>
<td>-$1935.49</td>
<td>-$579.59</td>
<td>-$581.36</td>
<td>+$415.31</td>
<td>-$236.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-951.96)</td>
<td>(-114.00)</td>
<td>(-82.06)</td>
<td>(+87.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td>$2747.07</td>
<td>$2746.23</td>
<td>$3331.88</td>
<td>$2296.39</td>
<td>$1634.74</td>
<td>$1053.38</td>
<td>$1556.51</td>
<td>$1320.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$1727.50</td>
<td>$2883.00</td>
<td>$3618.50</td>
<td>$2933.10</td>
<td>$3320.00</td>
<td>$3011.50</td>
<td>$2520.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>729.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1634.50</td>
<td>1299.00</td>
<td>2934.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>1968.72</td>
<td>2097.95</td>
<td>2517.93</td>
<td>3129.53</td>
<td>2909.16</td>
<td>4662.63</td>
<td>7576.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>442.99</td>
<td>501.56</td>
<td>646.00</td>
<td>698.82</td>
<td>521.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4436.72</td>
<td>$5533.97</td>
<td>$6579.42</td>
<td>$6564.19</td>
<td>$8509.66</td>
<td>$9671.95</td>
<td>$13552.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconference</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>1194.38</td>
<td>1484.63</td>
<td>1589.47</td>
<td>2175.94</td>
<td>2669.79</td>
<td>2754.29</td>
<td>5689.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>1421.10</td>
<td>922.56</td>
<td>1113.46</td>
<td>1050.78</td>
<td>2296.72</td>
<td>1822.20</td>
<td>3600.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearbook</td>
<td>261.18</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>577.64</td>
<td>585.25</td>
<td>133.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>1938.94</td>
<td>3252.40</td>
<td>3268.72</td>
<td>3195.93</td>
<td>3743.72</td>
<td>3759.33</td>
<td>4919.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4831.35</td>
<td>$5659.59</td>
<td>$5971.65</td>
<td>$6422.65</td>
<td>$9287.87</td>
<td>$8921.07</td>
<td>$14343.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit - Loss</td>
<td>-$394.63</td>
<td>-$125.62</td>
<td>+$607.77</td>
<td>+$141.54</td>
<td>-$778.21</td>
<td>+$750.88</td>
<td>-$790.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$925.71</td>
<td>$800.09</td>
<td>$1407.86</td>
<td>$1549.40</td>
<td>$771.19</td>
<td>$1522.07</td>
<td>$731.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4 (Contd.)**
TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Footnotes

a Compiled from balance sheets and other reports of expenses and income from records located in Institute files at Ohio State University.

b Insufficient records to report other years for a comparative analysis.

c Only a partial statement was available, indicating primarily expenses and total income.

d All contributions consisted of funds supplied by The Ohio State University unless otherwise noted.

e The entry "meals" includes entertainment which occasionally accompanied the banquet.

f Included stenographic services and other clerical incidentals but not editing services ($700) until 1949 and thereafter.

g Minor expenses or income received after closing books.

h Statements did not indicate any balance being carried forward until the end of 1941.

i The Payne Fund contributed $600.00.

j The Payne Fund contributed $400.00.

k No Institute was held in 1945 but the program evaluation was performed.
APPENDIX III

INSTITUTE PROGRAM FORMATS: 1930-1965

Table 5

Compiled from the official printed programs for each year. It is recognized that, occasionally, a last minute change in speaker or speech title occurs which is not reflected in the program. Since no reliable means of determining these changes was found, the program designations were followed exclusively. Table 5 attempts to indicate the content of the sessions in order of presentation, therefore the title of the speech or presentation was used where possible. However, space limitations necessitated liberal use of abbreviation with the primary intent being to maintain the sense of the title. When ever a theme was indicated to encompass more than one speech in a session this theme was underlined with a broken line. All sessions are single activities of that time period and attended by all unless the designation "concurrent" is used. Each printed program noted the desireability of audience questions and discussion at the end of each presentation. Such discussion periods were not indicated in this table unless a special session was reserved for discussion. Throughout the Institute history various means of imparting information and stimulating dialogue between participants were attempted. The various concurrent meetings attempted to satisfy the desires of the specialized interests of attendants. Although these
meetings carried different designations such as Work Study - Special Interest - Clinic, etc., the conduct of the meeting was determined more by the chairman than the designation of type of meeting. The basic purpose of all these meetings was to stimulate discussion on certain specific subjects in order to inform attendants of the activities in this area and provide ideas for future use. Thus, a chairman was assigned to each meeting to gather resource people, determine specific matters to be discussed and guide the conduct of the meeting. Many of the official programs indicated the resource people attending each meeting. All chairman met with the Institute director on the first day of the conference to receive instructions on general procedure of conduct and recording the meeting activities.

Table 6

Information for this table was gathered primarily from the official printed programs. The committees for the years 1930 through 1937 were determined from Institute records and correspondence.

Although the secretary and assistant director were not considered part of the official program committee in many years, there was no reliable indication of their status from year to year. Since the influence of these offices was evident, they have been included uniformly in the table.

The names are listed alphabetically under the category which they represent. Local representatives are those from the city of Columbus.

Table 7

This table was compiled from the list of meetings of allied groups
printed in the back portion of the Institute programs. Other records and comments indicate that, occasionally, a group was not listed on the official program although they did meet as a group at the Institute. Since no reliable check on these groups could be located, the table does not include them.

**Table 8**

This table was compiled from the information in the Institute program plus notations located in the published yearbook. Verification was also found in some cases in press reports of the Institute activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, June 23</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 24</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 25</th>
<th>Thursday, June 26</th>
<th>Friday, June 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Radio Contributions to Ele. &amp; Sec. Educ. in Canada</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Research in Radio Educ. (2 Speeches)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Parental Education by Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Radio Contributions to Ele. &amp; Sec. Educ. in Mexico</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Problem of Program Management</td>
<td>Administration of Schools of The Air (2 Speeches)</td>
<td>Relation of Library to Education by Radio</td>
<td>Educ. Sponsor of Radio Programs</td>
<td>Public Relations Work of Educational Broadcaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Saturday, June 28</th>
<th>Monday, June 30</th>
<th>Tuesday, July 1</th>
<th>Wednesday, July 2</th>
<th>Thursday, July 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Educational Broadcasting in Europe</td>
<td>Teaching Music by Radio</td>
<td>Problems of the Coll. &amp; U. Broadcaster</td>
<td>Foreign Language Instruction by Radio</td>
<td>International Understanding thru Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Principles in Selection &amp; Use of A.M. Broadcast Equip.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Creative Learning is Vital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Field Reports</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Drama by Radio</td>
<td>Centralized Unit in Educational Broadcasting</td>
<td>Educational Obligations of Broadcaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Ohio Schls. of the Air (Demonstration of 3 Props.)</td>
<td>Rural Education by Radio</td>
<td>City, State, &amp; Nation as Units for Educ. Broadcasting</td>
<td>Control of Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Monday, June 8</td>
<td>Tuesday, June 9</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 10</td>
<td>Thursday, June 11</td>
<td>Friday, June 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Work of National Committee on Educ. by Radio</td>
<td>(5 Short Speeches)</td>
<td>Ohio Schl. of the Air</td>
<td>Obstacles to Station Allocation Changes</td>
<td>Television's Contribution to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.R.C. Contributions to Education</td>
<td>Foreign Language Teaching by Radio</td>
<td>Chicago Schools' Broadcasts</td>
<td>Educational Schools of the Air Evaluation</td>
<td>Preparing a Chain Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian Radio</td>
<td>Educational Functions of Radio</td>
<td>Using Bonnch Concerts</td>
<td>Training Announcers Vocabulary Level of Radio Addresses</td>
<td>Executing a Chain Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Radio's Contribution to Agriculture</td>
<td>Using Extra-School Broadcasts</td>
<td>Liaison Problems in Schools of the Air</td>
<td>Conference on Investigations in Radio Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 (Contd.)

#### 1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, June 6</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 7</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 8</th>
<th>Thursday, June 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Program Effects in Schools</td>
<td>School Use of Radio Play</td>
<td>Radio Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Programs</td>
<td>Program Remembrance</td>
<td>Train Teacher for Program Use</td>
<td>Influence on Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>British School Broadcasts (Live Broadcast - 10:30)</td>
<td>Methods of Speech Delivery</td>
<td>Teachers' Uses of Programs</td>
<td>Measuring Station Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dramatic Continuity</td>
<td>Contribution to Religion</td>
<td>Demonstration of Use (Live Broadcast - 11:00)</td>
<td>French Lesson Demonstration (Live Broadcast - 11:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Preparing Radio Talks in Psychology</td>
<td>Teach Band Instrument</td>
<td>National School Broadcasts</td>
<td>Program Material Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker's Personality in Educational Programs</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Plan</td>
<td>Social Science Broadcasts</td>
<td>College &amp; University Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talks for Pupils</td>
<td>Demonstration of Broadcast (Live Broadcast - 2:45)</td>
<td>Measuring Audience Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Evaluating Programs</td>
<td>Dinner (7.00)</td>
<td>Demonstration of Production of a Radio Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics by Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCURRENT RO.-TABLE.

2. Financing Coll. Sta.
3. Selecting Programs
4. Technique of Measure
### TABLE 5 (Contd.)

#### 1933

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Thursday, May 4</th>
<th>Friday, May 5</th>
<th>Saturday, May 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Contribution to Government Programs Evaluation</td>
<td>North Carolina's School of the Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire and Mail</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>9:30 A.M. Personal Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Administration for Programs</td>
<td>Radio Discussion Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>College &amp; University Survey Method</td>
<td>Programs at Syracuse University</td>
<td>Civil Government for Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College &amp; University Survey Interpretation</td>
<td>Art of Radio Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching Art Appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer's Interest in Radio</td>
<td>Airways for Drama</td>
<td>Creative Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illustrated Radio Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Round-Table Discussions)</td>
<td>1. Co-op of Commercial Sta. &amp; Educ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Problems of College and University Stations</td>
<td>2. School Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Research and Measurement</td>
<td>Ohio Drama Tournament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 (Contd.)

#### 1934

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, April 30</th>
<th>Tuesday, May 1</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks *</td>
<td>Wisconsin Radio Service *</td>
<td>Importance of Educational Programs for Commercial Stas. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio's Place in Distributing University Stas. Accomplishments *</td>
<td>The Institutional Use of Commercial Stas. for Broadcasting, Educ. Radio Listening-Center Plan *</td>
<td>Cleveland College Broadcasts *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Planned Broadcasting for Canada *</td>
<td>Achievements of Educational Ra. *</td>
<td>Teaching by Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper Publicity for Programs *</td>
<td>Usefulness of Schl. Broadcasts *</td>
<td>Ra. in Voluntary Allotment Campaigns *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Arousing Interest in Ra. Educ. *</td>
<td>School News Broadcasts *</td>
<td>Europe On the Air *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

(Round-Table Discussions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:00 P.M.</th>
<th>1. Problems of Coll. &amp; U. Stas. 1. School Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Research &amp; Measurement 2. A.C.U.B. Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recordings of Selected Broadcasts of 1933-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, May 6</th>
<th>Tuesday, May 7</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks (10:00)</td>
<td>Program Organization</td>
<td>Techniques of Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Report of Council Director</td>
<td>Programs for Children</td>
<td>Techniques Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry Interest in Educational Broadcasts</td>
<td>Women Organize to Listen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Broadcasting and the American Home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.C.C. Interest in Educational Broadcasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Running an Educational Station</td>
<td>The Microphone in Politics</td>
<td>A State Unit of Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democracy and the Radio</td>
<td>Selling College Authorities on the Importance of Radio</td>
<td>Organizing Emergency Radio Jr.-College Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Interpreting Education</td>
<td>Legislative Support for State Radio Service</td>
<td>Organizing Listener Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BANQUET (6:00 P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio and the Voter (Live Broadcast 6:05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Broadcasting in the Future (2 Speeches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 5 (Contd.)

1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, May 4</th>
<th>Tuesday, May 5</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Techniques of Script-Writing (Clinic)</td>
<td>Techniques of Broadcasting (Clinic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Techniques</td>
<td>Integrating Music &amp; Information *</td>
<td>3-man Panel Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-man Panel Reaction</td>
<td>Direct Instruction to Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Objectives in Program Planning</td>
<td>Techniques of Script-Writing (Cont'd.)</td>
<td>Radio from Listeners Standpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American View of British School Broadcasting</td>
<td>News Commenation</td>
<td>Demonstration of Classroom Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-man Panel Critique</td>
<td>Children's Programs *</td>
<td>5-man Panel Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting Radio Menu</td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Demon. of Adult Program Discussion (6-man Panel Critique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>BANQUET (6:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Special Problem)</td>
<td>Looking Ahead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadcasting in the Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONCURRENT Fo.-Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. from Commercial Sta's.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. School of the Air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. College of the Air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Radio Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Music Appreciation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The Round Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The Discussion Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. High School Radio Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. The Nation-Wide Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Monday, May 3</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 4</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks *</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Training of Radio Talent</td>
<td>Studio Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospect on Licensing of Educational Stations</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Training of Pupils *</td>
<td>Techniques in Drama *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Educational Broadcasting by Educational Stations</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Training (Contd.)</td>
<td>Awards for First American Exhibition of Recordings of Educational Radio Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Stations on the March *</td>
<td>New York University Workshop *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why the Educational Station?</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Training of Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5 (Contd.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</th>
<th>BANQUET (6:00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting in the Schools *</td>
<td>The Government's Responsibility for Educational Broadcasting *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Broadcasting from Commercial Stations *</td>
<td>CONCURRENT Ro.-Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>N.A.E.B. Meeting *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research in Radio Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Monday, May 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Review of Studies of Education Broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How Radio Can Serve this Need B. Eval. of Sch. Broadcasts * Planning Women's Broadcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7-man Panel Discussion) D. Use of Shh. wtr. in Lang. Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2:00 P.M.</th>
<th>1. Agricultural Broadcasts</th>
<th>2:00 P.M.</th>
<th>1. University Radio Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2. School Broadcasts</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>4. Research in Ra. Educ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>3. University Radio Courses</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>5. Technical Ra. Developments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Special Problems)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:00 P.M.</th>
<th>1. Listener Participation</th>
<th>8:00 P.M.</th>
<th>1. Listener Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2. Dramatic Programs</td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2. Dramatic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>3. Music Program</td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>3. Music Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>4. Science Programs</td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>4. Science Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>5. Discussion Programs</td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>5. Discussion Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>6. Handling Controversial Issues</td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>6. Handling Controversial Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>7. Training &amp; Sel. of Radio Techn.</td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>7. Training &amp; Sel. of Radio Techn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>8. The Radio Workshop</td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>8. The Radio Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5 (Contd.)

1934

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, May 1</th>
<th>Tuesday, May 2</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks *</td>
<td>Demonstration of Utilization of a Classroom Broadcast *</td>
<td>Effect of Radio on Listener Attitudes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Place of Radio in a Democracy (3-man Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>6-man Panel of Evaluation of the Demonstration</td>
<td>Professional Training in England *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How School Broadcast Units Study Their Listeners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

(Work Study)

- Agricultural Broadcasts
- School Broadcasts

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

(Work Study)

- Continuation of Monday Sessions

**AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT**

* Demonstration & Discussion of Awards for Third Exhibition of Educational Radio Program

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

(Special Problems)

- NAEB Meeting *
- N.A.B. Meeting *

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

(6:00)

- Radio and Your Government *
- CONCURRENT Fo.3.Fables

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

- 1. Dramatic Programs
- 2. Forum Programs
- 3. Handling Controversial Issues
- 4. Public Relations Broadcasts
- 5. The Radio Workshop
- 6. Training School Radio Directors
- 7. The Princeton Study
- 8. The Wisconsin Study

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

- Use of Schl. Broadcasts *
- Adult Education by Radio *
- Music Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, April 29</th>
<th>Tuesday, April 30</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Demonstration of Utilization of a Classroom Broadcast</td>
<td>Activities of Federal Radio Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developments in International Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

**Work Study**

1. Agriculture Broadcasts
2. School Broadcasts
5. Public Serv. Broadcasting
7. (Clinic) Music Apprec. Progs.

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

Continuation of Monday Sessions & (Clinic) Science Broadcasts

6-man Panel Evaluation of Demonstration

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS**

(Special Problems)

1. Adult Education by Radio
2. Classroom Use of Broadcasts
3. Dedication of Workshop
4. N.A.B. Meeting
5. NAEB Meeting
6. Pre-Professional Training for Radio
7. School Supervision by Ra.

**DINNER (6:00)**

Radio as a Social Force

**CONCURRENT Ro.-Tables**

1. Writing for Radio
2. Radio Production
3. Handling Controversial Issues
4. Radio Workshops
5. Edu. Script Exchanges
6. Recordings for School Use
7. Engineering Quiz Section
8. News and Special Events
### TABLE 5 (Contd.)

**1943**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Monday, May 5</th>
<th>Tuesday, May 6</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welcome Remarks</strong></td>
<td>Radio in the Current Crisis</td>
<td>Radio in the Present Emergency (4-man Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>Radio in Maritime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td><strong>AGENDA: ARRANGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>1. Broadcasting Programs</td>
<td>Radio's Role in War-time Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Selective Service</td>
<td>Radio's Role in War-time Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training of BBC Personnel</td>
<td><strong>AGENDA: ARRANGEMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Propaganda in Film</td>
<td>2. Radio in Cultural Relations (4-man Panel Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The View of Youth</td>
<td>3. Youth in War-time America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA: ARRANGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>4. Radio and Education in Latin America (4-man Panel Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Radio in Latin America</td>
<td><strong>AGENDA: ARRANGEMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developments in Short-</td>
<td>American Radio Role in Case of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wave Today</td>
<td><strong>AGENDA: ARRANGEMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLOSING MEETINGS

**Work Study**

1. Agricultural & Home-making 
2. Education by Radio, Films, etc. 
3. Radio Education for Adults 
4. Children's Program 
5. Research in Religious Education 
6. School Broadcasts 

**SPECIAL MEETING (6:00)**

Reception Dinner 

**SPECIAL MEETING (5:00)**

1. Library's Organization 
2. Advertising Agency 
3. Film Editions of PI. Stamps 
4. Industrial Broadcasting 

**INSTITUTE MEETING (1:00)**

1. Broadcasting for Women 
2. Training New Radio Personnel 
3. Music Education by Radio 
4. Radio Production 
5. Supplementary Aids for Educators 
6. Writing for radio 
7. Social Responsibility of War 
8. Public School Relations Educating 
9. Teacher Education in Radio 
10. Educating to Organized Listeners
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Sunday, May 3</th>
<th>Monday, May 4</th>
<th>Tuesday, May 5</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Informal Tea for Newcomers (3:00-5:00)</td>
<td>Radio Drama in Wartime</td>
<td>This is War</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Radio Discussion in Wartime (7-man Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>Radio News Reports &amp; Comments in Wartime (4 speeches)</td>
<td>Plays for Americans</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-man Panel Discussion</td>
<td>7-man Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Radio Discussion in Wartime</td>
<td>Radio Drama in Wartime</td>
<td>This is War</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Radio Discussion in Wartime</td>
<td>Radio News Reports &amp; Comments in Wartime (4 speeches)</td>
<td>Plays for Americans</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-man Panel Discussion</td>
<td>7-man Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT**

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)**
1. Agricultural & Home-making Broadcasts
2. Broadcasting by Hall Organizations
3. Children's Programs
4. Religious Broadcasts
5. Recordings for Sch.-Ed.
7. School Broadcasting
8. College Courses in Radio

**CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)**
1. In-School Broadcasting
2. N.A.B.B. Meeting
3. NAGB Meeting
4. Cooperative Approaches to Educ. Broadcasting
5. Teacher Education in Radio
6. Broadcasting for Women
7. The Negro & Radio in Education
8. Radio & Wartime Morale

**INSTITUTE DINNER (7:45)**
Testimonial to Walter Damrosch

**CONCURRENT RE-Tables**
1. College Public Relations Broadcasting
2. Production Technique
3. Writing Radio Drama
4. Promotion of Educ. Programs
5. Social Responsibility of Radio
6. Children's Programs Idea Exchange
7. Teaching Radio Programs Discrimination
8. Radio in Civilian Defense

**Religious Broadcasting in Wartime (4-man Symposium) (2:00 P.M.)**

**Summary of Work Study**

**Summary of Spec. Interest and Round-Table Meeting**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Saturday, May 1</th>
<th>Sunday, May 2</th>
<th>Monday, May 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:30 A.M.</strong></td>
<td>Problems of Wartime Operation (Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>Problems of Wartime Operation (Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>Radio Interpreting a Region (Panel Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td><strong>Informal Tea for Newcomers (1:30-3:00)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Radio Interpreting a Region</strong> (Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>Radio &amp; Manpower (Symposium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radio's Wartime Strategy (Symposium)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
<td><strong>INSTITUTE DINNER</strong> (7:00)</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td><strong>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td>Developing Understanding Among the United Nations</td>
<td>Developing Understanding Among the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Meeting (9:00)</strong></td>
<td>Documentary Reporting</td>
<td><strong>Radio Interpreting a Region</strong> (Panel Discussion)</td>
<td><strong>Radio Interpreting a Region</strong> (Panel Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 P.M.</td>
<td><strong>Film Festival Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Radio Interpreting a Region</strong> (Panel Discussion)</td>
<td><strong>Radio Interpreting a Region</strong> (Panel Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radio's Wartime Strategy (Symposium)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
<td><strong>INSTITUTE DINNER</strong> (7:00)</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td><strong>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td>Developing Understanding Among the United Nations</td>
<td>Developing Understanding Among the United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6 (Contd.)
1944

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Friday, May 6</th>
<th>Saturday, May 6</th>
<th>Sunday, May 7</th>
<th>Monday, May 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Radio in the War</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>CONCURRENT No.-Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Voice of America</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>(9:45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>Continuation of Saturday</td>
<td>1. College Pub. Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon Sessions</td>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>except #12</td>
<td>2. Writing for Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Training Radio Journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Radio and Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Radio Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Recordings for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-CONFERENCE MEETING</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>Radio's Role in Understanding</td>
<td>Radio &amp; Post-War Problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Democracy thru</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>(2:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>The Post-War Situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Demonstration &amp; Discussion)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is Radio's Role?</td>
<td>What is Radio's Role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6-man Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>(Panel Discussion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPECIAL MEETING (5:00)</td>
<td>Summ. of Work-Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morale on the Fighting Fronts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summ. of Spec. Int. &amp; No.-Table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M. (4:00-6:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Tea for Newcomers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Free is Radio?</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>INSTITUTE DINNER</td>
<td>After Liberation: The Next Step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7-man Symposium)</td>
<td>(Special Interest)</td>
<td>(7:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. In-School Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Negro &amp; Radio in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Public Health Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Broadcasting by Local Youth Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. TV &amp; Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Friday, May 3</td>
<td>Saturday, May 4</td>
<td>Sunday, May 5</td>
<td>Monday, May 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Radio and the International Scene</td>
<td>CONCERT MEETINGS (Work Study) (9:30)</td>
<td>CONCERT MEETINGS (9:30)</td>
<td>CONCERT MEETINGS (9:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio in Post-War Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge of Peace in China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio's Role in Assisting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans for International Aid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>International Broadcasting Through Radio Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noon - Live Report of Senior Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Noon - Live Report of Junior Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Council of Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Secretariat for Women (4:00-6:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Our Foreign Policy&quot; (Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Newsreel: Discoveries in Radio Answering Post-War Obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Open Symposium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5 (Contd.)

1947

**Informal Reception for Newcomers**

(4:30)

**UNESCO's Role in Radio and Films**

5:30 P.M.

5-man Panel Discussion

AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT

**Informal Reception for Newcomers**

(4:30)

**Concurrent Meetings**

(Work Study)

1. Continue Sat. Sessions
2. Continue Sat. Sessions
3. Continue Sat. Sessions
4. Continue Sat. Sessions
5. ED Educational Stations
6. Radio Production
7. Radio Prod. Councils
8. Religious Broadcasts
9. Programs for Teen-agers

**Concurrent Meetings**

(Special Interest)

1. Opportunities of Campus Radio Stations
2. Clinic for College & University Stations
3. Clinic for Educational & Pub., Serv. Directors
4. Meeting & College Public Relations
5. Problems of Radio Chms. of Local Groups
7. Radio, Public & U.S. Foreign Policy

**Concurrent Meetings**

(Special Interest)

1. Campus Radio Stations
2. Clinic for College & University Stations
3. Clinic for Educational & Pub., Serv. Directors
4. Meeting & College Public Relations
5. Problems of Radio Chms. of Local Groups
7. Radio, Public & U.S. Foreign Policy

**Special Meeting (7:45)**

Broadcast of "Meet the Press"

**What Is Public Interest, Convenience, and Necessity?**

(4-man Symposium) (8:30)

**What can Colleges & Unv. Do?** (Panel Discussion)

**Special Meeting (3:30)**

Is Labor Getting Fair Shake on Air? (Symposium)

**Institute Dinner**

(7:30)

Radio in One World
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Friday, April 30</th>
<th>Saturday, May 1</th>
<th>Sunday, May 2</th>
<th>Monday, May 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE-CONFERENCE MEETING</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concurrent Meetings</strong></td>
<td><strong>SERIOUS RADIO IN AMERICA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Programming &amp; Production</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Reception for Newcomers (4:00-5:30)</td>
<td>1. Agricultural Broadcasts</td>
<td>1. Community Production</td>
<td>6-man Panel Discussion</td>
<td>6-man Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Junior Town Meeting</td>
<td>Radio Councils</td>
<td>* Summary &amp; Implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Radio Training in Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>2. Women's Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. School Broadcasts</td>
<td>4. Prop. Independent FM Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Radio Repeat</td>
<td>Topics 1, 3, 6, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Music Prog. on Local Stations</td>
<td>Continued from Saturday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Radio News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Intl. Organizations &amp; Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Children's Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building &amp; Producing Effective Radio Programs (5 Speakers)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong></td>
<td><strong>INSTITUTE DINNER</strong></td>
<td>(7:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Special Interest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. High Sch. Radio Workshop</td>
<td>Radio, 1945 - An Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Prog. Network Affiliates</td>
<td>Mental Hygiene Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Veterans Programs</td>
<td>in Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. A Critical Look at Radio Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Radio Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Adult Educ. by Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Thursday, May 5</td>
<td>Friday, May 6</td>
<td>Saturday, May 7</td>
<td>Sunday, May 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>Can Radio Contribute To World Peace?</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>INSTITUTE DINNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>(Work Study)</td>
<td>(1:00-2:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>1. Agricultural Broadcasts</td>
<td>V.O.A. &amp; U.S. Foreign Policy</td>
<td>1. Special Events Programs</td>
<td>1. &quot;75 Years of Educational Service&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Reception for Newsmapers</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
<td>INSTITUTE DINNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4:00-5:30)</td>
<td>(Special Interest)</td>
<td>(Special Interest)</td>
<td>(Special Interest)</td>
<td>(1:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;75 Years of Educational Service&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TV Demonstration</td>
<td>TV Demonstration</td>
<td>TV Demonstration</td>
<td>&quot;75 Years of Educational Service&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Clinic)</td>
<td>(Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>(Panel Discussion)</td>
<td>(Panel Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Clinic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TV Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Future of Broadcasting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM, FM, TV, &amp; FAX (9:30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Future of Broadcasting: Pre-Session Film (7:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM, FM, TV, &amp; FAX (9:30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>What Will Television Do to American Life?</td>
<td>Radio Effectively</td>
<td>What Will Television Do to American Life?</td>
<td>Radio Effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 3-man Panel React.)</td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 6-man Panel React.)</td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 6-man Panel React.)</td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 6-man Panel React.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 4-man Panel React.)</td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 6-man Panel React.)</td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 6-man Panel React.)</td>
<td>(Speech &amp; 6-man Panel React.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Thursday, May 4</td>
<td>Friday, May 5</td>
<td>Saturday, May 6</td>
<td>Sunday, May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Affairs: A Challenge to Broadcasters</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. School Broadcasting</td>
<td>2. Radio News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. TV in Agriculture</td>
<td>3. Clinic for 10-Watt FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadcast Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Training for Broadcasting by Private Schools</td>
<td>4. Radio in Agricultural Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Religious Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Broadcasting by National Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Broadcast by Gov. agen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Informal Reception for Newcomers</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Special Interest)</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Special Interest)</td>
<td>SPECIAL MEETING (12:30) TV Effect on Children (Live TV Broadcast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4:00-5:30)</td>
<td>(2:00)</td>
<td>(2:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3:45)</td>
<td>(3:45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ra. Trng. in Coll. &amp; U.</td>
<td>2. TV Trng. in Coll. &amp; U.</td>
<td>2. TV Trng. in Coll. &amp; U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Magnetic Readg. in Educ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Do We Need a New National Policy for Radio &amp; TV?</td>
<td>Are We Losing our Constitutional Freedoms?</td>
<td>SPECIAL MEETING (6:15) Demonstration of Health Telecast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Symposium)</td>
<td>(Demonstration &amp; Discussion)</td>
<td>Educational Administrators Look at Radio - TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4-man Symposium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Television and the Public Interest (Symposium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, May 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Friday, May 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Saturday, May 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sunday, May 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Broadcasting as Effective Medium for Developing Understanding among Nations</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness of U.N. Broadcasting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voice of America Broadcasting in Japan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Informal Reception for Newcomers</strong> (4:00-5:30)</td>
<td><strong>SPECIAL MEETING</strong> (7:00) INSTITUTE DINNER (7:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. School Broadcasting</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Clinic for 10-Watt Station</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. How Tell the W. N. Story</strong></td>
<td><strong>Demonstration of a School Telecast</strong> (Live Telecast)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Clinic for 10-Watt TV News</strong></td>
<td><strong>3. Clinic for Campus Station</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Bundy Audiences</strong></td>
<td><strong>TV: An Opportunity and a Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Health Information</strong></td>
<td><strong>6. Religious Broadcasting</strong></td>
<td><strong>4. Pa. Writing &amp; Production</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact of TV from various Age Levels (Discussion)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Reception for Newcomers</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. TV Writing &amp; Production</strong></td>
<td><strong>6. Children's Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>ANNUAL ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Bundy Audiences</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Teaching with TV &amp; Tape</strong></td>
<td><strong>3. Educational Stations in an Emergency</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Developments in TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Thursday, April 17</td>
<td>Friday, April 18</td>
<td>Saturday, April 19</td>
<td>Sunday, April 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre C.I - New Mass Media</td>
<td>concurrent meetings (educational)</td>
<td>concurrent meetings (educational)</td>
<td>concurrent meetings (educational)</td>
<td>concurrent meetings (educational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre Owners' Viewpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State U.</td>
<td>reception to the institute (4:00)</td>
<td>concurrent meetings</td>
<td>concurrent meetings (special interest)</td>
<td>concurrent meetings (special interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Radio Problems of Teacher Training Sht.</td>
<td>2. High School Radio-TV Workshops</td>
<td>2. Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Type Teaching Progress</td>
<td>5. Techs. in News TV News</td>
<td>5. Training for Educ. by Professional Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of TV From</td>
<td>institute dinner (5:30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural &amp; Educational Possibilities of TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of TV Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration of &quot;The Standard Hour&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming (Symposium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td>Tribute to Late</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. W. Charters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Use Civil Defense Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness of Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Thursday, April 16</td>
<td>Friday, April 17</td>
<td>Saturday, April 18</td>
<td>Sunday, April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Work Study)</td>
<td>Subscription TV (film)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>1. Organized Listener Qps.</td>
<td>1. TV Training in Coll. &amp; U.</td>
<td><strong>SUPERVISIGN ETV (10:00)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Agricultural TV Broadcasts</td>
<td>5. Clinic for Campus Sta.</td>
<td>Subscription TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. NCP Broadcasting</td>
<td>8. News Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>POST-CONFERENCE (12:45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception to the</td>
<td></td>
<td>How to Get More Teachers (Live TV Program)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4:07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Special Interest)</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong> (Special Interest)</td>
<td><strong>POST-CONFERENCE</strong> (12:45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>1. Progress Report in Sch. Telecasting</td>
<td>1. Building &amp; Holding Audiences</td>
<td>How to Get More Teachers (Live TV Program)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Communications Research</td>
<td>2. Systematic Instr. by TV Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Educ. thru Commer. Sta.</td>
<td>3. High Cable Radi &amp; TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ETV Abroad</td>
<td>4. Common. Coord. in ETV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3:45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. PA. Writing &amp; Production</td>
<td>1. Meeting, In Coll. Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Meeting, to Foreign Countries</td>
<td>2. Children's Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Film Production for ETV</td>
<td>3. Educational TV Sta.</td>
<td>Training Institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Educ. thru Commer. TV Sta.</td>
<td>4. Simple Techniques in ETV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Inauguration of TV Education Meetings</td>
<td>The Role of Educational Communications in Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Rules Safeguarding Witness &amp; Broadcasting? (3-man Symposium)</td>
<td>The Role of Educational Communications in Society</td>
<td><strong>INSTITUTE DINNER</strong> (7:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 7</td>
<td>Thursday, April 8</td>
<td>Friday, April 9</td>
<td>Saturday, April 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)</td>
<td>Local Educ. TV Programming (Demo. &amp; Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Religious Meeting.</td>
<td>2. Religious Meeting.</td>
<td>2. Religious Meeting.</td>
<td>(Work Study) (9:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Clinic for 10-Watt College Stations</td>
<td>5. Clinic for ETV</td>
<td>5. Clinic for ETV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. How to use TV in Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ohio State University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reception to the Institute</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(4:00)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Special Interest) (2:00)</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Special Interest) (2:00)</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Special Interest) (2:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outlook for Broadcasting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Role of Internal Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>World Air Waves to Peace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NAB Internatl. Exchg. Prog.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Common Obj. of Educ. &amp;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prog. Viewed by &quot; Outsider&quot; Broadcasting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local Educ. TV Programming (Demo. &amp; Discussion)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clinic for Campus Stats.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 12</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 13</td>
<td>Thursday, April 14</td>
<td>Friday, April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Anniversary Reception (4:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5 (Contd.)**

**Theme: Building for the Next 25 Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Tuesday, April 12</th>
<th>Wednesday, April 13</th>
<th>Thursday, April 14</th>
<th>Friday, April 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Anniversary Reception (4:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme: The Role of Serious Broadcasting in Today's World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Tuesday, April 17</th>
<th>Wednesday, April 18</th>
<th>Thursday, April 19</th>
<th>Friday, April 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>broadcasting in Other Countries (4:15)</td>
<td>Economies of Broadcast</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>Keynote 15 Discussion Groups</td>
<td>SPECIAL MEETING</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>Keynote 15 Discussion Groups</td>
<td>Educational Television</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institute Reception (4:00)**

**Concurrent Meetings (Clips)**

**Conference Summary**

**Keynote The Role of Serious Broadcasting in Today's World**

**The Educational Need Factor**
### Table 5 (Contd.)

**Theme: Great Issues in Broadcasting, 1957**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 8</th>
<th>Thursday, May 9</th>
<th>Friday, May 10</th>
<th>Saturday, May 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Conference Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Teaching by Television</td>
<td><strong>Concurrent Meetings</strong> (Clinics)</td>
<td><strong>Concurrent Meetings</strong> (Clinics)</td>
<td>Educational Television for Specific Audiences (Demonstration &amp; Discussion) (10:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two College Approaches</td>
<td>2. Coll. Teachers of Broadcasting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two School Approaches</td>
<td>3. Broadcasting by Call Org.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-man Panel Reaction</td>
<td>4. News Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Children's Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Student Radio Activ's.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Communications Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Training TV Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Youth Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Concurrent Sessions</strong></th>
<th>The Bcaster &amp; the Audience</th>
<th><strong>Concurrent Sessions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Concurrent Sessions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Annual Institute Reception</strong> (4:00-5:30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Knowledge About Audiences</td>
<td>Internat. Broadcasting in a Cold War</td>
<td>Hungarian Uprising</td>
<td>The Institute, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implications for Bcasters.</td>
<td>Role of International Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td>What Happened, 1946-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Panel Discussion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility of Broadcasters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Annual Institute Reception</strong> (4:00-5:30)</th>
<th><strong>Institute Dinner</strong> (7:00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio in a Television Age</td>
<td>Where Do We Go From Here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Radio</td>
<td>Commercial Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commercial Radio</td>
<td>Educational Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Educational Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Serv. Respon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Monday, May 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITV at College Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress at Hangestown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neb. TV-Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Instruct. Uses of Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What Have We Learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About Utilization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2. Instruct. Uses of TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Role of the Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSTITUTE RECEPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4:30-6:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 P.M.</td>
<td>The Educational Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-man Critique Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controversial Subjects &amp; Educational Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-man Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSTITUTE LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST CONFERENCE SESSION (12:15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Study of an Educa-Mass Media and the American National Television Station Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1:00-4:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What Kind of America Wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free Afternoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5 (Cont'd.)**

1958

Theme: Broadcasting: First Aid in the Educational Crisis
TABLE 5 (Contd.)

1959

Theme: Broadcasting's Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 6</th>
<th>Thursday, May 7</th>
<th>Friday, May 8</th>
<th>Saturday, May 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEWCOMER'S SESSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Introduction Speeches *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Concurrent Discussion Groups on Special Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSUES DAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whither Educational Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Future of ETV *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Allocations Picture *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Educ. (5-man Panel) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS DAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awards Winners Symposium (10:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Work Study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prof. Educ. in Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communications Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Religious Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Listener-Viewer Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td>INSTITUTE LUNCH (12:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTE RECEPTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructional TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Back to School Telecasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creative Pub. Ser. Prog. (3:45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTE RECEPTION</strong></td>
<td>Implications (6-man Panel) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-6:00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New Ra. Prog. Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An Organization Serves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Filmed TV Documentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEYNOTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming Remarks *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Broadcasting's Social Responsibility *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT

AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT

AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT

AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour A.M.</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 4</th>
<th>Thursday, May 5</th>
<th>Friday, May 6</th>
<th>Saturday, May 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>NEWCOMERS SESSION</td>
<td>Freedom &amp; Responsibility in Broadcasting (4-man Symposium)</td>
<td>CONCURRENT MEETINGS (Awards Clinic)</td>
<td>CCTV in Industry, Medicine and the Military (Presentation &amp; 3-man Panel Discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>PRE-CONFERENCE MEETING</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSIONS</td>
<td>RADIO LUNCH (12:00)</td>
<td>Freedom &amp; Responsibility in Radio Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>KEYNOTE</td>
<td>Laws, Codes or Czars? (4-man Symposium)</td>
<td>30TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER (7:00)</td>
<td>&quot;You Might Call It a Scrapbook&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Laws, Codes or Czars? (4-man Symposium)</td>
<td>&quot;You Might Call It a Scrapbook&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme: Freedom & Responsibility in Broadcasting**

1960
### TABLE 5 (Contd.)

**1961**

**Theme: Broadcasting for American Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Wednesday, April 26</th>
<th>Thursday, April 27</th>
<th>Friday, April 28</th>
<th>Saturday, April 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEWCOMERS SESSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT SESSIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT MEETINGS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Introduction Speeches *</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Accomplishing Spiritual Goals through Broadcasting</td>
<td>(Special Interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>10 Special Interest Discussion Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Training of On-Camera Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPE-CONFERENCE MEETING</td>
<td>RADIO LUNCH (12:15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Tour of O.S.U. TV Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSIONS (2:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished Goals thru Radio</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstration of Large-Class Use of a TV Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Special Quality of Canadian Broadcasting</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td>2. Use of TV in Military &amp; Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Tour of O.S.U. TV Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Future of TV Drama *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSTITUTE RECEPTION (4:30-6:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEYNOTE DINNER (7:00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplishing International Goals thru Broadcasting</td>
<td>INSTITUTE DINNER (6:15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks *</td>
<td></td>
<td>Government's Role in Educational &amp; Cultural Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 F.M.</td>
<td>Goals for Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadcasting in Newly Developed Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O.S. AWARDS DOCUMENTARY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 2</th>
<th>Thursday, May 3</th>
<th>Friday, May 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>The Impact of Technology on Education</td>
<td>COCONCURRNT MEETINGS (Special Interest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title VII in Perspective</td>
<td>1. Network Transmission Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Media Council</td>
<td>2. Training Program for Ra.-TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEA Technical Development</td>
<td>3. Credit Courses on TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. What's New in School Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 P.M.</td>
<td>COCKTAIL PARTY (5:00-6:00)</td>
<td>IERT LUNCH (12:15)</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS IN THE SPACE AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Educational Media Study Panel</td>
<td>MPATI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>KEYNOTE</td>
<td>INSTITUTE DINNER (6:45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Television Legislation</td>
<td>Opportunities for TV in a Technological Age</td>
<td>Space &amp; Satellites - Technical Promise of the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Reaction Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 12</td>
<td>Thursday, June 13</td>
<td>Friday, June 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Perspectives on Community Needs (3 Speakers)</td>
<td>Research &amp; the Broadcaster (4 Speakers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td>PRE-CONFERENCE SESSION</td>
<td>The Anatomy of a Program</td>
<td>INSTITUTE LUNCH (12:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ETV Facilities Act *</td>
<td>Community Case Study TV Program &quot;Burden of Shame&quot;</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The FCC All-Channel Committee *</td>
<td>Discussion with Resource Panel</td>
<td>AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT (Report &amp; Commentary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>KEYNOTE</td>
<td>The Anatomy of a Program</td>
<td>INSTITUTE BANQUET (6:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Perspectives, A Colloquium</td>
<td>A Network Study TV Program &quot;The Tunnel&quot;</td>
<td>Speaker-Howard K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Educator The Producer The Critic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme: The Program: The Heart of Broadcasting
### TABLE 5 (Contd.)

#### 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Tuesday, May 26</th>
<th>Wednesday, May 27</th>
<th>Thursday, May 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td><strong>New Spaces for Learning</strong> (3 Speakers)</td>
<td>Radio Re-Discovered</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>New Concepts in Programming</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>New Concepts in Production</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Educational Communications System</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Drama ala CBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRE-CONFERENCE MEETING**

- **The ABC's of ETV**
- Means to an End
- U.S. Public Policy on International Mass Media

**NAEB-IERT LUNCH (12:00)**

- (3 Speakers)

**2:00 P.M.**

- 2500 Mg. Fixed Service
- ETV Facilities Report
- Instructional Broadcasting Division, NAEB

**KEYNOTE**

- Welcoming Remarks
- *

**8:00 P.M.**

- ETV-Promise Still to Come
- 3-man Reaction Panel

**AWARDS DINNER**

- (1 Speaker)

- AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 2</th>
<th>Thursday, June 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Educational Media's Obligations for Specialized Education beyond the Campus and the Classroom (4 Speakers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Commercial Media's Obligation for General Public Education (3 Speakers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Broadcasting: Vitalize or Tranquilize</td>
<td>Speaker: Sander Vanocur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio State University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogen, Paul L. (Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosworth, Roger D. (Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrows, Robert B. (Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon, Dean C. (Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters, W. W. (Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabbe, John C. (Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope, Jamie A. (Secretary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrow, Ben H. (Dir. Ohio School of the Air)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing, William H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Program Dir., WOSU)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guba, Egon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dir., Bur. of Educ. Research)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heimlich, Friel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Program Dir., WOSU)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgy, Robert C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Manager, WEAO)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holton, Constance M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secretary)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy, T. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dir., Bur. of Educ. Research)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, Richard B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dir., Radio-TV)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbert, Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spvr., Ohio Schl. of Air)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, E. E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley, F. Hillis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley, F. Hillis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, James E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prof., Speech Dept.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mall, Richard M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prof., Speech Dept.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisonger, Herschel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chm., U. Radio Educ. Comm.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood, Frank W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettegrew, C. Wilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Program Dir., WOSU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Tracey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secretary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralls, M. Margarite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secretary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, William H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochte, Newton C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sill, Van Rensselaer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asst. Director)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley, Raymond J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acting Director)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summers, Harrison B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prof., Speech Dept.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler, I. Kieth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Director)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Paul H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Radio Advisory Comm.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallach, Bette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secretary)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch, Patrick E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asst. Director)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler, Ardis H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secretary)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Byron B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Program Dir., WOSU)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woelfel, Norman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Assoc. Dir., Bdcst. Eval.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year 1930</td>
<td>Year 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstone, J. Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Assoc. Dir., Eval. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schl. Bdcsts.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeager, W. Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chm., Speech Dept.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuber, Joan E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secretary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albinger, Al (WCOL)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beavers, William (WCOL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beebout, George (WHKC)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borel, Richard (WBNS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronson, Edward (WCOL)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Mrs. Clyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donohue, Howard (WCOL)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Irwin (WBNS)</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses, John (WHKC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith, William (WRFD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Representation

Bachman, John
(Union Theol. Seminary) X

Bartlett, Kenneth
(TV Broadcasters Assoc.) X X X

Bell, Richard H.
(Dir., Radio-TV,
Ariz. St. College) X X X

Benson, Mitchell
(TV Prog. Mgr.,
Westinghouse) X X

Berns, Karl
(Asst. Sec., Ohio
Educ. Assoc.) X

Blakley, Robert J.
(Mgr., Central Regions
Fund for Adult Educ.) X X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broderick, Gertrude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Assoc. for Educ. by Radio-TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codel, Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Consultant, TV Digest)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crothers, George D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CBS)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Franklin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chief, Radio-TV, U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Educ.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop, John W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dir., Internatl. Exch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC, Toronto)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Herbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pres., Peoples Bdcst. Corp.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair, Harold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAB)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatow, Natalie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Girl Scouts)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming, Marguerite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mgr., KSLH, St. Louis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Robert S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FM Assoc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein, Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Radio-TV Consultant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrigus, Fred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NARTB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Educ. TV &amp; Radio Ctr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hance, Wiley F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mgr., Public Affairs, ABC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy, Ralph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley, William G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pres., NAEB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinemann, George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mgr., Public Affairs, NBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hester, Harriet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Radio Coordinator, AMA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heffner, Richard D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dir., Spec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects, CBS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Harold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAEB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins, Luella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Assoc. of Jr. Leagues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A.E.R.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Eugene H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prog. Mgr., V.O.A.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lardie, Kathleen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mgr., WDTR &amp; WTIVS,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Public Schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks, Leonard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cohn &amp; Marks, Wash. D.C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Leo A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pres., AERT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, Robert T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pres. &amp; Gen. Mgr.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMRN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy, Lois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Council of Natl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations, A.E.A.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaney, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dir., Educ. Media,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Office of Educ.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niven, Harold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novik, M. S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Radio-TV Consultant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V.P. Programs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westinghouse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulu, Burton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAEB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuller, Charles F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pres., D.A.V.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherburne, Edward G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Consultant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skornia, Harry J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAEB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steetle, Ralph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exec. Dir., JCET)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, Alec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dir. Broadcasting, U. of Chicago)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton, Basil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyson, Levering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N.A.C.R.E.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X indicates participation in that year.
### TABLE 6 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller, Judith C.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Public Affairs, NBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, John F.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pres., NET)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman, Raymond</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TV Committee, D.A.V.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zook, George F.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Amer. Council on Educ.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total O.S.U. Participants      | 125 75 15 55 57 6 5 6 7 6 0 7 7 54 4 4 3 3 3 3 4 3 3 3 9 8 9 9 |
| Total Local Participants       | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 3 3 0 3 3 4 2 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| Total National Participants    | 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 7 6 0 0 0 9 1 3 B 1 7 B 1 5 B 1 5 |
| Grand Total                    | 2 2 5 7 5 3 5 5 5 8 8 8 9 D 9 0 D D 9 4 B 1 2 3 3 3 1 2 5 1 6 2 1 2 2 5 2 5 2 5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Association of College and University Broadcast Stations (ACUBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>ACUBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>ACUBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>National Advisory Council on Radio in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Broadcasters (NAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Teachers of Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Institute of Oral and Visual Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Broadcasting Company (NBC) Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Fifth School Broadcast Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Oral and Visual Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>CBS Affiliates (cont'd) NAB NAEB NBC Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Sixth School Broadcast Conference Association for Education by Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AER) Blue Network Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBS Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago Radio Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAB NAEB NBC Affiliates Radio Council for Children's Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>AER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago School Broadcast Conference Association of Women Directors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBS Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus English Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAB NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>AER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Women Directors, NAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Network Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campfire Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago School Broadcast Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus Association for Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus English Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Broadcasting System (MBS) Network NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Radio Farm Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBC Affiliates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies Association of Central Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1946 | American Broadcasting Company (ABC) Network  
       | AER  
       | Alpha Epsilon Rho  
       | American College Publicity Association  
       | Association of Women Directors, NAB  
       | Campfire Girls  
       | CBS Network  
       | Chicago School Broadcast Conference  
       | Council on Radio Journalism  
       | Institute for Democratic Education  
       | Junior Town Meeting League  
       | MBS Network  
       | NAEB  
       | National Association of Radio Farm Directors  
       | NBC Network  
       | Radio Directors Guild  
       | Social Studies Association of Central Ohio  
       | Television Broadcasters' Association, Inc. |
| 1947 | ABC Network  
       | AER  
       | Alpha Epsilon Rho  
       | CBS Network  
       | Chicago School Broadcast Conference  
       | Educational Film Library Association  
       | Institute for Democratic Education  
       | Intercollegiate Broadcasting System (IBS)  
       | Junior Town Meeting League  
       | MBS Network  
       | NAEB  
       | National Association of Radio Farm Directors  
       | National Association of Radio News Directors  
       | National Religious Radio Association |
| 1948 | ABC Network  
       | AER  
       | Alpha Epsilon Rho  
       | Association of Women Broadcasters  
       | Chicago School Broadcast Conference  
<pre><code>   | Community Radio Exchange |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Extension and Land Grant College Agricultural Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute for Democratic Education, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Council of Religious Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBS Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Radio Farm Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Radio News Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Religious Radio Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBC Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Association of Radio News Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Directors Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Writers Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. National Committee for UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>AER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Association for Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute for Democratic Education, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Radio Farm Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBC Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Association of Radio News Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Council Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. National Commission for UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>AER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Allocation of Educational Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Association for Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Association of Radio News Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1951 | AER  
Alpha Epsilon Rho  
IBS  
Junior Town Meeting League  
NAEB  
University Association for Professional Radio Education |
| 1952 | Association for Education by Radio-Television (AERT)  
Alpha Epsilon Rho  
IBS  
Junior Town Meeting League  
NAEB  
National Association of Radio News Directors  
New York Times Youth Forum  
Ohio Radio News Editors |
| 1953 | AERT  
Alpha Epsilon Rho  
Association of Junior Leagues of America, Inc.  
IBS  
Junior Town Meeting League  
NAEB  
Ohio Association of Radio and Television News Editors  
University Association for Professional Radio Education |
| 1954 | AERT  
Alpha Epsilon Rho  
American Council for Better Broadcasts (ACBB)  
Association of Junior Leagues, Inc.  
IBS  
Joint Committee on Education Television (JCET)  
Junior Town Meeting League  
NAEB |
| 1955 | AERT  
Alpha Epsilon Rho  
ACBB  
Association of Junior Leagues, Inc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League (cont'd)</td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>AERT</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American Association of University Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Junior Leagues, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus English Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Television and Radio Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio College Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>AERT</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Educational Telecasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Regional Education Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
<td>ACBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Junior Leagues of America, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Town Meeting League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Council for Educational Television</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
<td>ACBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Junior Leagues of America, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic Industries Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
<td>ACBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Rho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACBB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Junior Leagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>ACBB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>ACBB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>ACBB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>ACBB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Station or Network</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>6/30 WEAO</td>
<td>Current Events Lesson (H. Sayre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/8 WEAO</td>
<td>Geography Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/8 WEAO</td>
<td>Social-Science Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>5/7 NBC</td>
<td>Radio's Part in the Creation of an Intelligent Electorate, Robert Millikan (from Calif.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>5/4 NBC (Red)</td>
<td>Band Lesson (J. Maddy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>5/2 NBC (Red)</td>
<td>&quot;Radio in a Democracy&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4/28 WBNS</td>
<td>Interviews about the Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/29 MBS</td>
<td>Discussion of Program Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/30 MBS</td>
<td>Discussion of Workshop Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5/4 MBS</td>
<td>Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, (&quot;What Americans Think About the War&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>5/4 NBC</td>
<td>&quot;Radio Education in National Defense&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/5 Blue</td>
<td>Testimonial to Walter Damrosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>5/1 CBS</td>
<td>Of Men and Books (American Humor in Wartime Reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/2 MBS</td>
<td>Northwestern University Reviewing Stand (&quot;America After the War&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/2 NBC</td>
<td>University of Chicago Round-Table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Station or Network</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>E.O.A. Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1944 5/4</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>America's Town Meeting of the Air (&quot;Does Youth Want Social Security from the Cradle to the Grave&quot;), Developing Democracy Through Radio Discussions</td>
<td>pp. 149-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Invitation to Learning (Defoe's Robinson Crusoe)</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946 5/3</td>
<td>WOSU</td>
<td>International Junior Town Meeting and BBC &quot;What Does Youth Think of World Government?&quot;</td>
<td>p. 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Country Journal</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Invitation to Learning</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>American Farmer</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>Our Foreign Policy &quot;The Role of International Information Services&quot;</td>
<td>p. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>The People's Platform &quot;Would Government Supervision Improve Radio Programs?&quot;</td>
<td>p. 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>University of Chicago Round-Table &quot;The Implications of Atomic Energy&quot;</td>
<td>p. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>MBS</td>
<td>Northwestern University Reviewing Stand &quot;The Role of the School in Society&quot;</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947 5/2</td>
<td>MBS</td>
<td>Meet the Press &quot;Interview of Commissioner Clifford Durr&quot;</td>
<td>p. 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>University of Chicago Round-Table &quot;The Social Responsibilities of Radio&quot;</td>
<td>p. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>MBS</td>
<td>Special Program &quot;Is Radio Meeting the Needs of Our Children&quot;</td>
<td>p. 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948 5/2</td>
<td>WBNS</td>
<td>Columbus Town Meeting &quot;Should the FCC have any Control over Programs?&quot;</td>
<td>p. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Station or Network</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>E.O.A. Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5/5 WLWC</td>
<td>Special TV Program (Institute Reception)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7 WOSU</td>
<td>Special General Session Program, &quot;Can Radio Contribute to World Peace&quot;</td>
<td>pp. 101-134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8 WOSU</td>
<td>Annual Institute Dinner, &quot;Education by Radio at the Crossroads&quot;</td>
<td>pp. 375-396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>5/5 DuMont</td>
<td>The Court of Current Issues, &quot;Are We Losing Our Constitutional Freedoms?&quot;</td>
<td>p. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6 WBNS-TV</td>
<td>Demonstration of Health Telecast, &quot;Guardians of Your Sleep&quot;</td>
<td>p. 377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7 WBNS-TV</td>
<td>Columbus Town Meeting of the Air, &quot;What is Television Doing to Our Children?&quot;</td>
<td>p. 175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>5/4 WBNS-TV</td>
<td>Demonstration of Instructional TV, &quot;Teletown Express&quot;</td>
<td>p. 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>4/8 WTVN-TV</td>
<td>Demonstration of New Jersey, &quot;Junior Town Meeting&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10 WBNS-TV</td>
<td>Broadcast of Selected Educational Programs: &quot;On the Carousel&quot; &quot;The Adventures of Danny Dee&quot; &quot;Teens and Twenties&quot; &quot;Curtain Going Up&quot; &quot;Here's How!&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4/13 WOSU and CBS</td>
<td>Demonstration of Inter-Area Youth Discussion, &quot;Youth Looks to the Future&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5/5 WOSU-TV and NBC</td>
<td>Briefing Session, &quot;Communication in an Election Year&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4/28 WOSU-TV and CBS</td>
<td>Ohio State Awards Documentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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