

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CODE OF STANDARDS
AND PRACTICES OF THE UNIVERSITY
BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO

Thesis for the Degree of M.A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
HOWARD M. SIRINSKY
1984



ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CODE OF STANDARDS AND PRACTICES OF THE UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO

by Howard M. Sirinsky

The University Broadcasting Association of Chicago (hereinafter designated as TUBA) has varied in membership from eleven to six of the institutions of higher education in the Chicago area which participate in educational, informational, and public affairs programs over the commercial television stations and the educational television channel in that area. It was formed in 1957 to act as an advisory group to these stations on educational broadcasting, to insure maximal employment of the educational channel in the interests of higher education, and to elevate the standards of educational and public service broadcasting. In attempting to achieve this last purpose, the association has pooled the resources of its members in joint productions of television series when such cooperation has promised to insure better presentation. It has also formulated a Code of Standards and Practices, which states what TUBA believes to be the responsibilities of educators and stations towards each other and towards the public, then declares certain conditions as necessary for educational, informational, and public affairs programs to be of maximum value.

Howard M. Sirinsky

Without presuming to present a detailed history of the association, this study begins by explaining the circumstances which gave rise to the formation of the association and its code. It then reproduces the code and extracts from related documents. Lastly, it attempts to assess how far TUBA has succeeded in achieving the standards and practices delineated in its code.

The study is based on documents in the records of the association and on interviews conducted during 1963 with past and present member-representatives of the association and broadcasting station officials who have had dealings with the association.

These sources reveal that TUBA has been involved with a number of difficult questions, such as: How can one reconcile the aims of educators with the interests of commercial stations--or even those of an educational community station? How can public acceptance of educational programs be increased? How can the resources of institutions of higher learning be organized and encouraged to produce effective educational television programs? When institutions of different aims and capabilities band together in a broadcasting effort, can such a union succeed, and to what extent? Such are the problems which are reflected either in the tenets of TUBA's code or in its attempt to implement those tenets in actual practice. The aim of this study is to illuminate the problems, not to attain solutions for them. As TUBA has learned through its experience, some of these solutions may be a long time coming.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CODE OF STANDARDS
AND PRACTICES OF THE UNIVERSITY
BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO

By

Howard M. Sirinsky

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Television and Radio

1964

Calby Lewis

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer wishes to express his thanks to the interviewees referred to throughout this study without whose help this thesis could not have been written. I give special thanks to James Taylor of DePaul University for his continued encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF APPENDICES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Representatives, Past and Present, of TUBA's Member Institutions	
Chapter	
I. THE BACKGROUND OF THE CODE	7
The Conferences	
First Meeting	
The Problem of Favorable Time	
The Problem of Faculty Compensation	
The Problem of More "Lively" and "Attractive" Performances	
The Problem of Taboos	
The Problem of Initiative in Programming	
Suggested Solutions to the Problems	
II. THE CODE	28
The Stated Purposes of TUBA	
Text of the Code	
TUBA's FCC Testimony	
III. METHODS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS	36
Original Committees	
TUBA and Telecourses	
Treatment by the Commercial Stations	
Joint Programming	
TUBA's Presentation Skills	
The Withdrawal of Two TUBA Members	
Reasons for the Withdrawal	
TUBA Present and Future	
APPENDICES	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY	121

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
I. TENTATIVE PLANS FOR A PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FOR THE CHICAGO AREA	63
II. PROGRAM OF THE FOURTH ANNUAL CHICAGO AREA COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE	68
III. RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE FOURTH ANNUAL CHICAGO AREA COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE	72
IV. NOTES ON THE INITIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING COMMITTEE	75
V. TUBA'S BY-LAWS	81
VI. SAMPLE MINUTES OF TUBA MEETINGS	87
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER "MEETING OF MINDS"	96
VIII. PARTIAL LIST OF TUBA SERIES	100
IX. NEWS RELEASE CONCERNING THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO'S WITHDRAWAL FROM TUBA	119

INTRODUCTION

On March 19, 1962, the Federal Communications Commission began a hearing in Chicago, Illinois, to evaluate how well broadcasting stations in that area were serving community needs. Among the organizations which testified at this hearing was TUBA--The University Broadcasting Association. What this association is and what it stands for was summarized in testimony presented to the Commission by the president of TUBA, Donald P. Anderson, on March 20, 1962. He began by explaining that:

The University Broadcasting Association of Chicago represents the eight major colleges and universities in the Chicago area. They are DePaul University, Illinois Institute of Technology, Lake Forest College, Loyola University, Northwestern University, Roosevelt University, The University of Chicago, and the University of Illinois. We are a voluntary organization of the broadcasting representatives of these institutions. It is our united aim to improve the quality of educational, informational and cultural broadcasts and, thereby, better serve our institutions, the broadcasting stations, and the public. . .

Each member institution of the University Broadcasting Association participates in broadcasting activities independently in order best to serve its individual needs, strengths, and goals. The Association participates in broadcasting activities through the production of programs and series when our combined resources can insure better presentation. We believe there is no field of intellectual and professional importance in which we, having combined our resources of physical equipment

and some 9,000 experts, specialists, and educators,¹ cannot provide and produce programs of distinct value.

Mr. Anderson proceeded to comment that broadcasting stations should regard their public service obligations as at least equal in importance to their financial profit. Then he cited several conditions which his association had determined as necessary for educational, informational, and cultural programs to be of maximum value.

These conditions were essentially derived from TUBA's Code of Standards and Practices, which had been formulated during the previous year as a statement of what the association believes necessary to make the voice of higher education more effective on the public airwaves, particularly those reserved for television broadcasting. By many thoughtful persons these airwaves are considered too vast and influential to be devoted exclusively to advertising and entertainment. The voice of higher education, speaking effectively over these airwaves, could do much to further the well being of our society. As a statement of what is considered necessary to strengthen that voice in one of this country's largest cities, TUBA's code would seem to deserve recognition as a subject of study.

The study attempted here will begin by explaining the circumstances which gave rise to the Code. This background, it is hoped, will better prepare the reader to appreciate the Code itself, which will then be presented verbatim, together

¹Testimony of The University Broadcasting Association before the Federal Communications Commission Hearing, March 20, 1962 in TUBA files.

with the abbreviated version of it which Mr. Anderson included in his testimony. Finally, an attempt will be made to assess how far TUBA has succeeded in achieving the standards and practices delineated in its Code.

Let it be noted that the study does not pretend to present a complete history of the organization which authored the Code. Very little has been published about TUBA, and its own records are scanty and full of gaps. Hence, even this limited study has had to depend largely on oral opinion and recollection by persons who have been associated with the organization, mainly either as representatives of its member institutions or as officials of the stations which have carried its programs. There are lapses in their recollections and differences in their opinions. And a much more ambitious task of research would be required to reveal and analyze the intricate and tangled threads of motives and conflicts in the history of the association and to estimate its accomplishments on a basis of firm and complete statistical data.

Enough has emerged from these interviews, however, to expose a number of problems which should be of interest to anyone who is concerned with advancing the cause of educational broadcasting, particularly on the college level. During its existence TUBA has been involved with a series of difficult questions: How can one reconcile the aims of educators with the interests of commercial stations? To what degree can the aims of higher education be accommodated within the program schedule of even a community educational station?

How can public acceptance of educational and public affairs programs be increased? How can the resources of the institutions of higher learning be organized and encouraged to produce effective programs? When institutions of different aims and capabilities band together in a broadcasting effort, can such a union succeed, and to what extent?

Such are the problems which are reflected either in the tenets of TUBA's Code or in its attempt to implement those tenets in actual practice. The aim of this study is to illuminate the problems, not to attain solutions for them. As TUBA has learned through its experience, some of the solutions may be a long time coming.

For providing the information used in this study, the author is grateful to the following consultants, interviewed at various times during 1963:

Representatives, Past and Present, of TUBA's
Member Institutions

Donald Anderson--Director of Public Relations and Broadcasting at Illinois Institute of Technology and, during the research, Secretary of TUBA.

John Buckstaff--Assistant Director of Broadcasting at the University of Chicago, formerly Supervisor of Radio and Television at Illinois Institute of Technology.

Henry Bussey--Director of Radio and Television and Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama at Loyola University of Chicago, and, when the research for this study was conducted, Treasurer of TUBA.

Arlene Byrne--Director of Broadcasting and Assistant Professor of Speech at Lake Forest College and, at the time of the research, Vice-President of TUBA.

Paul Cahill--Manager of the Office of Public Information of the Chicago Division of the University of Illinois.

Henry Knepler--Professor of English and Chairman of the Department of Language, Literature, and Philosophy at Illinois Institute of Technology and formerly its Coordinator of Educational Television.

Alfred Partridge--Supervisor of Broadcasting for the Chicago Division of the University of Illinois until this office was closed in 1963.

Milton Shufro--Director of News and Broadcasting at Roosevelt University.

James Taylor--Director of Television at De Paul University and, during the research, President of TUBA.

Robert Thomas--Producer of Radio and Television Programs at Northwestern University.

Broadcasting Station Officials Who
Have Dealt with TUBA

Allen Burns--Manager of Public Affairs for WNBQ (NBC).

Alexander C. Field, Jr.--Manager of Public Affairs at non-affiliated WGN, Incorporated, which includes radio station WGN and television station WGN-TV.

Hal Fisher--former Director of Public Affairs for WBEM-TV (CBS).

Colby Lewis--former Production Manager for educational

television station WTTW, commonly referred to as Channel 11.

Chalmers H. Marquis, Jr.--Director of Programming for WTTW.

Daniel B. Schuffman--former Program Manager for WEKB (ABC).

Also helpful was Henry Mamet, who has been an interested observer of TUBA activities through his position as member of the Board of Directors of the National Association for Better Radio and Television (NAFBRAT).

The material for this study came from interviews with these persons or from documents supplied by them. For his transcription and interpretation of that material, of course, the author assumes full responsibility.

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF THE CODE

TUBA is a product of the television age. Before television came to Chicago, the various colleges and universities in the metropolitan area had been participating to varying degrees in programs on the commercial radio stations. Two of the universities had even developed notable radio network series, Northwestern University producing its Reviewing Stand and the University of Chicago its Round Table of the Air. But although these network series persisted after the coming of television, participation by all the colleges and universities in local broadcasts shifted decidedly to the new medium, attracted by the shift of audiences to this medium and by the advantages of appealing to sight as well as sound.

During the period covered by this study (the decade from 1954 through 1963), there were four commercial television stations in Chicago: WBBM-TV, WNBQ, WKLB, and WGN-TV--each of which has offered some programming in the nature of local public service, whether motivated by a genuine desire to serve its community or by the more selfish wish to demonstrate at license renewal time that it has been operating in the public interest. For such programming these stations could draw, among other resources, on those of the neighboring

institutions of higher learning, using their faculty members to lend authority to either single programs or program series.

Usually these faculty members came from one or another of eight institutions; which are described below in terms of their enrollments and teaching staffs in 1962:¹

Loyola University, a Jesuit-directed school with 10,140 students and 980 teachers.

De Paul University, controlled by the Vincentian Fathers, with 7,369 students and 324 teachers.

Roosevelt University, non-denominational, with 5,184 students and 276 teachers.

Chicago Division of the University of Illinois, which, including its main campus at Urbana, numbered 34,000 students and a full-time faculty and staff equivalent of more than 10,800.

Illinois Institute of Technology, privately supported, with 6,667 students and 449 teachers.

Lake Forest College, Presbyterian affiliated, with 741 students and a faculty of about 60.

Northwestern University, privately endowed, with 14,310 students and a faculty of 1,935.

The University of Chicago, private institution founded by Baptists, with a teaching faculty of 898 plus 358 research associates and 253 lecturers, serving 5,714 students, a majority of whom are in the graduate divisions.

¹Harry Hansen (ed.), 1962 World Almanac and Book of Facts (New York: New York World Telegram and The Sun, 1962), pp. 516-19, 521, 523.

Although none of these institutions has a Chicago television outlet of its own, each of them has been motivated to reach the public through broadcasting and has designated at least one person on its staff to supervise its broadcasting activities. As will be noted from the list of such persons interviewed for this study, some of the institutions associate their broadcasting with a function variously designated as "news" or "public information" or "public relations," indicating that their motives are not always purely educational. Like many other kinds of organizations, an institution of higher learning must establish and maintain a familiar and favorable image with the segments of the public on which it depends for patronage and support, but it is also true that this image can be strengthened by extending the educational resources of the institution beyond the borders of its campus and that some members of the institution may feel this to be a responsibility apart from whatever image building accrues from it.

Whatever their motives, it will be seen that both the commercial stations and the institutions of higher learning needed something that the other had to offer. So each of the stations solicited assistance from one or another institution, and each of the institutions endeavored to get air time from the stations. This situation was competitive and uncoordinated, and continued so for a number of years until certain problems, which will be identified in due course, suggested to the

institutions the need for some kind of cooperation between them. But this cooperation was not precipitated until the establishment of Chicago's educational station, WTTW, on Channel 11, and the annual Chicago-area conferences on educational broadcasting which began as a result of it.

The Conferences

WTTW is a community television station, operated by the Chicago Educational Television Association. Membership in this association is extensive and varied, including not only all of the degree-granting educational institutions of the area, but also the Chicago Board of Education, quasi-educational institutions such as the Museum of Science and Industry, Field Museum, Art Institute, and Public Library, and other members as various as the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the Cook County Forest Preserve.

By spring, 1954, the association had raised the larger portion of the fund necessary to make the station a reality and was seeking a director for it. This motivated the Illinois Institute of Technology to sponsor a conference on The Role of the Professional Educator in Educational TV. A typescript which outlined the tentative plans for this conference cited the reasons for calling it:

The educational institutions cooperating in the experiment in educational television in Chicago have not yet received any proposals or directives from the Channel 11 Committee regarding the philosophy, objectives, principles of operation, or details of administration of Channel 11. If the Channel 11 Committee leaves such matters to an appointed director and his appointive

staff, it is probable that the institutions involved may find themselves in the role of competitive program brokers, providers of talent, and suppliers of information. They would have little if any opportunity to plan and direct educational TV in this area.¹

In their relations with the commercial stations, the institutions of higher learning already knew what it was to be merely "competitive program brokers, providers of talent, and suppliers of information," with no opportunity to guide the educational program objectives of these stations; but with the advent of an educational station, they hoped to insure a more favorable situation. Hence:

A representative body of delegates from the numerous agencies and institutions now serving the public in an educational capacity, sharing and assimilating its views and ideas, might draw up statements of objectives and concepts that might be of use to those concerned with directing educational TV in this area. Such a body, acting as a kind of constitutional assembly, could draw up a statement of principles and procedures that could serve as a Magna Charta for educational TV in this area. Anyhow such a body could inform itself and become knowledgeable for future developments.²

Although the body met and did indeed inform itself, the recommended "statement of principles and practices"--at least as applying to televised higher education--was not attained until the formulation of TUBA's Code of Standards and Practices. But before there could be a TUBA Code, there first had to be a TUBA, and this did not happen until three more conferences on educational broadcasting had been sponsored under the same auspices.

¹"Tentative Plans for a Preliminary Conference on Educational Television for the Chicago Area," unpublished typescript in possession of Henry Knepler. (See Appendix I of this study.)

²Ibid.

The Fourth Annual Chicago-Area Conference on Educational Radio and Television was held on April 12, 1957, and was attended only by institutions concerned with higher education and by representatives from the five television broadcasting stations.

The fifth station was Channel 11, which by this time had been operating on a regular schedule for about a year and a half. As a not-for-profit, non-commercial enterprise, dependent on contributions for its support, the station's air time was limited to about forty hours weekly. Since this time provided for programs from National Educational Television, programs from various professional and welfare organizations in addition to those from schools, programs of a how-to-do-it nature, and programs intended to serve general needs and persons of limited education, there was limited time for programs by the colleges and universities. Although the station provided transmission and studio facilities, costs of the program package (including compensation for participants) were expected to be met by the producing agencies which brought programs to the station. Bringing these programs to a state of readiness for broadcast entailed agreement between the outside producer and the producer-director assigned from the Channel 11 staff.

Disagreements between these two functionaries were one of the problems on the agenda of the conference. Another subject considered by the conference was the possibility of broadcasting systematic courses for academic credit. There were resolutions passed on both of these subjects by the

conference, but the resolutions most pertinent to this present study were as follows:

The conference believes that there exist subjects which the educational institutions are best fitted to present; that methods of presentation appropriate to broadcasting can be found; and that the institutions have a duty to initiate broadcasts of their choice and desire to take the responsibility for doing so.

The conference recognizes the importance of active participation of educational institutions in radio and television. It urges that the institutions of higher learning which are prominently engaged in Chicago-area broadcasting should appoint two members each to constitute a University Broadcasting Committee. One member from each institution should be drawn from its office responsible for broadcasts, and one from its faculty.¹

The implications of these resolutions will be clarified in due course. Let it be noted here, however, that these resolutions were the "birth certificate" of TUBA. The University Broadcasting Committee which they called into being soon changed its name to The University Broadcasting Association.

First Meeting

The first meeting of the committee was convened at the University of Chicago on May 13, 1957. As will be seen from the minutes of this meeting, reproduced in full as an appendix to this study, the chairman began by expressing the hope that "on the one hand, practical problems involving liaison with the broadcasting stations might be considered, and on the other, that clarification of general educational

¹"Resolutions Passed by the Fourth Annual Chicago Area Educational Radio and Television Conference," April 12, 1957. Mimeographed copy in records of TUBA.

objectives for broadcasters might be achieved."¹ He suggested that "prior to any formal organizational action, the opinions of those present should be elicited with respect to the most pressing needs that could be met by a group of this character." From these opinions, duly given, emerged a roster of the difficulties which the institutions had mutually been experiencing in their uncoordinated relations both with the commercial stations and with Channel 11. It was hoped that these difficulties could be ameliorated through collective action.

The Problem of Favorable Time

Thus, "the collective opinion of the organization, responsibly expressed in the right quarters, might succeed in obtaining more favorable time on commercial stations." This is a problem which often besets public service broadcasters and particularly educational broadcasters on commercial stations. These stations are profit-motivated and make their profits from sponsored programs. It is usually difficult to find sponsors for non-entertainment programs, since these are apt to attract comparatively small audiences. Hence they are liable to be tucked away at times of day in the broadcast schedule which have the least chance of being sold.

An exception may happen when a sponsored program is

¹"Notes on the Initial Meeting of the University Broadcasting Committee," typescript from records of TUBA. All quotations in this section on "First Meeting" are from this source unless otherwise cited.

canceled out before a new sponsor is signed up, leaving a gap which must be filled temporarily. An economical way to bridge this gap and also win credit with the Federal Communications Commission is to offer the time to a public service producer. This practice results in what some members at the committee meeting called "scrappy programming." Such program scraps offer no chance to attract and build a consistent audience from week to week. Furthermore, they may have to be prepared on such short notice that little chance for quality is possible. Yet some of the less favored institutions in the Chicago area would accept short-notice offers rather than none at all. For doing so they were criticized by the more favored institutions, which considered that any educational program of poor production quality reflected adversely on the welfare of educational broadcasting in general.

Another problem faced by the educators was to start broadcasting a series in one time slot and, after a few programs, to have it moved by the station to another time slot. Obviously, this also did nothing to retain audiences.

Yet another problem was that time was assigned by the stations to the educators without seeming to consider the nature of the audience to whom the program was addressed and whether that audience would be able and likely to watch at the time available.

These were problems with commercial stations, but there was a time problem with Channel 11, too. In this instance, it was a matter not of favorable time, but of enough

time in the broadcast schedule. Subtracting network programs, films, and children's and youths' offerings, only eight half hours per week of local live time remained available for an adult audience, and for this time there were many candidates besides the colleges and universities, which, there are grounds to suspect, considered that they had more right to this time than some of the more "low-brow" contenders whose programs showed how to improve one's score at golf or how to bathe a baby.¹

The Problem of Faculty Compensation

Another need expressed at the meeting now being reported was for "a uniform policy on released time and payment of academic talent." This problem had a direct bearing on another matter which had been on the agenda of the recent conference: "Increase of general faculty interest in broadcasting." An educational program is only as good as the faculty members who can be induced to participate in it, and if the proper authorities for a contemplated topic cannot be secured, either the program must be inadequate or abandoned as impossible of realization.

The university broadcasting people knew that professors were apt to regard broadcasting as an extracurricular activity in which they were not required by their contracts to participate. Some of them might be induced to participate

¹Interview with Colby Lewis, Production Manager of Channel 11 at the time of the first meeting of the University Broadcasting Committee, June 10, 1964.

if their institutions, when considering them for advances in rank or salary, would give as much weight to their broadcasting activity as to their scholarly publications in the print media, or if their institutions would pay extra stipends for their broadcast appearances, or release them from some of their academic duties for the amount of time necessary to prepare and present their broadcast material. But it is difficult to induce an administration to make such concessions. The faculty members most often wanted for television appearances are likely to be the ones least easily spared from their academic pursuits. The period during which a given faculty member might be released is rarely foreseeable far enough in advance to make adequate plans for replacing him, nor is it apt to coincide with the duration of academic courses. (It is not easy to spare an instructor from a portion of a course; once he has started it, he should carry it to completion.) As for extra stipends, the funds for these are hard to come by--and why should such payment come from the university when the professor is obliging a commercial station which pays other kinds of performers for their services?

As might be expected, the commercial stations view this matter in a different light. True, they are obliged to pay entertainers and announcers according to their union contracts, but these persons, by and large, are appearing on sponsored programs and earning money for the station. With unsponsored public service programs, however, the stations are donating valuable studio and transmission facilities and

receiving no income in return. The colleges and universities are not on television merely to oblige the stations. They are getting needed publicity. They are--or should be--on the air to give the public something that they should be giving in line with their function as educational institutions. As for their faculty members, they are not exactly underpaid these days, and for a station to pay them for a one-time appearance an amount which may equal their weekly salary seems to be getting somewhat out of line.¹

Despite this path of reasoning, however, some faculty members were being paid for their appearances on commercial stations, but there was no consistency about the practice. The only consistency existed on Channel 11, where they were never paid.

The Problem of More "Lively" and
"Attractive" Performances

When one delegate to the meeting suggested "the compilation of an index of the personnel resources of the various institutions," another delegate recommended that "any such compilation should take into account not only academic attainment, but the capacity for lucid and attractive radio and television performance." A third delegate urged that the committee consider "ways in which liveliness and charm can be augmented in educational programs."

With these observations about attractiveness, liveliness, and charm, the delegates showed their awareness of the

¹Interview with Alexander C. Field, Jr., Manager of Public Affairs, WGN, Inc., February 12, 1963.

problem that educational programs must be made interesting to their audiences. Certainly, this problem seems very real to commercial stations, which worry lest the dullness of a public service program lose audience for the sponsored program that follows it. The problem was also of concern to Channel 11. Some of the aforementioned disagreements between Channel 11 producer-directors and the educational institution producers arose from the station's accusation that the institutional programs had not been constructed to arouse and maintain audience attention and that their participants were unused to the medium and not sufficiently rehearsed.¹

There is a tendency on the part of broadcasting people to regard educational presentations as "shows," whereas teachers regard them as education. Because education must be honest and thorough, it cannot make irresponsible use of emotional appeals and rhetorical devices and it cannot oversimplify its subject matter. Because the act of becoming educated requires assimilation and mastery of the subject by the student, it demands some work on the part of the audience, which cannot be altogether spoon fed by the instructor. So the faculty member who appears on television has good reason to protest that he is a teacher and not an entertainer.

But before broadcast audiences can be educated, they must first be induced to tune in and stay tuned in. And it was the hope of Channel 11 that many persons who were unused to the rigorous disciplines of education might have their

¹Interview with Colby Lewis, June 10, 1964.

latent intellectual curiosity aroused and their will to learn stimulated by programs which were skillfully enough constructed and presented to accomplish these objectives. Like those of the commercial stations, the audiences of Channel 11 were not captive like students in a classroom, but were only potential viewers who had to be collected and won over by the interest values of the station's productions.

Some of these interest values result from proper adaptation of the production to the television medium. Since this medium addresses the eyes as well as the ears, it would seem to require a constant variety of meaningful stimuli in the material which it presents. Many professors, however, are less inclined to visual expression than to talking, either by lecture or discussion. Sometimes, therefore, it seems needful to adapt their material to television by incorporating non-verbal communication, coaching them in physical business and movements which, besides adding change to the production in their own right, will also motivate camera movement and shot changes. This may, however, provoke the professors to proclaim that they are not performers or else that they lack the time to make the proposed adaptations.

Their protest may sometimes also be motivated by a reluctance to lose some of their independence. Many professors are accustomed to autonomy and to working by themselves. They are not used to getting scripts in early or being told by someone else where to stand, how to move, and how to speak. They find their natural style of expression hampered and

compromised by having to conform to the alleged technical requirements of the medium.

If their material is adapted to the medium, the result may be a production sufficiently elaborate to demand advance cooperation from station directors, advance preparation of materials by station production personnel, and more facilities rehearsal time than a commercial station may be willing to devote to a program which brings it no revenue. As a rule, according to TUBA members interviewed for this study, an unsponsored program on a Chicago commercial station was liable to be accorded a low budget and hasty preparation. It is fairly safe to say that this was among several factors in the delegates' minds when, at the first meeting, they spoke about "problems with the stations."

The Problem of Taboos

In the minutes of the meeting there are references to "censorship" and "a recognition of prevailing taboos with respect to broadcasting, and the formulation of common policy in this regard." These references require a brief explanation.

It is the role of education to pursue and proclaim the truth, no matter what effect this may have on established beliefs and interests. Accordingly, faculty members within their campuses are accustomed to "academic freedom," which allows them to teach with a minimal fear of strictures and reprisals. But when they broadcast their beliefs over the public airwaves, they encounter what the delegates to the

meeting described as "censorship" and "taboos."

Some of these taboos are imposed on the station by legal considerations. Thus, it is subject to lawsuit from those who accuse one of its programs of being slanderous or libelous or of invading their right of privacy. If it presents the cause of one candidate for public office, it is required to afford equal time to opposing candidates. The station's program policy is also affected by economic considerations. It cannot afford to offend either its actual or potential sponsors. And because, for commercial success, it depends upon maximum audiences, it cannot afford to offend large or influential segments of the public by opposing their moral convictions, religious beliefs, economic interests, or any other established mores and opinions.

In Chicago, this problem involved not only the commercial stations, but also Channel 11, which was subject to the same legal considerations and which depended for its financial support on contributions from individual citizens in great numbers and from industrial firms, besides being governed by a board of directors which included several high officials from large corporations and one from organized labor.

Another problem associated with the presentation of educational subject matter is that the content of any program in which educators participate should be honest, accurate, and free from distortion designed to promote any special interest. It is not in the interests of truth if a professor is invited to lend authority to a program designed to propagandize or

advertise or to distort by suppression of data, oversimplification, or any other means which attempts to popularize the subject or influence the audience dishonestly. One of the ways to avoid such participation and to minimize such programs is for educators to initiate their own programs.

The Problem of Initiative in Programming

Perhaps the greatest problem facing the meeting was the one first introduced for consideration. As the minutes record, it was "urged that initiative for program planning be assumed by the universities, and that the tendency of the colleges and universities simply to fill needs expressed by broadcasting stations be checked by positive action to induce stations to accept programming ideas originating with the institutions." These words harkened back to an already quoted resolution by the recent conference:

The conference believes that there exist subjects which the educational institutions are best fitted to present . . . and that the institutions have a duty to initiate broadcasts of their choice, and desire to take the responsibility for doing so.¹

As has already been suggested, the placement of programs and program participants on the commercial stations--or even on Channel 11 sometimes--was scarcely under the institutions' control. A station might originate the idea for a program or series and then call, sometimes almost haphazardly, on one institution or another to fill certain positions in its cast. In the case of a series, the station might draw from several institutions. However, the participants from

¹See page 13.

any one institution were concerned only with those programs in which they were to participate. They did not meet with participants from other institutions who were assigned to other programs in the series. Therefore, the series as a whole lacked proper direction and continuity.

Perhaps to the stations it seemed advantageous to thus "divide and control," but to the educational institutions it was irksome to have control denied them. Besides having little to say about the treatment of already scheduled programs, they played little part in choosing what kinds of programs should be scheduled to fulfill the aims of higher education in the first place. There was little evidence that the commercial broadcasters analyzed the educational needs and interests of their audiences and chose programs to satisfy them. And there was little coordination between the stations concerning gaps or duplications in their public service offerings.

Even the program schedule of Channel 11 was disappointing. Besides providing too little time for higher education, it seemed rather haphazard and uncoordinated. It showed little connection between one program and another. It did not seem to reflect a consideration of the most important subjects which should be brought to the attention of an adult audience, nor did it seem to achieve a calculated and equitable balance among the major categories of adult interests. Therefore, as one of the meeting delegates suggested, "Channel 11 might find it useful to emphasize certain

topics upon given nights (e.g. music one evening, science another, etc.) and thus invite coordinated planning by the various institutions to fill specific needs." Another delegate felt that "Channel 11 could benefit greatly from judgments collectively produced by this group, either with respect to programming needs which ought to be met, or to suggestions received by Channel 11 and referred to the group for academic opinion."

In speaking about both educational and commercial channels, one delegate introduced "the question of a quota of university time, to be assigned by Channel 11 or the commercial stations, and to be filled by thoughtful, systematic division of responsibilities." Another delegate affirmed "the need for the educators' taking the initiative, and revealed his hope that through a closer organization, our community broadcasting activities can achieve greater unity, quality, and importance." This line was followed by another spokesman who hoped, through "community deliberation and action," to achieve "affirmative, integrated, and respectable broadcasting projects."

Assuming that a University Broadcasting Committee (or Association) could take the initiative for such projects, what should these projects strive to accomplish? If they were to be affirmative projects, what should they affirm? Not too much attention at the meeting seems to have been devoted to this question, unless this is what was meant by the spokesman who thought that the group "might serve its greatest

usefulness by a critical consideration of what was being achieved in educational broadcasting, and the formulation of objectives which should be sought by educational institutions." He may not have meant program objectives, however, but rather the solution of the various other kinds of problems which have been cited in this section.

Suggested Solutions to the Problems

Several suggestions for attacking these problems were made at the meeting. One was "that such a group as ours might well devote itself to research, seeking to identify audience, and to the formulation of principles based upon the results of such research, with particular reference to the predilections of the audience for educational broadcasting." Another, which has already been alluded to, was "the compilation of an index of the personnel resources of the various universities."

Various degrees of caution were expressed concerning the exercise of power which might become possible from such a group acting in concert. The most outspoken opinion on this subject came from a delegate who

. . . with characteristic vigor, asserted that immediate problems involving the schools and such an outlet as Channel 11 should be directly considered, and negotiated with full exploitation of the collective strength resident in such a group as this. When asked whether she would regard such an organization as this committee as a potential pressure group, she replied in an unblushing affirmative.

As another means towards achieving coordinated and integrated programming, one spokesman introduced "the possibility of the committee's serving as a comprehensive

production agency." This brought to mind the long-defunct University Broadcasting Council, which had functioned before the coming of television. It was recalled that

. . . this organization, which flourished in the 1930's, had served as an independent packaging agency, designed to produce programs conceived by the member institutions, and had expired as a consequence of internecine jealousies and bickerings among its members.

So the proposal of joint productions was not immediately entertained by the delegates. Later, however, this possibility was to become more attractive to them, with consequences that will be reported in Chapter III.

The meeting was climaxed with the following resolution, which was unanimously passed:

1. That this group here assembled officially constitute itself the University Broadcasting Committee, its membership to represent all institutions of higher learning in the Chicago area actively engaged in public radio and television broadcasting, such institutions to be represented upon the Committee by two members each, one such member being primarily engaged in broadcasting, and the other being primarily involved in traditional academic activity;
2. That the Committee annually elect a chairman in the Spring to serve for a period of one year;
3. That the chairman elected for the present year be instructed as his initial task to appoint a Planning Committee, such Committee to review suggestions made at the present meeting and derived from other relevant sources, with a view to outlining explicit areas for exploration and group activity on the part of the University Broadcasting Committee.

And so the Committee, soon to change its name to Association, was officially under way.

CHAPTER II

THE CODE

Since, as previously disclaimed, it is not the purpose of this study to present a complete history of The University Broadcasting Association, it will be reported here only that, after the meeting just described, by-laws for the association were written, and officers duly elected. In the course of events, special committees were formed and functioned and became inactive. At regular intervals the association met as a committee of the whole (as it still does) to consider general business and to vote on recommended courses of action. The by-laws prescribe that

No action, except the election of officers and the payment of bills which are provided for elsewhere in these by-laws, may be taken on behalf of the Association without 100 per cent approval of the active members, even though all members may not wish to participate in such action.¹

Something of the business in which the association engaged will be discussed in the next chapter. Here, however, it is proposed to pass over four years to July, 1961, when TUBA's by-laws achieved their present form and when also its Code of Standards and Practices was formulated as a document to accompany these by-laws.

¹By-Laws in the records of TUBA.

The Stated Purposes of TUBA

A detailed consideration of the by-laws is not essential to this study. What of interest they do contain, however is a statement of the purposes of TUBA:

The purposes of The University Broadcasting Association shall be:

- A. To act as a consultative and advisory group on educational broadcasting to the several radio and television outlets of the Chicago area;
- B. To encourage and assist its members singly and collectively in producing educational programs of high quality, in accordance with the Association's code of standards and practices, on local and national commercial radio and television;
- C. To insure as far as possible the maximum employment of the facilities of Chicago's educational television station in the interests of higher education;
- D. To elevate the standards of educational and public service broadcasting by the production of programming in accordance with the Association's code, and by engaging in other activities which will recognize or commend broadcasters for improving standards.

It is hoped that, by reason of the background presented in Chapter I, the reader will have had no difficulty in understanding the purposes stated above. Likewise, it is hoped that he will now be ready to understand the positions expressed in the Code of Standards and Practices, which is reproduced below, with no comments inserted to destroy its continuity:

Text of the Code

The University Broadcasting Association believes:

That radio and television are essential forces in contemporary society for the advancement of education and culture;

That radio and television broadcasters have a fundamental responsibility to lend their aid and facilities toward the enlightenment of the general public;

That institutions of higher learning have a logical and natural interest in educational and public affairs broadcasts since they are designed primarily to inform and instruct;

That institutions of higher learning have an obligation to offer their facilities and assistance in the preparation and presentation of educational and public affairs programs;

That broadcasters and educators have an equal responsibility to give educational and public affairs programs their utmost in support, concept, preparation, production and presentation so that they will be of the greatest value to the listening and viewing public.

The University Broadcasting Association believes:

That radio and television are mass media of communication capable of reaching people of all nationalities, faiths, ages, interests and positions simultaneously;

That radio and television broadcasters have an obligation to determine and understand all facets of their potential audience so that they may be able to broadcast intelligently and sympathetically;

That radio and television broadcasters have an obligation to use their facilities in such a manner that a positive contribution will be made in all areas of the public interest including education, information, entertainment and advertising;

That radio and television broadcasters have an obligation to treat all program types with equal consideration in terms of support, remuneration, production and scheduling so that the result will be the greatest good for the public;

That commercial radio and television broadcasters have the right to fulfill their obligations within the demands, limitations and requirements of sound business practices;

That radio and television broadcasters have the right to determine and schedule their programs as they see fit so as to fulfill their obligations to the best of their abilities.

The University Broadcasting Association believes:

That educational institutions have an obligation to assist in the education of the American public and, therefore, within the scopes determined by their various boards of trustees, should extend their educational facilities beyond the campus whenever feasible;

That educational institutions have an obligation to understand and to be consistent with the needs, practices, and goals of all external media used to reach the general public;

That, although educational institutions may properly use radio and television, along with other media, to enhance their reputations, increase their prestige or alter their public image, those so engaged must recognize that their principal obligation in broadcasting is to fulfill the educational needs and interests of the broadcasting audience, and that all other considerations are secondary;

That educational institutions making use of the broadcasting media have an obligation to place equal emphasis on presentation and content, insisting always on the highest standards of excellence in both broadcasting and educational techniques;

That educational institutions have the right to participate in programs or prepare programs and series as they see fit in accordance with their individual and specialized abilities and needs;

That educational institutions have the right to expect and demand equal consideration with all other program sources for proper scheduling, facilities, remuneration and assistance from each radio and television station consistent with the highest standards of the broadcasting industry.

The University Broadcasting Association and all its members, therefore, subscribe to the following:

Educational programs and series must be designed for a specific purpose and a specific audience; catch-all programs attempting to reach everyone are unwise and should be avoided.

Educational programs and series must utilize air time in accordance with their intended purpose and audience; allowing programs to be broadcast during a period of the day when neither purpose nor audience can be adequately reached is unwise and should be avoided; demanding a period

of the day when more than the intended purpose or audience should be reached is unwise and should be avoided.

Participants on educational programs and series must be compensated for their time and special ability either in keeping with the current standards of the broadcasting industry or according to recognized official University policy which may consist of compensation in the form of money, released time and/or academic credit.

Educational programs and series must receive adequate planning and preparation to insure success in achieving both purpose and audience; agreeing to prepare and present programs or series on short notice merely to take advantage of suddenly available air time is unwise and should be avoided.

Educational programs and series must be given adequate technical facilities and necessary program materials to insure success in achieving both purpose and audience; allowing programs to be broadcast with limited technical facilities which would tend to compromise desired purpose or potential audience is unwise and should be avoided; demanding technical facilities unnecessarily complex to achieve purpose and audience is likewise unwise and should be avoided; failing to provide adequate materials for use by participants, making it difficult for them to achieve purpose or audience, is unwise and should be avoided.

As should already be evident, the meat of the code is contained in its last section, which posits certain conditions which will help to insure the success of broadcasts in which the institutions of higher education participate. The preceding sections of the code establish the conceptual framework or foundation for these conditions, setting forth the responsibilities of educators and stations towards the public and towards each other, and doing so in rather considerable detail.

TUBA's FCC Testimony

Although such detail has been of undoubted value to the association members themselves, it would seem to make the

code somewhat unwieldy as a public document, and as far as can be established, the code has remained unpublished in any public document until the present study. As noted in the introduction to this study, however, a brief and somewhat different version of TUBA's standards and practices was publicized when its current president, Donald P. Anderson, testified at a hearing in Chicago of the Federal Communications Commission on March 20, 1962. It is interesting to compare his presentation with the code itself. Mr. Anderson said:

While we recognize that the television stations must operate at a financial profit, we are convinced that their public service obligations are, at least, of equal importance. Therefore, we believe that the television stations must determine their programming schedule and content so as to fulfill consistently both obligations with equal success and to the best of their abilities.

The University Broadcasting Association has determined that the following conditions are necessary for educational, informational and cultural programs to be of maximum value:

The content of each program must be honest, accurate, and free from any distortion designed to promote any special interest.

Every effort should be made to achieve the highest professional quality of production.

Every effort should be made to schedule these programs to reach the largest possible audience consistent with the purpose of the program.

The participants on these programs should be encouraged to make full use of the techniques of television, but must not be considered as entertainers.

The value of participation in these programs should be recognized and compensated for in accordance with the standards and policy of other participants performing in the broadcast area.

WTTW, Chicago's educational channel, does not receive the same commercial revenue as the other Chicago stations

and, therefore, cannot be judged by all of these criteria. While we regret the educational station's inability to compensate participants and its need to gain support by means which limit its local, live programming, we would hope that more community, state, or federal support would permit the educational station to be able to meet these criteria. Therefore, the following statement does not apply to WTTW.

With all too few exceptions, it has been our experience that local educational, informational and cultural programs are not given as much attention by the stations in the areas of remuneration, scheduling, production facilities, production personnel, publicity, promotion, and rehearsal time as are those programming efforts which will insure the financial profit of the stations. Until this is done, we do not believe that the stations are meeting their obligations to the public trust.¹

Although some differences will be noted between this testimony and the actual TUBA code, there are no disagreements of principle between the two statements. In prescribing that "the content of each program must be honest, accurate, and free from distortion designed to promote any special interest," Mr. Anderson did add what may be considered by some a desirable proviso not included in the code. Although the third section of the code does hint at "special interest" in stating that an institution's use of broadcasting to increase its prestige should be secondary to fulfilling the educational needs and interests of its broadcasting audience, there is no reference in the code to such requirements as were discussed in Chapter I of this study under "The Problem of Taboos."² Yet an insistence on intellectual honesty and accuracy should, seemingly, form an essential part of any "Magna Charta" for educational broadcasting. On the other

¹"Testimony of The University Broadcasting Association before the Federal Communications Commission Hearing," March 20, 1962, in TUBA files.

²See pp. 21-23.

hand, Mr. Anderson's statement has nothing specific to say about "catch-all programs" and it is less specific than the code on a few matters such as "agreeing to prepare and present programs and series on short notice."

At any rate, by fusing in his mind the three documentary sources presented in this chapter (the purposes of TUBA, its code, and Mr. Anderson's testimony), the reader should be able to understand what TUBA stands for and what it has been trying to achieve. The extent of that achievement will be considered in the next and final chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The old adage, "Practice what you preach," suggests that it is easy to proclaim one's principles, but vastly more difficult to live up to them. It is also easier to tell others what one expects of them than to get from them what one expects. The experience of TUBA is a case in point.

This chapter will relate briefly some of the methods by which the association has tried to accomplish its objectives. It will also present the opinions of persons interviewed for this study who chose to comment on how well those methods have succeeded.

Original Committees

The first step which TUBA took towards accomplishing its objectives was to work through a number of committees. Central to these was the Executive Committee, which, as the first to be appointed, defined its own functions and recommended the formation of other committees:¹

Executive Committee: to coordinate the activities of the other committees and to present to the association or

¹"Recommendations of the Executive Committee of the Committee on University Broadcasting," typescript (undated) in TUBA files.

committees thereof matters which merit consideration or action.

Committee on Radio Research and Development: to evaluate current educational radio programs; to learn future program schedules of radio stations as they affect educational programs; to serve as liaison between stations and educational institutions when inter-institutional cooperative programming is involved; to develop program ideas for approval and production by member institutions.

Committee on Television Research and Development: to perform similar functions with respect to commercial television stations.

Committee on Educational Stations and Networks: to strengthen the members' relations with these stations and networks, making available to them the members' collective opinions, wisdom, and capacities for broadcasting, and providing to the academic community information concerning educational broadcasting.

Committee on Grants and Awards: to serve as a clearinghouse for information concerning grants and awards available to educational broadcasters; to explore whether the association should establish its own awards.

Committee on Public Relations: to publicize the association.

Committee on Telecourses: to keep abreast of research and developments in television courses, including problems of accreditation and teacher employment.

TUBA and Telecourses

Prior to the fourth conference on educational broadcasting, the new educational station, WTTW, on Channel 11, had shown an interest in offering college courses for credit, possibly using a "stable" of professors from the colleges and universities in its broadcast area. In some institutions this prospect generated tremendous hopes,¹ and one resolution passed by the fourth conference reads that "The conference expresses great interest in radio and television courses for credit and welcomes further experimentation and evaluation in this field."² It was, in great measure, this interest which prompted the conference to recommend, when urging the formation of a University Broadcasting Committee, that "One member from each institution should be drawn from its office responsible for broadcasts, and one from its faculty."

When TUBA was first organized, it therefore consisted of two representatives from each of its associated institutions. There were eleven of these institutions, three of which were associated with it primarily because of their interest in telecourses. These were the Chicago Board of Education (which operates junior colleges) and two universities in Indiana: Purdue University and Indiana University (both

¹Interview with Henry Knepler, Professor of English and Chairman of the Department of Language, Literature, and Philosophy, Illinois Institute of Technology, July 18, 1963.

²"Resolutions Passed by the Fourth Annual Chicago Area Educational Radio and Television Conference," April 12, 1957. Mimeographed copy in the records of TUBA.

of which operate branches within Channel 11's broadcast area). Of these, the Board of Education proved the most enterprising--or fortunate--by obtaining from the Fund for the Advancement of Education a three-year grant for offering over Channel 11 an experimental junior college curriculum, which continues to operate as "TV College." Having accomplished this objective, the Board of Education resigned its membership in TUBA. The two Indiana institutions exchanged active for associate memberships. This left as active members the eight institutions which have previously been cited: Loyola University, De Paul University, Roosevelt University, Lake Forest College, Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, and Illinois Institute of Technology.

What hopes these eight had had for placing telecourses on the educational channel were also frustrated. And, indeed, the inauguration of "TV College" also affected their hopes to place on the channel more non-credit programs of a general informative or cultural nature. A great deal of the station's air time was consumed with the courses of the junior college curriculum, particularly since each course was offered at two different times in order to accommodate its variegated clientele of students, which included housewives and working people on assorted shifts. WTTW naturally favored "TV College" as a guaranteed source of revenue and as a means towards future revenue, should the Board of Education become sufficiently encouraged to use the station's facilities for broadcasting to other grade levels. But this meant that the

station's time for programs from other sources was limited.¹

Few demands, therefore, were placed on TUBA's faculty representatives for help with the planning of formal courses. After a year of relative inactivity, they were dropped from the organization, leaving only the eight representatives from the broadcasting offices of the member institutions. The group was now small enough to meet regularly as a committee of the whole, and too small to warrant continuance of the seven committees previously described, which were accordingly disbanded.

The loss of the faculty representatives apparently did little damage. According to Dr. Henry Knepler, who had been one of them:

I think that in practice most academic people contributed very little. And if you have a good group of educational broadcasters--in other words, people who know something about education besides knowing something about broadcasting--they can, after they know their schools, draw on other people for given situations. And you don't have to involve a person in where there is essentially broadcasting administration. I don't believe their loss was great, frankly. I think most of them returned to what they considered their main pursuits with a certain relief.²

One of the remaining broadcasting representatives, James Taylor, was asked, "What hopes were dashed when the academic people were dropped from TUBA?" He replied:

None at all. We went right on. When we realized what the picture was at Channel 11 we went to the commercial stations. There were no hopes dashed because the academic people were not concerned. If I have any

¹Interview with Colby Lewis, Production Manager of WTTW during this period, June 10, 1964.

²Interview with Henry Knepler, July 18, 1963.

questions on the academic side, I confer with a professor here at De Paul. Every school broadcaster has an academic person to whom he can turn for advice.¹

Treatment by the Commercial Stations

Blocked from expansion on Channel 11, TUBA moved then towards the commercial stations, from which it hoped to secure more favorable treatment through collective action. It is evident from Mr. Anderson's testimony at the Federal Communications Commission hearing that it did not manage to secure all that it hoped for; but what gains did it make, if any, and in what areas? To answer these questions at all precisely, there are, unfortunately, no statistics. It is too much to expect that the eight TUBA delegates, busy as they were with many duties of their regular jobs, would calculate how many professors had been paid last month as compared to the month before, or collect any other such comparative data--nor could the gains sought by them always be described in numerical data anyway. So, in estimating these gains for the present study, it was necessary to fall back on the opinions of the persons interviewed.

Paul Cahill (TUBA representative from the University of Illinois) was asked: "Has TUBA managed to secure more favorable and consistent broadcast times?" He answered, not about broadcast times but about taping times, citing a series called "Vistas," produced in conjunction with WBEM-TV. He said that the taping times for this program were changed

¹Interview with James Taylor, Director of Television, De Paul University, January 22, 1963.

by the station so frequently that advance planning became next to impossible. Hence he and Milton Shufro (TUBA representative from Roosevelt University) wrote to TUBA's president, suggesting that the association cancel its affiliation with the series. When the president took these letters to the general manager of WBBM-TV, he obtained excellent cooperation thenceforward. Mr. Cahill does not believe that any single member could have accomplished this result as effectively as TUBA did through its combined pressure.¹

Chalmers Marquis (Director of Programming for Channel 11) thinks that TUBA has accomplished much in getting standardized treatment from the stations--not only in terms of time allotments, but also in terms of pay for professors who appear on camera.² Alfred Partridge (former TUBA representative from the University of Illinois) has explained how the pay situation was improved. In effect, the association told the stations that they would not let their institutions' faculties participate in programs unless they were paid. It was this action, more than any other, which made the stations aware of TUBA's existence. Before this, the stations did not realize that the institutions were communicating with each other about broadcasting matters. Hence, they would sometimes pay participants from one institution and not those

¹Interview with Paul Cahill, Manager of the Office of Public Information, Chicago Division, University of Illinois, February 1, 1963.

²Interview with Chalmers H. Marquis, Jr., Director of Programming, WTTW (TV), April 5, 1963.

from another. But because of TUBA, each institution knew who was being paid and who was not. Therefore, the stations commenced paying all TUBA participants the equivalent of AFTRA (American Federation of Television and Radio Artists) minimum scale, and many academic participants are now AFTRA members.¹

But in the case of Channel 11, which has no commercial revenue from which to pay its participants, TUBA had to establish a fund of its own for compensating persons who appeared regularly on its series. (Thus it paid twenty-five dollars per program to the host of its series, "Meeting of Minds.")

According to John Buckstaff (Assistant Director of Broadcasting, University of Chicago), TUBA has generally improved the treatment which educational institutions receive from the commercial stations:

TUBA has stood up to the commercial broadcasters in this town and said, in effect, "Faculty members of the educational institutions in Chicago, Illinois, are respectable, busy, hard working, not terribly well paid people, and you are not going to put your hands on their time just to chalk up your points in the log. If you want to deal with our faculty members, you're going to deal with them as reasonable people. You're not going to make unreasonable demands on them; you're going to deal with them on a businesslike basis; and you're even going to respect them, whether you like it or not." The major league broadcasters in Chicago know that they can't get away with any hanky-panky with faculty members from the major institutions.²

¹Interview with Alfred Partridge, former Supervisor of Broadcasting, Chicago Division, University of Illinois, February 27, 1963.

²Interview with John Buckstaff, Assistant Director of Broadcasting, University of Chicago, February 13, 1963.

This sounds rather as if TUBA had made its gains only by "talking tough" and perhaps stirring up some resentment thereby, but according to Chalmers Marquis of Channel 11, the colleges and universities have gotten increased respect from the stations because of the professionalism with which the association has approached them in dealing with production problems.¹

Joint Programming

Besides winning better conditions at the stations, it will be remembered that TUBA is dedicated to improving program quality. One of the ways in which its members have tried to do this is to engage in joint productions. This they have done despite their knowledge that the old University Broadcasting Council failed to function smoothly as a production agency. TUBA's arrangement, however, differs from that of the Council in that its members are free to produce programs independently whenever they feel that such independence will best serve their individual needs, strengths, and goals. They may place programs either through their own efforts or through those of the association. The stations may approach either the association or one of its members, or any combination thereof. If a member is asked by a station to supply program material, it may either fill the request itself or refer it to TUBA. If TUBA is approached by a station for a single program, it will probably refer

¹Interview with Chalmers H. Marquis, Jr., April 5, 1963.

the request to whichever of its members is best suited for the assignment; thus an assignment concerned with home design might be proffered to Illinois Institute of Technology because of its Architectural, Planning, and Design Division. But when the proposal is for a long series requiring a variety of qualified talent, the TUBA members are likely to merge their resources in a group effort. The purpose of group efforts is to do those programs which can be better produced co-operatively than by any single institution. And, as Mr. Anderson testified at the Federal Communications Commission hearing, "We believe that there is no field of intellectual and professional importance in which we, having combined our resources of physical equipment and some 9,000 experts, specialists, and educators, cannot provide and produce programs of distinct value."

Such joint productions, it appears, have been particularly welcome to the smaller and less influential member institutions. There is an understandable tendency for the broadcasting stations to favor the larger universities which have greater financial and intellectual resources, but with joint productions each TUBA member has a chance to participate.

For each program in a TUBA series, a different member institution serves as host and is responsible for selecting participants. This does not mean that only professors from the host institution will be used. The host may ask other TUBA members either to supply a particular individual or to recommend one of their personnel as an authority on a given topic.

Occasionally, it may obtain the cast altogether from other institutions, or even from outside the field of education, since it is entitled to choose whoever it considers most suitable for the task at hand. Normally, however, it will cast at least one of its own faculty in order to avoid the impression that it has no authorities of its own in the subject area. The vice-president of the association serves as executive producer of all TUBA joint productions and is responsible for assigning a producer to each program. When the programs form a series, however, this is usually accomplished automatically by a regular rotation of the members.

Although, somewhat surprisingly, a complete list of TUBA productions has not been preserved by the association, a few examples can be cited here. In 1963, WBEM-TV was broadcasting a TUBA series of weekly half-hour programs called "Vistas," to inform the public about some of the vital and interesting work which was being accomplished in various universities. In 1960 the same station had transmitted "Seminar Sixty," a lecture series using 27 faculty members to present 11 different subject areas in 220 half-hour programs encompassing 44 weeks. In 1963 it telecast a similar series called "Seminar Sixty-Three."

WEKB has carried TUBA's "Cornerstones," a series of television essays on the American heritage.

Channel 11 has carried "Meeting of Minds," a weekly series of half-hour panel discussions on which topics of current interest were explored by faculty members from various TUBA institutions and other experts. The station has also

offered TUBA's "News Perspectives," which employed 71 different faculty members to provide background information on current news topics.

A breakdown of individual programs in some of these series will be found in the appendices to this study. The variety and significance of the subjects covered and the caliber of the participants who have been enlisted to expound these subjects are indeed impressive. But how well were these programs produced? Were they presented with sufficient skill to command the interest of the maximum potential audience?

TUBA's Presentation Skills

To answer these questions, reliance must again be placed on the opinions of persons interviewed--and these opinions vary widely.

Henry Mamet (a director of the National Association for Better Radio and Television) states that most of the TUBA programs that he has seen represent the simplest forms of production: panel discussions and lectures. He feels that there is little creativity going into these programs, and that their dullness is lessening the public's estimation of educational and public affairs broadcasting in general. This dullness, he maintains, is not attributable to inadequate funds, since exciting programs can be produced on lower budgets than those under which TUBA operates. Nor is it the fault of the stations, since they are willing to provide the

facilities for any type of program which TUBA wants to do. Of this he is certain, since he himself produces television programs in Chicago and is therefore familiar with the stations and their policies.¹

Chalmers Marquis (Director of Programming for Channel 11) states that when his station began operating, the colleges and universities were able to produce programs at a higher creative level than most organizations in the area, but have now been surpassed by other local producers and by National Educational Television. Although the TUBA producers are capable of top level work, Mr. Marquis believes that they cannot fully utilize their production talents because their time is taken up by a variety of other responsibilities ranging from teaching to fund-raising. Furthermore (and here Mr. Marquis disagrees with Mr. Memet), they must operate on too limited budgets.²

On the other hand, TUBA's first president, Alfred Partridge, believes that TUBA is raising program standards. One reason for this is the competitive spirit generated by the association. When a member is responsible for a TUBA program, he knows that every other member is watching and judging it. Should it be below par, they will feel that he has let them down. Should it be particularly good, they will feel obliged to do as well with their programs. Thus, Mr.

¹Interview with Henry Mamet, member of the Board of Directors of the National Association for Better Radio and Television, February 4, 1963.

²Interview with Chalmers H. Marquis, Jr., April 5, 1963.

Partridge feels, joint programming gives each member a greater sense of obligation than results from independent programming.¹

With this belief, however, two of TUBA's original members have taken issue--and the issue has been instrumental in their withdrawal from the association.

The Withdrawal of Two TUBA Members

Within four days of each other in May, 1962, the representatives from Northwestern University and the University of Chicago wrote to the president of TUBA, announcing their decision to withdraw from the association. Each of these letters was preceded by another letter which expressed dissatisfaction with the values of membership. All four letters are reproduced below. The first two--the first a preliminary draft of the unavailable final letter--are from Robert W. Thomas, representative from Northwestern University:

May 8, 1962

Dear Don:

I am sorry I cannot attend the important meeting of TUBA on May 25, but may I make a few personal observations concerning TUBA for your inclusion in the discussion, should you feel they are pertinent....

I have found TUBA helpful in these ways: I get to meet peers in the same "business" at other universities, and can keep up with what their plans are in the TV and radio field; I enjoy the privilege of being able to draw on university personnel from the other seven colleges for my programs; and I very much enjoy the social contact with each of the TUBA representatives.

However, I am not completely sure that this is enough. First, meeting with other representatives could be accomplished less formally than through an organization

¹Interview with Alfred Partridge, February 27, 1963.

like TUBA, and perhaps less frequently, though the once-a-month get-together is helpful. This getting-together is, I feel, not a strong reason for continuing TUBA in such a formal organizational structure.

Secondly, I would hope that I could draw on other university personnel even if the colleges were not in TUBA. We do this via telephone, usually, and quite aside from TUBA meetings and official functions, except VISTAS, MEETING OF MINDS, and CORNERSTONES. Both VISTAS and CORNERSTONES are almost through, and I couldn't be happier at their demise--neither has lived up to the potential of any of our colleges, either jointly or individually. MEETING OF MINDS, I agree, had been successful because of joint cooperation, but again is set up via phone, and almost independently of TUBA meetings and organization. Such a program could continue easily on an informal, joint basis without the TUBA structure if a regular, rotating schedule were to be set up by WTTW.

If TUBA was to be retained in any form, I feel it would best serve our needs as an informal society, meeting with the express purpose of keeping one another informed, and to maintain a continuing contact between universities. I am not convinced by my observations, and as co-producer of the CORNERSTONES series, that TUBA can or should produce programs. And to act in any official way as a joint representative of the eight member institutions requires full agreement of the eight colleges--agreement which cannot always be obtained due to differences in size, objectives, and history of the member universities.

I hope that this series of personal remarks is helpful.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

Robert W. Thomas¹
Northwestern University¹

Six days later, Mr. Thomas mailed his notice of withdrawal:

May 14, 1962

Mr. Donald P. Anderson
The University Broadcasting Association
Illinois Institute of Technology
3300 South Federal
Chicago 16, Illinois

Dear Don:

¹The original final draft of this letter is in TUBA files.

After much consideration, I feel it is in Northwestern University's best interest to withdraw its membership in The University Broadcasting Association, at least for a period of time during which we may re-examine our goals, interests, and future plans.

In our main task here of presenting good public affairs radio and TV programming, our aims are often at variance with those of TUBA, though we have participated in the organization's productions during the past few years. In presenting the personnel and story of our university, we feel we can obtain better results through our own programming--programming with a continuity which cannot be obtained in joint efforts.

We could be quite wrong in our assumptions, but only by resigning from TUBA can we decide if our own efforts are achieving the desired results. We wish to leave the door open to rejoining an organization such as TUBA should unity be desirable in the future. And we always enjoy meeting with university broadcasting representatives informally. I hope such gatherings will be possible regularly.

We extend our thanks to TUBA for many services in the past, and wish the organization success in its joint goals and aspirations.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

Robert W. Thomas¹
Producer, Radio-TV

When interviewed concerning his withdrawal, Mr. Thomas stated that TUBA had turned itself almost exclusively into a program producer. Then he reiterated the belief, expressed in the first of the letters just quoted, that most TUBA productions were not successful because some of the institutions were not giving them their best efforts.

In this opinion he was supported by John Buckstaff, TUBA representative from the University of Chicago. In the early months of 1962, Mr. Buckstaff and Mr. Thomas had talked together and discovered that they were substantially in

¹The original is in TUBA files.

agreement about TUBA's shortcomings. Mr. Buckstaff expressed his disappointment with the association in the following letter to its president:

April 27, 1962

Mr. Donald P. Anderson
Supervisor, Radio and Television
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago 16, Illinois

Dear Don:

Some issues I would like to raise at May TUBA meeting:

An academic year-end appraisal after five seasons of TUBA--

Most members of TUBA have agreed most of the time that TUBA has some purposes:

- 1) To act as an organization where information about what is going on in educational and public-affairs broadcasting can be exchanged.
- 2) To act as a "pressure group" among all broadcasters for the general betterment of educational and public-affairs broadcasting.
- 3) To act as a producing agency in those cases where a group effort can produce a better series than any of us individually can produce.

I think we should consider (1) how important these purposes are in retrospect, (2) how well we have met these purposes, and (3) if new and different purposes would be desirable.

My own reaction to TUBA is one of disappointment.

Granted there is a useful communication among all of us with various goals and contacts.

As a "pressure group" we have accomplished perhaps one thing. We have given our faculties a bit of status by establishing the precedent of at least union-scale remuneration for performance. We have scarcely brought about the better programming or better time-slots. As a group, we seem formidable to the broadcasters; we must be dealt with because we represent so many institutions.

But I feel that, although most stations deal with us fairly, our performance is lax. I doubt that any TUBA production is superior to what could be produced individually. And personally, I find the TUBA relationship a discouraging one. Instead of being encouraged to reach those segments of the public with information which I could produce, I find myself content that I am doing about what everyone else is doing. I think most TUBA members are in the same boat. The "group" is mutually discouraging. Instead of bringing out each-other's best, we are each justifying our existence by saying we are keeping pace with the others.

I think we should take a hard look at our organization, perhaps based on some criteria larger than our narrow ones, to see if some revitalization is possible. If that does not seem feasible in this climate, I would suggest that we might set a date some months from now, certainly no earlier than the fall, when we might meet; but in the meantime go our own separate ways, seeking inspiration a bit loftier than we have been able to provide each other.

Sincerely, yours,

(Signed)

John B. Buckstaff
Assistant Director
Educational Broadcasting¹

Then, four days after Mr. Thomas had sent his second letter, Mr. Buckstaff also sent his second one:

May 18, 1962

Mr. Donald P. Anderson, President
The University Broadcasting Association
of Chicago, Inc.
c/o Illinois Institute of Technology
Technology Center
Chicago 16, Illinois

Dear Don:

It is with considerable regret that I must submit our resignation from The University Broadcasting Association.

As you know from our various discussions, the relationship between the Association and this university has been

¹The original is in TUBA files.

of concern to me for some while. I believe this is a reasonable time for disassociation, since both TUBA and our own broadcasting operation here are in a process of change.

At this university the trend is clearly away from the local cooperatively produced program or series. The emphasis is to be on unified and coordinated adult education, as well as programs of national and international significance.

In general, these objectives are not part of TUBA's mission, either stated or implied, and in the months to come I would not be able to make a contribution to the organization.

Please be assured that I will always look forward to the privilege of informal discussions with you, and with all educational broadcasters in the city.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

John B. Buckstaff
Assistant Director
Educational Broadcasting¹

Reasons for the Withdrawal

When interviewed for this study, Mr. Buckstaff was not too different from Mr. Thomas in stating that his principal reason for withdrawing from TUBA was the organization's failure to raise program and production standards. The University of Chicago's primary mission in broadcasting, he said, is not to get air time but to make its programs good.² It is likely that both of the withdrawing universities were particularly conscious of the need for program quality on

¹The original is in TUBA files.

²Interview with John Buckstaff, February 13, 1963.

their part because they had a national broadcasting reputation to uphold, having been engaged, as previously mentioned, in producing network radio series. Apart from broadcasting, both universities are undoubtedly conscious of their reputation as "quality institutions," with intellectual and physical resources surpassing those of some of the other TUBA members.

Paul Cahill (Manager, Office of Public Information, Chicago Division, University of Illinois) has stated that the two universities operate with budgets which, in comparison to some other TUBA institutions, are massive. Hence, he suggests, they may have felt that they did not have as much to gain from the association as did other members. It is a lot easier if one is a nobody, he says, to want a spirit of cooperation, than if one is big enough to do what one pleases. The University of Illinois, he claims, is obviously big enough to do without TUBA; nevertheless, it continues to participate because it subscribes to the spirit of cooperation which TUBA embodies.¹

In the case of Mr. Buckstaff and Mr. Thomas, however, the cooperation practiced by TUBA seems to have meant principally joint programming, and this joint programming seems to have denied them sufficient freedom to advance the unique interests of their employers. Note, for example, that Mr. Thomas wrote, "In presenting the personnel and story of our university, we feel that we can obtain better results through our own programming--programming with a continuity which cannot

¹Interview with Paul Cahill, February 1, 1963.

be obtained in joint efforts," and this statement was echoed in principle by Mr. Buckstaff's desire for "unified and coherent" adult education. Also, both men sought greater opportunity to negotiate directly with broadcasting stations to place programming which would be more strongly identifiable with their own institutions. Thus, in a press release announcing its withdrawal from TUBA, the University of Chicago concludes that "the needs of Chicago area stations and their audiences, as well as of the University, can be better served by program managers and public affairs directors dealing directly with the various universities."¹

It will be recalled that Mr. Thomas concluded his first letter by stressing the "differences in size, objectives, and history of the member universities." To him and to Mr. Buckstaff, it appears to have been most doubtful that representatives from such variegated institutions could reconcile their differences without compromising their obligations to advance the interests of their employers.

In line with this problem, Mr. Buckstaff cites a time when Channel 11 had available but one half hour weekly for all of the Chicago area colleges and universities. It became apparent to Mr. Buckstaff and his associates that a program proposal from the University of Chicago would not be seriously considered by the station since, in view of its limited program structure, the station felt that it was meeting its commitment to the institutions of higher education by filling

¹The complete release is reproduced in Appendix IX.

the half hour with a TUBA series. . By strengthening this series, Mr. Buckstaff felt that he was weakening his own position as representative of the University of Chicago. He did not enjoy being asked from influential quarters why the university did not have a half hour of its own on Channel 11 every week.¹

Not only Mr. Buckstaff but every TUBA representative has felt pressure from the public relations interests of his employing institution. According to Alfred Partridge (former TUBA representative from the University of Illinois), there is a conflict of interest between the broadcasting officers who are interested in educational program content and their administrations, which tend to want broadcasting used to advertise the institution and its resources. Therefrom may come pressure to get university personnel onto "name" programs, or onto as many programs as possible, or to engage in programs which bring the image of the university into sharp focus rather than those which divide the credit with other institutions.²

Mr. Buckstaff states the problem thusly:

The University of Chicago would be pleased as hell to be part of any organization, the members of which agreed about what they wanted to do and went about doing it. But TUBA has always been a group of minority factions. Each of us has had primarily a responsibility to his own university. We have liked to sit down with each other and say to ourselves, "We're broadcasters and we're going to be very wise about this. We're just going to put our own institutions a little bit in the background. We're going to use our best judgment as broadcasters to produce this series of programs." When it comes right down to

¹Interview with John Buckstaff, February 13, 1963.

²Interview with Alfred Partridge, February 27, 1963.

the wire, this isn't what happens. The University of Chicago is paying me, and I'm going to do what they want me to¹do. This is true of everybody else in the organization.¹

TUBA Present and Future

In consequence of the withdrawals, TUBA was reduced to its present membership of six institutions: De Paul University, Illinois Institute of Technology, Lake Forest College, Roosevelt University, Loyola University, and the University of Illinois. It must now do without the help of two competent production offices. It must bargain from a weaker position than when it could present a united front of all of the principal degree-granting institutions in the area. Although a few personnel from the departed institutions still appear on TUBA programs, essentially it is left with fewer faculty members to choose from, and often the best authority on a given subject can be found at one of the withdrawn universities.

Yet some feel that the withdrawals have not hurt TUBA in the least. According to Mr. Anderson (president of TUBA at the time of the withdrawals), neither the functioning of the association nor the quality of its programs have been injured, and perhaps the group has been positively strengthened by the departure of those who placed a negative value on their membership.² Henry Bussey (representative from Loyola

¹Interview with John Buckstaff, February 13, 1963.

²Interview with Donald Anderson, Director of Public Relations and Broadcasting, Illinois Institute of Technology, March 18, 1963.

University) claims that TUBA is now more successful than ever with the quality of its programs and its relations with the stations.¹

In concluding this account of TUBA's progress towards achieving the tenets of its code, it is tempting to speculate about what the future holds in store. The remaining representatives have various notions for improving the association. They are considering the pros and cons of widening the membership to include smaller institutions. Some of them see the need for a stronger publicity effort to make the public, broadcasting station administrators, and other academic communities better informed about TUBA's work. There is hope that a grant-in-aid from some foundation might be secured to hire an executive secretary to keep records and minutes of meetings, write publicity, handle communications with stations, and in general coordinate the TUBA effort from a central position, devoid of allegiance to any single institution. According to Allen Burns (Manager of Public Affairs for WNBQ), many organizations are only as strong as their executive secretaries, who keep the members operating effectively and, if given enough power, can make the decisions which might never get made because of individual allegiances of the members of the group.²

¹Interview with Henry Bussey, Director of Radio and Television and Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama, Loyola University, Chicago, January 28, 1963.

²Interview with Allen Burns, Manager of Public Affairs, WNBQ, Chicago, February 8, 1963.

Mr. Burns is one station official who considers it useful to work through TUBA, since it eases his task of scouting out what is being done at colleges and universities which would be of program value. There is at least one other station official, however, who sees little present need for the organization. In the words of Chalmers Marquis (Director of Programming for Channel 11):

The closest analogy to TUBA would be a labor union. A union almost always comes into existence when management gets to be bad in any number of ways: the union being a banding together of people to maintain their rights and expand their rights and income, etc. This was that kind of organization. As with many unions, when the management becomes enlightened and the conditions become better, the union becomes weak and in many cases simply is a paper union. Organizations of this kind exist only as long as there is a need to exist. Since there is no organization, there is no staff, the organization can band together or disband at any given moment. There is no loss felt if they separate; there is no gain felt when they meet unless there's some common purpose at that instant. I would say they will come together strongly whenever there's a need for it. I simply say that the need for it has probably disappeared. The stations, including ours, are capable, or certainly intend to be capable, of a professional attitude towards the universities and a respect for the universities. The antagonism by the commercial stations, I think, which was one of the basic reasons for the existence of TUBA, has all but disappeared. I think there is good reason to believe that TUBA probably won't exist as such after this year--and I don't say this maliciously.¹

This prediction--if it was such--has not come true.

As of June, 1964, TUBA is readying a thirteen week daily series for CBS-TV on the subject of "Literature of the City." It features participants from all the member institutions. Starting July 6, 1964, TUBA will present a thirteen week daily series on ABC-TV concerning "Urban Problems." WEKB

¹Interview with Chalmers H. Marquis, Jr., April 5, 1963.

wishes to continue with the universities in daily production in the fall. NBC-TV is planning a thirteen week daily exchange series with its owned and operated stations featuring TUBA professors. WBBM-TV's "Vistas" will repeat its best programs on tape during the summer, and the station plans to bring the series back live in the fall.¹

As we have seen, the TUBA institutions differ in a variety of ways, and each may have different broadcasting goals at a given time. Yet the members continue to cooperate through TUBA. At the present time, De Paul University is de-emphasizing outside broadcasting in favor of developing its own closed-circuit system, and Loyola University is starting to develop closed-circuit also. But these developments in no way affect the existence of TUBA or TUBA membership participation in regular broadcasting. The TUBA representatives, according to Mr. Taylor, are still very enthusiastic about the potential of the organization and are pleased with its accomplishments.²

We have seen that TUBA has made some progress in various areas and has also failed somewhat in others. But it is difficult for one to predict how long TUBA will survive and what its accomplishments and failures will be in the future. Its accomplishments and failures of the future will be of importance as were those of its past.

TUBA was and is an experiment, but, in this writer's

¹Interview with James Taylor, June 18, 1964.

²Ibid.

opinion, the association is to be respected if only on the basis of what it has tried to accomplish. Because television has become such a vital force in our society, it is apparent that no one can afford to be complacent about the quality of fare presented by this medium. TUBA is not complacent.

APPENDIX I

TENTATIVE PLANS FOR A PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE ON
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FOR THE CHICAGO AREA

Tentative Plans for a Preliminary Conference
on Educational Television for the Chicago
Area, Channel 11

Reasons for calling a conference: The educational institutions cooperating in the experiment in educational television in Chicago have not yet received any proposals or directives from the Channel 11 Committee regarding the philosophy, objectives, principles of operation, or details of administration of Channel 11. If the Channel 11 Committee leaves such matters to an appointed director and his appointive staff, it is probable that the institutions involved may find themselves in the role of competitive program brokers, providers of talent, and suppliers of information. They would have little if any opportunity to plan and direct educational TV in this area.

It may be argued that the cooperating institutions will be adequately represented by an executive council made up of appointed delegates from the administrative staffs of the several institutions. There, precisely, is the danger. Such a council is not likely to consult faculties or staffs before committing an institution to a policy either unwise or insufferable.

A representative body of delegates from the numerous agencies and institutions now serving the public in an educational capacity, sharing and assimilating its views and ideas, might draw up statements of objectives and concepts that might be of use to those concerned with directing educational TV in this area. Such a body, acting as a kind of constitutional assembly, could draw up a statement of principles and procedures that could serve as a Magna Charta for educational TV in this area. Anyhow such a body could inform itself and become knowledgeable for future developments.

Invitation to a Conference: Some school or institution must take the lead in calling this conference. It is proposed that Illinois Institute of Technology issue an invitation to a two day conference on Educational TV. The conference would be held at Illinois Tech, April 23-24. The invitations would be issued to the following institutions through their administrative heads. So far as possible it is suggested that the administrator appoint persons known to have an active interest in educational TV as a public service.

A. Educational Institutions:

Illinois Institute of Technology	
Conference Staff	
Northwestern University	4
University of Chicago	4
De Paul University	4
Loyola University	4
Roosevelt	4
University of Illinois	4
George Williams College	2
Lake Forest College	2
Elmhurst College	2
Wheaton College	2
Chicago Teachers College	2
Concordia Teachers College	1
National Coll. of Education	1
Wright Junior College	2
Wilson Junior College	2
Chicago Public School System	3

B. Quasi-Educational Institutions:

Chicago Art Institute	3
Chicago Museum of Natural History	2
Museum of Science and Industry	2
Chicago Public Library	1
Chicago Historical Society	1

C. Cultural Agencies:

Chicago Symphony Orchestra	1
Newberry Library	1
John Crerar Library	1

D. Resource Personnel:

Omnibus: Alistair Cooke
 NEAB: Ann Arbor
 Ford Fund for Adv. of Ed.
 Excursion: B. Meredith.

Should there be representatives from Shedd Aquarium, Adler Planetarium, Brookfield and Lincoln Park Zoos, Garfield and Lincoln Park Conservatories, Cook County Forest Preserve, and the professional (legal, medical, musical, theological) schools?

Plan of Conference: To get results from a conference of this nature the utmost utilization of the assembled brains and know-how must be achieved. Every delegate must be an active

participant. In two days a great deal of ground can be covered if the topics are arranged to produce logical progression of thought. A general stimulative session will precede each series of group meetings.

The sessions must be well manned by competent discussion leaders and secretaries. Ideas developed in each group meeting will be taken down, summarized, and presented at a final general session. The general session will then decide what to do next: another meeting to consider a statement of principles or set of resolutions; establishment of committees to implement ideas developed in discussions; publication of results; forwarding of ideas to Committee for Channel 11.

A. First Day

General Session: 9:30-10:30 Opening of Conference--Pres. John T. Retaliatta
 Explanation of Conference Procedure, Ill. Tech. Staff Member
 "The Challenge of Educational TV," NAEB representative

Group Meetings: 10:45-12:00 1. Educational TV Resources in Chicago Area
 2. The relation of Educ. TV to Private Networks
 3. The Public Responsibility of Educ. TV: Thought
 4. The Public Responsibility of Educ. TV: Taste

Lunch: 12:30-1:30 (No Speaker)

General Session: 2:30-3:00 "What is the Audience for Educational TV?" Alistair Cooke

Group Meetings: 3:15-4:30 5. Adult Education
 6. Adult Cultural Programming.
 7. Accredited Courses.
 8. Programming for Juveniles

Demonstration: 4:45-6:00 NAEB Materials or E.B.F.

Dinner Meeting: "A Cultural Historian Looks at
6:45-8:00 Educational TV," Author of
Radio, TV, and Public

B. Second Day

General Session: "Organization and Administration of
9:30-10:30 an Educational TV Program,"
Representative from Ford Founda-
tion.

Group Meetings: 9. Organization Plan for Channel 11
10:45-12:00
10. Relationship of Director to Co-
operating Institutions
11. The Production Problem
12. Program Personnel

Luncheon: "The MC and Educational Television,"
12:30-2:00 Burgess Meredith

General Session: Summaries of working sessions.
2:30-4:30 General discussion. Business.

APPENDIX II

**PROGRAM OF THE FOURTH ANNUAL CHICAGO AREA
COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE**

PROGRAM OF THE

FOURTH ANNUAL

CHICAGO-AREA CONFERENCE

ON

EDUCATIONAL RADIO AND TELEVISION

to be held on

Friday, April 12, 1957

at

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(Commons Bldg., Wabash Ave. at 32nd St.)

"EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING
IN CHICAGO"

MORNING SESSION

9:00 A.M.

Discussion by participants from eleven Chicago-area Collegiate institutions.

Formulation of joint opinions

The agenda for discussion:

- I. Should we and can we define relations between contributing institutions and the broadcasting stations in regard to:
 - A. Division of responsibility between station producer-directors and institutional producers.
 - B. Ultimate authority for decisions: within stations, within institutions, and between the two.
 - C. Definition of services which can uniformly be expected to be supplied by the stations for any program.
- II. In what proportions should the educational institutions provide:
 - A. Programs of instructional character
 - a. Credit
 - b. Non-credit
 - B. Documentaries, discussions, and the like, assuming a wish for balance in regard to:
 - a. Subject-matter
 - b. Level
- III. How can we correlate program decisions
 - A. Between the educational institutions
 - B. Between the institutions and the stations

IV. Can other common problems of the educational institutions be dealt with by inter-institutional correlation--such problems as:

- A. Uniform accreditation of television courses
- B. Budgetary standards, including forms of remuneration for faculty
- C. Uniformity in permissions fees, etc.
- D. Increase of general faculty interest in broadcasting.

At about 10:30 A.M. there will be half-hour's recess for coffee.

LUNCHEON

12:30 P.M.

Luncheon will be ready in an adjoining room of the I.I.T. Commons.

The participants from the broadcasting stations and from the newspapers are invited to attend.

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P.M.

In the order to be agreed upon, the opinions formulated in the morning session will be presented to the participants from the Chicago broadcasting stations and from the Chicago newspapers.

APPENDIX III

**RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE FOURTH ANNUAL
CHICAGO AREA COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE**

RESOLUTIONS

PASSED BY THE FOURTH ANNUAL CHICAGO AREA EDUCATIONAL
RADIO AND TELEVISION CONFERENCE

Held at Illinois Institute of Technology

April 12, 1957

PRESENT: Thirty-nine participants from nine Chicago-area collegiate institutions and five television broadcasting stations.

- I. A. Before the start of a program or series there should be a thorough understanding between the station and the educational institution on all responsibilities concerning production.

The following are illustrative of the items on which this prior understanding should be reached.

Air time	Video equipment	Clearance
Rehearsal time	Audio facilities	music
Program content	Sets and props	talent
Script	Art work	Publicity
Talent	Films	

- B. In order to prevent surprises to participants, the definitions of authority and all decisions indicated in I,A, should be made well in advance of studio rehearsal and air-time.
- II. The conference believes that there exists subjects which the educational institutions are best fitted to present; that methods of presentation appropriate to broadcasting can be found; and that the institutions have a duty to initiate broadcasts of their choice, and desire to take the responsibility for doing so.
- III. The conference expresses great interest in radio and television courses for credit and welcomes further experimentation and evaluation in this field.
- IV. The conference recognizes the importance of active participation of educational institutions in radio and television. It urges that the institutions of higher learning which are prominently engaged in Chicago-area broadcasting should appoint two members each to constitute a University Broadcasting Committee. One member from each institution should be drawn from its office responsible for broadcasts, and one from its faculty.

- V. Dr. Edward Rosenheim, Jr. was elected to be the convener of the committee.
- VI. The Committee was directed to send a copy of these resolutions to all who had been invited to participate.

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS:

Chicago Board of Education
DePaul University
University of Illinois
Northwestern University
Roosevelt University
University of Chicago
Illinois Institute of Technology
Loyola University
Purdue University

APPENDIX IV

NOTES ON THE INITIAL MEETING OF THE
UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING COMMITTEE
Monday, May 13, 1957 3 P.M.
University of Chicago
5801 Ellis Avenue, Room 10

Notes on the initial meeting of the University Broadcasting Committee:

Present:

John Buckstaff	Stan Sidlack
Norma Einbecker	Romulo Soldeville
Clifford Ericksen	Kendall Taft
Father Francis Filas	James Taylor
George Jennings	Eugene Vest
Henry Knepler	Charles Wegener
Al Partridge	Lee Wilcox
Edward Rosenheim, Jr.	

The following report attempts to summarize most of the things that were said at our first meeting. When the Planning Committee meets, it will, it is hoped, take into account the questions raised at this meeting, with a view to clarifying and classifying these questions and ultimately to inviting collective action, where this is feasible and relevant.

The acting chairman opened the meeting by confessing his own uncertainty as to the direction which the deliberations would take, by expressing the general hope that, on the one hand, practical problems involving liason with broadcasting stations might be considered, and on the other, that clarification of general educational objectives for broadcasters might be achieved. It was suggested that, prior to any formal organizational action, the opinions of those present should be elicited with respect to the most pressing needs that could be met by a group of this character. Following this suggestion, the acting chairman invited the opinions of those present, in round-robin fashion.

MR. PARTRIDGE urged that initiative for program planning be assumed by the universities, and that the tendency of the colleges and universities simply to fill needs expressed by broadcasting stations be checked by positive action to induce stations to accept programing ideas originating with the institutions. He further suggested that Channel 11 might find it useful to emphasize certain topics upon given nights (e.g., music one evening, science another, etc.), and thus invite coordinated planning by the various institutions of programs designed to fill specific needs. He finally suggested that such a group as ours might well devote itself to research seeking to identify audience, and to the formulation of principles based upon the results of such research, with particular reference to the predilections of the audience for educational broadcasting.

MRS. EINBECKER felt that a number of immediately useful services could be performed through such a group as this, a conspicuous example of which might be the compilation of an index of the personnel resources of the various universities. She suggested further that Channel 11 could benefit greatly from judgments collectively produced by this group, either with respect to programing needs which ought to be met, or to suggestions received by Channel 11 and referred to the group for academic opinion.

MR. TAFT underscored the tentative and exploratory character of the meeting by professing his uncertainty as to the purpose for which we were assembled, and elicited thereby the general view that, though affirmative action had yet to be determined, it was obvious that certain needs and deficiencies had prompted our assembling.

MR. BUCKSTAFF revealed his concern for the positive improvement of the programing offered by the universities on all broadcast channels. He echoed Mr. Partridge's view regarding the need for the educators' taking the initiative, and revealed his hope that through a closer organization, our community broadcasting activities could achieve greater unity, quality, and importance.

MR. VEST concurred in Mrs. Einbecker's opinion that an index of academic broadcasting talent would be most useful, adding that any such compilation should take into account not only academic attainment, but the capacity for lucid and attractive radio and television performance. He expressed the hope as well that a group such as this could succeed in formulating a unified and coherent educational goal which might be attained by broadcasting.

MISS WILCOX, with characteristic vigor, asserted that immediate problems involving the relationship between the schools and such an outlet as Channel 11, should be directly considered, and negotiated with full exploitation of the collective strength resident in such a group as this. When asked whether she would regard such an organization as this committee as a potential pressure group, she replied in an unblushing affirmative.

MR. SIDLACK gallantly concurred with Miss Wilcox's views. He then proceeded to introduce the possibility of the committee's serving as a comprehensive production agency.

FATHER FILAS initially drew the distinction between a general advisory group, by no means reluctant to exert relevant and useful pressure, on the one hand, and a mere lobby on the other. Viewed as a genuine and legitimate advisory group, he pointed out, the committee might profitably address itself to a number of important questions. Among these he included

1) the alertness to available time upon commercial stations, which should, he felt, be kept in mind despite the attractions of Channel 11; 2) the recognition of prevailing taboos with respect to broadcasting, and the formulation of common policy in this regard; 3) the awareness of the virtues of so-called "scrappy" TV programing, and the opportunities for varied and useful broadcasting provided even by miscellaneous and fragmentary opportunities for air time; 4) the common consideration of such intramural problems as uniform policy on release time and payment of academic talent; 5) the securing of more favorable broadcast hours for educational television and radio; 6) ways in which liveliness and charm can be augmented in educational programs. Father Filas also expressed skepticism regarding the possibility of the committee's establishing an autonomous producing unit.

MR. TAYLOR initially asked certain questions regarding the long-defunct University Broadcasting Council. MR. JENNINGS, in responding to them, made it clear that this organization, which flourished in the 1930's, had served as an independent packaging agency, designed to produce programs conceived of by the member institutions, and had expired as a consequence of internecine jealousies and bickerings among its members. Mr. Taylor went on to introduce the question of a quota of university time, to be assigned by Channel 11 or the commercial stations, and to be filled by thoughtful, systematic division of responsibilities. He concurred with Father Filas in questioning the wisdom or advisability of a communal production agency.

MR. SOLDEVILLE advocated an amalgam of both the advisory and rhetorical possibilities of the group, pointing out as an example of what might be achieved that the collective opinion of the organization, responsibly expressed in the right quarters, might succeed in obtaining more favorable time on commercial stations.

MR. ROSENHEIM, to the unfeigned astonishment of all concerned, made history by having nothing to say at this juncture.

MR. WEGENER sought to distinguish between three categories into which prior suggestions might be placed: those concerning production, those involving the "clearinghouse" possibilities of such a group, and those having to do with the critical function of the organization. He also pointed out that the problems previously raised assumed distinctly different aspects when considered in terms of WTTW or of commercial stations. He suggested such a group as this might serve its greatest usefulness by a critical consideration of what was being achieved in educational broadcasting, and the formulation of objectives which should be sought by educational institutions.

MR. JENNINGS, who had previously provided useful information in response to the queries of others, suggested that the group might be helped by a consideration of the responsibility and authority intrinsically vested in station management. He pointed out the need for understanding a just balance between management's susceptibility to outside suggestion, and the commitment to established broadcasting policy.

MR. KNEPLER, as the final contributor to the discussion, remarked that though previous comments had been widely diversified, they revealed a common sense of the need for community deliberation and action. While fully aware of the necessity for prudence and circumspection, we ought, he argued, to provide advice which in such cases as that presented by WGN, should result in affirmative, integrated, and respectable broadcasting projects. He expressed interest in the "clearinghouse" function of the committee, and suggested that his possibility, together with such other problems as those of censorship, release time, and educational objectives, might properly be considered through subcommittees established for this purpose. He urged that the committee be officially constituted, that its existence be properly announced, and that interested agencies--and particularly the broadcasting stations--be invited to proffer suggestions and, in general, engage in appropriate communication with this group.

Following a certain amount of general discussion, the following motion was moved and seconded:

1. The organization shall be known as The University Broadcasting Association, its membership to represent all institutions of higher learning in the Chicago area actively engaged in public radio and television broadcasting, such institutions to be represented by two members each, one such member being primarily engaged in broadcasting, and the other being primarily involved in traditional academic activity;
2. that the Committee annually elect a chairman in the Spring to serve for a period of one year;
3. that the chairman elected for the present year be instructed as his initial task to appoint a Planning Committee, such Committee to review suggestions made at the present meeting, and derived from other relevant sources, with a view to outlining explicit areas for exploration and group activity on the part of the University Broadcasting Committee.

The motion was unanimously passed.

Mr. Rosenheim was elected Chairman for the current year and Mrs. Einbecker was elected Secretary for the same period.

It was informally agreed that all colleges and universities eligible for membership in the Committee but not represented at the first meeting would be informed of the constitution of the Committee and invited to send representatives to its future meetings. It was also informally recognized that plenary sessions of the Committee would be held at relatively infrequent intervals (possibly two, three, or four times per year), and that the major activities of the group would largely be carried out by subcommittee work and attendant correspondence.

With the understanding that the Chairman would provide notes summarizing the meeting and would immediately appoint the Planning Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

APPENDIX V

TUBA'S BY-LAWS

(Adopted in this form)

PROPOSED NEW BY-LAWS FOR
THE UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION
July, 1961

I. Organization and membership

A. The organization shall be incorporated under the title of The University Broadcasting Association of Chicago. Membership shall be voluntary and shall be open to all degree-granting institutions of higher learning actively engaged in public radio and television broadcasting.

B. Institutional membership shall consist of two classifications: active and associate.

Active members shall be only those institutions which offer the bachelor's degree, which are engaged in broadcasting on the Chicago stations, which desire to participate in the group activities of the Association which subscribe to the code of ethics endorsed by the Association, a copy of which is appended to these by-laws, and which are represented at the annual meeting of the Association in person or in proxy.

Associate members shall consist of those degree-granting institutions which may or may not be engaged in broadcasting on the Chicago stations, but which subscribe to the purposes and code of ethics of the Association and which are represented at the annual meeting of the Association (in person or in proxy).

C. Active members shall be represented by one delegate as designated by each institution, or by an alternate

designed by the member institution or its regular delegate. Associate member institutions shall be represented by the person primarily responsible for broadcasting for that institution or by any other so designated by the associate member institution.

D. There shall be four officers: a president, a vice-president, a secretary and a treasurer who shall be elected by the active membership annually in June to serve for a period of one year beginning September 1 and whose duties are defined in section IV of these by-laws. No officer may serve more than two consecutive terms.

These officers shall be nominated and elected in the following manner:

1) The secretary shall annually mail to all active members a form on which the names of all eligible members shall be listed as candidates for each office. The members shall signify their nominees by placing an X before the name of one candidate for each office.

2) At the June meeting, ballot forms listing all nominees for each office shall be presented to the active membership by the secretary. The office of president shall be considered first, a secret ballot taken and results announced. Balloting shall then proceed to the offices of vice-president, secretary and treasurer. A vote of three-fourths of the active membership shall be required for the election of all officers.

E. Annual dues of twenty-five dollars shall be

charged each active member organization and dues of ten dollars shall be charged each associate member to cover costs of operation. Additional expense assessments for association activities may be necessary but can be levied on and are payable pro-rata only by the active members which have agreed to such activities and to their related assessments. Expenses proposed to be incurred on behalf of associate members shall require their individual approval in advance.

II. Purposes

The purposes of The University Broadcasting Association shall be:

A. To act as a consultative and advisory group on educational broadcasting to the several radio and television outlets of the Chicago Area;

B. To encourage and assist its member singly and collectively in producing educational programs of high quality in accordance with the Association's code of ethics on local and national commercial radio and television.

C. To insure as far as possible the maximum employment of the facilities of Chicago's educational television station in the interests of higher education.

D. To elevate the standards of educational and public service broadcasting by the production of programming in accordance with the Association's Code and by engaging in other activities which will recognize or commend broadcasters for improving standards.

III. Structure

To accomplish these purposes, one representative of

each active member institution shall meet once a month as a member of the committee-of-the-whole. No action, except the election of officers and payment of bills which are provided for elsewhere in these by-laws, may be taken on behalf of the Association without 100 per cent approval of the active members, even though all members may not wish to participate in such action. Committees in addition to the committee-of-the-whole may be appointed by the president from time-to-time without consultation with the membership. The recommendations of these committees, however, must be presented to and voted upon by the committee-of-the-whole and be officially recorded by the Association's secretary or by such recorder as shall be appointed pro tem by the president in the absence of the elected secretary.

IV. Authority, responsibility and duties of officers

A. The president shall be responsible for calling meetings of the Association and of the committee-as-a-whole, for directing all communications to active and associate members and for initiating new policy or program considerations for the deliberation of the membership.

B. The vice-president shall serve as chief executive officer in the absence of the president and as executive producer, shall be responsible for all on-the-air programs initiated and executed by the Association, producing or assigning a producer for all such programs.

C. The secretary shall record the actions taken at all meetings of the Association and of the committee-of-the-whole, shall send copies of these minutes as well as

notices of meetings to all members and shall keep any other records as may be determined by the president or required by these by-laws or by the laws of incorporation in the State of Illinois.

D. The treasurer shall keep such financial records as are required by the State of Illinois, shall bill the membership for regular dues and for special assessments as outlined in Section IE above, shall upon authorization of those members present at any regular meeting pay all bills incurred by the Association, shall present a minimum of one official report per annum to be recorded in the minutes of the statutory Association meeting and shall keep any other financial records requested by the president.

V. Amendments

The above by-laws and the appended code of ethics shall be subject to review annually or more frequently should the Association desire. Amendments shall be subject to 100 per cent approval of the active members if only active members are affected or 100 per cent of all members if the total membership is affected.

APPENDIX VI

SAMPLE MINUTES OF TUBA MEETINGS

THE UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION

Minutes of Meeting--March 7, 1961

The March meeting of the University Broadcasting Association was held Tuesday, March 7, 10:00 A.M., in Room 929, De Paul University, 25 E. Jackson Blvd.

In attendance were members from the University of Illinois, Illinois Institute of Technology, Northwestern University, DePaul University, The University of Chicago, Lake Forest College, and Roosevelt University. Mr. Jerry Levin, CBS-TV Public Affairs Producer, joined the meeting at 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Partridge opened the meeting stating he was not certain whether a representative from CBS would meet with us or not. His letter to Mr. George had not been answered and a phone call to Mr. George's secretary brought no confirmation.

A discussion regarding MEETING OF MINDS occupied the first minutes of the meeting. The last program will be June 5. Messrs. Anderson and Buckstaff were appointed to draft suggestions for a summer replacement for the series on WTTW. Mr. Taylor suggested that we should also plan a new series for WTTW in the fall and attempt to place MEETING OF MINDS on a commercial outlet, possibly WGN-TV. No action was taken.

Mr. Taylor reported that he and Mrs. Einbacker may again produce a 6:30 A.M. across the board series on WNBQ this summer.

Mr. Partridge said that the report on TUBA's activities which had been sent to the stations received a favorable response from Mr. Al Field, WGN-TV.

Mr. Levin explained the current organizational chart of WBBM-TV. (Copy attached.) He explained that the Board of Education may produce SEMINAR 61 through the summer. If not, he may ask TUBA to provide programming for the weeks of June 26 through September 8. Mr. Levin concluded his remarks by pointing out that Mr. George has expanded public affairs programming at WBBM-TV. He said that the CBS theme is no longer that of expediency, but rather asks the question, "does it fill a need?" Mr. Levin left the meeting at 12:00.

Discussion followed regarding the manner in which Mr. George handled his invitation from Mr. Partridge. It was suggested that future invitations might be extended to both the General Manager and the Public Affairs Director.

Mr. Taylor reported on a conversation with Mr. Alex Dreier regarding TUBA. His report indicated that Mr. Dreier felt

the Chicago chapter of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences should be built around a group like TUBA and that he (Dreier) would like to talk with TUBA. It was agreed that Mr. Dreier should be invited to a special meeting to be held Thursday, March 23, 10:00 A.M., Illini Center, La Salle Hotel.

Mr. Partridge reported that he had asked Messrs. Anderson and Brown to prepare a suggested statement of ethics for TUBA. He also reminded the group, at the request of Mr. Bussey, that each institution is still individually responsible for reimbursing Mr. Homewood for his MEETING OF MINDS expenses.

Mr. Partridge said he would invite Mr. Ward Quaal to the next regular TUBA meeting to be held Tuesday, April 4, 10:00 A.M., Room 203, Abbot Hall, corner of Lake Shore Drive and Superior.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN

John B. Buckstaff
Secretary

THE UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION

Minutes of Meeting--May 11, 1961

Mr. Partridge called the meeting to order at 10:30 A.M. All active members were represented with the exception of Northwestern and Loyola. Both Mr. Brown and Mr. Bussey had explained they would not be able to attend.

Mr. Anderson announced that members had voted the following casts for the final 2 programs on the MEETING OF MINDS series:

Where are we going with Kennedy?--At Home--May 29
Smithburg
Johnson or Finer
Rentschler

Where are we going with Kennedy?--Abroad--June 5
Percy
Barber or Grabner
Dunnington

It was agreed that Rentschler and Percy were interchangeable, and that those charged with inviting the participants should do so, reporting back to Mr. Anderson as soon as possible.

Mr. Brown had indicated he did not wish to produce the May 22 MEETING OF MINDS. It was decided therefore, to discuss "Municipal Transportation" with possible discussants coming from Northwestern, Roosevelt, and either U of C or the city.

Mr. Partridge's letter to Alex Dreier, explaining that TUBA would not be able to participate in the ATVAS June program, was read and approved. Mr. Partridge also read a letter from S. J. Meyer expressing his regret at not being able to attend the meeting, but favoring us with some of the philosophies on which his Foundation has been built.

Mr. Buckstaff mentioned WHFC's desire for Spanish-language cultural programming. Some of the representatives felt they might be interested in following this up on an individual basis.

Mr. Buckstaff moved that a committee be appointed to study and recommend changes in the by-laws of the Association. The motion was passed; Mrs. Byrne and Mrs. Einbecker were appointed to prepare such recommendations for the July meeting.

Mrs. Einbecker distributed outlines for the summer Channel 5 series, AMERICA ABROAD.

Mr. Partridge called our attention to WEKB's PRESS INTERNATIONALE at 4 P.M. Sundays. Mr. Taylor said they are

interested in people with some journalistic training and sufficient language background to comment on foreign language papers. Scale.

Mr. Partridge suggested we consider developing a radio series and apply for a grant for a larger series this summer. Both projects will be discussed at July meeting.

Mrs. Einbecker reported total TUBA brochure cost at approximately three hundred dollars.

Mr. Anderson, in Mr. Bussey's absence, agreed to check the SEMINAR '61 dates and urged each of us participating then to confirm our instructors. Mr. Brown plans to use two instructors. The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 A.M. Next regularly scheduled meeting Thursday, June 1, 10:30 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John Buckstaff

John Buckstaff, Secretary

THE UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION

Minutes of Meeting--July 11, 1961

Mr. Partridge called the meeting to order at 10:40 A.M. in Room 1300 of the Builders Building. All active members were represented. Mr. Brown introduced a new member of his staff, Robert Thomas.

1. The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved after Mrs. Einbecker's suggestion and a directive that the third paragraph, concerning AMERICA ABROAD, not a TUBA production, be removed from the minutes.
2. The treasurer's report indicated that Illinois, IIT, and Loyola still owe the treasury for their portion of the TUBA brochure. When all accounts have been settled, including bills due, the balance of the treasury will be \$26.14.
3. Mr. Partridge indicated the agenda for the meeting should include discussion of the by-laws, code of ethics, and MEETING OF MINDS. He suggested that reports on stations and networks not of immediate value should be shelved for a future meeting.
4. The by-laws, read by Mrs. Einbecker, were discussed seriatim and suggested changes recorded by her. A motion was made and passed that the by-laws, as revised during the meeting, and the code of ethics, which was never discussed, would be distributed to all active and associate members for their further study and approval. It was agreed that all suggested changes in the by-laws and code of ethics should be forwarded to Mrs. Einbecker no later than Friday, July 14. She, in turn, will assemble and distribute these prior to the next meeting.
5. Mr. Anderson distributed a report regarding MEETING OF MINDS. Mr. Partridge appointed a committee consisting of Messrs. Anderson, Bussey, and Buckstaff to prepare recommendations for the next meeting regarding the future of the series. Mrs. Einbecker asked that it be entered in the minutes that she felt MEETING OF MINDS had been such a vast improvement over previous TUBA series that we should continue our forward motion, and guard against slipping back to a less successful production.
6. The next meeting of the Association will be held Tuesday,

July 25, 10:30 A.M. in the Illini Center of the LaSalle Hotel. Principal items on the agenda will be the revised by-laws, the code of ethics, and MEETING OF MINDS.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 1:07 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Buckstaff

THE UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION

Minutes of Meeting--July 25, 1961

Mr. Partridge called the meeting to order at 10:40 A.M. in the Louis Sullivan Room at Roosevelt University. All active member institutions were represented.

1. The by-laws, as amended, were discussed. Further minor amendments were made. A motion was made and unanimously passed that the by-laws be accepted. Final acceptance of the by-laws is pending distribution of the by-laws is pending distribution of the by-laws to associate members and their vote.
2. Mr. Anderson recommended that the by-laws committee (Mrs. Byrne and Mrs. Einbecker) be commended for an excellent job.
3. The rest of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Code of Ethics. There appeared to be general agreement regarding what standards apply to a production of the Association, but there were varying opinions regarding the role that TUBA as an Association should play in the relationship between individual members of TUBA and the broadcasting stations. There was no action taken on the proposed Code of Ethics.
4. The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 P.M. Because of the vacation schedule of various TUBA representatives there will be no formal meeting of the Association until late September.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Buckstaff

ADDENDA:

1. Following the meeting all members of the group except Mr. Brown lunched with Charles Hinds, WBBM-TV Program Director.
2. Following the luncheon the members, now minus Mr. Taylor, considered the report of the committee for MEETING OF MINDS. The report is enclosed. Those present agreed that the series should be continued in the fall. Mr. Buckstaff was appointed for the interim vacation period to make appropriate and necessary arrangements with Mr. Homewood and the station.

3. May I urge you to study the enclosed report and to phone your comments to me no later than Monday, July 31 so that I will be properly endorsed to instruct Mr. Homewood and the station in arrangements.

John

APPENDIX VII

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE TO

CONSIDER "MEETING OF MINDS"

(Date not known)

The committee to consider MEETING OF MINDS, Anderson, Bussey, and Buckstaff, met Thursday, July 20 in Bussey's office at Loyola University. They considered the comments of Marquis regarding the series and reflected on what they believed the shortcomings of the producers, talent, and station were. The committee's recommendation is that TUBA continue the production of a 30-minute discussion program, MEETING OF MINDS, effective Monday, October 2, at 8:00 P.M., with the following changes and modifications:

1. Purpose, Content and Audience. The purpose of the series is to provide for the intelligent viewer material not normally made available widely by either broadcast or printed media. The series will continue to deal with topics of current interest on the international, national, and local levels. Topics will be discussed, not as hard news with the emphasis on recent facts and events, but rather in terms of underlying principles, issues, and movements. The discussion will involve material which university personnel and their guests are uniquely fitted to provide. The desired audience is principally a college educated audience, in a large measure the same audience that reads Harper's, The Atlantic, The Reporter, The New Republic, Scientific American, etc.

2. Format. To fulfill this purpose there will be alterations in the format. The program will open with the station announcer introducing the program and Homewood. Homewood will then present a four minute factual background to the subject. This reporting is designed to supply all the

relevant facts for the discussion so that it will not be necessary to deal with these at any length during the body of the program. While Homewood crosses to the main set, the guests are introduced by the station announcer. The body of the program, under Homewood's guidance, is then devoted to exploring the "whys" of the situation, ramifications, underlying issues, causes, and if applicable, perhaps solutions. The discussion runs out. There is no summary. The program is closed by the station announcer.

3. Production. The committee feels that "production" in its broadest sense--needs to be considerably more slick. Recommendations regarding "production"--both inside and outside the station--are as follows:

a. University producer will function essentially as previously in picking the topic for discussion and arranging for participants. It will be required that the university producer and the executive producer (see below) meet with Homewood several days prior to each broadcast to discuss the background he will prepare and what the content of the program will be. Although the university producer will not write Homewood's introductory material, he will provide information for it whenever possible.

b. The committee recommends that Mr. Partridge be appointed executive producer of the series, his specific responsibilities to be as follows:

1. In consultation with the individual program producer, the executive producer will have the responsibility and

authority to direct the content and production of the programs.

2. In consultation with the WTTW director and set designer, the executive producer will plan a new set and a new production approach which will be considerably more dramatic in terms of both camera work and lighting.

3. The executive producer will make suitable arrangements with WTTW, at what levels necessary, for an audio pickup of sufficient quality that tapes of the discussions may be used for AM or FM broadcast.

4. The executive producer will act as coach to Homewood, guiding him in all ways necessary in the art of becoming a polished television personality.

4. Publicity. The committee agreed that a considerable effort in publicity is necessary to reach the desired audience. The executive producer will appoint a publicity director for the series who will make appropriate publicity arrangements so that the series as a whole and each program in the series is promoted substantially.

APPENDIX VIII

PARTIAL LIST OF TUBA SERIES

"SEMINAR SIXTY"

WBBM-TV

"Seminar Sixty" was a five day per week discussion and commentary series over WBBM-TV, beginning in February of 1960 and continuing to the end of the year.

Feb. 29 thru March 25--"The Law"

A series of twenty programs produced by Northwestern University, featuring John Coons, associate professor of law, Northwestern University; Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University; John Hayes, professor and acting dean of law, Loyola University; Fr. William Kenealy, professor of law, Loyola University; Philip Romiti, dean, college of law, DePaul University.

March 28 thru April 22--"Education"

A series of twenty programs produced by DePaul University, featuring Urban Fleege, chairman of the education department, DePaul University.

April 25 thru May 20--"Shelter--The New Era in Building"

A series of twenty programs produced by Illinois Institute of Technology, featuring Kenneth Kessin, instructor in sociology; Alfred Caldwell, professor of architecture; Daniel Brenner, associate professor of architecture; and Reginald Malcolmson, associate professor of architecture, all of the Illinois Institute of Technology.

May 23 thru June 17--"Psychiatry"

A series of twenty programs produced by the University of Illinois, featuring Dr. Paul Nielson, associate professor of psychiatry; Dr. Marvin Schwarz, assistant professor of psychiatry; and Dr. Edward Wasserman, instructor in psychiatry, all of the University of Illinois College of Medicine.

June 20 thru July 15--"Books"

A series of twenty programs produced by Roosevelt University, featuring Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University.

July 18 thru August 12--"Chemistry"

A series of twenty programs produced by Loyola University, featuring Raymond Mariella, professor and chairman of the department of chemistry, Loyola University.

August 15 thru Sept. 9--"Man's Expression--Sight and Sound"

A series of twenty programs produced by Lake Forest College, featuring Robert Martin, professor of speech and chairman of the department of speech; Norman Welling, instructor in

political science and history; Franz Schulze, associate professor of art; Helmut Van Flein, instructor in art, all of Lake Forest College.

Sept. 12 thru Oct. 7--"Marital Problems"

A series of twenty programs produced by DePaul University, featuring Anthony DelVecchio, assistant professor, psychology department, DePaul University.

Oct. 10 thru Nov. 4--"Word and Picture in Western Culture"

A series of twenty programs produced by the University of Chicago, featuring Alan Fern, assistant professor of humanities at the University of Chicago.

Nov. 7 thru Dec. 2--"The Brain"

A series of twenty programs produced by Northwestern University, featuring Ray Snider, professor of anatomy and Harold Koenig, associate professor of neurology and psychiatry, both of Northwestern University.

Dec. 5 thru Dec. 30--"The Influence of Religion on the Arts"

A series of twenty programs produced by Lake Forest College, featuring Franz Schulze, associate professor of art, Lake Forest College; Donovan Smucker, associate professor of religion and chaplain of the college, Lake Forest College; David Spencer, assistant professor of English, Loyola University; Leon Stein, director, graduate division, school of music, De Paul University.

"NEWS PERSPECTIVES"
WTTW

"News Perspectives" was a four times per week program series for almost one year over WTTW, Channel 11. The programs were fifteen-minute commentaries on contemporary topics. The series began in 1959, ended in 1960.

June 22--Ray Billington, professor of history, Northwestern University, "Brainwashing in Our High Schools."

June 23--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "Our Federal Leviathan."

June 24--Daniel Brenner, associate professor of architecture, Illinois Institute of Technology, "The Form Givers."

June 25--Helena Lopata, professor of sociology, DePaul University, "Red Faces Greet Pan American Visitors."

June 29--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "Do Police Delays Defeat Justice?"

June 30--Morris Goran, chairman, physical science courses, Roosevelt University, "Space Vehicles."

July 1--Robert Ashenhurst, assistant professor, graduate school of business and Institute for Computer Research, University of Chicago, "Feeding Computers."

July 2--Jose Sanchez, associate professor of foreign languages, University of Illinois, "Pan American Festival."

July 6--Kenyon Poole, professor of economics, Northwestern University, "What Causes Inflation?"

July 7--J.A.B. Van Buitenen, Rockefeller Foundation, Post Doctoral Fellow in Linguistics, University of Chicago, "Tales of Ancient India."

July 8--Leon Stein, director of the graduate division of school of music and chairman, department of theory and composition, DePaul University, "Summer Music in Chicago."

July 9--Eben Vey, professor of civil engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Financing Federal Highways."

July 13--Benjamin Boshes, professor of psychiatry, Northwestern University, "What is the Proper Role of Tranquilizers?"

July 14--Brandel Works, associate professor of marketing, Roosevelt University, "Advertising--Leader or Follower of Public Opinion?"

July 15--Roscoe Braham, Jr., associate professor, department of meteorology, University of Chicago, "Dissecting a Thunderstorm."

July 16--David Snyder, instructor in geography, DePaul University, "Communist Infiltration into Labor Unions in Latin America."

July 20--Francis L. K. Hsu, professor of anthropology, Northwestern University, "The Organization Man and Self Reliance."

July 21--Henry Knepler, associate professor of English, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Summer Theatre."

July 22--Hollis Barber, professor of political science, University of Illinois, "Bi-Partisanship: A Way to By-Pass Democracy."

July 23--William Alberts, assistant professor of finance and economics, Roosevelt University, "Can Men Agree?"

July 27--Harold Mayer, professor, department of geography, University of Chicago, "The Seaway--Unsolved Problems."

July 28--Father John Battle, professor of philosophy, DePaul University "The Beginning of an Era: Freedom of Man."

July 29--Father Gerard Gray Grant, assistant professor of philosophy, Loyola University, "The Movement Toward World Federation."

July 30--Peter Jacobsohn, instructor in sociology, Illinois Institute of Technology, "The Status Seekers."

August 3--E. Lloyd DuBrul, associate professor of anatomy, University of Illinois, "Do Brains Work Like Modern Missiles?"

August 4--Raymond Mariella, professor of chemistry, Loyola University, "What Can We Expect from Chemistry in the Future?"

August 5--George Bobrinsky, professor and chairman, department of oriental languages and civilization, and dean of students, division of humanities, University of Chicago, "On Dr. Zhivago."

August 6--Urban Fleege, chairman, department of education, DePaul University, "Critical Problems of Education Today."

August 10--Dr. Rubin Battino, instructor in chemistry, Illinois Institute of Technology, "A Summer Institute for High School Chemistry Teachers."

August 11--Edward Heiliger, associate professor of library science and librarian, University of Illinois, "Bombing Our Information Libraries."

August 12--Father Francis Filas, chairman, department of theology, Loyola University, "Overpopulation--Nightmare or Imagination?"

August 13--Jack Roth, professor of history, Roosevelt University, "Main Street, USA--in Moscow."

August 17--Father Edward Kammer, executive vice president, DePaul University, "Steel Is Big."

August 18--Gerald Maatman, director of fire prevention and safety engineering department, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Urban Fire Department Service."

August 19--Dr. Mark Lepper, head of the department of preventive medicine, college of medicine, University of Illinois, "Prevention of Rheumatic Heart Disease."

August 20--Louis Turner, deputy director, Argonne National Laboratory, operated for the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission by the University of Chicago, "Breaking Ground at Argonne."

August 24--John Heneghan, assistant professor of industrial relations, Loyola University, "The Public's Plight in Labor-Management Relations."

August 25--C. William Reiley, director of admissions, Northwestern University, "The College Applications Muddle."

August 26--Bernard Weissman, director of athletics, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Pan American Games--Chicagoans Behind the Scenes."

August 27--Harold Bailey, associate dean of liberal arts and professor of mathematics, University of Illinois, "Special Scholar Programs."

Sept. 1--Martin Maloney, professor of radio and television, Northwestern University, "TV's Million Dollar P.R. Story."

Sept. 2--Dr. John Brophy, assistant manager, physics division, Armour Research Foundation of Illinois Institute of Technology, "The Passing of the Space Station."

Sept. 3--Paul Johnson, associate professor of history, Roosevelt University, "Casting Our American Horoscope."

Sept. 8--Morris Goran, associate professor of chemistry and course chairman, physical science, Roosevelt University, "The Science as Humanities."

Sept. 9--Paul Schilpp, professor of philosophy, Northwestern University, "Does Philosophy Have Anything to Say to Our Age?"

Sept. 10--John Wozniak, associate professor and chairman of the department of education, Loyola University, "American School in the Sputnik Age."

Sept. 14--Mrs. Jeanne Bamberger, assistant professor of humanities, University of Chicago, "What is Modern Music?"

Sept. 15--Urban Fleege, chairman, department of education, DePaul University, "Professional and Liberal Education."

Sept. 16--John Ford Golay, dean of faculties, Roosevelt University, "(Higher and) Higher Education."

Sept. 17--Rev. William Faughnan, chaplain, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Religion on the Campus."

Sept. 21--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "Should Capital Punishment be Abolished?"

Sept. 22--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "The Road Toward Next Fall's Elections."

Sept. 23--Richard Houk, chairman, department of geography, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Sept. 24--Dr. Norman Roberg, associate professor of medicine, University of Illinois, "Polio Vaccine: Is Live Oral Vaccine a Good Idea?"

Sept. 28--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "Should the Fifth Amendment be Repealed?"

Sept. 29--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "Khrushchev--Was His Visit a Good Idea?"

Sept. 30--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "A Look at Ceylon."

Oct. 1--Norman Roberg, associate professor of medicine, University of Illinois, "High Blood Pressure."

Oct. 5--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "The Ethics of Defending Criminals."

Oct. 6--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "Political Issues in the Steel Strike."

Oct. 7--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Oct. 8--Dr. Norman Roberg, associate professor of medicine, University of Illinois, "Swollen Legs."

Oct. 12--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "Should Police Wiretapping Be Legalized?"

Oct. 13--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "The American Implication of the British Elections."

Oct. 14--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Oct. 15--Norman Roberg, associate professor of medicine, University of Illinois, "Diet and its Relationship to Heart Attacks."

Oct. 19--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "How Should the Law Approach Mercy Killing?"

Oct. 20--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "Trends in National Politics."

Oct. 21--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Oct. 22--Norman Roberg, associate professor of medicine, University of Illinois, "Prevention of Rheumatic Heart Disease."

Oct. 26--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "The Lie Detector: Its Possibilities and Limitations."

Oct. 27--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "Trends in National Politics."

Oct. 28--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Oct. 29--William Burrows, professor and secretary, department of microbiology, University of Chicago, "About Immunity."

Nov. 2--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "The Juvenile Offender--Child or Criminal?"

Nov. 3--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "Trends in National Politics."

Nov. 4--Richard J. Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Nov. 5--William Burrows, professor and secretary, department of microbiology, University of Chicago, "About Immunity."

Nov. 9--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "Free Press vs. Fair Criminal Trials."

Nov. 10--George Watson, professor of political science, Roosevelt University, "Trends in National Politics."

Nov. 11--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Nov. 12--William Burrows, professor and secretary, department of microbiology, University of Chicago, "About Immunity."

Nov. 16--Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University, "Should Police Wiretapping Be Legalized?"

Nov. 17--Donald Smithburg, professor of political science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Censorship and Restrictions on Freedom of Speech."

Nov. 18--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Nov. 19--William Burrows, professor, department of microbiology, University of Chicago, "About Immunity."

Nov. 23--Rev. Gerard Gray Grant, associate professor of philosophy, Loyola University, "Problems of Peace and Disarmament."

Nov. 24--Donald Smithburg, professor of political science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Censorship and Restrictions on Freedom of Speech."

Nov. 25--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Nov. 30--Rev. Gerard Gray Grant, associate professor of philosophy, Loyola University, "Problems of Peace and Disarmament."

Dec. 1--Donald Smithburg, professor of political science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Libel--Is the Individual Protected?"

Dec. 2--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University "The Geography of World Affairs."

Dec. 3--William Burrows, professor, department of microbiology, University of Chicago, "About Immunity."

Dec. 7--Rev. Gerard Gray Grant, associate professor of philosophy, Loyola University, "Problems of Peace and Disarmament."

Dec. 8--Donald Smithburg, professor of political science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Sedition--What Constitutes Overthrow of Government?"

Dec. 9--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Dec. 10--William Burrows, professor, department of microbiology, University of Chicago, "About Immunity."

Dec. 14--Rev. Gerard Gray Grant, associate professor of philosophy, Loyola University, "Fall-Out and the Bomb."

Dec. 15--Warren Fitzgerald, assistant professor in the Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology, "A Product Designer Looks at the Automobile."

Dec. 16--Richard Houk, chairman, geography department, DePaul University, "The Geography of World Affairs."

Dec. 21--Rev. Gerard Gray Grant, associate professor of philosophy, Loyola University, "Should the Connolly Amendment Be Repealed?"

Dec. 22--Ronald Forgas, chairman, psychology department, Lake Forest College, "Motivation--A Consideration of the Development of Affection from Mother Love to Adult Love."

Dec. 23--Henry Knepler, associate professor of English, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Theater, 1959-1960."

Dec. 28--Rev. Gerard Gray Grant, associate professor of philosophy, Loyola University, "Do We Need a World Police Force?"

Dec. 29--Ronald Forgas, chairman, psychology department, Lake Forest College, "Frontier Research--The Role of the Brain in the Control of Emotions."

Dec. 30--Henry Knepler, associate professor of English, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Theater, 1959-1960."

Jan. 4--Canio Radice, associate professor of art, University of Illinois, "Current Trends in Art."

Jan. 5--Ronald Forgas, chairman, psychology department, Lake Forest College, "Creative Thinking--Influence of Parent-Child Relationships and Teaching Creative Ability."

Jan. 6--Henry Knepler, associate professor of English, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Theater, 1959-1960."

Jan. 7--Jacob Scher, professor of journalism, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, "Responsibility and Controls in the Mass Media of Communications."

Jan. 11--Canio Radice, associate professor of art, University of Illinois, "Current Trends in Art."

Jan. 12--Ronald Forgas, chairman, psychology department, Lake Forest College, "Parent-Child Relationships--the Effect of Child Rearing Practices on Emotional Stability."

Jan. 13--Roger Hildebrand, associate professor of physics and associate director, Argonne National Laboratory, University of Chicago, "Why Smash the Atom?"

Jan. 14--Jacob Scher, professor of journalism, Medil School of Journalism, Northwestern University, "Responsibility and Controls in the Mass Media: Newspapers."

Jan. 18--Canio Radice, associate professor of art, University of Illinois, "Current Trends in Art."

Jan. 19--Ronald Forgas, chairman, psychology department, Lake Forest College, "Interpersonal Relationships--Hostility and Guilt as Barriers to Getting Along With People."

Jan. 20--Roger Hildebrand, associate professor of physics and associate director, Argonne National Laboratory, University of Chicago, "Why Smash the Atom?"

Jan. 21--Jacob Scher, professor of journalism, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, "Responsibility and Controls in the Mass Media: Radio and Television."

Jan. 25--Canio Radice, associate professor of art, University of Illinois, "Current Trends in Art."

Jan. 26--Ronald Forgas, chairman, psychology department, Lake Forest College, "Human Barriers--A Consideration of Love and Courage as Basis of Human Morality."

Jan. 27--Roger Hildebrand, associate professor of physics and associate director, Argonne National Laboratory, University Of Chicago, "Why Smash the Atom?"

Jan. 28--Jacob Scher, professor of journalism, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, "Responsibility and Controls in the Mass Media: Movies and Censorship."

Feb. 1--Canio Radice, associate professor of art, University of Illinois, "Current Trends in Art."

Feb. 2--Rolf Weil, dean, college of business administration, Roosevelt University, "The Economist Views the News."

Feb. 3--Albert Crewe, director, particle accelerator division, Argonne National Laboratory, University of Chicago, "Why Smash the Atom?"

Feb. 4--Benjamin Willis, general superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, "Report to Parents."

Feb. 8--Canio Radice, associate professor of art, University of Illinois, "Current Trends in Art."

Feb. 9--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "Literary Limelight."

Feb. 10--Albert Crewe, director, particle accelerator division, Argonne National Laboratory, University of Chicago, "Why Smash the Atom?"

Feb. 11--Richard McVey, assistant superintendent in charge of personnel, Chicago Public Schools, "Have We Enough Teachers?"

Feb. 15--Warren Fitzgerald, assistant professor, Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology, "The American Automobile--Insolent Chariot to Innocent Chattel?"

Feb. 16--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "Literary Limelight."

Feb. 17--Albert Crewe, director, particle accelerator division, Argonne National Laboratory, University of Chicago, "Why Smash the Atom?"

Feb. 18--Irving Abrams, director, bureau of medical and school health service, Chicago Public Schools, "Your Child's Health."

Feb. 22--Warren Fitzgerald, assistant professor, Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology, "The American Automobile--Insolent Chariot or Innocent Chattel?"

Feb. 23--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "Literary Limelight."

Feb. 24--Francis Schwarzenberg, assistant professor of political science, Loyola University, "International Relations."

Feb. 25--Philip Lewis, director, bureau of instruction materials, Chicago Public Schools, "Instruction Materials."

Feb. 29--Warren Fitzgerald, assistant professor, Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology, "The American Automobile--Insolent Chariot or Innocent Chattel?"

March 1--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "Literary Limelight."

March 2--Francis Schwarzenberg, assistant professor of political science, Loyola University, "International Relations."

March 3--Mark Lepper, professor and head of the department of preventive medicine, University of Illinois College of Medicine, "Asian Flu."

March 8--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "Japanese Literature in the United States."

March 9--Francis Schwarzenberg, assistant professor of political science, Loyola University, "International Relations."

March 10--Mark Lepper, professor and head of the department of preventive medicine, University of Illinois College of Medicine, "Additives, Cranberries and Such."

March 14--Warren Fitzgerald, assistant professor, Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology, "The American Automobile--Insolent Chariot or Innocent Chattel?"

March 15--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "Lesser-known Contemporary Writers."

March 16--Francis Schwarzenberg, assistant professor of political science, Loyola University, "The East and West View the Captive Nations."

March 17--Mark Lepper, professor and head of the department of preventive medicine, University of Illinois College of Medicine, "T.B.--Massive Innoculation."

March 21--R. Gene Geisler, assistant professor, department of political and social sciences, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Primary Politics in Illinois."

March 22--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "The Short Story."

March 23--Francis Schwarzenberg, assistant professor of political science, Loyola University, "International Relations."

March 24--Mark Lepper, professor and head of the department of preventive medicine, University of Illinois College of Medicine, "Cigarettes and Cancer."

March 28--R. Gene Geisler, assistant professor, department of political and social science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Primary Politics in Illinois."

March 29--Robert Cosbey, associate professor of English, Roosevelt University, "Literary Limelight."

March 30--Francis Schwarzenberg, assistant professor of political science, Loyola University, "International Relations."

March 31--Sidney Davidson, professor, graduate school of business, University of Chicago, "What's Wrong With the Income Tax?"

April 4--R. Gene Geisler, assistant professor, department of political and social science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Primary Politics in Illinois."

April 5--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

April 6--Brandel Works, associate professor of marketing, Roosevelt University, "Television--a Dilemma of Democracy."

April 7--Sidney Davidson, professor, graduate school of business, University of Chicago, "What's Wrong With the Income Tax?"

April 11--R. Gene Geisler, assistant professor, department of political and social science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Primary Politics in Illinois."

April 12--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

April 13--Brandel Works, associate professor of marketing, Roosevelt University, "Television--A Dilemma of Democracy."

April 14--Harold Visotsky, director, mental health section, Chicago Board of Health and clinical assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, "Mental Health Problems."

April 18--R. Gene Geisler, assistant professor, department of political and social science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Primary Politics in Illinois."

April 19--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

April 20--Robert McCluggage, assistant professor of history, Loyola University, "History Behind the Headlines."

1

April 21--Harold Visotsky, director, mental health section, Chicago Board of Health and clinical assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, "Current Mental Health Program in Chicago."

April 25--R. Gene Geisler, assistant professor, department of political and social science, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Primary Politics in Illinois."

April 26--Father John Battle, professor of philosophy, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

April 27--Robert McCluggage, assistant professor of history, Loyola University, "History Behind the Headlines."

April 28--Harold Visotsky, director, mental health section, Chicago Board of Health and clinical assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, "Mental Health Picture in Chicago."

May 2--Norman Welling, instructor, department of social science and political science, Lake Forest College, "National Politics."

May 3--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

May 4--Robert McCluggage, assistant professor of history, Loyola University, "History Behind the Headlines."

May 5--Harold Visotsky, director, mental health section, Chicago Board of Health and clinical assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, "Child Psychology--General Considerations of Juvenile Delinquency."

May 9--Norman Welling, instructor, department of social science and history, Lake Forest College, "National Politics."

May 10--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

May 11--Robert McCluggage, assistant professor of history, Loyola University, "History Behind the Headlines."

May 12--Harold Visotsky, director, mental health section, Chicago Board of Health and clinical assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, "Mental Health."

May 16--Norman Welling, instructor, department of social science and history, Lake Forest College, "National Politics."

May 17--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

May 18--Robert McCluggage, assistant professor of history, Loyola University, "History Behind the Headlines."

May 19--Harold Visotsky, director, mental health section, Chicago Board of Health and clinical assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, "Mental Health."

May 23--Norman Welling, instructor, department of social science and history, Lake Forest College, "National Politics."

May 24--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

May 25--Robert McCluggage, assistant professor of history, Loyola University, "History Behind the Headlines."

May 26--Harold Visotsky, director, mental health section, Chicago Board of Health and clinical assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, "Mental Health."

May 30--Norman Welling, instructor, department of social science and history, Lake Forest College, "National Politics."

May 31--Philip Romiti, assistant dean of law, DePaul University, "Current Legal Decisions."

"MEETING OF MINDS"
WTTW

"Meeting of Minds," a continuing discussion program series moderated by Harry Homewood, midwest bureau chief of News-week Magazine, began on Oct. 24, 1960, and is continuing.

Oct. 24, "The Coming Depression," produced by Roosevelt University. Featured were Rolf Weil, dean of the college of business administration and chairman of the department of finance, Roosevelt University; James Hart, dean of the college of commerce, DePaul University; Steven Harris, assistant research director for the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.

Oct. 31, "The Myth of the Farm," produced by the University of Chicago. Featured were D. Gale Johnson, professor in the department of economics and dean of the division of social sciences, University of Chicago; Charles Hardin, professor of political science, University of Chicago; Lauren Soth, editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

Nov. 7, "The Brain Mystery," produced by the University of Illinois. Featured were Dr. Frederic Gibbs, professor of neurology, University of Illinois; Dr. Ward Halstead, professor in the departments of psychology and medicine, University of Chicago; Dr. Harold Himwich, director of the research division, Galesburg State Research Hospital.

Nov. 14, "Dangers of Higher Education," produced by Lake Forest College. Featured were Dr. William Graham Cole, president of Lake Forest College; Dr. Edward Sparling, president of Roosevelt University; Dr. Arthur Pickett, associate dean of administration for the Chicago Undergraduate Division of the University of Illinois.

Nov. 21, "Africa: Critical Continent," produced by DePaul University. Featured were Dr. Richard Houk, chairman of the department of geography, De Paul University; Andrew Nwani, Nigerian student at DePaul University; Dr. Ronald Forgas, associate professor of psychology and chairman of the department of psychology, Lake Forest College.

Nov. 28, "What's Wrong With Religion?" produced by Illinois Institute of Technology. Featured were the Reverend William Faughnan, chaplain, Illinois Institute of Technology; Dr. Anthony DelVecchio, assistant professor of the department of psychology, DePaul University; Dr. Kermit Eby, professor in the division of social science, University of Chicago.

Dec. 5, "We Were All Natives Once," produced by Northwestern University. Featured were Francis Hsu, professor and chairman of the department of anthropology, Northwestern University; Earl Bigelow, associate professor of music, history, and literature, Northwestern University; Wilbert Seidel, associate professor of art, Northwestern University.

Dec. 12, "The Economics of Abundance," produced by the University of Chicago. Featured were Dexter Keezer, vice president, director and economic advisor of McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Inc., and 1960 Filene lecturer at Roosevelt University; Dexter Masters, director of Consumers Union; Reuel Denney, professor of social sciences, University of Chicago.

Dec. 19, "Communism, Is It an Alternative?" produced by Loyola University. Featured were Francis Schwarzenberg, assistant professor in the department of political science, Loyola University; Edwin Reichert, professor of education, Lake Forest College; Arcadius Kahan, assistant professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Dec. 26, "The Heart of Humor," produced by Roosevelt University. Featured were Wayne Leys, dean of the graduate division and professor of philosophy, Roosevelt University; Everett Sentman, editor-in-chief, Tangley Oaks Educational Center; W. B. Scott, associate professor of dramatic literature, Northwestern University.

Jan. 2, "Is TV Violence Contagious?" produced by the University of Illinois. Featured were I. A. Burch, student counselor and assistant professor of psychology, University of Illinois; Catherine Richards, youth services consultant, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago; Mrs. Louis Malis, president of the Chicago Region of Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Jan. 9, "What Makes a Leader?" produced by Lake Forest College. Featured were Robert Martin, professor and chairman of the speech department, Lake Forest College; Elihu Katz, assistant professor of sociology, University of Chicago; Col. John O'Neill, engineer of the Fifth United States Army.

Jan. 16, "Water Pollution in the Great Lakes," produced by DePaul University. Featured were Rev. John Cortelyou, chairman of the biology department, DePaul University; Harry Schlemz, member of the President's Water Pollution Commission; Walter Poston, United States Public Health Service.

Jan. 23, "The Crisis of Fire in Cities," produced by Illinois Institute of Technology. Features were Gerald Maatman, director of the fire protection and safety engineering

department at Illinois Institute of Technology; Henry Mikolajczyk, professor of architecture, University of Illinois; Lawrence Reich, assistant commissioner of city planning.

Jan. 30, "Are We All Criminals?" produced by Northwestern University. Featured were Raymond Mack, associate professor and chairman of the sociology department, Northwestern University; Paul James Bohannon, associate professor of anthropology, Northwestern University; Claude Sowle, assistant professor of law, Northwestern University.

Feb. 6, "Cuba and Public Opinion," produced by the University of Chicago. Featured were Arnold Harberger, professor of economics, University of Chicago; George Blanksten, professor of political science, Northwestern University; Donald Starr, foreign news editor, Chicago Tribune.

Feb. 13, "The Legality and Morality of Sit-Ins," produced by Loyola University. Featured were Rev. William Kenealy, visiting professor of law, Loyola University; Marc Galanter, assistant professor of social science, University of Chicago; Marcus Alexis, associate professor of marketing and economics, DePaul University.

APPENDIX IX

**NEWS RELEASE CONCERNING THE UNIVERSITY
OF CHICAGO'S WITHDRAWAL FROM TUBA**

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Office of Radio and Television
From: John B. Buckstaff
Midway 3-0800, ext. 3182

The University of Chicago wishes to announce its resignation from The University Broadcasting Association of Chicago, effective May 18, 1962.

The Association was formed with the hope that co-operation in broadcasting among Chicago area universities, including joint productions, would provide higher standards in educational and public affairs broadcasting. After more than five years of experimentation, including several efforts at joint productions, The University of Chicago has concluded that the needs of Chicago area stations and their audiences, as well as of the University, can be better served by program managers and public affairs directors dealing directly with the various universities.

The broadcasting staff of The University of Chicago will continue, as in the past, to provide stations with faculty resources and will be available to discuss program ideas at any time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Broadcasting. 1963 Yearbook Edition. Washington: Broadcasting Publications, Inc., November, 1962.
- Hanson, Harry (ed.). 1962 World Almanac and Book of Facts. New York: New York World Telegram and The Sun, 1962.

Unpublished Material

- Notes on Meeting of Steering Committee of Committee on University Broadcasting. Chicago, September 17, 1957. (Typewritten.)
- Recommendations of the Executive Committee of the Committee on University Broadcasting. Chicago. (Date not known.) (Mimeographed.)
- Testimony of The University Broadcasting Association before the Federal Communications Commission. Chicago, March 20, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

Personal Interviews

- Anderson, Donald. Director of Public Relations and Broadcasting, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois. March 18, 1963.
- Buckstaff, John. Assistant Director of Broadcasting, University of Chicago. February 13, 1963.
- Burns, Allen. Manager of Public Affairs, WNBQ, Chicago, Illinois. February 8, 1963.
- Bussey, Henry. Director of Radio and Television and Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. January 28, 1963.

- Byrne, Arlene. Director of Broadcasting and Assistant Professor of Speech, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois. February 20, 1963.
- Cahill, Paul. Manager of the Office of Public Information, Chicago Division, University of Illinois. February 1, 1963.
- Field, Alexander C., Jr. Manager of Public Affairs, WGN, Inc., Chicago, Illinois. February 12, 1963.
- Fisher, Hal. Former Director of Public Affairs, WBEM-TV, Chicago, Illinois. February 4, 1963.
- Knepler, Henry K. Professor of English and Chairman of the Department of Language, Literature and Philosophy, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois. July 18, 1963.
- Lewis, Colby. Former Production Manager, WTTW, Chicago, Illinois. June 10, 1964.
- Mamet, Henry. Member of the Board of Directors of the National Association for Better Radio and Television, Chicago, Illinois. February 4, 1963.
- Marquis, Chalmers H., Jr. Director of Programming, WTTW, Chicago, Illinois. April 5, 1963.
- Partridge, Alfred. Former Supervisor of Broadcasting, Chicago Division, University of Illinois. February 27, 1963.
- Schuffman, Daniel B. Former Program Manager, WBKB, Chicago, Illinois. February 4, 1963.
- Shufro, Milton. Director of News and Broadcasting, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois. February 8, 1963.
- Taylor, James. Director of Television, DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois. January 22, 1963 and June 18, 1964.
- Thomas, Robert. Producer of Radio and Television Programs, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. February 20, 1963.

ROOM USE ONLY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03169 4296