A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE METHODS AND OBJECTIVES INVOLVED IN THE PRODUCTION OF FOUR RADIO DISCUSSION SERIES

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

John B. Barron

1959

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE METHODS AND OBJECTIVES INVOLVED IN THE PRODUCTION OF FOUR RADIO DISCUSSION SERIES

by

JOHN B. BARRON

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Television, Radio, and Film

1959

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to thank the following old radio hands who furnished so much useful material: Dr. Colby Lewis of this University who put into his hands the manuscript titled "Summary of Relevant Facts about the University of Chicago Round Table," Mrs. Estelle K. Moyer of the University of Chicago's Radio and Television Office who furnished the pamphlet called "On the Entertainment of Ideas," apparently the only copy extant, and Mrs. Kathryn Johnson, producer of the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, who sent him copies of material from the files of that program. Also my adviser, Dr. Gordon Gray, and lastly, Dr. Lyman Bryson, who died on November 24, 1959 while this thesis was being put together, for his letter which reinforced the writer's conviction that the term "predicament" best describes the position of a permanent host on a discussion program. None of this material has ever been gathered together in one place before--if that is any distinction.

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE METHODS AND OBJECTIVES INVOLVED IN THE PRODUCTION OF FOUR RADIO DISCUSSION SERIES

by

JOHN B. BARRON

AN ABSTRACT

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Television, Radio, and Film

1959

Approved _____

This
imaglo
unique
humaln
unlatti
ts the
ne throu
tion to
Nota
Library
the uni
Current
n involv
upon bro
perience
nlcad fr
writer
In con
(1) A
ut-with
ttract
ent.

ABSTRACT

This thesis involves (1) an examination of three radio network discussion programs: their origin, production methods, broadcast techniques and objectives, (2) a case history and analysis of a discussion program broadcast by a university radio station, (3) an examination of who listens to radio discussion, and (4) suggestions as to the university's opportunity to contribute to public enlightenment through radio discussion and the responsibility of the radio medium to move on a continuum between entertainment and education.

Data on the three network programs were drawn from three sources: (1) library resources, (2) books and pamphlets borrowed from members of the university faculty, particularly from the writer's adviser, (3) correspondence with the universities and networks whose programs were involved in the study. The case history and analysis of the program broadcast by a university radio station is based on the writer's experience as producer and host. This was supplemented by information obtained from a sampling of the faculty who took part in the program. The writer used a questionnaire for this purpose.

In conclusion, the author advances the following propositions:

(1) A "talk show" that raises basic questions--why, how, for what?--within a format of free, informed and lively discussion is bound to attract listeners whether the topic is Marx, prison reform or Marcel Proust.

(2) In the absence of a reliable measuring instrument, the effectiveness of any single discussion must rest in the last analysis on the listener's judgment. It is possible, however, to adduce some general criteria: (a) the topic is either timely or timeless and escapes the trivial, (b) the ideas discussed jostle and nudge one another a bit, (c) there is a freshness that comes from reaching for deep down things, (d) the talk flows in an atmosphere of creative tension, that is the participants are concerned with what they are saying. An analysis also suggests that the best program is probably real, fluid and spontaneous, yet intelligent enough to contain the most significant points that can be discussed within the time limit.

(3) What the listeners get from radio discussion probably stems from the fact that the discussion gives rise to a heightened sense of personal awareness, possibly quite brief, but one which can be derived from few other sources quite as satisfactorily.

(4) Radio discussion presents the university professor in his best light: as teacher, scholar and critic.

(5) No other type of radio programming affords the public so fine an opportunity to contribute to its own enlightenment.

(6) Talk, particularly discussion, with all its limitations, ought to be the guts of educational programming not merely the rind.

(7) Radio entertainment and education through radio are not mutually exclusive. The real question is toward which end of the continuum do we wish to move?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To condemn commercial radio for failing to broadcast educational programs is like berating stones for neglecting to produce orchids. Dedicated to "giving the public what it wants", its entrepreneurs have had only limited resources to apply to "that which we have in us to become"[1] which is the essence of education. And, it is generally acknowledged, educational radio stations, including those belonging to colleges and universities, have not been able to overcome a lack of money, talent and interest, despite some valiant efforts, consistent improvement and a few notable exceptions.[2]

Yet there is one type of program in which commercial radio has served the listener well. That is the "talk show": discussion programs like Invitation to Learning and the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand which place three or four knowledgable people around a table, assign them a topic and command them to talk for twenty-five

---

[1]Charles Siepman, quoted in Lyman Bryson (ed.), The Communication of Ideas (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948) p. 186

[2]On the Entertainment of Ideas (Chicago: University of Chicago, n.d., 1950), p. 16

minutes or so--brilliantly, perceptively, if possible, but at all odds to talk. The old radio forums of the thirties--America's Town Meeting of the Air, American Forum of the Air, The People's Platform -- are all gone now, unfortunately. But the Reviewing Stand, another product of the mid-thirties, and Invitation to Learning, launched in 1940, never seem to run out of wind.

Why talk shows at all? Perhaps because we are living in an age in which, whatever else we have lost, we have not lost our desire to search out and to understand. If modern man has lost the key to his salvation, it is hard to believe that he is capable of abandoning the search for it. Indeed, despite a shallow epicureanism, at least some of the evidence, including discussion programs on commercial radio, points the other way.

Broadcast talk, meaningful in its substance, tense in its sincerity and concerned with this search for understanding, can do us a great service. It can help to make us more aware; it can help us to preserve and to re-define values; and instead of showing us what we are, it can help to show us what we can become. And talk, when it sets itself to deal with our immediate problems, can certainly help to buttress the decision-making process in a democratic society. "Democracy," said John Dewey, "begins in conversation."[1]

---

[1]Quoted in Dialogue on John Dewey, Corliss Lamont (ed.) (New York: Horizon Press, Inc., 1959), p. 58.

It is the virtue of discussion programs, when they are at their best, that they can succeed in some measure in doing all of these things. And they can do them without being ponderously and self-consciously sagacious. We need not accept the notion that knowledge must be sugar-coated with interest to be acceptable. But broadcasting probably does well when it avoids the dilemma of Melville's Captain Ahab who was "damned most malignantly" because he had the "high perception," but lacked the "low enjoying power."

A future student of our times, examining them from another day and possibly another planet, may find some clues in the tapes of the radio discussion programs which are the subject of this thesis. For on these programs men of learning and affairs now and then tangle with ideas and issues. That most of these men are university professors need strike no one as strange anymore. For professors these days are no longer satisfied to "send out a pure beam of light for the people who are struggling up the hillside on their hands and knees."[1]

Professors, according to the evidence, are the leading actors in the drama of radio discussion as it has developed here and in Canada. It is rare to discover a discussion that does not have at least one working professor among its three or four

---

[1] Paul A. Miller, "What is a University?", Michigan State University College of Education Quarterly (Summer 1959), p. 7-8. This is a transcript of a radio discussion heard on Viewpoint, a program considered in Chapter III.

participants. Most of the programs considered in this thesis were carried on exclusively by professors. And these programs suggest that this is no accident. Where can ideas--not only knowledge, not only rigorous analysis, not only precise statements, but ideas--come from as well as from the university professor? Who is better equipped to express a "sensitiveness to ideas" which means "curiosity, adventure and change" and to articulate "a civilized order" which is "transformed by its power of recognizing its imperfections?"[1] Now our professors may speak in accents which are neither distinguished nor particularly mellifluous. They may deny that they are competent to talk about anything outside their own field or even that they are intellectuals. But the fact remains, at least from a sociological point of view, that many professors, judged by their mental powers, their habits of mind, are obviously intellectuals. They are, if we accept Van Wyck Brooks' celebrated definition, highbrows; that is, men with an ideal of disinterested intelligence who make strong demands on our powers of attention, reason, sensibility and seriousness in contrast to lowbrows whose sense of things have been formed by the give and take of life and whose ideas stem from inherited folk wisdom, folk art or prejudice or from myths conveyed to them by

---

[1]Alfred North Whitehead, quoted in A Report to the Board of Trustees, by the President of Michigan State University (East Lansing: 1959)

th
Br
Ne
th
to
ad
re

re
sp
th
st
ev
ob
ev
me

co
al
re
je
in
in

the mass media, the club, the church, the union or the military. Brooks, it must be said, was not unconcerned about this split. He pointed out the tendency of the lowbrow to genuflect before the shibboleths of convention and chauvinism, but also his tendency to be resourceful, pragmatic and inventive; and he was quick to add some acid comments about the highbrow who has intelligence and refinement, but is unable to bring either to bear on his experience.

What is good talk on radio? The evidence indicates that no really good instrument exists to measure the effectiveness of a specific discussion. The evaluation is one of judgment based on the question: to what extent did this discussion meet the accepted standards of excellence? The final dependence on judgment in the evaluation of discussion does not preclude the use of facts or objective evidence. Nor should it be discouraging that the final evaluation is a judgment rather than a completely objective measurement. There is no substitute for judgment in human affairs.

This thesis offers the general view that good talk is compounded of insight, judgment, humor, passion--and words. It also suggests that discussion programs, even the most diligent and respectable, are almost inevitably erratic. Not every discussion jells: brains are cold, the microphone numbs and thoughts struggle in vain to escape the chill. And smart production gimmicks are no insurance against empty talk. Only Russian shrimps whistle.

What production methods provide an effective frame for radio

di
br
pr
ot

th
ar
th
Di
by
we
ar
Br
ge
le
ar
ma
ar
no
sh

(C

discussion? The question is dealt with in terms of format, broadcast time, duration and participants actually used on network programs whose merits may be judged from their survival among other factors.

What techniques make for smooth conduct of the program on the air? These, too, are described program by program and others are suggested. Yet it may be necessary to add that any assumption that the bones of discussion can be laid bare is open to question. Discussion is an art; and an art is not communicable except north by northwest. The skills, knacks, insights of an art are rarely verbalized effectively. It is science that is communicable, not art. When an artist at radio discussion like the late Lyman Bryson tries to put his art into words, when he tries to make general statements about it, he is likely to fail and even to mislead himself as well as others. An academician studying a hundred artists working in a hundred different situations may succeed in making communicable and valid observations. But such observations are no longer art; they are science.[1] St. Augustine said, "If nobody asks me, I know. But if I wished to explain it to one who should ask me, I do not know."

On the other hand, there is the common danger that one can

---

[1]Franklyn S. Haiman, Group Leadership and Democratic Action (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1950) p. 20

become so enamored with Whitman's "single, solitary soul" and the "interaction of variables" that nothing can be said in a general way about discussion or anything else". Yet some patterns and techniques are persistent and relatively stable. And these can be suggested, at least.

This thesis is concerned with three aspects of selected radio discussion programs:

1. Format and production methods.
2. Techniques of conducting the program on the air.
3. Objectives.

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter II gathers up for the first time within the writer's knowledge the main threads which make up the warp and woof of the three major radio discussion programs of our time: The University of Chicago Round Table, the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand and Invitation to Learning.

These three programs, more than any others, have made a unique and lasting contribution to public education through radio. Two of them, the University of Chicago Round Table and the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, the last still on the Mutual Broadcasting System, are especially noteworthy because they are examples of collaboration between the radio networks and the universities. The third, Invitation to Learning, produced and broadcast by the Columbia Broadcasting System, is still on the air,

too. The programs are considered chronologically in the order of their first appearance on the air which is not necessarily the order of their significance for public education.

Chapter III presents a case history and analysis of a program called Viewpoint. Produced and conducted by the writer since December 10, 1956, this program is broadcast weekly by the radio stations of Michigan State University, WKAR and WKAR-FM. Most of the generalizations in this chapter have an empirical base, but they are also influenced by the results of a questionnaire sent to faculty participants on the program.

Chapter IV summarizes the contents of the two previous chapters and advances certain criteria for good discussion. It considers the question of who listens to radio discussion and who does not listen and why they do not listen. In a thesis which deals largely with the intellectual's use of words, it seemed appropriate to examine the point of view expressed in Anne Morrow Londberg's Caveat:

> The intellectual is constantly betrayed by his own vanity. Godlike, he assumes that he can express everything in words; whereas the things one loves, lives and dies for are not, in the last analysis, completely expressible in words. To write or to speak is almost inevitably to lie a little. It is an attempt to clothe an intangible in a tangible form; to compress an immeasureable into a mold. And in the act of compression, how Truth is mangled and torn! The writer is the eternal procrustes who must fit his unhappy quests, his ideas, to his set bed of words. And in the process, it is inevitable that the ideas have their legs chopped off, or pulled out of joint, in order to fit the rigid frame.[1]

---

[1]Anne Morrow Lindberg, The Wane of the Future (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952) p. 76

Finally, Chapter IV points out the university's opportunity to contribute to public education through radio discussion. For here, it is suggested, is a rich and inviting role which the university and its professors are uniquely fitted to play.

It is one thing to talk about discussion programs and another to listen to them. The next best thing to listening is to read a transcript of the discussion; edited to be sure, but still fairly faithful. Appendices A, B, C and D contain typical broadcasts of the programs discussed in this thesis so that the reader can get a better idea of what they were like. Appendix E offers some definitions of discussion by authorities.

CHAPTER II

THREE MAJOR PROGRAMS

The University of Chicago Round Table

When the first regularly scheduled "talk" program in the history of radio broadcasting went on the air on Sunday morning, February 4, 1931, over WMAQ in Chicago, the program consisted of spontaneous discussion by three professors huddled around a card table in a makeshift studio hung with sound deadening drapes.

This program was the University of Chicago Round Table. The studio was located in Mitchell Tower on the university campus. The topic that morning was the controversial Wickersham Report and the participants were Professors T. V. Smith, Percy Boynton, and Winfred Garrison, all of the University of Chicago faculty.

> We three builded that day larger than we knew--larger and wiser. Truth to tell, we then and there blundered into "big Business," one of the biggest and yet one of the most intimate businesses in the whole world--namely, the hatching of ideas, the criticism of notions, the sharpening of wits, and the slow shaping of consensus for democratic action.[1]

The name Round Table was suggested by a table in the faculty club dining room of the university around which for many years professors were accustomed to linger after lunch. In 1937 the table

---

[1]T. V. Smith, One Thousand Round Tables, reprint of NBC radio discussion, May 24, 1953.

became a triangle with sponge rubber elbow rests and signal lights.[1]

The idea for the Round Table grew out of a meeting between Allen Miller, secretary of the University of Chicago Radio Committee, and Miss Judith C. Waller, WMAQ's first station manager, later director of Public Service and Education Programs for the Central Division of the National Broadcasting Company, and a pioneer in adult education on radio.[2] The university's aim was to contribute to the policy-making processes of a free society.[3]

The program was broadcast entirely without script, although the participants met in advance to prepare a topical outline and to exchange views. To permit the experiment, WMAQ waived a then customary radio industry regulation against ad lib broadcasts. This was the same station which on November 28, 1922, broadcast the first university radio lecture by Professor Forest Ray Moulton called "Evening Skies."[4]

Round Table coverage at first extended no further than Chicago and vicinity. Participants were drawn almost exclusively from the University of Chicago faculty with occasional visitors from other faculties and from public and business life. The producers sought

---

[1] Look, November 5, 1940.

[2] Judith C. Waller, personal letter, July 9, 1959.

[3] Summary of Relevant Facts for Appraisal of the Round Table, MSS, The University of Chicago Radio and Television Office, 1954, p. 3.

[4] Carroll Atkinson, Radio Contributions to Network Education (Boston: Meador Publishing Company, 1942), p. 25.

participants who could project their personalities across a microphone in some measure; whose spontaneity was convincing; and whose background and experience qualified them to speak authoritatively on the topic.[1] The audience grew.

In October, 1933, the National Broadcasting Company's Red Network made the Round Table available to its member stations as a public service program. The evidence indicates that it was the first program of any type contributed by a university to a network, and the first to be aired without script.[2] For the next three years, thirty-six stations carried the program.[3] Then in 1936, to bring the Round Table to a still larger audience, NBC moved the program from Sunday morning to the afternoon.

The shift in broadcast time was the idea of William Benton, vice-president of the university, later United States Senator, Assistant Secretary of State, and creator of the Voice of America. Benton was convinced of the great powers of radio broadcasting in the field of adult education. Through his efforts, reportedly, the University obtained an annual grant of $45,000 from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to extend the scope of the Round Table. The grant was without strings. The university remained in sole control of the program. In all, the

---

[1]On the Entertainment of Ideas (Chicago: University of Chicago, n. d., 1950), p. 3.

[2]Paul H. Sheats, Forums on the Air, a report of plans and procedures developed in the broadcasting of public affairs discussion programs over local radio stations, lists 64 forums and panel discussions, all of them produced by local stations (Washington, D. C.: The Federal Radio Education Committee with cooperation of the U S. Office of Education Federal Security Agency, 1939).

[3]On the Entertainment of Ideas, op. cit., p. 3.

university spent a minimum of $60,000 a year in each of the last ten years of the Round Table.[1]

The Sloan Foundation's support enabled the university to bring a larger number of authorities of national reputation to its radio audience, to pay participants a small fee ($75 and expenses for out of town guests and $50 and expenses for local guests), to originate the programs in the city most convenient for the participants and to assemble a full-time staff. (In 1954, more than half the programs came from stations outside Chicago.)[2] While the program remained spontaneous, the production staff made possible more thorough, systematic planning of the topic and selection of participants.

By 1944, seventy-seven stations carried the Round Table weekly. During World War II the Armed Forces Radio Network selected the program for overseas rebroadcast more frequently than all other discussion programs combined.[3] Demand for the Round Table pamphlet, a printed transcript of the discussion, became large enough to put the publication on a self-supporting basis.

Until 1944, these Round Table pamphlets were made possible by grants. Originally offered to meet requests for program texts, the pamphlet grew into an effective weekly which sold for ten cents a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

[2] Summary, op. cit., p. 2.

[3] Round Table Memorandum, University of Chicago Radio Office, July 6, 1948.

copy and three dollars for a year's subscription. It printed not only the full text of the discussion (edited for publication purposes with colloquialisms and contractions deleted),[1] but contained supplementary articles by experts, illustrations, charts, maps, texts of documents, reading suggestions, letters from listeners, and discussion quizzes.

By the time the Round Table went off the air, subscribers and purchasers of single copies had brought the annual sales to more than a quarter of a million copies.[2] A single pamphlet, "Quality of Educational Opportunity," sold thirty-three thousand copies.[3] Two other programs "The Jews" and "Propaganda" sold as many as fifty thousand copies each within a few weeks of the broadcast.[4] The University of Chicago Radio Office reported in 1948 that almost half a million letters had been written between 1938 and 1948 by listeners expressing their appreciation for more than seven hundred Round Table programs.[5]

By June, 1955, when the Round Table finally left the air, it was broadcast over ninety-seven Red Network stations from Portland, Maine

---

[1]Judith C. Waller, Radio the Fifth Estate (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1950), p. 171.

[2]Henry L. Ewbank and Sherman P. Lawton, Broadcasting: Radio and Television (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 208. Summary, op. cit., p. 30, reports nearly half a million copies weekly.

[3]On the Entertainment of Ideas, op. cit., p. 4.

[4]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 31.

[5]Ewbank and Lawton, op. cit., p. 208.

(WCSH) to Honolulu (KGU). Twenty-one of the nation's largest educational stations re-broadcast it. In New York City, two leading stations carried the program at different hours.

The audience in 1950 was estimated at five to eight million listeners. Schwerin audience research studies of Round Table broadcasts indicated an "average liking score" of seventy-one out of a maximum "liking score" of one hundred, a rating "well above most commercial broadcasts."[1] A Saturday Review of Literature poll in January, 1951, showed the Round Table among the top ten most popular radio programs among its readers.

From 1952 to 1954 thirty-five universities were represented on Round Table broadcasts by one hundred different participants. Fewer than one third were members of the University of Chicago faculty. In the same period, twenty-six foreign statesmen and scholars and forty-nine government officials appeared.[2]

The Round Table was the first American radio program after Hiroshima to discuss the implications of the atom bomb. It was the first program to present the story and meaning of the discovery of cortisone, the "dust" theory of the origin of the universe, T. S. Eliot reading his own poetry, and Anna Freud on child psychology. It was the first program to bring to the American people the voices and views of Benes

---

[1]University of Chicago, Office of Radio and Television, personal letter, November 26, 1958. See also, On the Entertainment of Ideas, op. cit., p. 6. The Schwerin studies tested audience reaction to specific programs.

[2]Summary, op. cit., p. 2.

of Czechoslovakia and Nehru of India.[1] It was also the first national discussion program to combine radio listening with home study courses in politics, economics, and other subjects.[2]

The program also had its lighter moments. Edward Rosenheim, Jr., the Round Table's last director, now Associate Professor of Humanities and Chairman of the University's Board of Radio and Television, recalls an "enormous response" from a program called "The Spell of Baseball" with Ford Frick, "Red" Smith, Alec Sutherland, and Dean Robert E. Streeter.[3]

The Round Table pointed out the way in which the resources of an intellectual community can be used directly and continuously in the immediate service of the democratic process. It put before a wide audience information and opinion about pressing issues and about subjects of lasting concern.[4]

When the topic had to do with foreign or domestic policy, the producers aimed for "balanced policy broadcasts" which could contribute to "the discovery of rational public policy" by:

1. Clarifying goals of policy
2. Proposing and evaluating alternatives

---

[1] "First in Radio," Newsweek, June 13, 1952, p. 51.

[2] Summary, op. cit., p. 10.

[3] Edward Rosenheim, Jr., personal letter, January 19, 1959. The same letter notes that when the Round Table went off the air its subscriptions numbered four thousand. Requests for individual pamphlets varied from fifty to as many as twelve thousand a week and "we are still getting them after three and a half years."

[4] A transcript of a typical broadcast is contained in Appendix A.

3. Reviewing past and probable future trends

4. Pointing to "the causal interaction of relevant factors."[1]

On the Sunday following the invasion of South Korea in June, 1950, Americans in all forty-eight states and Canada who tuned to the Round Table heard five observers who could speak from long, close-up experience with the problems relating to the abrupt, new turn in our international relations. Mobilized overnight for the broadcast on "Korea" were:

> Edward Ackerman, geographer of the University of Chicago and consultant to General MacArthur on the Japanese-Korean economy;
>
> Hugh Borton, Chief of the Division of Northeastern Asian Affairs and in charge of the Japanese desk in the Department of State, later director of the Asian Institute, Columbia University;
>
> John K. Fairbank, Director of China regional studies at Harvard University;
>
> Shannon McCune, born in Korea, director of ECA for Korea and geographer of Colgate University;
>
> Phillips Talbott, political scientist at the University of Chicago and of the Institute of Current World Affairs, a specialist in Southeast Asia.

That week's Round Table pamphlet also contained reading lists on Korean life and culture, history, the Japanese occupation, the independence movement, American-Korean relations, and recent Korean political developments. In a later program the Round Table was the first to reveal the origin of the decision to divide Korea at the 38th parallel.[2]

---

[1]Summary, op. cit., p. 3.

[2]The Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 27, 1949.

Another significant program was on the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi on January 29, 1948. Within forty-eight hours, the Indian and Pakistan ambassadors to the United States and the United Nations, Gandhi's life-long associates, appeared on the Round Table with two American scholars. The topic was "Gandhi's Life and Death: Its Meaning for Mankind."

Equally timely Round Table programs presented during the year 1950 examined the significance of:

1. The Schuman Plan for pooling steel production in Europe.
2. The facts about the hydrogen bomb.
3. The proposal for a Marshall Plan of ideas to combat the propaganda of international communism.
4. The economic and political effects of British currency devaluation.
5. American efforts to raise living standards in Asia and encourage Democracy there.
6. What is happening in Red China?

Other programs dealt with "sick" steel production; the attitude of Asians toward the people of the United States; man's attempts to control the weather; and the Civil Rights issue. The Round Table also dealt with long-term social problems in a series of discussions on "Problems of Prosperity" which opened with a discussion by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, Ford Motor Company Vice-President Theodore T. Yntema, and Senator Paul Douglas on the relations of government and business. A program which brought a near record request for transcripts was "How to Live a Hundred Years Happily!" This Round Table presented a Monroe, Wisconsin, family physician's experience in helping fifty thousand elderly people at a community health clinic. This experience was compared with the findings of the University of Chicago's

Committee on Human Development on the needs of the aged in American society. Among other programs which drew unusually large listener response in 1950, a year selected at random, were "Mankind in a Revolutionary Age," "The Christmas Carols are True," "Morals and Higher Education," "Confucius and Present Day China," and "What Freedom of Information Means to You."

A breakdown of Round Table subject areas for discussions heard in 1951 showed:

Subject Area	Number of Programs
American Foreign Policy	5
Race Relations	3
Europe	4
Far East	4
Mental Health	4
Philosophy (Democracy, Human Rights, Civil Rights)	5
Atomic Energy	2
Education	3
Freedom of Communication	3
Domestic Economic Problems	8
World Economic Development	3
Medical Advances and Health	3
Science	3
Labor	3
	52

The popularity of the program was not limited to the United States. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation carried the Round Table every Thursday evening for several years. Selected Round Tables were re-broadcast in England. The Round Table pamphlets were translated into German and read by actors on the radio network of the Western Germany occupied zones. Stations in the Netherlands and Japan also re-broadcast the program.

Originally, preparation for the Round Table was rather casual. A half-hour before the live broadcast the three participants gathered around the studio table. Before each was a copy of a one or two page topical outline prepared beforehand. One of the participants acted as moderator. He assigned each participant the task of introducing one or more sub-topics into the discussion. On the air his role was limited. He opened and closed the program, kept an eye on pace, bridged the pauses and timed the broadcast. Usually, he assigned certain signals to help the smooth flow of the discussion. When he felt that one of the participants should pick up the conversation, he simply pointed to him. The participants talked for twenty-seven minutes and thirty seconds.

Soon after the Round Table was launched on the air, it became apparent that two participants had difficulty in maintaining a smoothly flowing conversation. On the other hand, four participants were too many for the listener to identify quickly. When four were scheduled it was also found that one of them invariably dropped into the background and contributed little to the discussion. Three was therefore set as an optimum. In these early days, the producers usually managed to find one authority on the topic and two others who served to bring the language within the understanding of the average listener. Nevertheless, on occasion the Round Table included as many as seven participants and, in fact, deviated from the discussion format into combinations of discussion, debate, and interview depending on the topic and participants.[1]

---

[1]Summary, op. cit., pp. 19-25, describes sixteen different variations of the format.

Like other programs on the air over a long period, the Round Table underwent production changes. Some of these changes were the handiwork of Sherman H. Dryer, who took over as Radio Director for the University of Chicago in February, 1939. Dryer's theme was "intelligent spontaneity is possible only through careful preparation."[1]

A typical Round Table broadcast was now put into the mill about ten days in advance of the Sunday program. Dryer and his assistants met to select the topic, the angle from which the topic could best be approached, and the exact title. The participants were also determined and invited either by telephone or mail. As soon as the participants were committed, the research staff of the Dryer office sent each one a memorandum containing background material culled from many sources. With this memorandum went a two-page topical discussion outline and the names of the other participants.[2]

About six days before the broadcast, the participants met for lunch and to make changes in the topical outline. If one of the participants was unable to be present, a copy of the amended outline was sent to him. On the Saturday night before the broadcast the entire panel met for dinner and informal discussion. Finally, the participants met again in the WMAQ studios to record a trial discussion which was played back to them.[3] Members of Dryer's staff listened, made criticisms of the program, and suggested changes to improve the actual broadcast.[4]

---

[1]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 27.

[2]On the Entertainment of Ideas, op. cit., p. 14.

[3]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 29.

[4]Eubank and Lawton, op. cit., p. 208.

By 1954, the pre-broadcast pattern had changed somewhat, but it still reflected the same careful, elaborate preparation:

> The participants receive a memorandum well in advance of the broadcast. This memorandum describes the production pattern evolved by the Round Table in the course of two decades and points out the kind of material most useful for a fruitful, well-paced discussion.
>
> The participants usually get together for a dinner meeting in the most convenient city on the Saturday evening before the Sunday broadcast. During a four or five hour conversation, they decide on what are the important issues to be included in the broadcast. The executive director of the Radio Office then prepares an outline of these principal points for the speakers to use on the broadcast.
>
> When they arrive at the radio station on Sunday morning, the participants undertake revision of this outline. They then run through an informal, practice discussion session. This preparatory work facilitates fair, smooth, and germane presentation of the problem. It gives each man ample opportunity to contribute the benefit of his factual knowledge and thinking. It assures clarity and full information; intelligible spontaneity is possible only through careful preparation. The participants and the Radio Office Staff then make criticisms of the rehearsal and suggestions for changes to improve the actual broadcast.[1]

If these preparations appear to later practitioners of the discussion art to be needlessly elaborate and painstaking, they had one virtue: they worked. They helped make the Round Table one of the most effective and influential programs on American radio and the prototype of discussion "panels" or "forums" ever since. Dryer wrote:

> It is estimated that in fifteen months the University of Chicago receives more than half a million dollars worth of free time on national networks. We are under the opinion that our success in getting this

---

[1]Summary, op. cit., p. 19.

> free time is in no small extent a reward for producing good programs.[1]

The Round Table's success was based upon something more than the acquisition of three professors who could talk well. Talk is cheap, but a good talk program for a national network comes high.

If there is any Round Table "formula" at all, it includes two main ingredients: a large number of experienced University of Chicago "participant-moderators," to use the Round Table's term, and an experienced production staff.

The participant-moderators represented many disciplines. They were developed by Round Table producers as a hard core of discussion leaders who were not only knowledgeable in their own fields, but knew the ropes around a microphone and had some exposure to the pitfalls of radio discussion. When the program left the air, there were almost one hundred of these old hands, among them many recognized authorities, like Harold Urey, atomic scientist; Robert Redfield, social scientist; Robert M. Hutchins, educator; Louis Wirth, sociologist; Quincy Wright, international relations; Louis Gottschalk, historian; Henry Brosin, psychiatrist; Harrison Brown, atomic scientist; T. W. Schultz, economist; Ray Blough, economist; Richard McKeon, philosopher; and Gerald Kuiper, astronomer.

The Round Table also enjoyed the services of an experienced production crew. Sherman Dryer, George E. Probst, and Edward Rosenheim, Jr., who followed each other in that order, knew many members of the University of Chicago faculty; they knew members of other faculties; and they had a broad range of acquaintance in public life. In short, they had at their finger-tips an inventory of informed, articulate

---

[1]Quoted in Atkinson, op. cit., p. 31.

people who could give them bright and balanced discussion. And they know from experience how to put a show on the air.

The Round Table was discontinued in June 1955, but it left an heir--a twenty-one minute program labelled "New World" which continued as a segment of NBC's weekend Monitor until June 1957.[1]

Alec Sutherland, Director of Educational Broadcasting, the University of Chicago, thus describes its demise:

> The disappearance of the University of Chicago Round Table from the NBC network was one of the many concessions to budgeting which the network was forced to make as its weekend operations continued at a mounting loss.
>
> The Monitor concept was based on the opinion of planners that there was no longer a place for 30 minute programs. The Round Table's successor, "New World," was therefore a 21 minute show, and for two years was one of the very few segments of Monitor which lasted more than five minutes.
>
> Around this time the national framework of all networks began to undergo radical change. This was partly based on the fact that local stations could more easily gratify local sections, such as bar associations, PTA's, religious groups, etc., and at the same time meet FCC requirements in the "public affairs" domain. This situation has remained pretty well unchanged until now.
>
> There was no demonstration of any dissatisfactions with the content of our programs. The situation simply was that factors of money, staffing, etc., were such as to bring about their end. And you know, these are the prime factors which motivate networks.[2]

The Round Table demonstrated that intelligent showmanship is no bar to high educational purpose. If anything, the program showed

---

[1]Estelle K. Moyer, Radio-TV Assistant, Office of Radio and Television, the University of Chicago, personal letter, January 1, 1959.

[2]Alec Sutherland, Director of Educational Broadcasting, Office of Radio and Television, the University of Chicago, personal letter, December 18, 1958.

the danger of divorcing these elements of good discussion. It recognized from the beginning the existence of not one public, but many, all of them on different levels of taste and discernment and all of them fluid.[1] To attract a broad audience required both significance and showmanship. The broadcast must not only clothe the facts with significance, but with interest, its producers believed. Rosenheim sketched the audience generally:

> I would be reluctant to describe our audience as "egghead," particularly in the last years, when a thoroughly mixed bag accounted for the audience on Sunday morning radio. We did assume obviously an audience that was educable if not educated, that was prepared, for whatever reason, to pursue discussion rather closely, and that was sufficiently broad-minded to react favorably to a diversity of opinions rather than seeking confirmation of its own dogmas. Such an audience included the aged and infirm (in increasing number in later years), school children grimly pursuing assignments, and really the whole spectrum which would be included in such a general definition. . . . And then . . . the Round Table also had its occasional listeners drawn by interest in a particular topic.[2]

Sherman Dryer asserted that the Radio Office had neither faculty committee nor official faculty advisers and that he answered only to the President's office.[3] George E. Probst, who succeeded Dryer as Executive Director of the Radio Office in 1944, said flatly, however, that he consulted with the University's Faculty Board of Radio and with individual members of the faculty. The Faculty Board, in fact, he added, determined general policy. It also suggested topics and participants and evaluated past Round Table programs.[4]

---

[1] Summary, op. cit., p. 25.

[2] Edward Rosenheim, Jr., personal letter, January 19, 1959.

[3] Quoted in Atkinson, op. cit., p. 30.

[4] On the Entertainment of Ideas, op. cit., p. 18. See also Summary, op. cit., p. 19.

Nevertheless, it is evident that once the program was ready for broadcasting it was the sole responsibility of the Radio Director. His staff, drawn entirely from commercial radio,[1] devoted itself exclusively to broadcasting what it conceived to be good radio, stimulating, informative, and well-paced. Dryer was emphatic:

> We do not try to be educational. It is our theory that radio consists of techniques of enticing and holding listeners. Since the materials with which we deal, or the participants whom we invite for our discussion shows, are educators it may be argued ipso facto that our programs are "educational." I want simply to emphasize that the interests of the Radio Office are on techniques of broadcasting and that we are not concerned (on the Round Table) with what the scholars say but only how effectively they say it from a radio point of view--pace, color, clash of opinions . . . . It is not our policy to request broadcast time on networks solely because we are an educational institution.
>
> We must submit finished programs which must earn their right to air because they are good radio--and for no other reason.[2]

The Round Table Philosophy.--When almost thirty years ago the University of Chicago undertook to use radio to fortify the American ideal of free discussion in the public interest, the undertaking was ambitious and the means small, but the principles involved were clear. They were five in number:

1. Radio is a platform for universal education--or universal exploitation.

2. Educational institutions have a duty to help build this radio platform for education.

3. The platform is able to provide a wide hearing for the best thinking that education and public and lay leadership, both in America and abroad, has to offer.

---

[1]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 30.

[2]Atkinson, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

4. The platform provides a model, not only for radio, but for every other form of serious, purposeful discussion that underlies all the other activities of citizenship.

5. The platform is open not to demagogues or to reckless partisans or to self-seekers, but to men and women to whom facts are sacred, opinions informed and judicious. It has no axe to grind, no line to hew to, and no censorship, open or implicit, to bow to.

The Saturday Review of Literature bestowed on the program the motto: "Tough Oak for strong teeth. Serious, Learned, and Bold."[1]

The University of Chicago thus assumed a responsibility in radio defined by its Chancellor, Robert M. Hutchins:

> To formulate, to clarify, to vitalize the ideals which should animate mankind is the heavy burden that rests upon the universities, and which rests upon the University of Chicago Round Table. The task of the Round Table is candid and intrepid thinking about fundamental issues. The most competent authorities clarify important issues of public policy and stimulate the listener to further study and thought.[2]

The Northwestern University Reviewing Stand

If the University of Chicago Round Table was the first regularly scheduled talk show to be carried by a commercial network, the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand clings to the merit of being the oldest still on a network. A less ambitious undertaking than the Round Table or Invitation to Learning, it has nevertheless built up a wide audience on the Mutual Broadcasting System. The program began its twenty-fifth year of broadcasting on Sunday evening, October 11, 1959.[3]

---

[1] The Saturday Review of Literature, October 28, 1950.

[2] On the Entertainment of Ideas, op. cit., p. 2.

[3] A transcript of a typical broadcast is contained in Appendix B.

Northwestern University started broadcasting early. In 1928, Professor Baker Brownell went on the air with lectures in "Contemporary Thought." Throughout the early thirties, the publicity department produced a variety of programs, most of them "straight talks" by members of the Northwestern faculty.[1]

In 1933 the university aired a series of talks dealing with the world of tomorrow.[2] This was described as "a glimpse into the future of government, literature and society." Station WGN carried this series each Thursday evening from 7:15 to 7:30.[3]

In the fall of 1934, Northwestern began to develop more clearly its interest in adult education by radio:

> Radio has an important function to perform so far as mass education is concerned. We believe its function is the awakening of intellectual and cultural interests rather than their broad and thorough development. Education in radio should serve as a leaven to quicken slumbering instincts, and to inspire in the individual the desire to know more about a given subject. It is not suited, we believe, to a broad and intensive development of any deep intellectual interest.[4]

It was this philosophy that prompted a series of discussion programs under the name the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand.

The name for the new series was suggested by Edward Stromberg, then Director of Publicity for the University. A memorandum from WGN read: "Lines have been ordered into your campus studio at our expense. This arrangement will carry through to the close of the fall

---

[1]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 109.

[2]Reviewing Stand files, undated record (approximately August 3, 1940), p. 2.

[3]Northwestern University Information, Vol. II, No. 7 (October 23, 1933).

[4]Reviewing Stand files, op. cit., p. 2.

semester--the week ending, December, 1934."[1] The studio mentioned was a small one in the basement of the School of Speech. Stromberg wrote:

> In providing for these broadcasts, WGN has shown a fine spirit of cooperation. We have been given for our programs very desirable hours, which have been guaranteed for the period of the schedule. In addition, WGN has agreed to pay wire and other charges involved in broadcasting these programs from our studio located on the Evanston campus. We understand that these charges will be in excess of $300 per month. This Evanston studio eliminates the necessity of our faculty's going to Chicago to broadcast, thus saving a great deal of their time and making possible a larger number of educational programs on the air.[2]

The first program under the new format was broadcast on Sunday morning, October 14, 1934, from 10:00 to 10:15. It presented two faculty members using a prepared script to discuss a "vital current issue"; the exact topic went unrecorded. The two professors were Augustus Hatton, of the Political Science Department and Irving J. Lee of the School of Speech who acted as "questioner."[3] Lee's questions and even Hatton's answers were prepared in advance and the two carefully avoided any deviation.[4]

The first broadcasts from the Evanston studio met with production and technical troubles:

> The School of Speech radio studios on the Evanston campus were first used . . . before many of the technical

---

[1]Ibid., p. 1.

[2]Edward Stromberg, "Memorandum on Radio" (typewritten) n. d. (approximately October, 1934), p. 1.

[3]"Radio Talks," publicity release (typewritten), p. d. (approximately November 1, 1934).

[4]Dr. Irving J. Lee, quoted in a letter from Mrs. Kathryn Johnson, Producer of the Reviewing Stand, Department of Public Relations, Northwestern University, July 28, 1959.

> developments of radio were perfected. WGN's engineer had trouble controlling volume of the speakers' voices in the university's studio and on one occasion when batteries were used, someone turned off the battery charger and the program nearly failed to get on the air. Before the days of large studio clocks, the program usually left the air one minute early and WGN announcers downtown were required to "fill" with announcements before the next program.[1]

These initial years of broadcasting were under the direct supervision of the Department of Publicity. On January 27, 1935, after the first Reviewing Stand series, however, President Scott appointed a University Faculty Committee on Radio which, in cooperation with the publicity department, assumed responsibility for four programs then being broadcast by WGN. This included the Reviewing Stand. The university committee consisted of George J. Cady, Clyde L. Grose, M. J. Herskovits, Garrett H. Leverton, William M. McGovern, and Alpheus Smith.[2]

This committee sought out expressions of opinion through a "N. U. Radio Jury" sheet which was sent to each faculty member. Letters of suggestion and criticism were welcomed.[3]

From this faculty committee Professor William McGovern was chosen to head a separate committee in charge of the Reviewing Stand. His committee members were Arthur Todd, Kenneth Colegrove, George Cady, and Ernest Hahne.[4] Under this new committee the Reviewing Stand continued on Sunday morning, but in November, 1935, it blossomed out in

---

[1]Press release, October 19, 1947.

[2]Memorandum to the Faculty of Northwestern University (mimeographed), n. d. (approximately February, 1935).

[3]Ibid., p. 2.

[4]Memo from the files of the Reviewing Stand.

the dress of a discussion program sans questioner, although still only fifteen minutes and with only two participants.[1]

Another development took place about this time which had a bearing on the broadcasting activities of Northwestern University. In 1934, a committee had been appointed to consider the problems of educational broadcasting in the Chicago area and to recommend improvements. This committee, consisting of two representatives each from the University of Chicago, DePaul, and Northwestern, tackled primarily the problem of competition for time among the three institutions. One result of the competition was that one university program appeared on a station at the same hour that another university appeared on a competing station. This led to the division of a small audience into even smaller segments.[2]

As a result of this committee's work each of three universities signed contracts in June, 1935, which brought into existence a corporation known as the University Broadcasting Council. It began to operate on July 1 of the same year.[3] Northwestern's first representatives on this Council were Dean Ralph Dennis of the School of Speech, and Edward Stromberg, the Director of Publicity for the University.[4]

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Resume of the Broadcasting Activities of Chicago, DePaul, and Northwestern Universities, 1933-1937 (Chicago: University Broadcasting Council, February, 1938), p. 2. (Dittoed)

[3]Ibid., p. 6. See also Atkinson, op. cit., p. 27 and Waller, op. cit., pp. 301-304.

[4]Letter from President Walter Dill Scott to Dean Ralph Dennis, June 4, 1933.

This organization acted as a clearing house and programming department for the broadcasting activities of the three universities. Northwestern's Reviewing Stand as well as the other university programs thus became related to the activities of the Council, although each university continued to produce and guide its own programs. In addition to the basic idea of cooperation between education and the radio industry, the Council announced as its policy:

> That its programs be interesting and stimulating, rather than pedantic and technical--to open up new fields of general interest to the vast lay audience, and to appeal to the persons of intellectual alertness and capacity in that audience.[1]

Some topics used in 1936 were "Safety in Transportation," "Christianity in 1936," and "The Future of the British Empire."[2] It was on January 19th of the same year that the first speaker outside of Northwestern's faculty appeared on a Reviewing Stand program. He was Dr. William Y. Elliott, Chairman of Harvard University's Department of Government. He appeared on a program with Professor Hatton and discussed "The Need for Constitutional Reform."[3]

Early in 1936 WGN joined the Mutual and Yankee Networks for the Reviewing Stand series.[4] Eight Mutual stations now listed the program:[5]

WLLH--Lowell, Mass.	WATR--Waterbury, Conn.
WHBH--Bedford, Mass.	WTHT--Hartford, Conn.

---

[1]Reviewing Stand files, op. cit., p. 4.

[2]Ibid., p. 5.

[3]Northwestern University Press Release, October 19, 1947.

[4]Minutes of the Northwestern University Faculty Radio Committee, February 11, 1936.

[5]"Shop Talk," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, December, 1958, p. 463.

WSAR--Fall River, Mass. WPRO--Providence, R. I.
WHAC--Boston, Mass. WGN---Chicago, Illinois

By 1937 the program's broad general topics had narrowed somewhat. Some titles, for example, were "The TVA Turmoil," "Arming for Peace" (a consideration of the billion dollar Navy increase bill) and; "Britain of Today" (on the occasion of Anthony Eden's resignation from the British Cabinet)1[1]

The year 1939 marked the second major transition in Northwestern's radio broadcasting. A few months before the University Broadcasting Council was dissolved, the publicity department set up a department of radio with a director and assistants to carry on Northwestern's programs independently.[2] Parker Wheatley, who had been affiliated with the University Broadcasting Council, was named director of this office. He also took over as director and moderator of the Reviewing Stand. As moderator, Wheatley's role resembled that of the "questioner" on the first Reviewing Stand programs, but he freed himself from the script,"represented the listener,"and guided the discussion. Outlines were prepared, some rather extensive. But even before this time the producers had realized that an extemporaneous style was much more effective than a prepared script. Wheatley gave definition to the role of the moderator; and his example remained the pattern of his successor. Experiments late in 1939 using three and even four speakers in addition to the moderator also developed into a standard practice which has been followed with variations since then.[3]

---

[1]Reviewing Stand files, op. cit., p. 5.

[2]Ibid., p. 6.

[3]"History Briefs," from the files of the Reviewing Stand.

In May 1939 the number of Mutual stations carrying the Reviewing Stand increased to twenty-six.[1] The first group of stations to carry the program were eastern stations. In November 1939, an additional increase in stations brought the total to thirty-nine. "Token" payment of participants had been inaugurated on October 1. At the same time, more distinguished guests from government, business, and the press were invited to appear. The program was also reoriented to involve the listener more directly in the discussion by soliciting comments, questions, and topics.[2]

The year 1940 brought another major change in the Reviewing Stand. In February, the length of broadcast was increased from fifteen to twenty-five minutes.[3] The subject of the discussion on that date was "Is the United States R peating 1917?" The participants were three Northwestern professors: Joseph P. Harris, political scientist; Tracy E. Strevey, specialist in American History; and Ernest Lauer, authority on European and modern world history.[4] (The producers also experimented with a studio audience, but gave up this idea after one performance when two of the visitors got into a fist fight!)[5]

With the increase in time given to the program, the number of stations scheduling the Reviewing Stand jumped to sixty-two. Audience mail steadily increased and requests for copies of the broadcasts became

---

[1]Reviewing Stand files, op. cit., p. 5.

[2]Reviewing Stand files, op. cit., p. 6.

[3]History "briefs" from the files of the Reviewing Stand.

[4]"Mutual Broadcasting System News," n. d. (approximately February 5, 1940) (mimeographed).

[5]J. B. Bubb, Memories of a Broadcaster (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1949), p. 121.

numerous enough to warrant the mimeographing of form post cards to announce that transcripts were not available.[1]

In February 1942, the university and the network agreed to boost the length of the program, this time to a full half hour.[2] The subject of the first half hour discussion was "What Singapore Means to the United States." In May 1942, Parker Wheatley, was called into the military service and Dr. James H. McBurney, now Dean of the School of Speech, took over as moderator of the Reviewing Stand. Except for short periods, he has served continuously since then.

From 1942 to 1945 format and topics remained the same: a moderator and from three to four participants speaking extemporaneously on timely economic, political, and social problems, both national and international in scope. After 1945, however, the producers found that listener interest had shifted more to personal problems and to questions dealing with literature, science, and the arts. Topics such as "Can We Cure Alcoholism?," "Chemistry and the American Way of Life," "How to Talk Politics," "Are You Too Old to Learn?" and "Tensions in Modern Living," reflected this change.[2]

From its earliest days the Reviewing Stand received request for transcripts of the discussions, but none was published until February, 1943, when the university distributed an experimental publication. The success of this transcript was evidently enough to warrant continued publication. The first program thus made available to the public was the discussion of May 2, 1943, entitled "America After the War."

In 1945, the Reviewing Stand, like the University of Chicago Round Table, began to travel. Three programs originated from Los Angeles

---

[1]Northwestern University press release, February 3, 1942.

[2]Northwestern University press release, October 19, 1947.

and San Francisco the first year, followed by programs from Denver, Colorado; Columbus, Ohio; and Columbia, Missouri, in 1946.[1] This has proved to be an effective variation and is still carried on.

In the Reviewing Stand's history, places around the discussion table have been shared with leaders in many fields from outside the university. In 1946, Dean McBurney wrote:

> Since May, 1943, 52% of our speakers have been academic men and 48% engaged in non-academic pursuits. Of this 52% in educational institutions, 65% have been members of the faculty of Northwestern University and 35% from other colleges and universities. One third of all of our speakers have been affiliated with Northwestern University.
>
> Our record further shows that of the men from non-academic positions appearing on the program, 36% hold national positions, 22% hold regional positions, and 42% hold local positions.[2]

By 1942, the number of Mutual outlets carrying the Reviewing Stand reached sixty-two. By 1949, the number jumped to 175 Mutual stations and single printed transcripts sold about 1,100 copies weekly, including subscriptions.[3] Estimates of the program's audience ran as high as one million persons.[4] More than seventy-five stations reported carrying the program in June, 1959.[5]

---

[1]James H. McBurney, "A Memorandum on Purpose, Format, Subjects, Speakers, and other Matters," October 7, 1946, p. 4. (typewritten).

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

[3]Eubank and Lawton, op. cit., p. 209, put the figure at 1,500 to 3,000 weekly, but this appears to be too high.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Mrs. Kathryn Johnson, Producer, The Reviewing Stand, Department of Public Relations, Northwestern University, personal letter, July 20, 1959.

The Reviewing Stand is taped early in the broadcast week for airing on WGN Sunday evening at 8:35, Central Daylight time. The tape is then sent to New York for broadcast to all Mutual stations the following Monday. The network's Pacific Coast chain broadcasts the program a week later. Since May, 1953 the program has used twenty-five rather than thirty minutes.

The Reviewing Stand's pre-broadcast procedure has changed through the years in the direction of less formal rehearsal.

> Ordinarily, a formal rehearsal takes the life out of the program on the air. A spontaneous and spirited discussion is desired and too much rehearsal is felt to be detrimental . . .[1]

Usually, the participants meet a few days before the broadcast to discuss the topic in general and to prepare a topical outline. They meet again an hour before air time to go over the outline and to "reach certain agreements and understandings. . ."[2] But there is no formal rehearsal. Dean McBurney believes, in the first place, that "the interesting and vigorous discussion which gave rise to these understandings cannot possibly be repeated." Any attempt to do this results in "a stale program or one which begins with 'starting points' beyond the grasp of the audience."[3]

The Reviewing Stand Philosophy.--The Reviewing Stand is based on the idea that public discussion is a necessary condition of a free society. It never seeks a common denominator, except the willingness

---

[1]Mrs. Kathryn Johnson, personal letter, op. cit., July 20, 1959.

[2]Quoted in Bubenk and Lawton, op. cit., p. 209.

[3]Ibid.

of the participants themselves to meet and talk. The outcome is that the listener makes contact with a kind of broad and radical thinking that is normally out of his reach. The Reviewing Stand is education in twentieth century dress.

Invitation to Learning

Few network radio shows are long-lived. A trickle of soap operas still moan and pant through the daytime hours, and now and then some comedy seminar mines a precious guffaw, but television and programming shifts have doomed the rest--except, strangely, for two hardy discussion programs: The Reviewing Stand and Invitation to Learning.

Invitation to Learning, a discussion of great books and a third program of major significance for radio discussion, went on the air for the first time on Sunday morning, May 26, 1940, over the Columbia Broadcasting Company's New York outlet, WCBS. Time dubbed it "the pearl of all educational programs."[1]

The program brings together writers, critics, and professors, who talk about the classic works of literature.[2] Lyman Bryson, its longtime host and Director of Public Affairs for the Columbia Broadcasting System until his death in November, 1959, tells us the purpose is "to prove to millions of radio listeners that the old adage 'great books are those nobody reads' is untrue."[3]

---

[1]Time, November 20, 1941.

[2]Quoted in Atkinson, op. cit., p. 45.

[3]A transcript of a typical broadcast is contained in Appendix C.

Bryson called Invitation to Learning "the most unashamedly high-brow program on the air."[1] A publisher labelled it "C.Q."--Civilization Quotient.[2] A rival network had another name for it: "Columbia's Hour of Silence."[3] And two salaried contributors to the public prints referred to it, somewhat ungraciously, as "Imitation of Learning" and "the only program that uses a lorgnette instead of a microphone."[4]

Identified in 1959 as a "public affairs presentation of CBS News," the program idea appeared originally in the fertile imagination of Stringfellow Barr, then president of St. John's College, the "Great Books" school, and a member of the network's Adult Education Board headed by Lyman Bryson, until 1943 holding forth as professor of Education at Columbia University.[5] The Program Department worked out the actual format. It was an experiment new to radio broadcasting. Bryson had a hand in the program's final format, but he did not take over as host--the program uses the term "host" and "chairman" interchangeably--until 1943.[6]

---

[1]Lyman Bryson, Time for Reason about Radio (New York: George W. Stewart, 1948), p. 20.

[2]M. Lincoln Schuster, quoted in Katherine Spreul, "Dialing Civilization," The Saturday Review of Literature, August 19, 1950, p. 20.

[3]Ibid., p. 20.

[4]Ibid.

[5]"Radio Book Program Thrives," The Christian Science Monitor, May 27, 1958.

[6]Ibid.

In the first seventeen months of its existence, Invitation to Learning confined itself to literary classics known to have been read by the framers of the Constitution of the United States, a broad canvas which was to prove not broad enough. The first program had to do with the famous document itself. It was broadcast in a studio in which the air conditioning failed and sent the temperature up to 115 degrees. Three Columbia professors perspired around the microphone: Mark Van Doren, Allen Tate, and Huntingdon Cairns. Van Doren, one-time literary editor of The Nation, acted as host. These three continued as program regulars, although occasionally spelled by Helen Hull Miller, Irwin Edman, Stringfellow Barr, and Andrew Chiappe.[1]

After sixty-seven programs, the network decided on a change which, by hindsight, was indicated from the start. The three regulars had run dry.[2] The show needed fresh ideas from new voices to sustain its vitality. Van Doren, an engaging radio personality, was retained until Bryson succeeded him as regular host, but from then on--November, 1941--Tate and Cairns made only guest appearances.

Invitation to Learning has hewed consistently to the three-participant format. Since 1940, more than eight hundred participants representing education, literature, government, and the arts, have appeared.[3]

As part of the change-over in 1941, the time of the broadcast was also changed from 11:30 A.M. to noon (Eastern Standard Time). But a

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Time, November 24, 1940, p. 49.

[3]"Radio Book Program Thrives," op. cit.,

more fundamental change had to do with the books discussed. Broad categories--History, Poetry, Philosophy, Fiction--were abandoned in favor of a thirteen week series, each category under a more specific title such as "Understanding the Arts" and "Tradition and Change." An attempt was also made to give the discussion a little more contemporary glitter. Thus, historian Allen Nevins linked Herodotus' History with World War II. A classic of conservatism, Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France, was discussed along with Tom Paine's classic of revolution, The Rights of Man. In a program on Don Quixote, John Peale Bishop and Jacques Barzun examined the mad knight of Cervantes as an archtype of "high-minded, but ill-informed reformers," and found a treatment of the same idea in Mr. Deeds Goes to Town.

Bryson tried to make the program sound like a real conversation. The listener is cast in the role of an eavesdropper. No remark is ever aimed at him directly; he remains "off stage," yet, of course, always present. The participants are careful not to "talk down," however esoteric the language of the book. To heighten the eavesdropping illusion, the program closes without formal summary or conclusion. Even the old custom of "throwing the last speech" to the author,[1] that is, breaking off the discussion with a reading by one of the participants of a few lines from the book itself, is now seldom used. Bryson himself had an easy manner, a keen sense of timing and an ever-alert curiosity which flowed out from the microphone.[2]

---

[1]Mark Van Doren (ed.), The New Invitation to Learning (New York: Random House, 1942), p. xii.

[2]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 46.

Invitation to Learning leans much less heavily on pre-broadcast preparation than its older relative, the Round Table:

> The book to be discussed is chosen well in advance of the broadcast. Participants agree on a general outline and select a passage which is read at the end to give the listener an example of the author's style and to assure an effective conclusion. They do not prearrange the detailed development of the outline. But, although these broadcasts are described as "unrehearsed," it would be hard to find three people better prepared to talk about great books.[1]

Bryson's sharp insight goes to the heart of the problem:

> Someone someday will find some profound effect on the art of conversation in the broadcasting necessity to prevent dead air. The responsible participant, whatever you call him, has to serve that purpose always. If he can talk sense so much the better. And if he can talk sense about the subject, he is good. If he can talk sense about what the others have said about the subject, he is a genius. Of these there are too few.[2]

Bryson might also have cited Thoreau's remark: "It takes two to speak the truth--one to speak and the other to hear."[3]

To Mark Van Doren, Bryson's predecessor, the discussion art was difficult and strangely simple:

> The art of participating in dialogue . . . (is) not to be pursued here because it has its trade secrets. But one observation can be made. Any art has its difficulties, and the difficulty in this case may seem strangely simple. Nevertheless, it is real. It is the difficulty of listening to the other man while preparing to answer him. It is the difficulty of being courteous, mind to mind.[4]

---

[1]Eubank and Lawton, op. cit., p. 204.

[2]Lyman Bryson, personal letter, January 24, 1959.

[3]Quoted in Robert Louis Stevenson, "Truth of Intercourse," Virginibus Puerisque (New York: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1925), p. 32.

[4]Van Doren, op. cit., p. xiii.

Bryson did not cast the program himself, although he reserved a seldom used veto privilege. The staff attempts to achieve a balance of personalities and voices and, if possible, to select participants whose views are likely to provide some contrast. But, Invitation to Learning does not seek disputes. "If they come," Bryson wrote, "I let them warm up. But if we have interesting opinions without clash, that does as well."[1]

Invitation to Learning differs from the Round Table in another important respect: it assigns more importance to the discussion host. Consider the Round Table's reasons for dropping a permanent host:

> One reason why the leader of the series was not retained has been that we feel that the Roundtable [sic] "personality" derives from the University of Chicago as an institution. Invariably, if any one person becomes a more or less permanent leader, he may gain personal prestige at the expense of the real values of the institutional sponsorship. Further, if one person were indeed selected as a more or less frequent leader he would more or less have a voice in the selection of topics and participants, and no respectable person would submit to being a stooge. Thus, one man would in effect become the "boss" of the Roundtable sic at the expense of the present setup, where the minds of many people are tapped for suggestions concerning topics and participants. The wide variety and significance of topics selected for the Round Table seems to me to preclude any one person's being on very often--for the simple reason that no person is really competent to discuss over a nationwide hook-up a variety of topics of issues.[2]

Produced by CBS, Invitation to Learning, however, represents only that network. Its reasons for preferring a single, permanent host were, first the rare capabilities of Lyman Bryson and, second, the conviction that a discussion leader who appears regularly gives

---

[1]Lyman Bryson, personal letter, January 24, 1959.

[2]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 30.

continuity to the program and helps to identify it for the listener.

In any case, the host has a difficult assignment:

> If one thing rather than another distinguishes the good conversation leader--besides his quickness of speech and thought which are sine qua non--it is, I think, the ability really to hear and remember for the time what others say. Too much preparation of the wrong kind can be a handicap because the leader is then full of things that the actual talk do not make appropriate and most leaders will force others to give them leads for their prepared wisdom and wit.
>
> I don't even stick to our outline if real interest develops in an unexpected direction. And I refuse to discuss the subject with any guests except for the hour--never more--with which I work with them in the studio before cutting the record. The hour is enough for discovering what they want to cover and make an immediate outline of it which they'll agree to, also to alleviate nervousness, discover their compulsions, soothe their hostilities and tell them about the mechanics of the show such as frequent mention of names and of the author (of the book under discussion), timing, etc.[1]

Van Doren described the program in 1942 as a living thing:

> Three persons come together . . . and start the book moving among them. For an hour they do this, neither formally nor solemnly but with a genuine desire in each of them somehow to know the others; and then they are on the air. The only two things they are certain about beforehand are the question to begin with and the passage to be read at the close. The half hour between, except as its agreements and disagreements are colored by memories of the preliminary meeting, is unrehearsed and free. There have been occasions when a disagreement is lost by having been too clearly anticipated; the element of surprise, even of anger, was missing. But on the whole the contrary is true; the argument benefits from previous knowledge of the limits to which it can profitably go.[2]

---

[1]Lyman Bryson, personal letter, January 24, 1959.

[2]Van Doren, op. cit., p. xiii.

"Great books," said A. Whitney Griswold, "require great conversation to complete their meaning."[1] Perhaps, Invitation to Learning has not always provided great conversation. In 1942, Carroll Atkinson, author of many books on radio in education, whose Radio Networks Contribution to Education, has been cited liberally here, found fault not with what was said, but how it was said:

> While Invitation to Learning, because of its idealistic purpose and its broadcasting coast-to-coast, merits the distinction of being ranked among the most outstanding educational radio programs, there has been considerable criticism against its presentation. The scholars, whose reputation as "scholars" is without question, hem and haw at times indicating that their education in oral presentation has been sadly neglected. There are a large number of radio listeners who are so imbued with a great love of the classics that any faults of presentation can be forgiven . . . but a few simple lessons . . . in how to speak the English language in an interesting manner minus the unnatural pauses would go a long way to increase the value of the program to those who could be taught to revere the classics . . .[2]

Like the Round Table, Invitation to Learning is an ad lib program, but uses a topical outline which is frequently observed in the breach. Twenty-five minutes in length, like the Reviewing Stand, it is recorded in advance, but broadcast without editing. The tape is cut for about 23:20 to allow time for an opening and close.[3]

Who listens to Invitation to Learning? As usual, when it comes to sustaining programs, there is no data. Bryson had some ideas, though:

---

[1]Quoted in Eric Barnouw, Mass Communication (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1956), p. 85.

[2]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 46.

[3]Barbara Loeb, secretary to the producer for Invitation to Learning, personal letter, July 8, 1959.

> Our audience seems to have several layers. At the bottom in social and educational background, but very valuable to me are the people who write me penciled postcards saying they don't always understand but always think it a great privilege to listen to persons of a kind they would otherwise never know.
>
> Then there are students, many of them for various motives including ideas for term papers. Then club women and more or less self conscious intelligentsia. Then writers and scholars of many kinds.
>
> I often get letters from men and women who say they have listened for years and feel ashamed not to have thanked us sooner. Then of course there is a fringe of nuts--abusive, derisive, superior or demanding a discussion of some special book.[1]

In general, Bryson found that listeners fall into three groups:

1. The kind who want to say they listen because of the prestige value.

2. The people who normally would know these books and enjoy discussing them.

3. And "the average people" who get out of the series a kind of thinking outside their ordinary experience--a stretching out for ideas not beyond their reach.[2]

"It is the third group that interests me the most," Bryson wrote.[3] *Time* in 1941 estimated a million listeners for each broadcast.[4] It also cited a collection of twenty-seven discussions which sold ten thousand copies.[5] Today, the Columbia Broadcasting Company estimates

---

[1]Lyman Bryson, personal letter, January 24, 1959.

[2]"Radio Book Program Thrives," *op. cit.*, May 27, 1958.

[3]Lyman Bryson, personal letter, January 24, 1959.

[4]*Time*, November 24, 1941.

[5]Huntington Cairns, Allen Tate, and Mark Van Doren, *Invitation to Learning* (New York: Random House, 1941).

a million or more.[1] To this, Bryson added "and about three million who would say 'Oh, yes, I listen to that program.'"[2] Changed network-station relationships may have worked to cut the figure down in recent years, he noted. "Not being commercial," he concluded, " I can't even guess."[3] Another source estimates that in November, 1949, seventeen per cent of those who had their radios turned on were listening to it.[4]

Bryson had this to say about gauging audience size and listener taste:

> . . . It is possible to rank programs roughly in order of size of audience. That standard does not, of course, measure their quality or excellence except insofar as all radio tries for large audiences. We would not expect a discussion of public affairs even to get more than about half the audience of a popular singer. No programs are even planned to get a small audience. What I mean is that all programs are planned to get as large an audience as possible--the largest number of listeners who want that kind of a program. Five million people listening to a symphony orchestra would be a great success for classical music--twice as great a success as that many listening to a comedian.[5]

<u>The Philosophy of Invitation to Learning</u>.--<u>Invitation to Learning</u> is the only network sustaining program that has successfully brought out the drama that exists in the disinterested play of ideas. It

---

[1]Barbara Loeb, personal letter, July 8, 1959.

[2]Lyman Bryson, personal letter, January 24, 1958.

[3]<u>Ibid</u>.

[4]Eubank and Lawton, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 205.

[5]Bryson, <u>loc. cit</u>., pp. 47-48.

does it by getting articulate thinkers to talk spontaneously about a great work of literature. "While we are planning to defend our civilization, we should not fail to keep it alive."[1]

The topics of Invitation to Learning are "books which the world has not been willing to let die."[2] They are classics; classics in the special sense that the ideas and visions they contain are present in our thought even when we have not read them. But if we have not read them, these ideas and visions come to us imperfectly; through textbooks that repeat them; through historians who quote them for some special prupose; through amateurs who misquote them.

The great books are more alive than many of their contemporaries. The fact of their survival through hundreds of years is some indication that what they contain is worthwhile.

> Not only is it impossible to say the last thing about a great book; it is difficult even to say the first thing well. A great book is never obscure, but it is regularly elusive; it refuses to yield a narrow meaning. To one reader it may mean something quite narrow indeed--as narrow as that reader's mind. Should he, however, undertake to trade his experience with another, he will find to his amazement that he has read a different book. The truth is with both readers, and with as many readers as may be. A great writer has many minds; which is why he should be discussed by at least three men. It is not that the sum of their judgment will produce the equivalent of his book, but rather that his book will then be free to do what it most likes to

---

[1]Leon Levine, Assistant Director, Department of Education, The Columbia Broadcasting Company, quoted by Milton Kaplan, Radio and Poetry (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), p. 5.

[2]Huntington Cairns, Allen Tate, and Mark Van Doren, The New Invitation to Learning (New York: The Home Library, 1942), p. ix. This book contains the transcripts of thirty-two programs.

> do, namely glance off one mental sphere to strike another and still another, returning in time to strike the first one with a new force. A great book cannot be kept quiet or in place. It was made to move, somewhat as in dialogue truth moves among the speakers, never resting never giving up.[1]

Some educators believe that the great books are not only readable, but that college students will read them. The CBS network is trying to prove the same thing about millions of people among radio listeners. Invitation to Learning is aptly described by its title. It is a friendly invitation from those who know what they have to offer to those who will accept.

Bryson imagined that ". . . Plato and Abelard, surely those two, and possibly Augustine and Tolstoy and Confucius also would have enjoyed being on the program."[2]

He's probably right.

The three programs discussed in this chapter provided the background for two discussion program series of identical format produced and conducted by the writer on non-commercial stations since October, 1953. One of these programs, Viewpoint, is the subject of the following chapter.

---

[1]Van Doren, op. cit., p. xii.

[2]"Bryson Talks About 'Learning,'" The New York Times, December 12, 1947.

CHAPTER III

VIEWPOINT: A CASE HISTORY

The writer has produced Viewpoint, a half hour discussion program, since December, 1956. As host, he also conducts the talk on the air. WKAR and WKAR-FM, the radio stations of Michigan State University, broadcast the discussion every Sunday during eight months of the academic year.

The third oldest and the second most powerful station in Michigan, WKAR can be heard in twenty-five counties of lower Michigan and in a few of the northern counties of Ohio and Indiana. Its potential listening audience in Michigan alone is slightly more than five and a half million, or about seventy per cent of the state's population at 1955 figures. Among the first thirty-two university stations in the nation, it is a member of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters.[1]

In the spring of 1959, WKAR sent a questionnaire, referred to in footnotes in this chapter, to eighty members of the Michigan State University faculty who had appeared on Viewpoint during the period from October, 1957, to March, 1959, a span of a year and a half. It was designed to test responses to certain elements of the format;

---

[1]These figures are contained in a pamphlet published by Michigan State University which describes the operation of WKAR.

among others, the use of first names, the role of the host, and the absence of a formal close. Sixty participants responded. Of the remaining twenty, the station discovered afterwards that eight had left the campus permanently or for an extended period, two did not receive the questionnaire for some reason, while ten either did not return it or merely answered in a single generalization. Altogether, these professors composed a highly critical and sophisticated group.

Viewpoint stemmed directly from another half hour program produced and conducted by the writer from November, 1953 to June, 1956, over VOUS, the radio station of Pepperrell Air Force Base, St. John's, Newfoundland. The capital city of this recent Canadian province, St. John's boasts a population of about 120,000, with three other radio stations and one television outlet. The writer, an Air Force career officer, was assigned as Information Services Officer at Pepperrell, then the headquarters of the Northeast Air Command.

Called Pepperrell Forum, VOUS broadcast the program every Thursday at 9:00 p.m. It was also fed on tape to other affiliates of the Armed Forces Radio Network in the northeast, from Newfoundland to Greenland and to a few units in the remote Canadian archipelago. Like Viewpoint, the program used a host and two participants. On occasion, when the time was extended to forty-five minutes, the program sometimes added a fourth participant.

Pepperrell Forum presented discussions on topics of broad cultural interest, as well as social and political issues. Like the station itself, the program also served a public relations mission. Through discussion over a three year period, the program tried to give

Newfoundlanders some idea of the people and institutions of the United States. By the same token, for the enlightenment of Americans, it offered topics which dealt with Newfoundland and Canada. Thus, the topics embraced a broad spectrum from United States foreign policy to William Faulkner, and from jazz to Count Frontenac. The program drew many of its participants from the provincial government, visiting Canadian officials, and, particularly, from the faculty of Memorial University of Newfoundland in St. John's.

A university radio station like WKAR is also engaged in public relations. The totality of its broadcasting fare furnishes a clue to the university's own self-image. And, for better or worse, this image tends to influence the public image. The same thing is true, of course, in a more limited sense, of a program like the old Round Table; and today's Reviewing Stand, which, although it is carried by commercial stations, nevertheless reflects directly on the university that sponsors it.

To produce Viewpoint required an answer to a few basic problems at the outset. These had to do with naming the program, deciding on the format, and methods of selecting both topics and participants. The writer considers each question here from the standpoint of getting the program on the air, which is, strictly speaking, production. What goes out on the air, who says it and how, are problems which relate more specifically to conducting the program on the air. Admittedly, the two are not mutually exclusive.[1]

---

[1] A Report to the President of Michigan State University from the Committee on the Future of the University. (East Lansing: 1959), contains a chapter on interpreting the university to its publics.

Production

An unscripted discussion program on a university station is usually not difficult to produce; the "talent" is at hand, and the technical problems can scarcely be regarded as complex. The difficulties arise out of getting the talk to jell on the air.

> In the final analysis, regardless of twists and "gimmicks" in format, the success of any . . . discussion program depends on the ability of the speakers . . . and the skill of the moderator.[1]

Viewpoint welcomes the clash of opposing views. But it is even more devoted to the scholarly exposition of a subject without regard for polemics. It concerns itself with both issues and ideas, with the urgent questions of today's headlines, but also with matters of less perishable concern. The name Viewpoint gives the listener some idea of what he may expect to hear. It is intended, at least, to suggest a program which is more informal than formal, and spontaneous rather than scripted, terse, and concise. It is a name which is not too stiff or trite and which is not associated with any other show currently on the air. It sets the tone of the discussion.

The program provides twenty-eight and three-quarters minutes of actual discussion time. A musical theme (Golden Tango by the Frank Chacksfield orchestra) introduces and closes the show. This is a conventional gambit, but one that gives the show immediate identity.

---

[1]Chester and Garrison, Radio and Television. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950), p. 289.

The time element raises this question: Does thirty minutes, including the opening and close, represent the time limit for discussion programs? Or, is this limitation, accepted by both professional and amateur radio savants, really a cliche? Bryson, speaking of dollars-and-cents radio, asserts that we live in a fifteen minute world.[1] In discussion programming do we live in a thirty minute world?

Twenty-eight minutes of actual talk is inadequate for a discussion that attempts to do more than merely scratch the surface. Despite this shortcoming, it is possible that many people will not listen beyond that time. Thomas Griffith, in The Waist-High Culture, points to what might be called our capsule mentality:

> We no longer wish to read long books with leisurely descriptive passages: our literature is pell-mell in style; television programming rarely dares to go beyond an hour, or at most ninety-minutes, if it would hold an audience; we have become a land of digests, of quick summaries and of "briefings." Our picture journalism specializes in telling us "all we need to know" about Aztec civilization in five pages--and so resourceful is American ingenuity that the job is often quite competent, representing the splurge of time and money that used to go into those gilt-lettered volumes made for a king. In laying out the pages, the editor judges by his own viscera how much he thinks readers can endure of the Aztecs, and how this topic must fare against the competing attractions of shapely Miss Tillamook Cheese and an article on the revival of Christianity. He knows that if he wants to keep five or seven million restless readers he cannot saturate them with Aztec culture. So another fast foray has been made into "understanding the world we live in." Many have labored to keep a "drowsy emperor awake" and their majesties, the American public, can feel themselves well served. Their foreshortened attention span then turns to something else.[2]

---

[1]"Bryson Talks About 'Learning'" The New York Times, December 12, 1947.

[2]Thomas Griffith, The Waist-High Culture (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 207.

The problem suggests that educational radio, which enjoys a freedom denied to commercial radio, experiment with longer time sequences for discussion programs.[1] For educational radio it is realism rather than naive idealism to suggest that the question is not how many listeners will twist the dial after twenty-eight minutes, but how well is the program meeting its objectives, and what can be done to improve it?

Viewpoint is done without script and without rehearsal, except for an informal in-studio forty-five minute warm-up before air time. It is broadcast live on Sundays, at 2:00 p.m., with two participants and the host.

> Three is the usual, the best, number. Radio listeners find it difficult to identify more than four speakers and to follow the broad outline of their conversation. Moreover, the least vocal member is likely to be crowded out of a four or five way dialogue. The three-speaker conversation obviously provides more sources of information and ideas. . . .[2]

---

[1]Questionnaire: In response to the question, "Did you think 30 minutes (including the announcer's opening and close) just right for the discussion? Would you have preferred another 15 minutes? 30 minutes? Of sixty responses, thirty-three thought 30 minutes just right; nine preferred 45 minutes; six preferred 60 minutes; seven said it depended on the topic; two expressed no preference. Three did not respond to the question. It was obvious in evaluating the comments that many of the thirty-three who favored 30 minutes thought that the time was just right from the listener's standpoint. A typical comment was "30 minutes is good for the listener. . . with anything longer you'd lose your audience." Among the fifteen who favored 45 or 60 minutes, the most common reason was that 30 minutes was insufficient to discuss the topic with the best results. Typical comments were these: "At least another 15 minutes. After all, this is educational radio." "I find it frustrating to face the 30 minute restriction. . . there is really no time to develop more than a few points."

[2]Ewbank and Lawton, op. cit., p. 204.

For reasons which have little to do with enlightening their listeners, both Invitation to Learning and Reviewing Stand are broadcast on Sunday, although some affiliates tape the Reviewing Stand for re-broadcast during the week or on Saturday. The Round Table was also aired on Sunday. Edward Murrow condemns this exile of "meaningful programming" to "an intellectual ghetto--Sunday Afternoons."[1]

Without examining the merits or demerits of Sunday programming in general, there are special reasons for broadcasting Viewpoint live on Sunday. These apply to its participants rather than to its listeners. Many of the faculty and staff find it easier to make the Sunday date. Furthermore, a program taped on a week-day evening for re-broadcast on Sunday may be undesirable because some participants are likely to approach the program with minds (and voices) that are less than fresh. Some, of course, are well able to handle the talk. But others, in the writer's experience, appear somewhat jaded. (Goodman Ace opines that people are more intelligent on Sundays.)[2] On university stations, with their meager budgets, taping the broadcast at night may also involve over-time with or without pay. Parenthetically, university stations have their problems: money, of course, but personnel, too. Student announcers and "engineers" who must be hired to supplement the regular staff sometimes perform their duties in a state of absent-mindedness only a little less conspicuous than the narcoleptic fat boy in Dickens' "Pickwick Papers" who was constantly falling asleep even on his feet.

---

[1] Look, August 18, 1959.

[2] Goodman Ace, The Book of Little Knowledge (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), p. 27.

Viewpoint uses a single microphone, a BK-1 or "ice-cream cone." The three participants sit around the customary small studio table. Although some participants prefer a more informal setting built around a coffee table (mindful perhaps of Stephen Leacock's remark that if he were asked to start a college with one room only, he would make it a lounge), the table has some advantages; elbows resting on the table help to insure a uniform sound level; the body posture itself, to some degree, induces mental alertness; participants work on the same microphone; and their proximity fosters a useful kind of intimacy. All the programs cited in this study use a table, round or triangular.

For a discussion program which is interested in both ideas and issues, topics are inexhaustible. Not only is the old in art, literature, philosophy, and politics perpetually new, but the world, as usual, is standing on its head and out of its inverted pockets come tumbling more ideas to set it right than any program could explore in an infinity of talk.

Viewpoint strikes for contrast in programming. If the topic is "Shaw and the Shavians" one week, it is likely to be "Southeast Asian Trouble Spot: Indonesia" the next, and "The XYZ of the ABC of Modern Art" after that.

Topics are selected about two weeks in advance of the live broadcast, except when a current news development may dictate immediate scheduling. Titles of the topics are usually phrased to invite listener attention. "The Berlin Crisis" is not as expressive or catchy as "Berlin: Island in a Red Sea"; "New Approaches to Penology" is not as good as "What's Wrong with Our Prisons?"

Topics in the winter and spring of 1959 included: "The Lost Dimension in Religion," "Should the United States Change Its China Policy?," "Some of My Best Friends are Professors," "Beat Zen, Square Zen, and Zen," "Hawaii--50th State," "The Idea of a University," "The Population Explosion," "Ten Quintillion Stars," "The Existentialists," "Machiavelli in Modern Society," "Can the Republicans Hold the Line?," and "The Beat Generation." Among the topics broadcast during the fall of 1959 were: "Sex, Censorship, and D. H. Lawrence," "Mr. K--: the Iceman Cometh," "What Now With Civil Rights," "Samuel Johnson--The World's Greatest Conversationalist," "What's Behind the Steel Strike?," and "Students Talk About the University."

The producer's yardstick is that the topic must either reflect the day's more significant news and issues or concern itself with ideas of universal significance which have resisted the tarnish of time. Narrow, specialized topics are avoided, although there are occasional excursions into interesting trivia like "How Professional are Amateur Sports?"

Listeners to Viewpoint frequently express curiosity as to how topics are chosen for a program which holds the air week after week. The selection of topics is actually one of the least vexing chores simply because there is a large inventory of talent on any university campus which is capable of handling almost any topic. It is not always the most expert talent; or, if expert, not the most forceful or glib. Especially on the broader topics which, while they cut athwart every field, are not to be identified with any specific one, are professors

most likely to hang back. But professors there are in abundance on a large university campus. Some topics may have to be abandoned, but for most, participants can be found.

To choose the topics themselves requires nothing more than a rudimentary sense of news and human interest values. Most topics are suggested by the day's headlines or by the quality periodicals. A new interest in Marcel Proust among the literati, the constantly changing political picture, a revival of O'Neill on Broadway, a new book which is making something of a splash, an old book merely because it is a great book, a serious disturbance in Latin America (the Nixon incident), increasing public awareness of the problems of our schools or of our retired folk as reflected in the press and elsewhere, all these suggest topics for fruitful discussion.

Once the topic has been selected, the producer invites two participants or "guests," the title actually used on the program, preferably from different departments of the university. These faculty members are either known to the producer or recommended by another faculty member who has appeared and in whom the producer has confidence. An experienced producer, of course, will always attach a <u>caveat</u> to such a recommendation. Professors sometimes suggest a colleague who, whatever his merits as a scholar, may have something less than the aplomb of a T. V. Smith or a Van Doren behind a microphone.

The fact that the participants represent different disciplines helps to insure some contrast in point of view, a contrast which should be present in some measure if the discussion is to stimulate and challenge.

This does not mean, however, that the participants are selected in order to give voice "to the right, to the left, and to the middle of the road."[1]

The unsophisticated are apt to assume that a debate or "fight" makes the best discussion. But the University of Chicago's experience with the Round Table shows that most listeners are not interested in overheated, black against white arguments. The programs which "drew the largest number of responses were discussions and explanations of difficult problems or ideas."[2]

Bryson's observation about "People's Platform," a debate program which expired in the late forties, bears out Alfred North Whitehead's observation:

> The worst of dispute is that it spoils a good discussion. There are broadcasters who believe that a radio debate should be lively, even if it has to be vicious. They generally use the word "showmanship" to justify turning a discussion into a battle of personalities. Sometimes they are able to point to good listening audiences and reputations as their rewards. I can remember the office conference, at which the management at CBS decided that noise and angry words did not settle questions wisely, and that, for the sake of enlightenment, we should give up that kind of showmanship. We decided that we were willing to lose listeners, if we had to, in order to do more in clearing up the thinking of those who stayed with us. The interesting result of that decision was that our discussion programs did not lose any audience, so far as we could find out, and the programs were much more useful. . . . Our guests have been told that we want to help people to think, not to put on a gladiator's show,

---

[1]Judith Waller, op. cit., p. 159. She acknowledges, however, that "it is better to avoid extreme points of view. Otherwise, the program may develop into a personal controversy from which nothing constructive evolves, tending to leave the listener utterly confused." Chester and Garrison, op. cit., p. 289, adopt the same point of view.

[2]Summary of Relevant Facts, op. cit., p. 17.

> and we have even said that we have no objection to a general agreement. In fact, we welcome agreement. . . . Millions of people still listen to our discussion programs.[1]

Another shrewd student of talk, after listening to "at least twenty broadcasts of four different discussion programs," decries the undue focus on "dramatic values":

> It may well be that the very sharpness of the give-and-take holds the attention of an audience who might turn off the program. . . . I would, however, plead this: that our goal is a group facing problems in an atmosphere of understanding because of the need for dramatic effects.[2]

Edward Murrow sums it up when he writes that controversy is good when it illuminates, not when it agitates.[3]

The departments most frequently represented on Viewpoint are Political Science, Communication Skills, Philosophy, Sociology and Anthropology, Humanities, English, Foreign Studies, Education, Business and Public Administration, Fine Arts, and Journalism. A few participants are members of the university staff rather than faculty. On rare occasions a program includes one or more participants from the community or from the state government in Lansing.

One hundred and fifty professors have appeared on one hundred and one hundred and two programs from December, 1956, to January, 1960. Twenty-two have participated more than once, four as many as four times in three years. These are professors who have demonstrated an

---

[1]Bryson, op. cit., pp. 68-69.

[2]Irving J. Lee, How to Talk With People (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), pp. 39-40. Subtitled "A program for preventing troubles that come when people talk together," this is a valuable little book for those interested in discussion per se.

[3]Edward R. Murrow, "A Broadcaster Talks to His Colleagues," The Reporter, November 13, 1958.

ability to handle the medium with more than ordinary poise and expertness, whose vocal quality is good, and who are at home in broad areas of discussion. This group is analogous to the Round Table's hard core of experienced discussion leaders. They have a talent for improvisation, an eye for hard fact, and a taste for irony and abstraction.

(Despite the Round Table's proud, well-used core of discussion leaders, the director obviously took no chances. A secretary was stationed in the studio armed with cards which she flashed at the participants at the direction of Sherman Bryer, who sat in the control room. These cards, "decorated with whimsical drawings so that the guests won't bristle," read: "Keep your ELBOWS on the table! signed Emily Post," "Don't be polite! INTERRUPT!" "Do you know a joke? USE IT!" "Stress the American angle!", and "Avoid Pauses, PLEASE!")[1]

Invitations to participate are handled by telephone two or three weeks in advance, under normal circumstances. In this initial contact, the producer sketches the objectives of the discussion; in effect, what he proposes to talk about, and why. The purpose is more to induce the producer--if inducement is necessary--to take part than it is to fill him in on the details of the discussion. Such details are unknown to the producer at this early stage of the game in any case.

The producer is also careful in this first conversation to welcome suggestions as to the program's content and scope. He may even offer to change the topic,--and, indeed, insist on it--if a better one is suggested.

---

[1]Atkinson, op. cit., p. 29.

Within four to seven days after both participants have committed themselves to join the discussion, they receive a page or two of questions and comments. These "fingerposts" to the discussion not only stimulate their thinking, but they attempt to isolate the meat of the topic. If possible, they also pinpoint those areas of the topic on which either or both of the participants are known to speak with more than usual authority. A secondary purpose here is to reduce their fear of the radio medium as terra incognita and to allay quite normal fears that they may be confronted with some aspect of the topic with which they are unfamiliar.

These key comments and questions sent to participants in advance, constitute an outline only in the Pickwickian sense, that is in no sense at all. To some extent, they are more useful because they convey specific questions and comments to which the participant can mentally prepare an answer ahead of time. Outlines are difficult to adhere to in spontaneous discussion. They represent to some extent an over-intellectualized approach to a very fluid medium. There is such a thing as being too cerebral like the Laputans in Swift's Gulliver's Travels, a sad and dreary lot who are incapable of ordinary conversation. When they leave their homes they have to be accompanied by a boy carrying a stick at the end of which is a bladder filled with pebbles or dried peas; these rattle as the boy strikes the mouth or ears of his master to signal him when he is to talk and when he is to listen while he converses with another Laputan. Otherwise, the absent-minded intellectual might drift off into empty and vacuous introspection and forget all about the Laputan in front of him.

The Round Table's producers held to the belief that the best discussion program was structured. The term "structured" here appears to offer a wider connotation than the term "organized." Consensus would probably establish its meaning in this context as referring to methods of achieving a set of pre-planned objectives. Does the program deliberately set out to talk about certain selected, significant points in a fairly fixed, logical order? This is a structured program. Does the program proceed with some regard for significance, but without any logical order and purely as the wind blows? This program is unstructured. The best discussion program is probably real, fluid, and spontaneous, yet intelligent enough to contain the most significant points that can be raised within the time limit.

If Viewpoint suffers from the absence of a carefully prepared topical outline, the results might have shown up in the responses to the questionnaire. The contrary is true: the majority of respondents thought that the program was neither too much nor too little structured. The writer's hypothesis that more educators would find the program too little structured was not borne out by the results.[1]

Nevertheless, there is much to be said for a straight outline designed to give frame and point to the discussion. Most students of the problem insist on an outline. Waller's approach is typical:

---

[1]Questionnaire. In response to the question, "Did you think the discussion in which you took part too structured? Too little structured?" Forty-nine of sixty responses indicated the program was not too structured; eight thought it was; one took the form of "somewhat"; and two respondents did not answer the question. With reference to too little structured, forty-seven indicated the program was not; six thought it was; one took the form of "a little"; and six did not answer the question.

> Written or ad-libbed, a round table must first be outlined. This helps the participants to organize their materials to convey an ordered discussion to the listener. Also it helps to insure inclusion of all points which the participants are desirous of presenting. Without an outline, too much time may be devoted to one point, so that a final and possibly more important point may be left out completely. Then it is the duty of the chairman of the round table to see that the outline is followed, so that only the number of minutes decided upon ahead of the broadcast shall be given to presentation and discussion of each point. He must be on the alert to see that none of the speakers devote too much time to one point, as the whole balance of the program will thereby be destroyed. Naturally, if a script has been prepared ahead of the broadcast, this condition will not exist if care has been taken with timing, but it needs careful watching when the discussion is spontaneous.[1]

Another authority supports Waller's view:

> One of the criticism most often levelled at round table programs is that they never get anywhere. Their conclusions are not clear. Of course, the purpose may not include reaching any conclusions. Such programs, however, are often muddled because the audience cannot dredge out an outline from the mass of seeming heterogeneous conversation. A director can help in this respect by insisting that outline and transition points are clear.[2]

As a final step in the pre-broadcast preparation, the producer asks each participant to select two or three important points--no more--which he would like to make during the discussion, to elaborate them to the extent of a typewritten page or two and then send them to him. This furnishes the program host with some knowledge of the participant's point of view in advance and it gives him an area into which he can profitably lead the participant during the discussion.

---

[1]Waller, op. cit., p. 160.

[2]Albert Crews, Radio Production Directing (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1944), p. 253.

Participants are occasionally urged to keep notes in front of them during the broadcast. This tends to bolster their confidence. But they are cautioned against reading them verbatim unless they can make the delivery sound spontaneous and unrehearsed. In practice, the flow of discussion usually prohibits more than a fleeting glance at notes, except by the host. It is likely that the best discussion dispenses with notes altogether. It must be stressed that guests on discussion shows that last twenty-eight minutes or less can only barely articulate a point of view completely or reach a definite conclusion.[1] It is also probable that the best program makes a few points interestingly and well and then quits. The more abstruse or fine-spun the topic, the greater the necessity for simplicity. In a larger sense, this is part of a continuing human problem as Griffith indicates:

> Presumably we are handed the cumulative wisdom of what has gone before, and since more is constantly being accumulated, we speak of progress. But what in fact is being handed to us is complexity and each generation, while adding its own deposit of discovery and complexity, must somehow establish a new simplicity.[2]

Viewpoint, like Invitation to Learning, assigns a key role to the host. Why the label "host"? The answer is that, however pretentious and stuffy, the English language offers nothing better. The alternatives, "chairman" and "moderator," do not accurately define the discussion leader in either the Invitation to Learning or the Viewpoint format, even though Bryson's program uses "chairman" as well as "host."[3]

---

[1]Education on the Air (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1939), pp. 18-38.

[2]Griffith, op. cit., p. 208.

[3]Supra, p. 39.

It should be clear that the host on *Viewpoint* does not interview the participants. He does not ply them with questions while assuming a minor role himself. A discussion which relies on interrogation quickly becomes something else: an interview. This is not to demean the art of interviewing, which is still another variety of conversation and a difficult art in which the secret, perhaps, is to know at least half the answers beforehand.

Nor does the host moderate in the dictionary sense of the word. He may, if he chooses, but he is not obliged to take a middle ground or to reconcile differences. The word moderator applies to debate rather than to discussion of the *Viewpoint* type, even if discussion involves elements of debate. (See Appendix E.)

If, as a practical matter, we accept the term host to mean a discussion leader, like Lyman Bryson, who appears on each program and takes an equal share in the discussion in contrast to a mediating role, it is relevant to ask: what determines which shall be used, a host or a moderator?

The answer is simply a matter of choice, a choice conditioned by circumstances. The *Round Table*, for example, chose to select a moderator from among the participants on each broadcast largely because it did not wish the program to become identified with a personality, but rather with the University of Chicago.[1] The *Reviewing Stand* uses a moderator, Dean McBurney, who appears regularly. He lends continuity to the program; Northwestern University is always represented; and the same experienced discussion leader makes the program easier to handle from the production

---

[1]*Supra*, p. 43.

standpoint. Invitation to Learning uses a host because Lyman Bryson was "a man in a million,"[1] big enough to spread himself from Homer to Hemingway. Viewpoint, broadcast by a university radio station, uses a host more out of convenience than principle, although faculty participants are on record as preferring a single discussion leader.[2] It is difficult to find a faculty member willing to invest himself without remuneration week after week. When the station manages to flush this rare bird, it is naturally anxious to keep him for as long as possible. Under such conditions, the station manager is also likely to give him a blank check as to format. This is true, at least, of Viewpoint. Whether he chooses the role of host or moderator is then entirely up to him. Actually, a discussion program can prosper (or flounder) with either. But the choice is largely a matter of personal preference rather than reasons grounded in the nature of radio discussion.

To discuss means generally that the host has a point of view. If he does not have one, he needs to discover one for the sake of the discussion. If the topic is "Are Our Schools Being the Job?", he may give tongue to the classical view, modified to his own tastes, as opposed to the "progressive" view, although the two providentially

---

[1]Barbara Leeb, personal letter, op. cit., July 8, 1959.

[2]Questionnaire: Forty-two of sixty participants indicated they approved the same host on each program; seven thought some variety would be helpful; four did not respond to the question; seven thought a change in host from time to time would be desirable. Among those who approved, continuity was cited as the chief reason. In four of the sixty responses, the flat statement was made that the respondent would prefer a moderator who remained in the background rather than a host who participated actively in the discussion.

are not immune to synthesis.[1] He need not be too concerned with the merits or demerits of his position as long as he can articulate it intelligently, provocatively, and with some degree of sincerity.

It helps creditability for the host, if he is on regularly, to establish an image of himself in the listener's mind. He should (heaven help him!) appear to the listener as perceptive, broad, balanced, and not without wit; a gentle gatherer in the orchards of truth, beauty, and facticity. (And with voice to match.)

Unless he is willing to risk the suspicion that he is, after all, merely a brazen parlor-intellectual and know-it-all, the host must also cultivate the charming art of being wrong at the right moment. (He will be, but not always at the right moment.)

He must also find the courage to stress a point a bit too much for the sake of vitality. To do the program at all requires a nice, ripe strain of exhibitionism, preferably of the non-clinical variety. Radio, however, is a live medium; it does not respond to the passive, polite, and virtuous. It responds to knowledge and intuition colorfully and incisively expressed.

The host on Viewpoint is an education broadcaster. He is more concerned with influencing the listener than entertaining him. But he is an educational broadcaster with special skills. He must possess as a base not only a large capital of information, but a high order of sophistication, or risk sounding like an arrivisto. Add to this another essential ingredient: at least a modicum of showmanship.

---

[1]A transcript of this discussion, which appeared in the Michigan State University College of Education Quarterly, Fall, 1958, is contained in Appendix D.

are not immune to synthesis.[1] He need not be too concerned with the merits or demerits of his position as long as he can articulate it intelligently, provocatively, and with some degree of sincerity.

It helps creditability for the host, if he is on regularly, to establish an image of himself in the listener's mind. He should (heaven help him!) appear to the listener as perceptive, broad, balanced, and not without wit; a gentle gatherer in the orchards of truth, beauty, and facticity. (And with voice to match.)

Unless he is willing to risk the suspicion that he is, after all, merely a brazen parlor-intellectual and know-it-all, the host must also cultivate the charming art of being wrong at the right moment. (He will be, but not always at the right moment.)

He must also find the courage to stress a point a bit too much for the sake of vitality. To do the program at all requires a nice, ripe strain of exhibitionism, preferably of the non-clinical variety. Radio, however, is a live medium; it does not respond to the passive, polite, and virtuous. It responds to knowledge and intuition colorfully and incisively expressed.

The host on Viewpoint is an education broadcaster. He is more concerned with influencing the listener than entertaining him. But he is an educational broadcaster with special skills. He must possess as a base not only a large capital of information, but a high order of sophistication, or risk sounding like an arriviste. Add to this another essential ingredient: at least a modicum of showmanship.

---

[1]A transcript of this discussion, which appeared in the Michigan State University College of Education Quarterly, Fall, 1958, is contained in Appendix D.

He must be a "quick study." There is no mystery about this. No subject worth his time is likely to be ignored for long by current newspapers and magazines. If the topic is timely, he can be certain that the editors of the New York Times, Harpers, The Atlantic Monthly, The Reporter, The Nation, The Saturday Review, Life, Time, and others are alive to it. If the topic is less ephemeral, say a discussion of novelist Thomas Wolfe, then almost any library, but particularly a university library, will usually abound in fresh, usable material. The scholarly Reviews and Quarterlies (Partisan, Sewanee, Yale, Southern, Virginia, South Atlantic, Northwestern, and others) are suggestive.

With or without an outline, some form of preparation is indispensable to a discussion show. Even professors with twenty-five years of teaching and scholarly research behind them must prepare if they are to bring what they know to a focus before the microphone. But for the host, in the role in which he is cast by his own choice, there is no escape. He does not know precisely where the discussion will lead. He must be prepared at every moment to contribute or to assault the "dead spots" with sentient noise. Preparation is also necessary to him as a means of learning for himself where the heart of the topic lies; and to avoid the snare of discoursing learnedly about events he is not qualified to understand. Ideally, under the Viewpoint format, he should speak with some substance. If what he says is superficial, he may fail to provide the necessary springboard for his guests. Vapid, random talk pulled out of the air is likely to breed equally banal talk from his guests. This is not a case of intelligence leads and ignorance follows which would be altogether presumptious in the first place. Nor is the host cast here in the part of an authoritarian. The leadership

exercised by a discussion leader is intended to help the talk flow smoothly and meaningfully. It may pass to another participant at different times; and indeed it may be highly desirable that it should if it strengthens the discussion. In some successful efforts, the host's role may be reduced to a cipher; he then becomes one with the group on equal terms rather than its leader.

Spontaneity does not entail randomness. "The excellence of the spontaneity depends in large measure on the intensity of the preparation."[1] There is always a risk that freedom and spontaneity will be achieved at the expense of covering the question. The host must accept some responsibility for balance.

One of the greatest problems will be to get the most out of his guests. If he can, he must try to avoid the fault that Jack Gould ascribes to television:

> Removal of the pressures of broadcasting [the clock] almost invariably results in better interviewing. The art of interviewing is a close cousin of the art of conversation; it cannot always be hurried and molded to fit a predetermined format.
>
> But within the inherent limitations of TV a little more thought could bring substantial improvement. Perhaps the first requisite is greater appreciation on TV's part of the value of people who have something to say and, with intelligent probing and encouragement, can be induced to say it. They are, after all, TV's only inexhaustible supply of fascinating programming material.[2]

---

[1]Eubank and Lawton, op. cit., p. 209.

[2]"Pallid Interviews," The New York Times, January 29, 1956, quoted in Stuart Hyde, Television and Radio Announcing (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959), p. 178.

In-Studio Pre-broadcast Preparation and Conducting the Program on the Air

Like *Invitation to Learning*, *Viewpoint* tries to create the illusion of live conversation. The two participants and the host talk in Professor Huxley's living room--loose and unbuttoned with a nice glow of intimacy, if it can be achieved.

This is not to say that they are completely relaxed and without tension. But tension there must be; the tension that comes from a deep sense of personal concern with what is being said. People simply do not think or speak creatively without this kind of tension. Small talk contains very little of it and becomes merely ceremonial; it fulfills an important social function, as Bronislaw Malinowski once pointed out, but it is not the result of reflection. One of the earmarks of good discussion is that the participants obviously care about what they are saying; the conversation never degenerates into a mere exchange of platitudes or pious abstractions.

Another writer suggests two poles of discussion: earnestness and half-heartedness:

> A person in earnest seems to believe what he says . . . thinks it important to have his say . . . has a strong desire to communicate . . . speaks with some force and volume . . . makes an effort to reach his listeners . . . shows an over-all tension . . . gestures firmly . . . speaks with a rush.
>
> The half-hearted doesn't seem to care whether he makes his point or not . . . suggests an indecision and inconclusiveness . . . has no sharp sense of direction . . . reveals some disinterest. . . . doesn't try very hard . . .[1]

There are only a few ground rules for the discussion--so the "talent," to use television jargon, is told. These are:

---

[1]Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-124. Periods are Lee's.

1. To keep talking like the little dog in the Mother Goose rhyme: "Two little dogs sat by the fire over a fender of coal dust; said one little dog to the other little dog, 'If you don't talk, why, I must.'"

2. To keep faith with the three-people-in-your-living-room-illusion. This means no reference to the "listener" or to the "audience" or to "our limited time." Such references destroy veri-similitude. Otherwise, the participants are free to say what they please, even to reciting the Tetragrammaton backwards, if it is relevant to the discussion. This is an important freedom for educational radio.

3. To avoid talking down. But at the same time to eschew overly technical jargon which blocks the listener's understanding.

4. To avoid "yes and no" answers, monologues, and oratory.

5. To realize that the whole canvas cannot be covered in the time allowed.

The Round Table, in its pre-broadcast instructions, went into detail:

1. Do not destroy the illusion of live conversation. While no carefully planned program can be truly conversational because of its compactness, it can leave the audience with the impression of conversation if it is extemporaneous and if the following pitfalls are avoided.

    a. Reference to the listening audience.
    b. Formal introduction, such as "Gentlemen of the Round-Table."
    c. Comments on time limitation.
    d. Unnatural bursts of platform oratory.

2. Do not attempt to discuss too many diverse subjects or too many subdivisions of one subject. It is a well-known educational fact that no audience can assimilate a large number of items of information at one time. Concentration on a limited field and the expansion of that field by the use of illustrations are important. Two or three principal thoughts well developed are sufficient for a single program.

3. Do not digress far, or for any length of time, from the central theme. Frequent digressions confuse the audience and give the impression that the conversation has rambled or even that it has been entirely pointless. While stories, jokes, and specific examples are highly desirable they should always be in point.

4. Do not belittle or underestimate the intelligence of your audience. This is a point of primary importance in all forms of public speaking, including speaking for radio audiences. The fact that the lay audience does not understand a technical jargon is no reflection upon its intelligence. The wise speaker will couch his message in words that will be understood by an intelligent audience that has not specialized in the field under discussion. Technical words and even non-technical words that are not found in the vocabularies of most people should be avoided when possible. If for some reason a technical term or an uncommon word must be used, then the context of the sentence should carry the meaning of the word to those not familiar with it.

5. Do not quote statistics exact to the third or fourth significant figure. Approximations in round numbers are far more effective. Over a million is a more understandable statement than one million ninety-eight thousand two hundred and eleven. A more definite picture is impressed upon the minds of the listeners if a little less than half is used, rather than 47.21 per cent. It is difficult for many people to grasp statistical facts, where they are able both to see the figures and to hear them explained.

6. Do not permit the conversation to become a series of monologues. Even though in many conversations a single speaker may talk for quite some time without interruption, if this were done in the Round Table program, members of the radio audience who tuned in after it was under way might be totally unaware of the fact that a conversation was in progress. It is important, therefore, that interruptions occur at fairly frequent intervals, even though they do not break the continuity of an explanation that is under way.[1]

(Unfortunately, neither the host on Viewpoint or the savants of the Round Table offer much advice on how to keep talking importantly when one

---

[1]Quoted in Radio and Education, Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, Levering Tyson, editor, 1934, pp. 234-237.

hasn't a thing to say. But Hayakawa points out that "it is completely impossible for us in society to talk only when we 'have something to say'" -- one might add, "even on radio.")[1]

Viewpoint strives for a natural flow of conversation--even to the clutter of ordinary talk: interruptions, mirthful grunts, asides, hesitations which are inevitable in any case on a live program. Even two men talking at once is not bad; it gives the effect of impromised conversation. This objective also suggests the use of common words, but with the addition of words of fresh, original coinage which express the uniqueness of each personality:

> Few words are used to symbolize many facts. The bulk of our spoken language is made up of one-syllable words; ten commonly used words account for 25 per cent of our conversation, and 100 high-frequency words for as much as 75 per cent of all small talk. Yet individuality is expressed by uncommon words, and one is as definitely identified by his language as by his fingerprints.[2]

The host on Viewpoint does not meet the other participants--in some cases it is for the first time--until they show up at the studio some forty-five minutes before air time. During the first year, the participants, with few exceptions, were unknown to the host. In the third year, fewer than half were unknown. The fact that the host does not meet each guest beforehand probably appears rather odd, but it is one of the facts of life in conducting a talk show with voluntary talent, including the host or moderator, on the radio station of a university with a large faculty. The host, unless he is a member of the station's regular staff, or somehow blessed with idleness, seldom has the time

---

[1]Hayakawa, op. cit., p. 73.

[2]Marie Pei, Review of Your Most Enchanted Listener, by Wendell Johnson, The New York Times Book Review, June, 1959.

to talk to each participant personally. He has to resort to the wooden leg: the telephone. Lyman Bryson, even without this handicap, refused to spend more time with his discussion guests than the hour he had with them in the studio.[1]

The pre-broadcast warm-up is intended to establish an atmosphere of good humor, to give the participants the "feel" of the studio, of the host and of each other, as well as to canvass the high spots of the topic and to search out areas of agreement and disagreement which can be profitably explored on the air. The warm-up, to repeat unashamedly, is deliberately short. Most people, no thespians, hesitate to repeat on the air what they have said to each other during the warm-up. The upshot is usually pause and hesitation. There is nothing in the writer's experience to back up the assertion that "The participants . . . during the broadcast . . . may quote almost verbatim what they have said in previous conversations" (the warm-up) .[2]

Any rehearsal beyond the forty-five minutes warm-up, this writer has found, on balance, to be unnecessary, perhaps undesirable, but always impractical from the time standpoint. However keen their sense of mission, voluntary participants on university stations rarely warm-up to the idea of rehearsals.

Whether rehearsal blunts spontaneity, the <u>sine qua non</u> of radio discussion, draws varying opinions from students of the problem:

---

[1]<u>Bryson</u>, p.

[2]Eubank and Lawton, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 203.

> The University of Chicago Round Table follows a practice of thorough planning and preparation for the broadcast. Participants may actually make one or two "dry runs" of a program before it goes on the air. This method assures that most irrelevancies will be eliminated before it goes on the air. . . . But such detailed preparation occasionally results in dull broadcast discussions. The speakers lose their spontaneity and anticipate their opponents' statements. The controversy has been practically "talked out" of the program before the broadcast. . . . The producers of such round tables must ask themselves whether, in sacrificing spontaneity for orderly discussion, they have organized the program to death.[1]

A veteran broadcaster writes:

> On some round-table series it has been a practice to do a preliminary round table and to record it for study and observation. This procedure holds dangers but also advantages. It gives a chance to correct wrong balances and other faulty technical details. Each speaker can also hear for himself weaknesses in his own argument and can work to repair them before the broadcast.
>
> Whether this or other methods of preparation are used, it is well for a round table to go on the air taking advantage of the show values of spontaneity, but avoiding the pitfalls of complete unpreparedness--arguing in circles, wasting too much time on side issues, and debating what the facts are.[2]

Two other authorities offer this observation:

> Whether or not a script is used, a recorded rehearsal is helpful. As the record is played, the speakers may wish to note changes in their presentation, the outline may be improved, and time adjustments made. If the panel is composed of comparative strangers, the recording serves to break the ice and to create the spirit of informality so essential in this type of program.[3]

---

[1]Chester and Garrison, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 291.

[2]Erik Barnouw, <u>Handbook of Radio Production</u> (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1949), p. 113.

[3]Levenson and Stasheff, <u>Teaching Through Radio and Television</u> (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1952, revised edition), p. 77.

But the writer finds more wisdom in Van Doren's remark already quoted in full:

> The only two things they [the participants] are certain about beforehand are the question to begin with and the passage to be read at the close. The half hour between . . . is unrehearsed and free. There have been occasions when a disagreement is lost by having been too clearly anticipated; the element of surprise, even of anger, was missing. . . .[1]

Methods on discussion programs are usually designed to induce spontaneity without sacrificing content. The Round Table's method was to structure the discussion as much as possible by using several pre-broadcast rehearsals and a topical outline. Invitation to Learning and Viewpoint, on the contrary, are not structured in any detailed sense. They depend more on the host's judgment than on any pre-arranged scheme. The host tries to lead the discussion to the heart of the topic; he must also try to control the flood of words or, admittedly, risk drowning. But he must also cherish the completely unpremeditated utterances; the products of deeper associations, these are like trout in a salmon stream, not salmon, but still delectable. If the guests are held to a pre-arranged pattern, vitality--the blood and bone of a talk show--may be lost. Producers of discussion shows of the Viewpoint vintage are well advised to celebrate Emerson's wisdom: "an erroneous vitality is better than a dead accuracy."[2] The same flexibility may apply to group discussion per se:

---

[1]Supra, p. 42.

[2]Ralph Waldo Emerson, Society and Solitude (Boston: Fields Osgood & Co., 1879), p. 121.

> If people in a group want to interrupt serious discussion with some diversion or personal expression --let them. Then bring them back to the agenda. Committees work best when the talk swings between the personal and the purposeful.[1]

To advance the eavesdropping illusion, first names of participants are used during the discussion, except when high position and courtesy may dictate "Mr.," or "Dr.," or "Dean." This practice undoubtedly presents some disadvantages:

> . . . . the listener cannot see the participants and therefore does not know who is speaking. It takes more than a few minutes to identify for the listener each of the three different voices, and even then it is sometimes impossible because of the similarity of voices. It is far better to use names frequently--last names, not first names. The listeners are not intimately acquainted with the participants and do not know them as "Jack" or "Tom" but only as "Jones" and "Brown." It is, therefore, preferable to use last names leaving out the prefix "Mr." or "Dr." unless one of the participants uses such a title as "General" or "President," but in the case of a woman, "Mrs." or "Miss" should precede the use of the last name. . . .[2]

The few writers who deal with discussion programs recommend last names; and in fact, this practice is followed by all of the programs described, except Viewpoint.[3]

---

[1]Lee, op. cit., p. 9.

[2]Waller, op. cit., p. 164.

[3]Questionnaire: It is apparent that, while first names may add verisimilitude, most of the participants as listeners to the program preferred last names. Of sixty responses to the question: "As a listener, would you rather the participants used first or last names?" Thirty-one preferred last names; eleven preferred first names; eleven expressed no preference; seven did not respond to the question. Only fourteen out of the sixty reported any difficulty in identifying the speakers, however.

If verisimilitude is to be preserved, the eavesdropping principle logically tends to preclude a formal conclusion to the program. Neither Viewpoint nor the program which most influenced its format, Invitation to Learning, presume to come to any formal conclusion. The Reviewing Stand also avoids closing with a "solution" to the problems raised. Viewpoint closes without conclusion. It avoids the frequently banal, homiletic close which consists of "Now we may conclude from your comments, gentlemen, that the product of bees is beeswax." Thus the program gains in verisimilitude. The talk never finds a period on Viewpoint; the guests are not thanked unctuously; the talk simply "fades under" as the announcer's lead-out comes in above the voices to identify the participants once more and to announce the topic for the following week. Sometimes the program ends with an open question deliberately left hanging to engage the listener's attention after the radio discussion has ceased.

Waller points out the hazards of drawing conclusions:

> Always more than one point of view has been presented each Sunday. There are probably many listeners each holding different points of view, and if the chairman, or the participants, attempted to tie up the discussion in a neat little package, definitely drawing up a conclusion and a solution, many listeners would be dissatisfied and would accuse the chairman of being prejudiced one way or the other. With the discussion left open, each listener can think of his own conclusion without malice.[1]

Nor--again for the sake of verisimilitude--is a summary used on Viewpoint or Invitation to Learning.[2] If Invitation to Learning uses

---

[1]Waller, op. cit., p. 165.

[2]Questionnaire: in response to the question "Would you prefer a summary of the main points at the end of the discussion rather than the gradual fade-out," twenty-five answered "No"; thirteen answered "Yes";

a summary, it is so unobtrusive as to be hardly worthy of the name.

A 1954 discussion, "The Spirit of Youth on the City Streets," by Jane Addams, closed with this statement by Bryson:

> I suppose what you have really said is that partly because she was a great poet as well as such a great saint she succeeded in some measure in inspiring our whole civilization.[1]

Another discussion on John Stuart Mill's classic "On Liberty" ended with this:

> Well, gentlemen, I suppose if Mill were here--and I wish he could be--we'd find that wonderful resilience and power of his would make him show us how his ideas could be adapted even to our difficult situation.[2]

Van Doren remarks:

> . . . A dialogue is of course not an essay; the chief mark of its difference being that it does not know how to end. Dialogues stop--because time is up, because the talkers are tired, because dinner is announced--but they do not end. The end would be only when there was nothing more to say.[3]

But most discussion programs appear to be wedded to the summary in some form, among them the old Round Table and the still thriving Reviewing Stand. Sheats' dictum is typical:

---

sixteen had no preference; two said it "depends on the topic"; four did not respond to the question. As teachers, professors might be expected to lean toward a summary. This is not indicated by the figures. Entries made under "State the basis for your preference" showed that the respondents appreciated the reason for the absence of a summary and, indeed, several singled it out as a particular merit of the program.

[1]Arthur W. Hepner (ed.), The Invitation to Learning Reader, Vol. 4, No. 2 (New York: Herbert Muschel, 1954), pp. 135.

[2]Ibid., pp. 168-173.

[3]Van Doren, op. cit., xi.

> Summarize the points of agreement from time to time. The repetition of statements is desirable in maintaining continuity of thought in the minds of those listening. It is particularly important that a carefully planned summary statement be made at the end of the discussion, drawing together all dangling thoughts so that a definite impression is left with the listener.[1]

Still another source urges the summary as an essential ingredient:

> Conclude the broadcast with a brief summary of the main points of the discussion. Do not, however, introduce conclusions.[2]

Miss Waller agrees, although she appears somewhat more flexible:

> At the close of each broadcast the chairman takes about forty seconds to sum up the points which have been presented in the course of the discussion, but he never offers a solution. On the whole, this is the best way to end any round table discussion.[3]

For the same reason--verisimilitude--Viewpoint begins in medias res. The host starts the discussion immediately, either by an omnibus statement which provides the listener with essential background or with a short, pithy comment or question. The conventional opening "Now I have with me today the Great Panjandrum of the Philosophy World, author of that popular book 'The Evolution and Analysis of Amorous Metaphysics'" is left to the announcer who has a better title to it. Whether the opening is a statement or a question, the premium is on interest. Listeners are allergic to dull, over-burdened openings.

---

[1]Sheats, op. cit., p. 28.

[2]"Suggestions for Radio Presentations," University of Oklahoma Family Life Radio Forum (Norman, Oklahoma, 1939), p. 14.

[3]Waller, op. cit., p. 165.

Professors, of course, occupy the center of the stage. Many of them are sponges; the host need only "cue" them in and squeeze gently.

But not all the lettered denizens of Academia are articulate, at ease before a microphone, or able to talk with that soupcon of passion that lifts a conversation out of the ordinary.

In the midst of swans of learning, the host will draw an occasional swallow to whom the invisible audience is nothing less than a predatory eagle ready to sweep down ruthlessly on a facile generalization or a seeming half-truth. Littera scripta manet, volat irrevocable verbum: writing abides, but the spoken word flies off and cannot be recalled.

Still others suffer from the learned man's acute awareness of the compromise involved in all language; the inability to bridge the gap between intuition and language; the knowledge that things are seldom either so or not so. Prone to conciliate, they frequently fall into the trap of an excess of good manners. The program loses tang. (Wise-men, Lao-Tse said, are never scholars and scholars are never wise-men.)

Still others, for strange reasons, regard the discussion as unworthy of their best efforts. They become suddenly dry, non-committal or defensive. Raised in a temple dedicated to the impersonal and the unemotional, some of the less reformed are apt to regard anything that might be construed as an original statement as heresy.

For the sake of flow, the host--who has his own limitations--must find some way to depth-charge the slow. If the talk becomes passive, polite, or ponderous (a few dominies retail the magic numbers of their

particular dogma, like World Series announcers intoning the score of the final game), a little absolutism from the host, a bit of quite unjustifiable dogmatism, an over-simplification, a rash generalization put in unsatisfactory terms, all of which come all too naturally, will jog Herr professor. Often a sense of urgency communicated through voice level will incite him to feel more violently.

A University of Oklahoma educational broadcaster (WKAD) notes, rather gratuitously, that the free "talent" on educational programs is not always the best:

> . . . Voluntary talent isn't worried about such things as quality, timing, or even appearing punctually for broadcasts. Yet this labor of love demands a lot of time and attention from people whose business isn't broadcasting. I'm not saying that voluntary talent cannot be good. Often times it is excellent. But one bad apple in the barrel spoils the whole.[1]

Most participants on Viewpoint have done well; some extremely well. But many of them would have done better if they had taken the trouble to plan their attacks, literally to bring to bear what they knew on a microphone.[2] This, however, under the circumstances, is no easy assignment: topics are broad, the participants busy men, the rehearsal limited, and the labor unrewarded in any material sense.

The control room engineer tapes the live broadcast of Viewpoint simultaneously. A playback immediately after the program gives the participants, especially the host, a chance to listen to the discussion critically, an impossible chore while the program is in progress. For

---

[1]John W. Dunn, "Radio Programming for the College or University Station," Problems in College Radio (Columbia, Missouri: Stephens College, 1946), p. 106.

[2]Supra, p. 87

some participants this is a dubious recompense, but it is the only one. As a matter of long standing policy at Michigan State University, faculty members are not paid for appearances on either the university's radio or television station. (As teachers they are scarcely habituated to money.) Participants on the Round Table received $75 and expenses if they came from out of town. For local guests the fee was $50 and expenses.[1] Invitation to Learning talent fees today run from $150 to $250.[2] Guests on Background, a weekly half-hour discussion program broadcast on WUOM, the University of Michigan's radio station, receive $15 for each appearance.[3]

For some professors, listening to their own voice on tape leads to an unabashed romance. This type is most likely to respond quickly to an invitation to appear again. For a few others, however, the result is rather disheartening. The rest have "heard it" before. In any case, the post-mortem is worthwhile, more often than not.

Listening to the tape of the show after the broadcast rather than before may appear to be putting the cart before the horse. It is a fact, however, that participants on Viewpoint at least, rarely have the time to tape and critique the program beforehand, even if the wisdom of taping a rehearsal is admitted.[4] This is particularly true when talent fees are not available.

---

[1]Burns, p. 13.

[2]Cairns, Tate, and Van Doren, op. cit., p. xi.

[3]Jerry Shandler, producer-editor, Radio Station WUOM, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, personal letter, December 29, 1958.

[4]Burns, p. 14.

The tape serves another purpose. It permits WKAR to rebroadcast the program during the summer months and to offer the program to a state net of 105 stations. In October, 1959, the number of stations using Viewpoint regularly varied from twelve to sixteen. Three of these stations, all FM, were in Detroit.

Who listens to Viewpoint? There is simply no data. The station has none (surveys cost money); the writer has none.

Certainly a broadcaster, any broadcaster, ought to speak to an image of a listener in his mind. In default of any positive data, only this intuition can guide him.

The writer offers the conviction that the number of listeners varies from one (his wife) to 96,788. He suggests, moreover, that the audience consists of eggheads, eggheads defined as people who find satisfaction in ideas, how-to-think ideas, now how-to-do ideas; and who have a few ideas of their own to add to a healthy stock of intellectual curiosity. This includes Somethin' Smith from Kalamazoo (and the Bronx) who has never heard of Marcel Proust, but who listens because he has never heard of him. Without benefit of a Third Programme in the United States, we shall have to call him our Second Program listener.

It is at least a contingent truth in radio that listeners rarely write, unless it is to request some odd bit of information or a musical piece. After three years of broadcasting, Viewpoint's producer has received all of fifty-eight letters, eight post-cards, or so, and a dozen short scribbled notes from the faculty (all of them laudatory; they came from eggheads). The pourparler that drew the most mail--seventeen pieces and a Lone Ranger badge--included a parody on the 23rd Psalm which began:

Science is my Shepord
I shall not want
He maketh me to lie down on foam
rubber mattresses
He leadeth me beside six lane
highways
He rejuveneth my thyroid glands
He leadeth me in the paths of
psychoanalysis
For peace of mind's sake.[1]

Listeners wanted a copy of the parody, that's all.

Much of the feedback is oral. This means a dozen or so telephone calls a year from an assortment of people: high school teachers, housewives, and especially, members of the faculty. The program is well known, particularly among the faculty and staff, less so among the students, who have other fish to fry, only a few of them even mildly tainted with intellectualism.

Barnouw is right: "everything has to be promoted."[2] Or, as TV Guide puts it, ". . . nowadays you just don't make a mousetrap, you gotta call it."[3] Certainly, publicity has helped Viewpoint. The program is the most publicized radio program originated by Michigan State University. In addition to advance publicity which announces the topics and the guests, what is said on the program by the guests, (not by the host) is usually quoted at length in the Monday editions of the State News, the student daily, and the Lansing State Journal, the newspaper which services this community of 130,000. Because the program enjoys status, one of the main objectives of its publicity, persuading the faculty to participate, has never been a problem.

---

[1]Rev. Edward Ziegler, Roanoke, Virginia, quoted in Philosophies of Modern Life, Rabbi Charles Schulman, Vital Speeches, April 15, 1957.

[2]Barnouw, op. cit., p. 29.

[3]"Candid Shots," TV Guide, vol. 3, No. 3.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

For more than a quarter of a century, the University of Chicago Round Table, which was made available by the National Broadcasting Company to its member stations as a public service from 1933 on, furnished a platform from which the crucial issues of our times were discussed by knowledgable and articulate men. The program finally left the air in June 1955, a victim, largely, of three circumstances: first, the National Broadcasting Company's mounting losses in weekend operations; secondly, a conviction that there was no longer a place for thirty minute programs; and, lastly, the fact that local stations could more easily gratify local groups--bar associations, parent teacher associations, religious groups, and others--and at the same time meet Federal Communications Commission requirements in the "public affairs" domain.[1]

The Round Table, however, was succeeded by a program similar in formal called New World, reduced to twenty-one minutes and inserted as a segment of the network's weekend Monitor program. It was one of the few Monitor segments that lasted more than five minutes. New World was discontinued in June, 1947.

---

[1]Mrs. Kathryn Johnson, personal letter, July 20, 1959.

The Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, another program dedicated to the thesis that radio discussion contributes to the democratic process, is still on the air after twenty-five years of continuous broadcasting on the Mutual network. Like the Round Table in format, it differs largely in its use of a permanent moderator and in assigning somewhat less importance to pre-broadcast preparation. Dean McBurney, its moderator, tries to present "thoughtful discussion on questions of national interest and significance."[1] In recent years, an analysis of the Reviewing Stand's topics shows that the program has devoted more attention to questions which affect the listener directly and to literature, science, and the arts.

Invitation to Learning, a CBS production now nearing its twentieth year, is a discussion of the great books that have nourished Western thought, some of them for more than two thousand years. Its format assigns a key role to the program host as essential to both the listener and the discussion. It also depends less on pre-broadcast preparation than either the Round Table or the Reviewing Stand. Lyman Bryson, the program's host, until his death, believed that:

> The fact that so many people hesitate to try the masterpieces of yesterday and today, fearful that they will find in them dead ideas and boredom, is a very serious defect in our democratic culture.[2]

Mark Van Doren sums up the program's philosophy: "as in dialogue truth moves among the speakers" and the ideas of great books "bounce off one mental sphere and strike another."[3] Whatever the number of

---

[1]"Shop Talk," op. cit., p. 463.

[2]Quoted in Atkinson, op. cit., p. 45.

[3]Van Doren, op. cit., p. xii.

its listeners it is safe to say that they exceed the number of copies published of each book discussed by Bryson and his guests.

All three programs, the Round Table and the Reviewing Stand, models of serious, purposeful discussion largely on timely issues, and Invitation to Learning, a program devoted to universal ideas found in great books, grew out of the American ideal of free discussion in the public interest.

There were other beliefs involved: that radio can be an effective educational tool; that institutions dedicated to education have an obligation to use the tool; and that this type of programming provides a hearing for the best thinking that education and lay leadership has to offer the American public.

The programs discussed in Chapter II have made especially noteworthy contributions to adult education in the past; the Reviewing Stand and Invitation to Learning continue to make them. Their topics and participants are chosen with care; their discussions are enjoyed by a large audience, many of whom would not be able to come into contact with the type of broad-gauged, challenging thinking they offer. They present the university professor in his best light: as teacher, scholar, and critic.

Viewpoint, a weekly, thirty-minute talk show broadcast during the regular academic year by the radio station of Michigan State University, presents members of the University faculty. The program, examined in Chapter III, uses two kinds of topics: those that reflect today's more urgent headlines and those that are concerned with ideas of broader scope and application. Production methods are adapted to

conditions which obtain on the campus of a large university. Some insight into these methods should be of value to university stations undertaking discussion as part of their regular programming.

The program, like Invitation to Learning, assigns a key role to the host who appears on each program and takes an equal share in the discussion. It is unrehearsed, except for an interchange of notes beforehand among the participants. It strives for natural flow of conversation with the listener in the role of eavesdropper. Its objective is more an illumination of the topic rather than a clash of views.

What are the criteria for good discussion?

In the absence of a reliable measuring instrument, the effectiveness of any single discussion must rest in the last analysis on the listener's judgment. It is possible, however, using the four programs involved in this study, to suggest four general characteristics:

1. The topic is either timely or timeless and escapes the trivial.

2. The ideas discussed jostle and nudge one another a bit.

3. There is a freshness that comes from reaching for deep down things.

4. The talk flows in an atmosphere of creative tension. In plain English, the speakers are concerned with what they are saying.

As the analysis of Viewpoint also suggests "the best program is probably real, fluid and spontaneous, yet intelligent enough to contain the most significant points that can be raised within the time limit."[1]

---

[1] Supra, p.55.

Who listens to radio discussion? Who does not listen and why? There is ample room for research here. Such investigation is beyond the scope of this thesis. It is relevant, however, to examine some aspects of the problem in general.

It is apparent that if we are the talking animal, the talking animal is much less inclined to listen. And, in Walter Lippman's words, it is "the necessity of listening that makes the right to talk important."[1] Nevertheless, a talk show that raises basic questions -- why, how, for what? -- within a format of free, informed and lively discussion, is bound to attract some listeners whether the topic is Marx, prison reform or Marcel Proust.

This conviction guided and informed the Round Table and still nourishes its successors. Among their listeners are those Van Wyck Brooks has called--not patronizingly, not invidiously--"lowbrows," that is people who live out their lives without much understanding of their origins, their traditions, and the goals of their country or mankind--the vast lumpen population. Exactly why they listen is difficult to determine. Bryson offers some reasons.[2] It is easier to furnish some clues as to why they do not listen:

> The practical, non-intellectual man . . . resents the fact that his own importance, as well as his own understanding of the world, are threatened by the intellectual and the intellectual's ability to change ideas. There is a tendency for the older class struggles rooted in clear historical

---

[1]Walter Lippman, "The Indispensable Opposition," Atlantic Monthly, August, 1939, pp. 187-190.

[2]Supra, p.47.

> antagonisms, to be replaced by a new status warfare; one between the groups which by reason of rural or smalltown location, ethnicity or other parochialism, feel threatened by ideas and the better educated upper-middle-class people . . . who create or follow the modern movements in science, art, literature and opinion generally.
>
> In other words, anti-intellectualism in this country has increased in proportion to (though not only because of) the growth of intellectualism. City slickers are no longer only bankers, lawyers and drummers--they are drummers of ideas, that is professors, teachers, writers and artists.[1]

Perhaps, too, we should recognize a certain unconscious wisdom in refusing to talk on what may be called the deeper levels or to listen to what purports to be serious talk. This is the wisdom that lies in refusing to take language more seriously than it deserves, that recognizes that language is in no way equivalent to immediate experience or a source of knowledge in itself about the nature of things. "When you give a child the name of a bird, it loses the bird."[2] Definition is not the thing. Literature itself diminishes whatever it touches, as Renan saw.

Korzybski argued that words alone are insufficient to convey meaning because, among other reasons, definitions are circular; we use words to define other words; ultimately we reach the bottom of the barrel. Besides, words must of necessity exclude the basic assumptions that underlie them.[3]

---

[1]David Riesman, Individualism Reconsidered (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1954), p. 111.

[2]Joyce Cary, Art and Reality (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 119.

[3]Alfred Korzybski, Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics (Lancaster, Pa: The International non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company, 1941), pp. 92-95f.

In the same sense, modern artists working in the abstract expressionist manner are not doodling or selling the medium down the river, but simply making deeply felt statements about man and the world in terms of a certain kind of pictorial metaphor. They have found that the ordinary language of art, honed to a fine edge through the centuries, is no longer adequate to express the modern predicament.

But whatever we may think about words themselves, ours is still la civisation du dialogue, as Albert Camus observes.[1] We live by words, the slipperiest, the most lethal, and the most momentous of all man's inventions. Language admits us into a conceptual world of light and air. But only at a price. For this world of light and air is also a world where the winds of doctrine howl destructively; where delusive mock-suns keep popping up over the horizon; where all kinds of poison comes pouring out of the propaganda factories and the tripe mills. Living amphibiously, half in fact and half in words, half in immediate experience and half in abstract notions, we contrive most of the time to make the worst of both worlds. We use language so badly that we become slaves of our cliches and are turned either into conforming Babbitts or into fanatics and doctrinaires. And we use immediate experience so badly that we become blind to the realities of our own nature and insensitive to the universe around us. The abstract knowledge which words bring us is paid for by concrete ignorance.

F. C. Bartlett has recorded the results of a number of experiments designed to test the influence of language on memories of various kinds

---

[1]Albert Camus, The Myth of Sisyphus (Paris: Gallimard, 1942) p. 72.

of experience. In one of the tests, photographs of soldiers and sailors of different ranks were shown to a group of subjects. They were then asked to describe the faces and answer questions about them at intervals from half an hour to a week or more later.

> A particular fact often at once arouses a more or less conventional attitude appropriate to the given type. Thereupon, the attitude actively affected the detail of representation. Even in immediate memory the features of the face often tended to be made more conventional, while in subsequent recall they tended to approach yet more closely to conventional patterns.[1]

Bartlett made other experiments with literary material. Subjects were asked to read a passage first from one of Emerson's essays and then from an American Indian folk-tale. When they reproduced this material immediately after reading, and again at longer intervals, all that was fresh and original in the essay and the story tended to disappear. Slaves to the cliches in which they habitually expressed themselves, the subjects changed what they had read into the likeness of their own familiar notions as embodied in the language of their class and culture. Summing up the results of these experiments with literary material, Bartlett concluded that, when reproduced from memory, the stories were apt to be shorn of their individualising features, the descriptive passages lost most of their peculiarities of style and matter and the arguments tended to be reduced to a balk expression of conventional opinion.

Or, said Bartlett:

> . . . if they [the stories] express an original point of view, they tend to pass over into opposed conventional views. Where the epithets are original,

---

[1]Charles F. Bartlett, Remembering (Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1932), p. 191.

> they tend to become current, commonplace terms. The style gets flattened out and loses any pretensions it may have had to forcefulness and beauty.[1]

Bartlett's observations merely confirm what every serious broadcaster painfully discovers for himself--that full communication with a large audience is impossible, that most people read into what they hear the standardized notions with which they set out, that the speaker's laborious efforts to find an adequate verbal equivalent for experiences are simply not noticed by the majority of his listeners, who automatically transform what Mallarme calls the _sens plus pur_ of the language into the soiled and shopworn _mots de la tribu_.

Language, evidently, has its Gresham's law. Bad words tend to drive out good words, and words in general, the good as well as the bad, tend to drive out immediate experience and our memories of immediate experience. How complete, in every one of us, is the amnesia for all the novel and immensely exciting experiences of infancy--the age of the non-talker!

Hegel elaborated the thesis that words have acquired an alien existence, a world of their own; man has become estranged from the creatures of his own mind.[2] The existentialists from Kierkegaard to Sartre and a psychologist like Erich Fromm[3] take their cue from Hegel. Among contemporary philosophers, particularly in England, the hard-boiled logical positivists would reduce all problems to linguistic problems. A core idea in Zen, the Japanese variety of Buddhism which

---

[1]_Ibid._, p. 195.

[2]George W. F. Hegel, _Phenomenonology of Mind_ (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), pp. 79f.

[3]Erich Fromm, _The Sane Society_ (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1951), pp. 110f.

has been attracting attention in the West recently, is that truth is beyond the reach of words; language is a barrier to reality through which man can penetrate only by meditation, discipline, and finally, intuition.[1] When Louis Armstrong was asked to define jazz and he replied, "Man, when you got to ask what it is, you'll never get to know,"[2] he was only echoing Goethe's more romantic language. "When on the moment of illumination the Soul speaks," said the German poet, "it is no longer the Soul that is speaking." It is suggestive that Irving Lee begins his useful little book with this sentence: "This is a time of much talk. It would be hard to estimate how helpful it is or how destructive."[3]

To confess our predicament is not to declare, however, that words are merely a clever set of deadly man-traps. Huxley's words can be taken with equal seriousness:

> . . . We talk about "mere matters of words" in a tone which implies that we regard words as things beneath the notice of a serious-minded person.
>
> This is a most unfortunate attitude. For the fact is that words play an enormous part in our lives and are therefore deserving of the closest study. The old idea that words possess magical powers is false; but its falsity is the distortion of a very important truth. Words do have a magical effect--but not in the way that the magicians supposed and not on the objects they were trying to influence. Words are magical in the way they

---

[1]D. T. Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 30f. The dean of Zen in this country, Suzuki recently returned to Japan.

[2]Quoted in Hayakawa, op. cit., p. 54.

[3]Lee, op. cit., p. ix.

> affect the minds of those who use them. "A mere matter of words," we say contemptuously, forgetting that words have the power to mold men's thinking, to canalize their feeling, to direct their willing and acting. Conduct and character are largely determined by the nature of the words we currently use to discuss ourselves and the world around us.[1]

So there are those who for one reason or another do not listen or are unlikely to listen. In general, it is possible to conclude that the discussion program's audience includes the more sensitive and aware; and those who are somewhere on the road to becoming more sensitive and aware: hausfraus, ordinary Joe's, even an occasional furtive freshman. There is probably more than a little truth in Alexander King's comment on television in one of John Crosby's columns. "The one thing I wish Congress would investigate is the low mental voltage of television instead of its crookedness . . . . From the mail we get it is obvious that people are famished for . . . . conversation."[2]

Certainly the answer to the question of who listens to "highbrow" discussion programs or any other kind, to the extent that the problem is susceptible of an answer, is worth pursuing. It will not be easy to come by. Ordering the variables of the communication process may be the tallest order research has yet assigned to itself. For the present, we have moved off the plane of intuition without finding much solace in models of the communication process or in theories of communication which frequently appear to assemble as many doubts as they dispel.

---

[1]Aldous Huxley, Words and Their Meanings (Los Angeles: Ward Ritchie Press, 1940), p. 51.

[2]Quoted in the Lansing State Journal, January 15, 1960.

Perhaps it is not entirely illogical or impractical to adopt as at least a working hypothesis the notion that people are influenced to some degree by what they hear. It may be pointed out that there is actually no statistical evidence that the mass marketing of books or the increase in the number of concert-goers has improved the quality of our lives and our culture, either. One need not go as far as the old populist notion of bringing light to the masses; or, as far as the Round Table publicists, or Lyman Bryson, and yet retain a faith that when discussion is blessed by both substance and vitality its effects are all to the good:

> The Round Table indicated the way in which the resources of the nation's great universities can be utilized discreetly and continuously in the immediate service of the democratic process, placing before a wide audience information and opinion regarding pressing issues and values. University faculty participants can contribute expert opinion based on fact; they bring to the program minds trained in cutting through vague generalizations to the core of the problem; and they have a way of insisting that all the cards be laid on the table, and not merely the cards which an advocate of a point of view wishes to display. By bringing university participants . . . to the local community, the level of [public] discussion can be elevated and the community . . . enriched.[1]

And, Bryson:

> . . . Our discussion programs [CBS] are not expected to settle, finally, and forever, the questions discussed. They are designed for a different purpose, a purpose which we hope will eventually lead to the wise solution of these problems for the discussions themselves are intended and designed to help listeners to think for themselves. They are planned to help those who listen understand what the important

---

[1]Summary, op. cit., p. 10.

> problems are, why they are important, to learn what arguments can be offered to back them up. In short, discussion programs are aimed to assist in the most important process in the whole business of democratic government, to help make an informed and vigorous public opinion . . . . They are serious--but not solemn--attempts to help the process of deliberation.[1]

It is in order to ask: Do people listen because they are aware or to become aware? Do they listen for the vicarious satisfaction of taking part in the discussion, especially if it has in it an element of debate? Do they listen because, like going to college, it is prestigeful to listen? Katz and Lazarfeld note that:

> . . . In practice [they tend] first to select from the mass media only those materials which they know in advance they will like or be in agreement with; second, the materials selected tend to reinforce the values already present in the individual that were called out in the action of selection; third, the process of interpersonal relationships act as "anchorage points" for individual opinions, attitudes, habits and values. That is, interacting individuals seem collectively and continuously to generate and to maintain common ideas and behavior patterns which they are reluctant to surrender or modify unilaterally.[2]

Nor should laborers in the vineyards of radio discussion, at the same time, labor under the amiable illusion that the listener derives a large fund of specific and lasting knowledge or information from other people's talk no matter how insightful, closely reasoned, and dynamically presented. Some information they probably do get; how

---

[1]Bryson, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

[2]Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarfeld, Personal Influence (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955), p. 16.

meaningful and how lasting it is may be open to question. There is also some slight evidence for a shift in attitudes.[1] But the evidence does not support the claim that discussion brings about any radical change.[2] By and large, what the listener gets from radio discussion probably stems from the fact that the discussion first focuses his attention on the subject and then gives rise to a heightened sense of personal awareness, possibly quite brief, but one which he can derive from few other sources quite as satisfactorily. One of the goals of the Round Table was to make the listener "more actively aware of his heritage and his responsibilities."[3] Both the Reviewing Stand and Invitation to Learning express their objectives in similar terms.

This is not quite the same thing as saying that the discussion makes the listener think. Bryson believed that discussion programs "when they are doing their best help to make people think."[4] But what is thinking? The teacher, especially the university professor who is, or should be, concerned with critical thinking, has to grapple with the same question:

> The mental operations implied by thinking are not well understood; the means of provoking and cultivating thinking on the part of individuals is not entirely clear; and the seeming necessity for covering large masses of material in the classroom leaves too little time for any but the

---

[1]William S. Howell, "The Relative Effectiveness of the Radio Round Table and the Radio Forum" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1938).

[2]Joseph T. Klapper, The Effects of Mass Media (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1949), p. 2, and Paul F. Lazarfeld, "The Effects of Radio on Public Opinion," Print, Radio, and Film in a Democracy (Chicago; University of Chicago Press, 1942), p. 68.

[3]Summary, op. cit., p. 3.

[4]Bryson, op. cit., p. 89.

> most able students to reflect on the meaning, interrelationships and applicability of knowledge which is gained. The able student, too, often displays reluctance to think for himself, in part because the exercise of thought and judgment is time-consuming, difficult, and, in part, no doubt, because he sees little evidence that such efforts will yield returns in the currency of the academic realm.[1]

But whether the result of radio listening is awareness or thinking or something else, it is the seed of personal growth and possibly of some degree of learning; possibly; no more than a seed, but essential to the final harvest. Socrates, who might have defined education as a conversation about wisdom, insisted it may be remembered, that he taught nothing. Like a mid-wife of the spirit, he said he only helped others bring their ideas to birth. Professor Sidney Hook pointed out years ago that the most important educational use of radio is the ". . . development of the listener's intelligence to the point where he can find entertainment in the play of ideas, the confrantation of argument with argument and the quest for truth."[2] One may quarrel with Hook's use of the term intelligence, but certainly a discussion show worth the name will concern itself with the play of ideas and the quest for truth. Prime Minister Nehru of India once wrote to a friend: "Out of discussion sometimes there comes a little bit of truth."[3]

---

[1]Paul L. Dressel (ed)., Evaluation in the Basic College of Michigan State University (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 129.

[2]Quoted in a reprint of a symposium on "Radio in Education" broadcast at the dedication exercises of Station WEVD, New York City, November 11, 1938, p. 19.

[3]"Nehru's India," The New York Times, January 7, 1956.

In short, nothing much is accomplished unless we are willing to live with ambiguities, at least temporarily. The educational broadcaster will have to nourish his ideals; perhaps his illusions. The wise one will also cultivate a cleansing pessimism about his ability to remake the world of men. What people do with his message is still anybody's guess. Recent studied like those of Hovland, Janis, and Kelley, leaves us in some doubt as to the results of the communication process.[1] Even if some segments of the communication process can be isolated, the totality is apt to remain obscure.

This is no secret to educational broadmasters or their critics. They offer no easy remedy, to wit that broadcast media are a substitute for either classroom or books, or a primrose path to wisdom and encyclopedic knowledge. Typically, Jack Gould writes of "radio and television's special ability to quicken public interest in important issues."[2] Edward Murrow writes hopefully of an "instrument . . . which illuminates . . . even inspires."[3]

Perhaps we shall have to be content to say that radio <u>influences</u>, and that to this extent radio is an educational medium whether it wants to be or not and regardless of whether its effects are to be measured in terms of thinking, awareness, or interest.

> Radio in <u>any</u> form, commercial or sustaining, good or bad, is educational in the sense that it wields influence and power over ideas and actions,

---

[1]Hovland, Carl I., Irving L. Janis and Harold H. Kelley, <u>Yale Studies in Attitude and Communication</u>, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1959.

[2]Quoted in a reprint of a symposium on "Radio in Education" broadcast at the dedication exercises of Station WEVD, New York City, November 11, 1938, p. 19.

[3]"Nehru's India," <u>The New York Times</u>, January 7, 1956.

> emotions and opinions, of its listeners. In this way, and to this degree, radio and education are one.[1]

This much must be added: discussion on educational broadcasting media may--and should--aim high. The number of listeners is not important; only the quality of the product matters. The fact that the typical American cannot distinguish between Marcel Proust and a bench-warmer for the Chicago Cubs is no reason to ban a discussion of the French novelist. It is, in fact, a compelling reason for putting the program on the air.

> Unquestionably, education in a democracy has the responsibility of lifting the level of understanding and appreciation of the people, of giving the individual a knowledge of himself and his society and of the sources of tensions and perplexities in each. . . . Educational broadcasting has been most clearly distinguished by its high concern for integrity in the selection and handling of materials, and by its consistent dedication to social purpose. This purposeful activity may take several forms, among them . . . broadening participation in the culture of our society and leading the way by experiment, toward new forms of broadcasting. People cannot come to like what they have never experienced. Broadcasters must provide that variety of experience which permits and encourages the development of tastes and interests. This implies an obligation to experiment with both form and content.[2]

This is not to say, either, that the goal is the "undemocratic" one of a small, elite audience.

> The universal audience includes a diversity of smaller publics distinguished by needs and interests which are less than universal. . . . One great purpose of the educational broadcaster is to render service

---

[1]Armand L. Hunter, "The Radio Curriculum--A Question of Content, not Context," Problems in College Radio, op. cit., pp. 15-16.

[2]From the Proceedings of the Educational Broadcasting Seminar held at the University of Illinois, June and July, 1949, Wilbur Schramm, Director.

> to those publics which are not otherwise being served. In creating a program for any public in terms of the needs and interest that defines that public, the broadcaster will try to reach that entire public. When broadcasting is serving the interest of such publics, the size of the obtained audience is not to be measured against the size of the universal audience, but rather against the size of the public selected. When the public is small, the obtained audience will, of course, be small. If the need or interest served is important, the smallness of the audience may be justified. But there is no merit in smallness itself. If the potential audience is large and the obtained audience is small, the situation should be analyzed carefully to make certain that the size of the audience is not a result of poor audience promotion or lack of imagination and skill in program design.[1]

It is not news that most educational stations, particularly university stations, are beset by difficulties. Their record as a group is spotty. No doubt, some are effective; without sacrificing content, their programs are bright and alive. Others, one knows even without a systematic collection of evidence, are not quite as effective. Operating on the fringes of commercial radio, they have not had the courage to fail and have been too ready to settle for half a success; too many have been content to peddle a limited menu of mild intellectual fare centered around the farm, the home, Beethoven, and Bach. (The fear in the twenties that "mechanical radio" would displace the flesh-and-block teacher has been less than prophetic.) Some college and university stations are service-to-the-public oriented. This sometimes means service, not in any broad social sense, but in the narrower sense of contributing bits of useful information to farmers, housewives, and other special groups. Such programs, of course, are relatively cheap and easy to produce. For these and other reasons linked with lack of support from administrators, students, and faculties, these undernourished,

---

[1]Bryson, op. cit., p. 89.

neglected pillars of broadcasting have seldom broadcast programs of epoch-making caliber.

> Educational radio stations and educational programs have never had money and resources enough to maintain high continuing audience interest through quality programs. Case histories of typical stations operated by a college or university make grim reading, because the initial enthusiasm often gave way to lagging faculty and student interest, amateur standards of production which failed to entertain audiences at any level, and lack of funds. There has been scattered, but substantial improvement in the educational radio stations since the war, but quality programming remains the unsolved problem.[1]

University stations are entitled to point out with pride that their directors and staff frequently "come out of commercial radio." Yet this may be another reason why some of them fail to measure up to their capacity. Many times men reared in commercial radio never lose their addiction to "what the public wants." Having declared war on dullness in any form, they are prone to regard education as legitimate only if happily married to entertainment; so that, even transplanted to an academic climate, they tend to lean heavily on "balanced programming" which in practice usually means a souffle of home economics and popular music intermingled with a few serious programs distributed by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

It seems necessary to add that broadcasters are under no compulsion to devote their entire bill of fare to "egghead" programs. The point is that they have a responsibility not only to meet tastes as they are, but constantly to improve them:

---

[1]<u>On the Entertainment of Ideas</u>, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 16.

> . . . as you raise your level of taste in music, drama, literature, or any other art, you find that you demand more, that your expectations move up. Your tastes get to be more and more like the preference of listeners who have had more experience and training. This happens, of course, only if you are exposed to good things, to fine music, to drama, to talk that is logical and thoughtful.[1]

Even commercial radio does not have to appeal to the widest level of popular taste all the time or almost all the time. This is to confuse the objectives of advertising with the responsibilities of broadcasting:

> . . . The best thing for the broadcaster to do is to keep the volume of educational broadcast slightly above what the masses want. In this way he [the commercial broadcaster] may contribute to a systematic rise in the general cultural level without defeating the educational goal by driving audiences away. This policy will disappoint some educators and it will alienate some listeners, but it is precisely the kind of compromise solution which must be found.[2]

Of course, the university broadcaster should meet professional standards of production, if he can. There is no inconsistency here with his primary purpose which is education--the most momentous act any society can undertake.

> Whereas a commercial broadcaster may highlight a public service or educational program with great production skill and for a large ready-made audience, the more non-commercial broadcasters can design his <u>entire</u> program structure in the light of educational needs and resources. . . . It is in terms of the primary purpose of non-commercial

---

[1]Bryson, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 41, 46-48.

[2]Paul Lazarsfeld and Patricia Kendall, <u>Radio Listening in America</u> (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1948), p. 42.

> programming that the essential difference between commercial and non-commercial broadcasting may best be defined.[1]

Educational broadcasters have an important role to play in American society. And they may ask themselves the same question that Ed Murrow poses for commercial television broadcasters, but with even more point:

> Do we merely stay in our comfortable nests, concluding that the obligation of these instruments has been discharged when we work at the job of of informing the public for a minimum of time? Or do we believe that the preservation of the Republic is a seven-day-a-week job, demanding more awareness, better skills, and more perseverance than we have yet contemplated?
>
> This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, and it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely wires and lights in a box.[2]

Many of us, it appears, are cowards safe inside a convention and need to be encouraged to come out. Discussion is as necessary to a free society as the free press and radio which provide it. No other type of program affords the public so fine an opportunity to contribute to its own enlightenment. And here, too, is the role in which the university and its professors are superbly cast. They can help us clarify; they can help us to act; they can send a breath of fresh air through the age-old fastnesses of authoritarianism, prejudice and provincialism; they can deflate the shibboleths and fetishes which stand in the way of a decent approach to our problems.

---

[1]Proceedings of Education Broadcasting Seminar, op. cit.

[2]Murrow, op. cit., p. 26.

Talk, the writer concludes, particularly discussion, with all its limitations, ought to be the guts of educational programming, not merely the rind, and no matter whether this type of fare is offered by commercial or educational broadcasters. Commercial broadcasters are in the education business, too, willy-nilly; and, at times, do a mighty fine job of it as many superlative programs can testify. In any case, this does not mean that networks, individual stations or even educational stations connected with our universities are under any necessity of becoming wailing walls for "effete" college professors to bemoan the vulgar state of American culture.

Commercial radio, peddling largely entertainment, and educational radio, oriented toward knowledge and the arts, even "egghead" discussion, may appear to be worlds apart. They are not; nor should they be. The only question these days is toward which end of the continuum do we wish to move? Discussion programs wake up the mind and light its curiosity. They are service programs, too; service in its more radical sense.

APPENDIX A

PEACE WITH RUSSIA: REALISM OR UNREALISM?

The University of Chicago Round Table, an NBC radio discussion, broadcast on January 29, 1950, with the following participants: Harrison Brown, atomic scientist, associate professor of chemistry, Institute of Nuclear Studies, the University of Chicago; William Henry Chamberlain, writer, associate editor of the New Leader, editorial contributor, Wall Street Journal, author of many books on Russia, including Russia's Iron Age (1934), The Russian Enigma (1943), The European Cockpit (1947); Malcolm Sharp, professor of Law, the University of Chicago; and Gilbert White, president of Haverford College and formerly assistant executive secretary, American Friends Service Committee. Published as pamphlet No. 619 for public sale.

From Chicago

Mr. Brown: The government of the United States has been called upon to make a momentous decision--a decision which may determine whether millions of people live or die.

The question which must be answered can be put into a few words: Should we, or should we not, make an all-out effort to produce the so-called "hydrogen bomb"?

The limitations of secrecy have prevented a full and open discussion of this bomb by those scientists who know the most about it.

Nevertheless, there are certain facts which are so well known to scientists all over the world that they cannot be properly considered classified. As an atomic scientist I can say these things here:

First, it is probably possible to build such a bomb. It requires no knowledge of secret data to compute the conditions under which a nuclear explosion can be started in the light elements, such as hydrogen or lithium. Of course, as with any major technological development, one can never be sure that it will work until it is tried. Nevertheless, the fact that calculations give strong indication that such a bomb would work must be taken seriously. This is knowledge common among scientists all over the world.

Second, it is very simple to obtain a rough idea of the explosive effect of such a reaction. It seems clear that the explosive effect would be much greater than that of ordinary atomic bombs. Exactly how much greater the destruction would be is difficult to estimate, but it would appear quite possible for such a bomb to devastate an area of three hundred square miles. If dropped centrally in New York, London, Paris, or Moscow, possibly two million or more people could be killed by a single explosion.

Third, there is absolutely no reason to believe that the Russians cannot build such a bomb. We seem to have a national obsession that the Russians are not capable in science--an obsession which persists in spite of the fact that they succeeded in exploding their first atomic bomb in a time interval corresponding to the minimum estimates made by our own scientists many years ago. Clearly the scientists of the Soviet Union possess basic knowledge which is necessary; and the direction which must be taken in order to produce such a bomb

is so obvious that it is inconceivable that the Soviet scientists do not see clearly the steps to be taken. Indeed, we know that, as long ago as the 1930's, the Russians seriously considered the possibilities of producing atomic energy, utilizing the light elements. Then there were too many technological difficulties. How many of the obstacles have been passed.

In the presence of the cold war, in the absence of anything approaching a stable peace, there is little reason to believe that the Russians will not build such a bomb. Indeed, if the Russians have already made the decision to proceed with this development, then they are probably ahead of us, for our own progress in new developments has certainly been much slower than it was during the war. One need point only to the fact that a very large percentage of the most famous physical scientists in America was employed on the bomb project during the war and that almost none of these men is now in full-time employment with the Atomic Energy Commission. There are probably few scientists who would like to claim that our present rate of progress is more than one-tenth of what it was during the war. There has been no sign of an appreciable increase of pace in recent months.

Perhaps the most important single feature of the hydrogen bomb is that there may well be no upper limit to the destruction which is possible. We know that ordinary atomic bombs cannot exceed a certain limit of destruction: but, with hydrogen bombs, almost anything may be possible. Because of this we scientists can only ask: Where will it all stop? When will scientists be permitted to stop this terrible business of devising increasingly effective means to kill and to destroy? How far will we go before we appreciate that war must be a thing of the past?

Whether or not we should put a great effort into the building of a bomb some thousand-fold more powerful than the present atomic bomb is a terrible decision. Clearly it cannot be answered out of context of the question: Is a real peace with Russia possible? But even while we worry about whether we should make such a bomb, we must face the question whether a military defense is meaningful any more. What happens to armaments superiority if even the weaker nations can completely destroy the stronger?

It seems clear to many of us that the decision to make or not to make such a bomb is probably a decision which should be made by the American public in full knowledge and understanding of the facts and terrible potentialities.

From New York City

Mr. Sharp: In this grim situation, Brown has reminded us of the circumstances in which we meet to discuss the question of peace with Russia--realism or unrealism?

White, you have been chairman of a committee which prepared a report recently published by the Yale University Press, Quaker Proposals for Peace.

Mr. White: The Quaker committee considered the whole problem of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and reached the general conclusion that improved relations are possible. Our group included businessmen and scholars with experience in relief and rehabilitation work, from Finland down through Poland, Hungary, Austria, Germany, into Palestine, and over on both sides in China.

Our conclusions were based on this set of considerations: First, we felt that there is a widespread and sincere desire for peace, even though many people feel that we can attain peace only through war. Secondly, we came out of our studies with the conviction that both the Soviet Union and the United States are going to continue to exist in this world for a long time and that, while there are many drastic differences between the two countries and their systems, there are also some important similarities. We feel that it is possible for them to accommodate themselves to each other sufficiently so as to coexist. Third, we felt it highly probable that the present tension between these two countries is based on mutual fear of attack by the other one. We think it improbable that this fear can be overcome by armament competition. Indeed, we think that it is desirable to reduce armaments and to reduce the whole reliance on military weapons before the burdens of an arms competition weaken the very democratic institutions which we are interested in preserving.

On the basis of these considerations, we suggested what we felt were some constructive actions which might be taken by the United States at this time, as samples of a whole program of general settlement. Specifically we indicated concrete steps which could be taken with respect to East-West trade, with respect to Germany, and with respect to strengthening and developing the United Nations, particularly in armaments control.[1]

---

[1]American Friends Service Committee, The United States and the Soviet Union: Some Quaker Proposals for Peace (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949).

Mr. Sharp: Chamberlin, what is your opinion of this approach?

Mr. Chamberlin: I read this Quaker report, and I certainly sympathize with its spirit and would be inclined to indorse it fully, if there were the slightest sign that there were any similar ideals on the other side of the Iron Curtain--if there were any Quaker spirit in the Politburo or in the Kremlin.

Unfortunately, we have learned, or should have learned by this time, that Soviet bad faith and bad will must be taken for granted. Here is Lenin's formula for bad faith, and I quote from one of his books which, of course, is entirely authoritative for the Soviet population: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth." Here is Lenin's formula for bad will, for the inevitability of ultimate conflict. I may add that that same formula is repeated, again and again, in the writings of the Soviet dictator, Joseph Stalin.

I quote again from Lenin: "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable."

This is unfortunately not just theoretical formulation. It has been expressed in Soviet policies before the war, during the war, and since the war. I do not think even Adolf Hitler has a worse record for broken treaties, broken promises, disregard of obligations which it is inconvenient to keep, and indifference to international public opinion.

We have, just at this moment, a scandalous situation where the Soviet Union is trying to bully the U.N., by boycott, into accepting its protege, Communist China. There in the U.N. the pages of recent history are simply strewn with Soviet broken promises.

That leads me to ask White whether the proposals of the Quaker committee are based upon an assumption of automatic Soviet good faith and good will or whether they are what might be called "self-enforcing" --that is, whether they could be put into effect with safeguards against the possible consequences if the Soviet government should fail to keep its word.

Mr. White: That question gave our committee a great deal of concern. We talked about it with many officials in many governments and in the United Nations, and we consulted the outstanding experts who had dealt with the Soviet Union at various international conferences.

Our feeling was that the situation is not so hopeless as you would imply. I would like to come back later to the specific proposals which were put forth, but, in general, I think that we can say that our committee recognized that the primary drive of the Soviet Union at the present time seems to be in the direction of development of resources and of reconstruction. The Soviet Union has some of the dogmas to which you have referred. One of them, for example, is that capitalist countries will be driven into war and that they will cause wars. It is within our power to demonstrate the error of that dogma.

Another dogma, it seems to us, is the one that dogma itself can be adjusted to history. You quoted some of the Russian leaders a moment ago. Let me quote this statement from Stalin on the problem of socialism

in one country: "What would have happened to the Party, to our revolution, to Marxism, if Lenin had been overawed by the letter of Marxism and had not had the courage of theoretical conviction to discard one of the old conclusions of Marxism and to replace it by a new conclusion affirming that the victory of socialism in one country, taken singly, was possible, a conclusion which corresponded to the new historical conditions."

Does that not raise the question of whether, by presenting the Soviet Union with new historical conditions, some of this resistance to peaceful settlement can indeed be reduced?

Mr. Chamberlin: If that is a plea for what some people might call "conciliation"--what others might call "appeasement"--I submit that that policy was tried and proved a pitiful bankrupt failure during the war. I do not think that anyone could have gone further in bending backward to satisfy Soviet demands and to relieve Soviet fears than President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins did during the war. Roosevelt gave Russia half of Poland (which he had no moral right to give), large slices of Germany and Austria, control of the Manchurian Railway, Port Arthur, the Kuril Islands, three votes in the United Nations. In return for all this, he merely hoped to get from the Soviet Union cooperation in a world of peace and order. He died bitterly disillusioned. This policy of appeasement, therefore, has been tried and failed.

More recently, we have gone over to what I consider a far more realistic policy and a more hopeful policy--the policy of organizing a free world, of giving our military guarantee to the countries of Western Europe, of cooperating with the free countries in economic

reconstruction. While that policy cannot yet be pronounced a complete success and while there are still many difficult problems to adjust, I do think that it has created a sense of security in Europe which one did not feel at all, let us say, two or three or four years ago. It was the impression which I brought back from a trip to Europe last summer that our new policy of stepping in and underwriting the freedom of the west European countries is giving definite and favorable results.

Mr. Sharp: You are a special student in this field, Chamberlin, and yet one can have some reservations about your interpretation of the history. The history is ambiguous, as all history is. We can say that we turned immediately to the attack, with regard to Russia, as soon as the war was won and began to put pressure on the Russians.

I am more interested now in asking about the implications of your proposal. Your proposal is that we stay with the cold war and continue with the effort to build up military superiority. What is the outcome of that going to be?

Mr. Chamberlin: The outcome, I hope, will be the ultimate disintegration of the Soviet empire and the emergence of a united, free Europe. I do not favor, I would like to make this point clear, an aggressive or preventive war.

Mr. Sharp: Why not? Why is that not the logic of what you were saying?

Mr. Chamberlin: Because it would be a fearful responsibility to unleash a war and a responsibility which, I think, no civilized democratic leader would want to take so long as there is even the one chance in ten or one chance in a hundred that war could be avoided.

And there is always the possibility of crackup within the Soviet satellite states, perhaps even more than in the Soviet empire itself. So that the final responsibility, I think, for launching a war with Russia must rest with Moscow.

Mr. White: But does not the policy of relying primarily on military force, on a hydrogen bomb if you please, lead inexorably to a preventive war?

Mr. Chamberlin: I do not think so. I think, on the contrary, that weakness invites attack much more than strength. The helplessness of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia did not save them from being overrun by the Soviet Union. The strength and knowledge that the whole military and industrial power of the United States are behind Western European countries have, I think, been an effective deterrent to Soviet attack on Western Europe.

Mr. Sharp: It seems to me that we are faced with a certain amount of what we could call "unrealism" in most proposals which we hear today. White, you seem to be a little unrealistic in your report in supposing that people generally want peace if by that you mean they do not want war, too. As I read history, people want both and are fascinated by war at the same time that they dread it.

Similarly, Chamberlin seems to me to make a comparable simplification of the problem in supposing that we are the peace-lovers and the Russians the war-lovers. We have been aggressive. We are like other human beings. Byrnes went to the first London Conference suspicious. We have borne down on the Russians, from one point of view, ever since the war was over. But what seems to me more unrealistic about Chamberlin's proposal is that he does suggest that we are in for a long-time

arms race. Arms races have led to only one end in the past--war! I see no reasons to think that we can avoid war.

It seems to me that one has to face the position that here we are taking a big chance that one side or the other will launch a preventive attack, and we will have a war. And it seems to me most unrealistic not to try for over-all peace negotiation at this time. Whether your precise proposals will stand the test of criticism, or not, it seems to me high time for over-all negotiation.

Mr. White: It seems to me that some sort of an attempt at an over-all agreement is in order at the present time and that strengthening of a policy which places reliance on our scientific ingenuity in developing newer and better weapons at each stage ahead of our opponent is far more dangerous, far more perilous, in the long run.

Mr. Sharp: Do you see any time ahead, Chamberlin, when negotiations could be entered into?

Mr. Chamberlin: That is entirely, in my opinion, dependent upon a change of attitude and method in Moscow. If the Soviet government will restore free institutions in eastern Germany, if it will withdraw its occupation troops in Austria (along with the occupation troops of the Western powers, which is something for which we have been working patiently and unsuccessfully now for years), if it will withdraw its armies within the Soviet frontiers, then I think that an atmosphere would be created. But I would be very skeptical of the results of a peace conference which would be begun without some very binding and specific assurances on all these points. I feel that, with these, we would just repeat the humiliation, the failure, the defeat of Teheran, of Yalta, and of Potsdam.

Mr. Sharp: In some ways this seems a most propitious time for an effort at over-all settlement. A little over a year ago, President Truman, in one of his campaign speeches, spoke of his effort to dispel the poisonous atmosphere of distrust which has surrounded negotiations. Without charging either side with creating it, he said that he was going to set himself to dispel it.

Mr. Chamberlin: I would really very much like to know the opinion of both of you gentlemen on perhaps the most dramatic question before us and one which figures quite largely, I think, in the Quaker report. That is the question of agreement on atomic disarmament.

I believe that that problem is completely insoluble, because there are two reasons why the Soviet Union is practically, to my mind, a country which cannot be effectively controlled or inspected: First, there is its enormous size. It is almost three times the area of the continental United States. There is the inaccessibility of great areas of Siberia and Karaganda. There is the ease with which great atomic installations or caches of atom bombs or hydrogen bombs, or other deadly weapons, could be concealed. And, second, the character of the Soviet regime--its complete dictatorship and the absence of any kind of free public opinion.

So, along with that, and given the complete bad faith of the Soviet government which has been proved so often in violation of treaties and specific agreements, I would really like to know whether you think that there is any kind of self-enforcing scheme of atomic inspection and control. If there is no such scheme, what possible justification could there be for staking our very national existence

on Soviet good faith which has hitherto been tried many times and always found wanting?

Mr. Sharp: You have lived in Russia for many years, Chamberlin, and have a more vivid sense than many of us perhaps of some of these spaces and of the character of the population. On the other hand, White, you have consulted with men of some experience and some prominence in this field. You have spoken not only with students, or relief workers, or people of that sort, as I understand it, you have talked with people from the Atomic Energy Commission, and so on.

Mr. White: That is correct. We talked with a number of the officials who have been concerned in some measure with these negotiations. We feel that there is a possibility of working out a general agreement affecting the limitation not alone of atomic weapons but of all conventional weapons. That is, the time seems to be past when we can think of limiting only one weapon. We are in for general disarmament if we are to have anything short of this alarming race between two nations for the most powerful means of destruction. We feel that there is an opportunity to work out a program of inspection which would be agreeable to the several nations concerned and would put a stop to the present hectic race.

Mr. Chamberlin: Do you not think that the really essential condition of a disarmament agreement which would stick and which would really bring a sense of security would be the dissolution of the Soviet dictatorship? So long as that dictatorship lasts, and so long as it has this unlimited power over the minds and bodies of the Russian people, is it really conceivable that a few inspectors of the United States,

even if they were admitted to Russia, could have any certainty of finding out about hidden armaments? So long as the dictatorship persists, would there not always be the great danger that that dictatorship would find the means of circumventing any scheme of inspection, however conscientiously thought out, which might be devised?

Mr. White: There is such a danger, just as there is danger in any kind of an agreement or international arrangement into which we enter. But it does not seem out of the realm of possibility that our physical scientists and social scientists could devise means of adequate inspection with the same ingenuity and the same vision with which they devised these remarkable new weapons of destruction. It seems to me that we should put emphasis on such innovations in international relations rather than relying entirely upon the use of force.

Mr. Chamberlin: I would not suggest that we should rely entirely upon the use of force. I think that the idea of a united, free Europe is something which should be inscribed on our banner. That is a very fine ideal and one which would certainly surpass in attraction, to the masses of the European people, the grim prospect of Soviet domination of Europe. But I do feel that in the present world, unfortunately, while force certainly should not be the final arbiter, lack of force is likely to mean nothing short of a collapse and capitulation of our whole Western civilization.

Mr. White: It seems to me, in summing up, that accommodation between the United States and Russia does appear to be possible in the eyes of many observers. I feel we should work toward it by seeking, on the broadest possible front, concrete points at which

cooperative action may be taken and agreement may be reached. We should avoid measures which build mutual fear and distrust and yet strengthen the very regimes which limit human freedom.

Rather than put our faith upon "H-bombs," that is, upon superior scientific ingenuity in an armaments race, we should stress constructive acts, such as long-range programs of technical assistance, in which we show our concern for workable steps toward world peace.

I suppose this means a faith that all man, irrespective of creed or cultural heritage, can come into possession of free wisdom and tolerance and that the incomparable reaches of man's soul can triumph even yet over those things which now divide us so deeply.

Mr. Chamberlin: There is only one way to get along with the Soviet dictatorship and to preserve freedom and to avoid war: That is for America to be stronger militarily, politically, economically, and morally. American science is surer and better defense for our country than reliance upon nonexistent Soviet good faith. To disarm ourselves or to give up important strategic positions in Europe, in return for Soviet paper assurances which have been repeatedly proved worthless in the past, would be just about as intelligent as to extend a loan upon the unsupported word of a fraudulent bankrupt.

There is no peace in appeasement. There is no security in wilful blindness to the hard realities of the totalitarian part of the world. There is no safety in retreat. It is only upon the basis of superior strength that we can hope to realize, ultimately, Senator Vandenberg's fine nonpartisan idea--honorable peace in a free world of free men. We want no more. We cannot safely settle for less.

Mr. Sharp: In concluding, I should like to quote from Winston Churchill, who said a little over a year ago: "With all consideration of the facts, I believe it right to say today that the best chance of avoiding war is, in accord with the other Western democracies, to bring matters to a head with the Soviet government and by formal diplomatic processes, with all their privacy and gravity, to arrive at a lasting settlement.

"There is certainly enough for the interests of all if such a settlement could be reached. Even this method, I must say, however, would not guarantee that war would not come, but I believe it will give the best chance of coming out of it alive."

APPENDIX B

ARE WE WILLING THE WAR OF WORDS?

A broadcast of the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, a radio discussion over WGN Chicago and the Mutual Broadcasting System with the following participants: Edward Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; Donley F. Feddersen, Department of Radio and Television, Northwestern University, and a member of the Radio Advisory Committee, U. S. Advisory Committee on Information; David Nichol, foreign correspondent, Chicago Daily News; and James H. McBurney, Dean, The School of Speech, Northwestern University. Published as pamphlet Vol. 17, No. 8 for public sale.

Mr. McBurney: Our speakers today include Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Barrett, what does your post involve in the State Department?

Mr. Barrett: It involves general supervision of our entire United States Government's information program. This includes the Voice of America and a great many other things. It includes advising the Secretary of State on public relations problems here and abroad, and it includes certain work in connection with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and finally, a great many operations concerned with maintaining contact between the Department of State and the American people.

Mr. McBurney: We are also glad to welcome to this Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, David Nichol, Foreign Correspondent, the Chicago Daily News. Nichol, what has been your contact with our information program.

'Berlin a Focal Point'

Mr. Nichol: I spent a good deal of the time since the war in central Europe, most of it in Germany, and particularly in Berlin. Berlin is a focal point in this question of the story of America as against that of the Soviet Union.

Mr. McBurney: You have been able to see some of the results of this program Barrett represents, at first hand?

Mr. Nichol: Yes, and to talk with the people who come out of the Iron Curtain countries and tell us what happens there.

Mr. Barrett: Yes, I would say Berlin is enormously important because it is an island behind the Iron Curtain, really.

Mr. Nichol: It's the only place that we can get in behind the Iron Curtain successfully, I think.

Mr. McBurney: Are you going back to Germany?

Mr. Nichol: Yes, I'll be going back in November.

Mr. McBurney: Also on this Reviewing Stand broadcast we have Professor Donley F. Feddersen, Chairman of the Department of Radio and Television, Northwestern University, and member of a special committee advising the Voice of America.

We have already had several references to the Voice of America. What is that program, Feddersen?

World-wide Network

Mr. Feddersen: Barrett is probably better able to answer that than I am, but as I have seen it, it is a world-wide network broadcasting in nearly fifty languages over seventy-five transmitters throughout the world. It is financed by United States Government funds, from the State Department, and it speaks for the United States Government and the American people.

Mr. McBurney: Do those broadcasts emanate from this country?

Mr. Feddersen: Many of them do. Most of them, I should say at this point, although there are moves afoot to regionalize the output to carry some of the programming to local areas overseas.

Mr. McBurney: In this country we have heard a great deal recently about Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia. How are these programs related to the Voice of America?

Mr. Feddersen: Radio Free Europe is an enterprise of private citizens in the United States. It concentrates on captive countries behind the Iron Curtain -- Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and so forth -- and it is largely financed, as I said, through individual contributions.

It differs chiefly in this respect, that it can be a citizen's station for the people of Czechoslovakia, for example. Czechs who have come out from behind the Iron Curtain can speak via these facilities to Czechs who are still behind the Iron Curtain. Of course, Radio Free Europe has the freedom to allow people to speak back to their own people much more than the Voice of America, which is really an instrument of American policy.

Mr. Barrett: Yes, basically, the Voice of America speaks as "we Americans speaking to you Poles," whereas, basically, Radio Free Europe speaks as "we Poles speaking to you Poles," or "you fellow Poles."

I'd like to emphasize, though, that Radio Free Europe is distinctively a free enterprise, and deserves the support of the people in this country. You see, the Russians are spending today between one and two billion dollars a year on propaganda. The combined expenditures of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and all other American information operations total only about one hundred million dollars; therefore, you can see the need for putting all the resources we can into this battle.

Importance of Words

Mr. McBurney: That comparison suggests the need, but Barrett, how important are words in winning a war? We are talking about the question,"Are we winning the war of words?"

Mr. Barrett: I would say that words or ideas, if you will, are immensely important in winning the so-called cold war, because if we don't convince people on both sides of the Iron Curtain of the justice and the promise of our cause, and of the "phoniness" of the other man's, we are likely to find ourselves in a real shooting war.

Mr. McBurney: Is this war of words or ideas essentially a battle between Russian and American propaganda, Nichol? Is that the way you feel about it?

Mr. Nichol: I wouldn't think so. It is primarily a struggle between two systems. The one system of complete totalitarian control

is best exemplified, almost exclusively exemplified at the present time, by the Soviet Union. The other side of it is the free world, of which the United States is a major proponent at the present time, and we certainly hope it will continue to be an example of what freedom can do.

Mr. Feddersen: Barrett, doesn't this really dramatize one of the problems which the information service has? We speak, you say, for the American people, the Voice of America and other information services speak for the American people. Isn't it pretty easy to miss this point that Nichol has just made, and to give the impression that we are speaking solely in terms of America's self-interest, rather than in terms of the purposes of free peoples, and our identity with the common cause?

Free World Cause

Mr. Barrett: Yes, Feddersen; I'm glad you brought that one up. That is the very reason why we shifted emphasis very markedly in this program in the last year and a half.

We are not just trying to win friends for America. We are not just trying to win admirers. We are trying to win friends for the whole cause of freedom and justice -- the whole free world cause. Accordingly, we are working increasingly with other organizations in a great international campaign of truth.

Mr. Nichol: I talked with a Russian officer who came over to Western Germany not long ago, and I asked him some questions about Voice of America and its effectiveness. His criticism at that time

was that a man who is risking his life to listen to an outside radio is not much interested in hearing an "interest story" of American book publishing, or a story of American household appliances. He said the one thing that is important is a hard-hitting message that will give people some hope -- news, political comment, an indication of what is going on in the free world, in very short, concise form.

Mr. Feddersen: Barrett, isn't that essentially what the Voice of America is doing?

Mr. Barrett: That is essentially what the Voice of America is doing. We have stepped up the proportion of our output -- that is, hard, straight news, to begin with -- and the proportion that is commentary. We still carry some material to Russia itself, not to most of the rest of the world, about the relative well-being of Americans, telling how many hours they have to work to get a pair of shoes, for instance -- which is something like four hours, whereas a Russian has to work something like 45 hours -- because we have found that type of story particularly effective behind the Iron Curtain. Many Russians who come out have told us it is effective.

Mr. McBurney: Do you tell them about the number of bath tubs we have, and the number of automobiles we have, and so forth?

Mr. Barrett: To Russia, yes; to underdeveloped areas and most other countries of the world, no.

Mr. McBurney: How would you sum up, tersely, the primary purposes of this information program?

Four Purposes

Mr. Barrett: I would sum it up in four main categories. The first purpose is to expose the phony, vicious really reactionary nature of Communist imperialism. The second is to instill in free peoples everywhere a desire to cooperate with us, and this we can do by showing up the lies that the Communists are telling about us, and by demonstrating that we are a decent people whose moral strength and physical strength can be counted on. The third purpose is to build behind the Iron Curtain every possible psychological obstable to Kremlin aggression; and the fourth is to build up on this side of the Curtain, among all free peoples, a new spirit of unity and spunk and determination, a spirit to resist aggression at whatever cost.

Mr. McBurney: In phrasing these four objectives, in each case you made reference to Russia. I take it, then, that we are directing our effort primarily against Russia and against Russia's story and Russia's propaganda?

Mr. Barrett: We think the very critical situation that faces the world is the preservation of the free world from Russian aggression. Accordingly, we are putting maximum emphasis on that today.

Mr. Nichol: I would like to suggest at this point what seems to me a very important distinction we should always make. I think we feel that the peoples of Poland and Czechoslovakia and the various other countries within the Iron Curtain are our allies already. They know what freedom is because they have lost it, and I think they probably know more clearly what freedom is than some of the areas which still have it.

I do think we must always make clear that it is the government or the system under which these people are living which we oppose,

and not the best interests of the people themselves. We are trying to help the people of Poland as much as we are trying to help the people of Germany, England, or any other country.

Mr. Barrett: I'm glad you brought that up, Nichol, because a cardinal point in this entire program must be a distinction between the peoples and their Communist governments. You notice that in summing up those four points I used the word "Kremlin" instead of "Russia" or "Russian" -- for just that reason.

Mr. McBurney: Is this story of ours getting across, Nichol? You have been in Europe, and are in a position to say what has happened there.

'Need for Improvement'

Mr. Nichol: Let me suggest this. We haven't been in this business very long, and we are still experimenting with ways of getting the story across. I would say that the story isn't across yet; there is a very great deal that has to be done, and improvements will have to be made constantly.

I would like to point out that Feddersen spoke of regionalization of the output. My own experience has been that the most effective operation we have in this war of ideas is the radio station which is operated in Berlin through the office of the High Commissioner and the State Department there. The important thing in connection with this radio station, which is called RIAS (Radio in American Sector), is that the work, the thinking, are almost entirely done by Germans, and that the American supervision is limited to four or five men.

Mr. Feddersen: RIAS is not a Voice of America station. As you pointed out, it is a station that is operated largely by Germans.

Mr. McBurney: We own it?

Mr. Barrett: Oh, yes; it is integrated with the Voice of America program.

Popularity of RIAS

Mr. Feddersen: The Voice of America carries some programs on it.

A survey I saw recently from your program evaluation bureau pointed out two things of major interest, first, that RIAS is one of the most popular stations, not just in our zone in Berlin but in the whole Eastern zone of Germany, and that by long odds it outstrips all competition; and secondly, that one of the Voice of America programs which it relays for you is, I think, the second most-listened-to program in that area.

Mr. Barrett: Yes, there is no question that RIAS has proved one of the most effective instruments we have, and it is because of that experience that we are transferring some of our own Voice of America operations to points overseas nearer the Iron Curtain. For example, we are starting this month, I believe, broadcasting from Munich to Iron Curtain areas.

Mr. McBurney: You said a minute ago, Nichol -- or suggested a minute ago -- that we have friends behind the Iron Curtain. Does that mean that this story we are telling via this German station you have been discussing -- and our Voice of America programs -- is getting into the Iron Curtain countries?

Mr. Nichol: I would put it this way: The people are our friends because we stand for freedom, which they don't enjoy at the present time. We stand for getting the Russians off their backs, where they are at the present time. To these people our story is a very simple one, just to "Keep your hopes up," that "Some day its going to be better."

Mr. Barrett: Yes, the story that "We're still with you; we haven't forgotten you. Keep up your spirit of resistance. Don't go in for active resistance now, but keep up your spirit of resistance."

'Know What Communism Means'

Mr. Feddersen: Of course, I think it is important, too, to add this comment, that it is much easier to reach those people with our story because these people, by personal experience, know what Communism means. We have quite a different problem in certain other areas where Communism is an abstract idea--pretty much as democracy is an abstract idea--where you have two abstractions fighting for predominance.

Mr. Barrett: Yes, I think Nichol could tell you that the nearer people are to the Iron Curtain, by and large, the more hatred they have for the Kremlin's system, the more fear they have for it.

Mr. Nichol: Certainly, that is true. I think in Berlin we have the feeling that the Berliners are our most effective allies in Germany, and that our second most effective allies are the Eastern Germans who live in the Soviet zone, and that the people who are still questionable in their attitude toward us are the Western Germans in the areas that we occupy.

Mr. McBurney: Don't the Russians have a more exciting story to tell than we have? They couch their story, at least, in terms of freedom, in terms of breaking the shackles, in terms of revolution. Does that story get over in a way that our doesn't Feddersen?

Mr. Feddersen: Of course, you raise a very crucial point here. The difference between a negative approach to information and a positive approach to information is at stake it seems to me. If our effort is solely confined to denying the Russian promises, I don't think we shall get very far, which is one of the reasons why I was impressed recently when I heard one of our people on the Voice, I think, tell about a program which had recently been developed, called "The Permanent Revolution." To my way of thinking, this symbolizes a way of presenting the democratic idea in a positive and dynamic way that will appeal to the target audience, an audience that does not care to look forward to a future that is completely bereft of the hope of changing its situation, and which might be easy game for a Russian promise of "pie in the sky."

'The Permanent Revolution'

Mr. McBurney: In what sense is the democratic hope identified with "The Permanent Revolution"?

Mr. Feddersen: Simply in the sense that, as Barret has pointed out here, the Kremlin story is essentially a reactionary one in the sense that once the status quo is established, there it is; it is the status quo, and it may be expected to stay that way, whereas the democratic story, as exemplified by American history and the histories

of all democratic peoples has been one of gradual evolution. The so-called "Permanent Revolution" is really the achieving of social ideas and social action through peaceful means rather than by simply going in and throwing out the "haves" and putting in the "have-nots."

Mr. Nichol: I think we should be careful in our discussion about revolution to point out that we are not at the moment preaching revolution in any sense to the people of Eastern Europe, to the people who live within this Russian area of control. I take it that what you mean is that we are trying to point out to the people of Western Europe that they can achieve the things which Communism promises but doesn't deliver.

Mr. Feddersen: Yes -- that we have at least an equivalent for social change, and that our equivalent is really what we know as social evolution, an evolution which has been going on in this country, with the consent of the governed, for lo! these many years.

Mr. Barrett: Yes, I would say it is a great deal more than equivalent to social change. You really are implying that the progress we have been making in this country -- and that other free countries have been making for the last 150 years or more, really much more -- is the most revolutionary trend that this world has ever seen. It's a dynamic thing, and that is the story we are trying to tell increasingly.

Importance of Story

Mr. McBurney: I should think it would be a matter of considerable importance that this story be told vitally and dynamically, because you are directing your program, as I understand it, to a good many

people who haven't a great deal to look forward to as things are now.

Mr. Barrett: That is right.

Mr. McBurney: And to the degree that we get ourselves identified with the status quo in some of those countries, we might be telling a story of despair.

Mr. Feddersen: Well, yes, I would agree with that. And, of course, at the same time, this is a campaign of truth that we are waging. We cannot match the Russian promises of "pie in the sky" and washing machines and refrigerators, and still remain honest and credible. However, we can say that freedom is the way that the individual can do these things, that in a free country he is permitted the opportunity to work out his destiny under circumstances which at least permit him to change his status.

Mr. Barrett: And how it offers him the greatest hope over the long run for justice and his own welfare.

Mr. Feddersen: Exactly.

Mr. Nichol: I think at this point we should be quite sure that we are not identifying the best interests of everybody else with our own selfish interests as Americans. We must point out to them that the system under which America has achieved greatness is the system which offers Frenchmen an opportunity to achieve greatness as Frenchmen.

Mr. Feddersen: Nichol, I'm glad you brought that up. One of the most encouraging things I have found since I have been working with The Voice of America is the rather highly developed program of evaluation service which they have. Some of the researches which they are doing

on communications habits in various countries, and on the needs and interests of people in the various areas -- which are, as you point out, quite rightly, different from our own -- are providing our information service with an invaluable tool, one as you say, Barrett, for actually talking to people in terms of where they are going and where they want to go.

Mr. Barrett: That is correct. One of the most important things we are doing today is making groups in the countries concerned on this side of the Iron Curtain sit down and listen to the Voice of America, giving us their criticisms and comments, filling out questionnaires. In the case of countries behind the Iron Curtain, we are taking persons who have recently escaped and forming them into panels, getting them to sit down daily to listen to the Voice, and then giving their criticisms and their suggestions.

Methods and Materials

Mr. McBurney: That begins to give us some of the facets of this program of information we are discussing, Barrett. Can you give us a broader picture of it? What methods and materials do we use? We have mentioned the radio, of course.

Mr. Barrett: Well, Dean McBurney, I could speak for 45 minutes on that, but I imagine you prefer my 45-second version.

We have radio, which uses 75 transmitters and reaches about half the radio set owners behind the Iron Curtain and about two million people a day in France; a recent survey showed it brings in 33,000 letters a month, and so on.

We have films which reach an audience of approximately 400,000,000 a year. We have press publications, pamphlets, posters that are put up by ourselves and by cooperating organizations abroad. There are the 100-odd information centers which are, in a sense, serving as

arsenals of ideas for those who are fighting for the cause of freedom.

We have the exchange-of-persons program, which to my way of thinking is one of the most important of all programs. We find that about 97 per cent of the leaders who are brought to this country and given a chance to see this country for themselves--the good along with the bad--somehow go back sold on our decency, our honesty, our determination to make progress and our physical and moral strength.

Contributing Factors

Mr. Nichol: I would like to point out simply that we must be very careful not to consider this information program as a thing in itself. There has been a very great increase in confidence in Europe in the last twelve months or so. Some of it, no doubt, is due to the Voice of America, or to the information programs. A good deal of it is also due to the arrival of General Eisenhower. A lot of it is due to the arrival of American divisions with full equipment; it gives people great heart to see this evidence that the free world is not only talking but building and getting ready.

Mr. Barrett: I'm very glad Nichol brought up that point, because words alone are not worth a great deal in the so-called war of ideas. Actions alone, unless they are well publicized, are not worth a great deal. Eisenhower's arrival was a tremendous shot in the arm for Europe. That became much more a shot in the arm when it was well publicized, when the true meaning of it was told, when the story of "Ike" Eisenhower

as an individual--a humanitarian as well as a military leader--was told by films and radio, et cetera. And the Communists' efforts to smear him were rebutted when the simple quotations of the things that Stalin had said about Eisenhower five years ago were used.

Mr. McBurney: Now we raise the question, "Are we winning the war of words?" I should like to direct to you again, Nichol, this question: In your judgment, is this war of words we have been describing here going over?

Mr. Nichol: I would say we are making slow and very painful progress, but we are making progress. The spirit of the West is building steadily, not nearly as rapidly as we had hoped, and with many delays and many heartbreaks along the road, but I think we are making progress.

Mr. McBurney: Do you think people are really listening to these broadcasts or reading these pamphlets or getting this story?

Mr. Barrett: It is much broader than that. It is through these broadcasts and through these pamphlets and the activities of many forces in the countries concerned that the story is getting across, but I would like to agree with Nichol that it is not getting across as fast as I would like to see it.

But Americans are absurd when they say we are losing the war of words. Let's remember that the Communists, who put on the greatest propaganda effort the world has ever seen in their own satellite states, have failed dismally at it. The vast majority of the people of the satellites are with us, and not with the Kremlin today. The Communist party has lost strength in every country in Western Europe during the last four years, although there was one little setback in Italy. The

spirit of resistance, of spunk and determination that Mr. Nichol mentioned, is increasingly evident in Europe.

'Need Facilities'

Mr. Feddersen: I would like to point out, too--while we are talking about the success in getting our story across in the various areas of the world--that our information service is, as you pointed out, relatively a new thing, and that our facilities for carrying on this kind of campaign are rather small compared to the facilities of the opposition. Russia has as many transmitters attempting to jam our broadcasts into Soviet Russia as the Voice of America has in all. We need the addition of a ring of facilities around the world in order to be able to get the broadcast message to the target audiences. There are still some audiences we do not reach with the kind of signals we would like to get in there.

Mr. McBurney: Are you suggesting that the Communists have more facilities in this area, are giving more to it than we give it?

Mr. Barrett: Oh, very, very definitely. That is the reason we are going back to Congress in the very near future, I hope, to ask for funds for the sort of facilities that Mr. Feddersen has mentioned.

Mr. McBurney: How do the Russians try to combat our program of information?

Soviet Resistance

Mr. Barrett: Well, to begin with, they shut out virtually all publications and similar materials from the entire Iron Curtain area.

They make it very dangerous to listen to the free world radios, and, finally, they put on the most massive effort to jam us out that the world has ever seen.

Mr. McBurney: How do you "jam out" a program?

Mr. Barrett: You put another transmitter on a program that has the same wave length--let's say a Voice of America transmitter -- that just makes squeaking noises or clacking noises, in order to prevent the Voice of America program from being heard.

We are now facing approximately 1,200 Soviet jammers. That is important, and that is one reason why we are asking for these increased facilities.

We find from a survey made by a lot of top scientists in this country that it costs the Russians approximately five to one in terms of dollars and in terms of manpower to jam out an American station. If we put up the right kind of stations, our expenditures are going to have to be matched, five to one, by the Russians, if they want to keep us out, and I think you will agree they'll make every effort to keep us out, won't they?

Mr. Nichol: Yes, they certainly would.

Mr. McBurney: Do we do any jamming of Russian stations?

Mr. Barrett: No, we don't. We do not believe . . .

Announcer: I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up.

APPENDIX C

JOHN STUART MILL--*ON LIBERTY*

A broadcast of *Invitation to Learning*, a radio discussion, over the CBS radio network on June 20, 1954, with the following participants: Edward R. Murrow, CBS news commentator; James B. Reston, chief of the *New York Times* Washington Bureau; and Lyman Bryson, Director of Public Affairs for CBS and host. Published in *The Invitation to Learning Reader*, Vol. 4, No. 2.

Bryson: A hundred years is a long time for a brief book to be at the top of the list for its expression of ideas. It's rather striking that we have gained a great deal of liberty in a hundred years. We don't seem to have anybody who says it any better than Mill did.

Murrow: It seems to me that this is one of the most current books that we could discuss in spite of the fact that it was written about a hundred years ago. It rather reminds me of one of the better editorials in the newspaper that Mr. Reston decorates, *The New York Times*. It is essentially a defense of the right of dissent. I think Mill was rather a frightened man when he wrote it because he was worried about the tyranny of the majority. Basically, it seems to me a document that might well have been written yesterday.

Reston: Well, Mr. Murrow, I thank you for that compliment. Mill writes so well that I'm sure my associates would be very pleased

if they thought they wrote as well as he did. I think it might be useful if we try to illustrate what it is you mean by the essence of this book and the tyranny of the majority. It would perhaps be an impertinence for me to try to define it in my words so let me try to put it in his. He says in his essay, On Liberty: "If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind." That, I think is what we're talking about.

Bryson: It's just a flat denial of the idea that majority rule and opinion has any right.

Murrow: He is not only defending the right of dissent, he is urging its importance, its necessity, isn't he now?

Reston: Yes, he's saying not only is there a right of dissent, as I understand it, but he's saying there is a duty of dissent. I am interested in this phrase, "the tyranny of the majority," that Mr. Murrow uses because it seems to me that what we are confronted with now, particularly in Washington, is a form of a tyranny of the minority rather than the tyranny of the majority. Would you agree about that, Mr. Bryson?

Bryson: I would, but I'd like to hold it a minute because it seems to me about the most important thing to be said here, Mr. Reston. I'd like to hold it until we take a little better look at what Mill actually said. A hundred years ago Mill had the illusion--great prophets are, I suppose, a combination of illusion and prescience--that the barbarians were conquered; we didn't need to worry any more about our

opinions being invaded from the outside. Now, that was an illusion because the barbarians are . . .

Murrow: Never conquered!

Bryson: . . . always there. But he did see something that people of his time didn't see as he did, this business about the majority. He was completely wrong about the barbarians, but he was prophetic about the majority. He was one of the first great truth-seekers, wasn't he, who ever said the truth is not what the majority says it is?

Murrow: No. He was concerned, I think, Mr. Bryson, to contend that the citizen had to be defendd--protected--against two possible tyrannies: One, the tyranny or the oppression of the State, of the government; and, two, the tyranny or the oppression--the pressures for conformity--which might emanate from his fellow-citizens. That is, he was concerned about the climate of opinion as well as the nature of the government.

Reston: Mr. Murrow, could I go back and just quote him on this particular point because it seems to me to be very relevent to what we're discussing? In this essay, he points out that in the old societies it was the King or the magistrate who was the real source of tyranny, but he goes on to make this point. He says: "Protection, therefore, against the tyranny of the magistrate is not enough: there needs protection also against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling; against the tendency of society to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them." I think that is particularly relevant to our time at the present.

Murrow: He was talking not, Mr. Reston, only about legal sanctions, but about social sanctions. Isn't that right?

Reston: Precisely.

Bryson: But isn't it true also, gentlemen, that he didn't foresee the extent to which the sanctions of a majority, the social atmosphere in a society, or in a government rather more subject to the control of public opinion than any he knew, could be coalesced? We have a situation now in which a government more or less responsive to the people may at times--this may be the point you want to make, but it isn't true now, Mr. Reston--produce against the individual a kind of combination of all the engines of government and all the engines of conformity that come out of the atmosphere.

Murrow: I think Mill would be appalled, if he were here now, not so much at the government sanctions as at the social sanctions that are imposed. I think he would defend your right or mine, Mr. Bryson, not to remove our hat in the elevator. He would be appalled at the fact that from one end of this country to the other we tell the same kind of stories, the same jokes; we wear the same kind of neckties, the same kind of shoes--the standardization, the conformity, that goes from one end of the country to the other. I think he would perhaps be more eloquent in opposition to that now than he was a hundred years ago.

Reston: That's right, Mr. Murrow. He defends not only the right of dissent, or, as I said before, the duty of dissent; he also defends the right of eccentricity and says if we will be tolerant of the odd guy, the fellow who is keeping his hat on in the elevator or who dresses

in an outrageous way, then we will be more tolerant of any different opinion that we hear.

Bryson: See how far he pushes that, Mr. Reston. Take some of his famous examples. He even says you have the right to be wrong even though it may damage you, and in the extreme case may damage your children, because you take the famous case of the poison. He says if somebody goes into a drugstore, into a chemist's shop, and says, "I want to buy some deadly poison. I'm willing to give you my name and address"; even if you suspect he's going to use it on himself you have absolutely no right to interfere. Now, we wouldn't quite accept that, would we?

Murrow: I don't think we would. But Mill himself in a curious fashion was, as an individual, proof of eccentricity. Certainly no young man was ever more thoroughly indoctrinated by his father in an attempt to make him an orthodox utilitarian, and it didn't work.

Bryson: Just didn't suit his temperament so he revolted. Take this another step, Mr. Murrow. He says you can't keep a man from committing suicide with poison, if he wants to, and still allow for freedom. But if you see a man--I'm sticking to his examples because they're so striking--walking across a bridge and you know there's a hole in the bridge and he's going to fall in and get drowned; you know he can read; there's a sign, "Bridge-Dangerous"; nobody has the right to interfere. There again we would disagree, wouldn"t we?

Murrow: I think we would, but I think also, Mr. Bryson, there is a distinction between Mill's defense of the minority, of the right to dissent, and the current writings on that subject. Most of the

current writings, including those of Judge Learned Hand, for example, are disposed to contend that the minority is now important because it may be tomorrow's majority. Mill wasn't really concerned about this. He was concerned to defend the right of the minority, of the individual, even though he be perpetually in the minority.

Reston: I would like to go back, Mr. Murrow and Mr. Bryson, to this idea he defends of the duty of dissent, and to quote him because he says this: "The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error."

Bryson: Isn't that, Mr. Reston, what we most doubt now?

Reston: I think it is. Of course, you must remember that I live in the community of Washington.

Bryson: Is that a community?

Reston: It is a community of transients, I would say, but it is a community.

Murrow: Only tangible product is waste paper. Isn't that right?

Reston: Well, that's pushing me a little far. But I do think that we have lost something in Washington which one might call the art of listening, in the true sense of listening with the whole mind --and particularly with listening to the dissenter, that one man whom Mill tries to defend against the whole of public opinion.

Murrow: I would like to go back to something Mr. Reston said a little earlier. We were talking about Mill's concern with the tyranny of the majority. Mr. Reston indicated it and then you stopped him, Mr. Bryson.

Bryson: I postponed him, Mr. Murrow.

Murrow: I would like to put to Mr. Reston this question: If Mill were in Washington now, do you think he would be concerned about the tyranny of the majority or, perhaps, more concerned about the tyranny of the minority?

Bryson: Now, let's get at that, Mr. Reston.

Reston: Of course, this is only Reston's opinion; it may be entirely wrong. But I'm impressed with this, just as a reporter trying to gather facts. One of the most interesting things in Washington today is that there is a fight going on about the relative power of the Executive and the Legislature. The really interesting thing there is that I don't think there's much difference, frankly, between the opinion of the Chief Executive, President Eisenhower, and the policy that he wishes to put through in general, and the majority opinion of both houses of Congress, if you keep it in the realm of ideas. If, however, you translate that whole thing into the partisan struggle, then the idea falls down. What I'm trying to do in trying to be responsive to your point, is to suggest that there is a minority within the President's own party which is in opposition; and so much deference is being paid to that minority--which, I must say, I think Mr. Mill would not have liked --that that minority tends to obstruct the natural majority, composed of the President's opinion plus the majority of both houses of Congress, in both parties.

Murrow: Certainly it's a long time since a President proposed a program that went more down the middle, that won more support on both sides of the aisle. What you're saying is that the difficulty in getting it through arises primarily from the minority opposition largely in the President's own party. Is that right?

Reston: Oh, yes. I don't want to stop a thought here by bringing in Senator McCarthy's name, but obviously he is very germane, in terms of contemporary ideas, to what we're talking about. In Washington at the present time we are paying a great deal of attention to the opinion of Senator McCarthy; yes, I do not think that he meets Mill's specific test about the kind of people we should pay attention to.

Bryson: I was going to ask you that, Mr. Reston, because, superficially, one would say immediately that in freedom one has the right to be wrong; even if you happen to think Mr. McCarthy is wrong--which, of course, is not what we're discussing--Mill would still support his right to be wrong, wouldn't he?

Reston: Absolutely! And the only really interesting thing about the McCarthy thing, in terms of what we're talking about, is not that he is crying loudly to the country but that, in the process of so doing, he has tended to tyrannize a great number of people who normally in the past would have spoken up. I think that's changing now. I think the other side is speaking up. And so long as that is true, I think McCarthy should go on talking as loudly as he can.

Murrow: Speaking of shouting to the country, speaking loudly, what do you think Mill would have felt about current practices and procedures in radio and television, Mr. Reston?

Reston: I think he might have had some serious doubts about the right, or ability, of an advertiser to choose the man, or the body of ideas, that he wished to present to the country. In that sense, I think he might have been a little alarmed about it. He was a thoughtful man; he might have been a little alarmed about too much of a tendency to take ideas in through the air, or through the ear, and not enough through the eye. But I mustn't argue for the newspaper over a radio station, I realize.

Bryson: The eye being a little more rational, you think.

Reston: A little slower.

Murrow: I don't regard this as a criticism of radio; I regard it as a commercial for television, where the eye is operational.

Reston: I was just trying to make the point, you see, that Mill makes himself. He talks about various aspects of truth. And one of the things that he says, and tries to remind us, is that truth is not something one side of an argument can monopolize; you need the nonconforming opinion in order to supply the remainder of truth, of which the received doctrine embodies only a part. In other words, he would have wanted all sides of the argument to come in and to realize that truth is not the property of any one man.

Bryson: As a matter of fact, that's a weaker statement, Mr. Reston, than the other one that you quoted. He says there than even if the opposition is wrong, really wrong and ultimately wrong, it still is valuable because it sharpens our appreciation of what is right. But there are several points here which seem to me to be germane to current affairs in which Mill has to be questioned a little bit. One is the extent to which he would have resisted and rejected

what is called, sometimes by its friends but nearly always by its enemies, the welfare state--the tendency in the last twenty years or more to have the Government intervene more and more in the lives of individuals for their good. Now, he would have rejected that.

Reston: He certainly would, Mr. Bryson. And that is one very interesting point about the book. Reading it again for the first time since university days, I'm reminded that in that span of twenty years, and certainly in the hundred years since he wrote this book, there is now a new, contemporary definition of what is a liberal, which is quite different. Making allowances for labels and so on, I think that he would have rejected the idea now very popular among liberals in the country that the Federal Government should be a stronger unit. He is clearly, all the way through the essay, saying, as Mr. Jefferson said: be careful of the accretion of power at the center of the government. That is not a popular idea, I think, among many people who identify themselves with Mill today.

Bryson: Even people who believe a great deal in freedom have moved away from that. How's it happened?

Murrow: I think if Mill were here now he would suffer, to a degree, the same sense of frustration that encompasses the three of us. In terms of information, Mr. Reston, I think he would be deeply distressed at the number of single-newspaper towns and cities in this country. I think he would be distressed at the fact that so much of radio and television emanates from New York or Washington; is in a sense superimposed upon the country. I think he would have in a sense that the machine age had overrun him, that the mechanics of our present society produce a great wealth of information, a lot of it unsorted, unassimilated. And I think he would conclude that,

although we have a great deal of information flung at us, we are not necessarily the best-informed of people because there is too much conformity, even in the news business, Mr. Reston.

Reston: Yes, I should remember the figures, but they are startling if you look at them over, say, the span of this century. You take my own home town of Dayton, Ohio. When I was a boy there, there were three different papers, individually-owned, with totally different expressions; now those papers are all in the hands of a man who shares a liberal view, which I happen to support. But I can't bring myself to believe that it was a good thing when the Journal, which was a great supporter in those days of the late Senator Taft, went to the wall and was bought by former Governor Cox of Ohio.

Bryson: Are you gentlemen saying that there is too much information and not enough dissent, that information doesn't itself breed these creative differences that Mill cherished so much?

Murrow: I think the standardized output of information tends to decrease or diminish the possibility of dissent.

Reston: I would like to make this point: the real thing he is arguing about is something which is very largely lost at the present time. That is what I defined earlier as the habit of listening, the art of listening, of honestly listening, to the other side, instead of trying to prove that the man who differed with you in 1928 belonged to something that is now on the Attorney General's list. I think this is what he was really arguing for.

Murrow: Who was it who said that we are not content to be right unless we can prove the other man to be completely wrong?

Reston: Precisely. As a matter of fact, Mill himself has an aphorism here in the essay, On Liberty, which defines this generation

to a T. He refers to a society which is "destitute of faith, but terrified at skepticism." This, I think, is true. There is not the faith of Nineteenth-Century America, nor is there at the same time this willingness to listen and to tolerate the dissenter, that one man who stands against society.

Bryson: Well, gentlemen, I suppose if Mill were here--and I wish he could be--we'd find that the wonderful resilience and power of his would make him show us how his ideas could be adapted even to our difficult situation.

APPENDIX B

OUR SCHOOLS -- ARE THEY DOING THE JOB?

A broadcast of Viewpoint, a radio discussion, over Michigan State University's radio station WKAR-AM and FM on May 11, 1958, with the following participants: Branford Millar, Department of English, and editor of the university's Centennial Review of Arts and Sciences; Walter Johnson, Department of Administrative and Educational Services, and president of the American Personnel and Guidance Association; and Major John Barron, Department of Air Science (host). Published in Michigan State University College of Education Quarterly, Fall, 1958.

I

Barron: Professional educators are under fire as they have never been before. Criticism comes from some unexpected sources -- from rear admirals to just plain mommas. People who never had an idea about education in their lives are now busily trumpeting the superiority of the big Red schoolhouse -- I mean the one on the banks of the Volga. Is there some fire under this smoke? Are our schools failing us?

Johnson: There's a lot to be said about this, John. I could use up the whole half-hour in defensiveness and also, I suppose, in

trying to explain why we are as weak as we are. Incidentally I attended one of the little red schoolhouses and I taught in one. Education and professional educators are on the defensive, there's no question about it.

At the same time, everybody in our society is on the defensive because we have been challenged for the first time in a long period of our history as to a superiority which we have always maintained or attempted to maintain. Therefore the military, the political scientists, the economists, the businessmen, and certainly the educators all have to be on the defensive.

Barron: Perhaps this public interest in education, particularly since Sputnik, is something we've needed, even if some people fail to realize the complexity of the educational process. There is at least a new interest which points the way to improvement -- an illumination of the fact that we've lost our sense of direction in education. And I'm tempted to add, Walter, that all this must bear fruit provided you professional educators do not find this criticism of the innocent objectionable. Some of you have given me the impression that you are fighting a rear-guard action. Do you get that impression, Bran?

Miller: Yes, I do. And although there's room for criticism, I think the situation we're in is understandable, if we realize that there has been an enormous growth of the school population, and part of the problem has been merely to cope with this. And at the same time there has been an enormous increase in the complexity of our society and therefore in the requirements for which education must educate. If we have lost our objectives, or if they're not as clear as they were in the much simpler society of 50 or 75 years ago, I don't know how it could be otherwise.

Barron: What are the purposes of education? Is this what we're confused about?

Johnson: I suppose there is some confusion about the fundamental purposes of education. Obviously education has changed along with all the other things that have happened in our society. If you go down to one of our big industrial plants, Oldsmobile, you'll find that this plant has changed drastically since 1905 or thereabouts when it began on some kind of assembly-line basis. Now education has done the same thing. It would be difficult for us to return to the horse-and-buggy kind of education, and still take care of the needs of society today.

Yet all too many people think of education as being "the way it was when I went to school," because this is what they're most familiar with. And at the same time maybe our public -- and I like your point about Sputnik having certain disguised blessings -- our public has possibly been too complacent. I'm sure they've been too complacent about what the education of their children should be. We have the old stalwarts that attend every PTA meeting and try to do their job, but we also have too many people who are apathetic and haven't helped educators to define as well as they should what they really want.

Barron: But have you really answered my question? Can we say there is a purpose? Does the society set a goal for its schools?

Johnson: I'd like to respond to this a little more, and I'm sure Branford has something to say about it. First of all, education is the sum total of the experiences that any individual has. Education

down on the corner, with the gang, is education because learning is taking place. The trouble is that too many of our critics regard what goes on in "academia," if we can put it that way, and what goes on in the poolroom as two different entities. Actually education is learning how to behave -- "behave" in a broad psychological sense; we certainly don't learn all this in the classroom.

Miller: Maybe what we really need, then, is better poolrooms so that so many schools wouldn't have to each youngsters how to play pool. Which leads me to the observation that the schools have burdened themselves unnecessarily with what I must confess I regard as frills and substitutions for serious subject matter. The reason for this has been partly the deficiencies of parental and other social institutions -- if parents can be described as social institutions.

Johnson: I suspect education in a democracy has some frills, although maybe some of the things we call frills are really much more fundamental than we are giving them credit for being.

Barron: I'm glad you used the word <u>frills</u>. It seems to me necessary that youngsters use their minds effectively: the first steps are reading, writing, and arithmatic; the second steps are science, English, history, and foreign languages. And what some educators seem to be saying today is that these fundamentals are not really necessary, except for certain students; the need is for "life adjustment." This means social studies so that they know how to act, the radio programs they should listen to, and that abomination, "co-ed" cooking! (Let's preserve our masculinity and keep boys out of the kitchen.) This is called <u>life adjustment</u>. This is a <u>parody</u> of

democracy. A democracy needs trained minds, not conformity to conventions of social behavior.

Millar: Walter, life adjustment is your business.

Johnson: John, you are talking the way men have talked as long as they've been gregarious. I haven't with me today my favorite quotations from Socrates and Plato and other classic writers, but I can point out that they were concerned about the same things. One of the difficulties is that we confuse some of the problems of growing up and maturing with some other problems concerning standards and adult values.

Life adjustment is not a frill in the way I think you impute it to be. Life adjustment is the sum total of adjustment, including the academic, including understanding how to learn and live effectively. Too often we have got the idea that life adjustment is some namby-pamby spoonfeeding operation and that it's an attempt to fit everybody into a societal mold. The sociologists have criticized our society for this with some justification. At the same time, the educator, that is, the enlightened one -- the educator who is a guidance-minded, guidance-oriented professional person -- is most interested in finding the ways in which people are different, finding ways of developing their uniqueness.

Barron: Some of us disagree. We don't see this encouragement of individuality and personality. We see an unending pressure to conform. We see undue emphasis on interpersonal relationships, adjustment to the group, rather than on self-awareness or self-reliance. And the type of person produced by this system is a homogenized produce without individuality.

It occurs to me that we have confused the role of the modern medicine man, the psychiatrist, with that of the teacher. The psychiatrist tries to get the statistically abnormal to adjust themselves to the behavior patterns of the statistically normal, whereas the aim of the teacher, it seems to me, is not to teach the statistically normal to behave in some set and predetermined way, but to teach them that they are in fact insane and ought to do something about it. This is my position, and I protest this stress on "adjustment." Adjust to <u>what</u>? The fast buck and the gray flannel suit. The philosophy that says "If you're so smart, why ain't you rich?"

Millar: Since we're beating the schools, may we beat society a bit? Schools, like other institutions -- political, religious, economic, and so forth -- are pretty much what society makes them, and pretty much what society deserves. If what we really want today is two dozen chickens in every deep freeze, three cars in every garage, and a trip to the moon with all expenses paid for guessing the hit tune on a quiz show -- I don't think you can blame the schools for this.

If I may go back to the factor of growth, enormous growth, which has taken place in the last 50 years or so, due to the commitment for education to a vastly larger number of students -- we have met an entirely new problem of education that has never appeared, so far as I know, anywhere else. To cope with it there has grown up a new breed of educators who specialize in the techniques of pedagogy and who, to a great extent, have made it possible to turn out a standard, uniform, if somewhat mediocre, product en masse. This kind of thing being distasteful to your true egghead and academic, what he has done,

of course, is to turn his back on the elementary and secondary schools. And now, when the going has got a little rough, he wants back in again where he should have been all the time.

I remember, for instance, some experiences I had when I was Assistant to the Dean of Graduate School here. The scientists -- who are now crying the loudest about deficiencies in science education and are getting the most money from foundations and from the government -- for many years were not willing to develop graduate programs which were of primary interest and value to high school teachers, to say nothing of elementary. If teachers in these subjects -- and in others, too -- then had to go to the Schools of Education, it was the only place they could go. I think there might well be a little breast-beating in this respect.

On the other hand, because the schools have tried to be -- or had to learn how to be -- all things to all men, there has been a reduction to the lowest common denominator, or to an "average denominator," if there is such a thing. If what we need now is a change, it should be a change that would reflect the diverse and legitimate differences in requirements of our society in an increasingly complex age. I think we should be able to, and will, develop techniques for doing this, in fact we are doing it. But one of the ways you adjust to a complex society is not to downgrade the fundamentals but upgrade them, not to retreat from them or adulterate them but to bring them into play in more and more directions. There is, of course, the very nice question of what the fundamentals are these days.

Johnson: I think we've some evidence to show, John, that the fundamentals, as you call the three R's -- and believe me I'm in favor of doing the best job possible with them -- , are being taught as well as (or better than) they were 50, or 25, or even 10 years ago. I'm afraid professional educators are too modest sometimes. They don't hit the tabloids, but we have factual information to show that pupils read better today at the elementary level, that they are just as proficient in mathematics, that they have much more knowledge of science than youngsters their age ever had before.

Not only that, but our teachers are much better prepared, and I don't mean just in the pedagogical sense but in terms of good solid subject matter. In 1911 (this was the first real survey of the educational preparation of teachers) the average teacher began teaching with less than one year of college preparation. Today, almost every teacher is expected to have at least a bachelor's degree. So when we say our teachers don't have as much subject matter at their command as they once had, I think that is ridiculous.

Barron: It seems to me that this clamor for greater stress on the three R's is really a symbol of a desire for a broader and deeper education. It isn't only the fundamentals. When we protest that the three R's are being neglected, what we are really saying is that mathematics is being neglected, that literature has been neglected, that science, that foreign language, that history has been neglected.

You say that as educators we are doing as good a job today as we did years ago. There are some people who question this. It is reported, for example, that more than half the high schools in the United States

offer no courses in physics. Roughly a quarter offer neither physics nor chemistry. Even geometry is omitted in some 23 percent of our schools. Now 10 years ago 84 percent of all high school students were taking some sciences. This has dropped to 54 percent. These are the Federal Office of Education figures. In mathematics, the percentage has dropped from 86 to 55. In place of these subjects we have been going in for auto mechanics, basketball rules, retail store management, and assorted social studies -- what Bram refers to as the frills. I can't see these as substitutes for science or literature.

Miller: Do they have to be substitutes?

Barron: No.

Miller: That's my point. If our schools have a weakness, it has been to try to be all things to all students at all times in all courses. And I think there has been some weakness in this respect. I see room for improvement at all levels and in all directions. There is no question but that there have been certain great improvements in -- if I may use the old-fashioned word -- pedagogy. The books my boy uses in fourth grade are infinitely superior to the rote books which I used. The books he can get in the library treat subjects that simply were not available to me. The question is not whether there have been improvements of this sort but whether there hasn't been too much uniformity in order to cope with the masses of pupils.

Certainly we have to deal with the question of numbers, but we also need to bring out greater differentiations and elicit more "quality" performance. It seems to me that in dealing with the expanding numbers there has been -- and let me use the horrid word -- a certain amount of anti-intellectualism. Not everybody is going to

be an intellectual, thank God! It would be just as much of a mistake to assume that all we were trying to do was to train a race of intellectuals -- because this is not practical. And what's more, it isn't necessary in a democracy to assume that there is an equality of talent, goals, and objectives. There is a rich diversity, and I would stress the fact that part of the diversity that has been missing is the avid pursuit of the intellectual.

Johnson: Bronford, I'd like to take up right there. I think the schools are the last great stronghold of intellectualism we have. We've been fighting an almost overwhelming battle against the forces of society to make people conform. That is, the advertisers, particularly, and the newspapers are directing all their efforts toward making everybody want two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage.

John, I think you've committed what I call a beautiful "Bester." Bester pulls statistics out of context and makes them sound credible. I can quote from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare statistics and say that in proportion to the general population class enrollment in science, mathematics, and similar subjects has increased significantly since 1900. I can go to the records of the Modern Language Association -- which I'm sure you'd agree are objective -- and tell you they show a significant increase in high school Spanish, Latin, and French enrollment since 1900. The only language that has lost ground is German.

But what I'd like to comment on is your saying that half the high schools don't offer physics. This may be true. But it's the half that represents the servicing to a very small part of our population. If

you talk in terms of opportunity, you will find that the vast majority of students have opportunity to enroll in these subjects. We professional educators are doing everything we can to get small schools consolidated into large enough units to offer them. But who are the people that are fighting this? They are the people who pay the taxes, who support the schools, who want their little identities. And so we're sympathetic to your point.

Barron: I should have known better than to quote statistics. The point I wanted to make is that, like Bram, I'm suspicious of mass education. I think it perverts and destroys.

Miller: I am in profound disagreement with you here. While universal education certainly creates problems, we can't turn our backs on it superciliously. We have committed ourselves to it deeply, and I think rightly. The alternative is to cultivate ignorance in all but a chosen few. This is an intolerable position. Nevertheless, I grant you, on the other hand, that we haven't always been clear in our minds what universal education is, whether it implies uniformity, universal availability in all respects at all levels, and so forth.

A lot of water, or something, has got into the pea-soup, and I will argue with the educators who have created a general science course, for instance, that is a sort of mish-mash, making it superficially attractive so that a student thinks he has an idea of what science is like but has not encountered the bedrock disciplines of physics, biology, and chemistry.

And as to who takes these subjects, I'm not impressed by statistics, I don't care how much better or how much worse we are doing theoretically.

I don't know any way of comparing our society with the society of 50 years ago statistically. And on the question of languages, I don't care how many students know other languages; I know simply that not enough people now do. Certainly we have got to train more people in languages, in sciences, in mathematics, and in other disciplines to the extent of their ability.

Barron: The notion has got about in the last 20 years that science courses are only for future scientists, that only future writers need to know how to write, that languages are for people who want to travel.

Johnson: Some of these theories have been hare-brained, I agree with you.

Barron: Look at the students coming to our universities who can't read and write. We are deeply involved in world affairs, and yet the study of history, geography, and foreign languages has declined. We don't encourage students to take language courses. Our whole curriculum needs to be looked at critically.

Johnson: I'd like to argue for a comprehensive system of education; however, as Branford says, we've got to do something about mass education. We've got to keep standards as high as we can while we're faced with an even greater increase in our school population during the years ahead. I don't know the alternative to a comprehensive system unless we go to the kind of thing that Admiral Rickover and some of the other critics have suggested.

Barron: We ought to make up our minds that there's a difference between the acquisition of trade skills and education.

Millar: The question is, can we do both without the one impugning the other? We need trained minds. We need trained hands. And the man who has the trained hands should not feel that there is something sinful about having a trained mind. Nor should the man with a trained mind feel that the hand should not be trained. The greatest danger from anti-intellectualism, of course, is its assumption that ideas don't have consequences. They do, and ideas must be kept in training -- they must be exercised.

Barron: The feeling among certain legislatures apparently is that research leads only to a lot of impractical ideas, especially ideas that are hard to measure. Therefore, if you have to slough off something, slough off the research.

Millar: You can slough off the ideas of people like the former head of General Motors, who is alleged to have said that research is when you don't know what you're doing. They're in important positions in society and reflect widespread popular beliefs.

Johnson: We have political leaders who are more interested in expediency than in ideas, and so they don't support education since Vanguard has been launched.

Millar: I should have spoken of the gentleman as head of the Department of Defense, who should have been a little busier about research.

Barron: I don't think we need to swallow all the Russians are saying about the education Ivan Ivanovitch is getting. But perhaps the Russians are getting more out of their students in certain dimensions.

Johnson: I don't think so.

Barron: I say "perhaps." The Soviets have mobilized education just as they've mobilized industry -- for the attainment of certain limited technical and military goals.

Johnson: If that's what we want, we can do it.

Miller: We haven't done it. This is exactly the difference between the two societies.

II

Barron: Robert Hutchins would have us believe that America has become rich and powerful not because of our educational system, but in spite of it. We have cherished the illusion, he says, that excess of quantity makes up for lack of quality. Perhaps this is our problem. In an orgy of self-criticism we are trying to reconcile mass education with quality education, and we are again asking ourselves what education is and what it is for. I think we've been confused about both these things.

Miller: I believe we made that point last week. We've been faced with the problem of how to deal with the masses. In learning to do this with a degree of success, we have perhaps neglected part of the problem -- that is, attention to both the gifted child, as he is now called (he used to be just a bright kid), and also the subjects which he should be learning, the things which are the fundamentals of all learning -- vocational, life adjustment, call them what you will. I agree that this is part of the current problem: have we been guilty of neglecting our bright kids and our fundamental ideas, skills, and attitudes?

Johnson: I'd like to take up two aspects of this, John. You mentioned Hutchins and his belief that we were succeeding in spite of ourselves. I think we have to recognize that Hutchins believes that philosophically the truth is everywhere the same and therefore all education should be the same. Opposed to that, at least to some extent, would be the thinking and writings of philosophers like Bertrand Russell and Alfred North Whitehead, who believe that education is relevant to time and place and that we have to make certain kinds of adjustments in education as a result.

I wouldn't want to use the word adjust too loosely because we're so criticized about this today; but I submit that it's because throughout many years we have been able to adjust our educational system to time and place, as well as to carry forward our heritage, that we have been successful in our society, our culture, and our economy.

Barron: Doesn't it strike you, Walter, that the Hutchins philosophy is enjoying a renaissance? People are saying that the fundamentals of knowledge are for everyone; that everyone needs them as a basis; that you can't understand the present unless you know something of the past; that we need people who have been trained to think about the problems of man and society.

Johnson: I think there's no question about that. I think we've always felt that way. The purpose of education is twofold, to transmit the heritage and to help us understand the present. This has been from time immemorial the objective of education -- even though some people believe one or the other is unnecessary, and there are educators who have gone with them. But for the most part we feel that this is our dual role and responsibility, and I believe we'll continue to feel that way.

Barron: Knowledge has increased, all right, Walter, but I think wisdom has decayed. This sounds very gloomy. We're in an age of the specialist -- the specialist who is frequently a trained barbarian. We've been aware of this, and we've even proceeded to marry specialist training with work in the humanities. But I'm not sure it's been effective. Again, I'm afraid that since Sputnik we may overemphasize the sciences and get away from the fundamentals which I take it Hutchins is trying to bring us back to.

Miller: The fundamental subjects are a form of life adjustment. The whole concept of life adjustment, which is an honorable one, may have become perverted to the extent that it becomes more important to be adjusted than to think. I am afraid that in a society that craves the security of safeness and in schools which are trying to deal with wide levels of ability and interest and background, and also with large numbers, adjustment may have been oversimplified, and the theoretical norm to which we are theoretically adjusting may have become a shibboleth.

I'd like to return to the idea that the fundamental subjects are a form of life adjustment, and that the intellectual aspects of life adjustment are what the schools have a particular obligation to provide. This is a unique function, because they are provided nowhere else. This is not true of many of the schools' activities.

Johnson: I'll accept that. There's no question that what we learn of the fundamentals is bound to materially affect the way we adjust or the way we behave, and certainly has to do with our effectiveness. And this notion of too much quantity and not enough quality. I think rather than to narrow our curriculum in mass education and go

back to the traditional one, we are going to have to continue to look realistically to greater differentiation on some levels.

In a recent UNESCO Educational conference in Paris we find that European educators have begun to say they've got to do more diversifying and more specializing. I could quote M. Gall in France, and Joseph Loureys from London. They are saying European education has got to do something besides what it's now doing. So maybe we're off the beam a bit, but not all the way.

Barron: It's interesting that Europeans are now seeing merit in our system while we see new merit in theirs. I want to raise a point. Are we in danger of having to admit that the affects of university education are almost superficial? That value judgments and behavior patterns are not substantially altered from the high school level?

We are failing to get through to our students in a basic way. We say the schools reflect society's value system, which we recognize is unduly self-centered and materialistic. What do we do as educators -- stand by and let this value system be foisted onto a new generation? The value judgments of American students aren't changed by college experience. Students leave as they come, with the same adolescent scale of values.

Miller: I'm not sure that I agree -- in fact I'm positive I don't agree -- that students don't change their value judgments during the course of higher education. I'm suspicious partly of the methods which are used to measure the changes, but let's take an example like this: when they come to college and when they leave college, they will believe "thou shalt not steal"; and if this is the only question you

asked, you haven't learned anything. They will have, I think, more subtle notions of what constitutes "stealing" -- politically, economically, socially, humanistically; they know more of the ways by which other men may be diminished. If you want to be perverse about it, they ought to be better thieves -- many of them are in certain ways.

Johnson: There is evidence to show that in certain ways they haven't changed materially; for example, the Time Magazine study entitled "They Went to College" shows certain facts about the political beliefs and the kinds of magazines read and so forth, and that some aren't different from non-college-going people. But I think Bramford has a point when he says these facts are not quite true because of the way in which a study of this type has been designed and the things it looks for.

Moreover, education isn't the only keeper of the value system we have. If it were, then we would have to take under our control, or within our orbit of activity, the church and the various community agencies. It seems that everybody has a little something to do with value formation. Education has a greater responsibility than indoctrination of values. It has a responsibility for transmitting facts and information which can be used in relationship to values.

Miller: Isn't its business to provide to the individual the tools for arriving at values rather than to impose values on him? My quarrel -- and it is with myself as well as with other educators at all levels -- is that the problem of adjustment has been oversimplified. The problems of life and learning are not always easy, and are not always to be met by the direct pragmatic approach. But they are often made to seem so in courses directly concerned with life

adjustment -- as if there were a "know-how" to goodness, to truth. There isn't. It's a long and devious business.

Barron: That's exactly the point. Some of us are distressed because in a university laundering is regarded as the practical equivalent of Latin. It's considered as important to learn how to get the laundry done as it is to acquire a foundation in the classics. Now --

Miller: Excuse me, I don't think there is a --- I think this is a parody. Though we are taking in a lot of society's laundry. We're taking in society's values, and it's society's values that we have to break down into their components so that they can be understood, studied, and brought into more meaningful relationship to life adjustment.

Johnson: What we're saying is that imparting a philosophy isn't the educator's responsibility, but we should help a student find the means for developing a philosophy of life in living.

Barron: Maybe we expect too much from education. That's why we become so easily disillusioned with it, especially higher education. It's not a panacea for all our social ills, by any means; actually it's only a road map to some hard-won destination. Let me be more forceful in what I've been saying. We recognize the need for man and woman to be taught skills, including laundry skills; how to cook, how to manage a hotel, how to prepare the chicken for market -- these are essential skills in any society. But they are distortions of the purpose of a university.

We need scientists, we need technicians, we need engineers; but we also need, just as much, young people with a broadly liberal education who have been trained to think seriously about the problems of man and society. Slide rules and techniques for using them are no substitute

for the arts which release man from ignorance, from prejudice, from superstition. The whole problem of our society, the problem of personality, of values, of life goals is practically untouched by the university.

The feeling among many today is that society is unbalanced; that it is spiritually sick. This is almost heresy, I grant you. The cure-all is buy. Buy. Buy more. But what? Buy anything. This is what I find discouraging. In our universities we're not getting down to basic questions. We're not asking "Who am I and what can I do about it?" This is the existentialist question which Socrates, Jesus, Buddha all asked. Apparently the only people interested in this question "Who am I and what, if anything, can I do about it?", are the advertising copywriters, who are the myth-makers of our time.

Miller: Yes, the advertiser, speaks loud and often and in technicolor, and certainly it's distressing to an educator when people in responsible positions make such shocking statements that they leave one almost breathless. It is politically and economically and morally irresponsible to say that to solve our dilemmas you should buy things, buy anything. Never think of buying better schools, paying teachers better salaries -- just buy and squander your way to prosperity. This is a variety of materialistic paternalism that we educators have to battle against all the time.

Johnson: It's been said, too, that there's too much pseudo-egghead ism, that we should have more science because of Sputnik and not for its intrinsic worth. I think we ought to look at all the subjects we teach for their intrinsic value more than for expediency. Legislatures and government leaders seem to feel that they must respond to societal

pressures, and the needs of the moment rather than the basic worth. Now if this is what you are talking about, John, I am with you. If you aren't, I am "agin" you.

Miller: I'd like to put in a plug here too, Walter. Certainly we should not be panicked by Sputnik -- and we are being panicked to a certain extent -- on the assumption that all we have to do is rear back with our know-how, flex our muscles, and we're in. Actually we shouldn't do anything as a result of Sputnik that we shouldn't have been doing anyway -- unless we want what Russia has, a crash program in space hardware, and nothing else.

We shouldn't put all our hopes in sciences, mathematics, and languages, and how to do them quickly, and support these only. You don't even get the best science this way. The best science, in the long run, will come from disciplined minds, curious and eager on all fronts, in a healthy community of learning. And from those who have chosen science or mathematics voluntarily and not because it enables them to get on for a free ride. And secondly, are only the scientific minds valued because they can produce technologically? Are only these minds valued sufficiently to be encouraged to their highest levels?

If we want a free society, there is nothing in science to tell us how to be free, or what to be free for. We need history, the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts to give us a knowledge of human behavior and human values. If our scientific problems are complex, how much more so are our human ones. This is why I panic when I see the panicking going on about what we need to do to catch up with the Russians. I don't want to catch up with the Russians if it's going to cost us our education, or our humanity -- I want to go somewhere else.

Barron: I won't let the universities off the hook. I say the evidence indicates that the chief result of a college education today is to give the individual a little skill training, to polish his manners a bit, and then reinforce his values so that he fits comfortably into the ranks of the alumni. We are turning out a man with some practical skill to peddle in the marketplace and with a few character traits to go with it. What we profess to be doing is another matter.

Johnson: I would take great exception to that. I think there is some truth in it, but if we compare our system of higher education with European education we'll find it stacks up favorably. For example, 70 percent of our 16-year-olds are enrolled in school, whereas in England and France only 10 percent of the 16-year-olds are enrolled. Of our college-age group, 25 percent are enrolled in college; in European countries the percentage is only 5 to 6. Now it is possible that a considerable portion of this 25 percent are being very well served with the kind of college education you're talking about. And there is still room for training the technicians, the engineers, the practical applied professionals; I don't know how you make them professionals without giving them advanced training; we happen to call it university education when we train a doctor. You could call it something else if you wanted to. But if we look at the basic professional preparation of these people, we find an awareness, on the part of engineering schools, for instance, of the importance of a liberal education.

If you analyze engineering education for the last 15 years, you will find a consistent trend toward more liberal education because it

is recognized that an engineer has to interact with people. So I'm quite heartened by the trend and feel that it's going to continue; and as a result of the present furor I believe we will give education a new focus and a desirable one.

Miller: This trend might even develop some new cliches. There are a few of the old ones I'd like never to hear again. "Education for living" -- what else for? "Life Adjustment" -- even though there's a great deal to be said for it; "How to be an individual in a confused society" is another way of putting it. "Teach children, not subjects" -- well, let's face it (and be grammatical, too), we really should teach subjects to children. "Pupil-centered" -- why not "learning-centered"? "Enriched curriculum" -- why not "unadulterated curriculum"?

Many of these cliches were developed years ago and can be understood as efforts to get away from serious restrictions on both quantity and quality of education. But we need some new slogans to suggest that, though we know a lot about the psychology of learning and methods of teaching, these are not what we want to teach. We want to use them to teach more things to more people and not to teach on the easiest and most readily available level. I'll propose a new one: "Think! The brain that directs you might as well be your own."

Johnson: I don't think so, John. I think Bran is right in that cliches are coined by the superficial kind of thinker.

Barron: I'd like to look at another problem. If there is a problem of the gifted, there is also that of taking care of those not gifted. Should we curtail the opportunity to go to college?

Johnson: This is too big a question to treat in the couple of minutes we have left. I believe we have to take a long look at the purpose of higher education and probably also define the different kinds of higher education. Maybe there is justification for community colleges which have a kind of post-high-school, adult-education flavor more than college preparation. On the other hand, I believe we need to evaluate higher education as we have it before we could answer that question properly.

Barron: We take in students in wholesale lots and after a year or less eliminate them in wholesale lots -- a wasteful process, one would think.

Johnson: That isn't quite true. I'd like to argue the statement at length.

Barron: Look at the elimination figures. Too many of our young people are going to school. Now I recognize that in a democracy --

Millar: What did you say? Too many young people going to school?

Barron: I mean too many who are unfit and do not do themselves or society any good by pursuing higher education.

Millar: Well, I'd rather have a little learning, knowing its dangers, than to propagate ignorance. There are some who may lack the capacity to pursue higher education profitably, but who have skills which could be developed . . . .

APPENDIX E

THE NATURE AND PURPOSES OF DISCUSSION

About the specific purpose of discussion, there is no disagreement. Discussion is a "means of better understanding and action in human affairs."[1] But on the definition and scope of discussion there is less unanimity.

Usage has made of discussion an omnibus term whose only essential ingredient is talk. It includes everything from a bull-session to a thinly disguised debate. Garden variety interviews frequently wind up as "discussions."

Among students of speech, O'Neill makes discussion synonymous with extemporaneous speaking.[2] Overstreet describes the old NBC American Town Meeting of the Air, which featured prominent individuals speaking from scripts, as a "weekly discussion."[3] Wiese calls discussion "thinking out loud."[4] Baird and McBurney and Hance offer two analytical definitions:

---

[1]James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, Discussion in Human Affairs (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. vii. This is one of the best treatments of the subject, although without specific reference to radio discussion.

[2]James M. O'Neill, A Manual of Debate and Oral Discussion (New York: Century, 1920), p. 18.

[3]Harry A. Overstreet and Bonaro W. Overstreet, Town Meeting Comes to Town (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938), p. 5.

[4]Mildred J. Wiese, Let's Talk It Over (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 19.

1. Discussion . . . is the art of reflective thinking and communication usually oral, by members of a group whose aim is the co-operative solution of a problem of fact or policy.[1]

2. . . . The cooperative deliberation of problems by persons thinking and conversing together in face-to-face or co-action groups under the direction of a leader.[2]

Judson regards discussion as an "educational tool" designed to give "information and instruction."[3] This approach makes intentional reasoning the basis for discussion. But McBurney and Hance, reject the intentional reasoner because he "begins with a predetermined proposition to which he is committed either by desire or the nature of the circumstances and seeks to secure an acceptance of this proposition. . . ."[4] With Elliott,[5] they find fault with this interpretation because it smacks too much of debate.

McBurney and Hance distinguish between debate and discussion. Inquiry is the attitude of discussion; proof that of debate. Discussion stimulates reflective thinking; debate necessitates intentional reason or reason guided to a conclusion. A discussion leader, in the McBurney

---

[1]A. Craig Baird, Representative American Speeches 1939-1940 (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1940), p. 20.

[2]James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, The Principles and Methods of Discussion (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939), p. 23.

[3]Lyman Judson and Ellen Judson, Modern Group Discussion (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1937), p. 34. An excellent description of discussion as a teaching tool is contained in Bower Aly, "Teaching by Discussion," The University of Missouri Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 17 (May, 1954), pp. 27-35.

[4]McBurney and Hance, op. cit., p. 36.

[5]Harrison S. Elliott, The Process of Group Thinking (New York: Association Press, 1932), p. 36.

and Hance analysis, does not guide a group toward a predetermined conclusion; he helps the members of the group reach their own conclusion.

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary follows popular usage in failing to discriminate between discussion and debate. Discussion is ". . . consideration of a question in open debate; argument for the sake of arriving at a truth or clearing up difficulties."

The writer offers no dogmatic definition of discussion. Debate is not the blood brother of discussion, but it is certainly its first cousin. Discussion involves communication within a group for the cooperative study of a problem. Its goal may be insight and understanding or decision as to a course of action.

It must be asserted, however, that the intent of programs like the Round Table, Invitation to Learning, the Reviewing Stand, and Viewpoint, is in varying degrees to produce insight and understanding rather than to achieve solutions. Invitation to Learning and Viewpoint are plainly indifferent to conclusions or solutions. The more significant problems resist solution and the participants to radio discussion run the risk of dogmatism if they insist on them. This does not mean that solutions are not ventured. This would be an artificial obstacle to discussion, indeed. But the point remains that the emphasis in these discussion programs is not on solutions, but on awareness and thinking--which may or may not lead to solutions for the listener. When the topic is a problem, suggestions as to solution and the reasoned development of a hypothesis are major parts of the discussion. But the objective is never a single solution. It is the exploration of several possible solutions.

More essentially, discussion means an attitude of respect and a desire for mutual understanding. There is no necessity for either agreement or solution.

Discussion also means a search for common ground on objectives and analysis. The debater seeks to understand an opponent's argument only so that he can refute it; the superior participant in discussion so that he may re-examine and perhaps modify his own. His orientation is toward agreement rather than defense of a position, on diagnosis rather than clash of argument. Discussion pulls the participants together; debate drives them apart.

There is no evidence that the University of Chicago introduced the expression "round table" into the language. But it did much to popularize it here and abroad, both on and off radio. For the University of Chicago a radio round table was:

> A cooperative effort combining the special knowledge of radio technicians and scholars for the presentation of a simple, informative and generally spontaneous discussion of important contemporary problems.[1]

The writer offers the thesis that in practice and theory round table and discussion programs are synonymous. He would modify the University of Chicago's definition only to add the final words "and subjects of more lasting concern." Less importantly, he would broaden "scholars" to read "men of knowledge and understanding." Thus the definition would read:

> A radio discussion program is a cooperative effort combining the talents of special knowledge of radio

---

[1]The University of Chicago Round Table, Memorandum to Participants n. d.

> technicians and men of knowledge and understanding for the presentation of simple, informative and generally spontaneous discussion of important contemporary problems and subjects of more lasting concern.

Fortunately, there is always the astute Hayakawa to remind us that "the words in definition often conceal even more serious confusions and ambiguities than the word defined."[1] Definition is man's search for that will-o-the-wisp, certainty. God, science, philosophy are all trying to nail us to some tree or other. What are definitions but statements about language.[2]

---

[1]Hayakawa, op. cit., pp. 172-173.

[2]Ibid., p. 171.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Radio, General

Barnouw, Eric. Handbook of Radio Production. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1949.

Chester, Giraud, and Garrison, Garnet R. Radio and Television. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.

Crews, Albert. Radio Production Directing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1944.

DeForest, Lee. Father of Radio. Chicago: Wilcox and Follett, 1950.

Dunn, John W. "Radio Programming for the College or University Station," Problems in College Radio. Columbia, Missouri: Stephens College, 1946.

Ewbank, Henry, and Lawton, Sherman P. Broadcasting: Radio and Television. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Fitzgerald, Stephen E. Communicating Ideas to the Public. New York: New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950.

Foreman, Bob. "What's Happening In Radio?" Advertising and Selling, XLII (February, 1949), p. 31.

Gantelme, J. "Broadcasting in the U. S." (Comments on Judith Waller's book, Radio--The Fifth Estate.) European Broadcasting Union. Documentation and Information Bulletin, II (January 15, 1951), II (March 15, 1951).

Hyde, Stuart. Television and Radio Announcing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959.

Jason, Don R. "Sarnoff Predicts Brighter Future for Television and Radio," Advertiser, XXLII (January, 1952), p. 16.

Kirtland, George. "Who Said Radio's Dying?" Holiday, IX (June, 1951), p. 14 .

Levenson and Stasheff. Teaching Through Radio and Television. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1952. Revised.

Marcus, P. "Friendly Voice in the Rockies, KVRM," Colliers, CXXVII (June 30, 1951), pp. 26-27 .

Murrow, Edward. "A Broadcaster Talks to His Colleagues," The Reporter, November 13, 1958.

National Association of Broadcasters. "The Broadcaster's Creed," Mass Communications. Wilbur Schramm, ed. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1949.

_____. Dimensions of Radio and Television. Washington: National Association of Broadcasters, 1950.

Waller, Judith C. Radio, the Fifth Estate. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1950.

Weeks, Charles G. "Broadcasting in a Big City," Education on the Air. Twenty-first Yearbook of the Institute of Education by Radio and Television. O. Joe Olson, ed. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1951.

Radio, Social Aspects and Criticism

Anonymous. "Schoolmen Discuss Television, Radio, and Movies," Secondary Education, XIV (February, 1950), p. 9.

Ace, Goodman. The Book of Little Knowledge. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955.

_____. "Madison Avenue Dialogue on Ford Grant for a Radio and Television Workshop," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXIV (September 1, 1951), pp. 40-41.

_____. "To Air Is Human to Forgive Divine," Saturday Review of Literature, XXV (January 5, 1952), p. 27.

Allen, Harold B. "Mass Pressure on Radio and Journalism," English Journal, XXXVIII (October, 1949), pp. 447-453.

Bender, William Jr. "Radio Presentation of Sociological Topics," American Sociological Review, XIV (February, 1949), p. 449.

Boutwell, William D. "Radio: Industry or Art?" English Journal, XXXVIII (November, 1949), p. 525.

Carson, Saul. "On the Air: The Reformed Gadfly," New Republic, CXXII (March 13, 1950), p. 22.

Chase, Richard. The Democratic Vista. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1958.

Chester, Giraud. "What Constitutes Irresponsibility on the Air: a Cast Study," Public Opinion Quarterly, XIII (Spring, 1949), pp. 73-82.

Corwin, Norman. "Radio and Television--A Prediction," Association for Education by Radio Journal, IX (April, 1950), pp. 87-88.

Crosby, John. "Dear Sir, You Cur: Radio Listening Public Writes in Anger," Colliers, CXXIV (December 10, 1949), p. 25 .

_____. "Seven Deadly Sins of the Air." Life, XXIX (November 6, 1950), pp. 147-148 .

Edman, Irwin. "War with Inflections," American Scholar, XX (January, 1951), p. 109.

Ernst, Morris L., and Loth, David. The People Know Best. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1949.

Fromm, Erie. The Sane Society. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1955.

Freund, Arthur J. "The Mass Media Before the Bar," Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, VI (Fall, 1949), pp. 90-97.

Grey, L. "Radio, a Means Not an End," English Journal, XL (March, 1959), pp. 144-149.

Griffith, Thomas. The Waist-High Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Hardy, Ralph W. "Do We Need a New National P licy for Radio and Television?" Education on the Air. Twentieth Yearbook of the Institute for Education by Radio and Television. O. Joe Olson, ed. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1950.

Hartwell, D. "John Crosby: Gadfly of Radio," Coronet, XXVIII (July, 1950), pp. 110-114.

Hayakawa, S. I. "The Task of the Listener," ETC, VII (Autumn, 1949).

_____. Language on Thought and Action. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. "Freedom for Radio and Television; the Risks Involved," Commentary, X (November, 1950), pp. 434-438.

Larrabbee, Carlton H. "Radio, a Public Servant," English Journal, XXXVIII (February, 1949), pp. 92-94.

Lee, Irvin J. How to Talk With People. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Novik, M. S. "Radio Must Serve," American Federationist, LVII (October, 1950), pp. 24-25.

Price, Lucien. Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead. New York: The New American Library, 1956.

Saudek, Robert. "Radio in Today's World," Teachers' College Record, LIII (December, 1951), pp. 136-138.

Seldes, Gilbert Vivian. The Great Audience. New York: Viking Press, 1950.

Shayon, Robert L. "Sunday Comes But Once a Week," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXV (January 12, 1952), pp. 28-29.

Siepmann, Charles A. Radio, Television, and Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Tocquerille, Alexis de. Democracy in America. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Tyler, Tracy F. Listening, the Number One Problem," Association for Education by Radio Journal, VIII (April, 1949), p. 85.

VanHorne, H. "Replacement Season," Theatre Arts, XXXV (June, 1951), pp. 54-55 .

_____. "Television on Talk Kick," Variety, November 19, 1958.

Radio, Programs

Anonymous. "A Talking Hit," Look, November 5, 1940.

_____. "Godfrey Talks Back," Newsweek, March 10, 1958.

_____. "Learning Scores on Air," Time, November 20, 1941.

_____. On the Entertainment of Ideas. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

_____. "Radio Book Program Thrives," The Christian Science Monitor, May 27, 1958.

Anonymous. "Shop Talk," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, December, 1958.

_____. Summary of Relevant Facts for Appraisal of the Round Table. MSS. The University of Chicago Radio and Television Office, 1954.

_____. "What is a University?" Michigan State College of Education Quarterly (Summer, 1959), a transcript of a radio discussion.

Cairns, Huntington, Tate, Allen, and Van Doren, Mark. Invitation to Learning. New York: Random House, 1941.

Hepner, Arthur W. (ed.). The Invitation to Learning Reader, Vol. 4, No. 2. New York: Herbert Muschel, 1954.

Kaplan, Milton A. Radio and Poetry. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

"Media Information: Invitation to Learning Begins Tenth Anniversary Series," Publisher's Weekly, CLVII (April 22, 1950).

National Broadcasting Company. Radio and Television Broadcast Standards. New York: National Broadcasting Company, 1951.

Smith, T. V. "One Thousand Round Tables," Reprint of NBC Radio discussion. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1953.

Sproul, K. "Dialing Civilization: Invitation to Learning," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXIII (August 19, 1950).

Van Doren, Mark (ed.). The New Invitation to Learning. New York: Random House, 1941.

Radio, Research and Audience Impact Studies

Anonymous. Listening Habits, KSAC. Manhattan: Kansas State College, October, 1949.

_____. "Public Taste in Entertainment," Fortune, XXXIX (March, 1949), pp. 43-44.

_____. "University of Illinois Completes Study of Radio Habits," Advertising Age, XX (April 11, 1949), p. 50.

Baker, Kenneth. "Radio Programming; a Summary," Mass Communications. Wilbur Schramm, ed. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1949.

Beiler, Ross C. "The Effects of Mass Media on Opinion and Behavior, Education on the Air. Twenty-first Yearbook of the Institute for Education by Radio and Television. O. Joe Olson, ed. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1951.

Beville, Hugh M., Jr. "The ABCD's of Radio Audiences," Mass Communications. Wilbur Schramm, ed. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1949.

_____. "The Challenge of the New Media," Communications in Modern Society. Wilbur Schramm, ed. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1948.

Dunn, S. Watson. "A Qualitative Analysis of Radio Listening in Champaign County, Illinois," Dissertation Abstracts, XII (1952).

Klapper, Joseph. Effects of Mass Media. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1949.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Berelson, Bernard. Analysis of Communication Content. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1949.

Sandage, C. H. Building Audiences for Educational Radio Programs. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1951.

Schramm, Wilbur. "The Effects of Mass Communications: a Review," Journalism Quarterly, XXVI (December, 1949), pp. 397-409.

_____. Mass Communications. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Swanson, Charles E. "Predicting Who Learns Factual Information from the Mass Media," Groups, Leadership, and Men. Harold Guetzkow, ed. New York: Carnegie Press, 1951.

Trenaman, Joseph. "Understanding Radio Talks." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (April, 1951), pp. 173-178.

Wilson, Elmo C. "The Listening Audience," Communications in Modern Society. Wilbur Schramm, ed. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1949.

Radio, Educational

Anderson, Borghild F. "Are Good Radio Listeners Made?" English Journal, XXXVIII (September, 1949), pp. 391-394.

Anonymous. "University of the People," National Education Association Journal, XXXIX (April, 1950), pp. 302 .

Bender, William Jr. "Educational Radio: An Uphill Fight," Adult Education Journal, IX (January, 1950), pp. 23-26.

Broderick, Gertrude G. "What About Radio Programs," National Education Association Journal, XXXIX (December, 1950), p. 705.

Carlson, E. F. "Effective Listening," Chicago Schools Journal, XXX (March, 1949), pp. 20-21.

Corwith, Doris. "Radio as an Educational Medium," Educational Record, XXXIII (January, 1952), pp. 24-29.

Fulrath, Marilyn M. Radio's Role in Adult Education. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1951.

Garrison, Garnet R. "University of Michigan Hour," Education on the Air. Twenty-first Yearbook of the Institute for Education by Radio and Television. O. Joe Olson, ed. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1951.

Goldstein, H. "Air Waves for Adult Education," Adult Education, VIII (January, 1949), pp. 60-63.

Greenwood, D. F. "Education for Adults on the U. S. Air Waves," Food for Thought, XII (May, 1952), pp. 9-15.

Hunter, Armand L. "Fulfillment of Public Service," Education on the Air. Twenty-first Yearbook of the Institute for Education by Radio and Television. O. Joe Olson, ed. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1951.

Lyon, Donald W. "Is Educational Radio Here to Stay?" Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVI (October, 1951), pp. 355-359.

Luscombe, I. "WNYC, Outstanding Example of Public Service," American City, LXV (December, 1950), pp. 136-137.

Novotny, Lillian E. "Education and the Mass Media of Communication: Radio," Elementary English, XXVII (April, 1950), pp. 240-246 .

Saudek, Robert. "Educational Broadcasting on Commercial Stations," Education on the Air. Twenty-first Yearbook of the Institute for Education by Radio and Television. O. Joe Olson, ed. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1951.

Temple, W. J. "Our 121 Educational Stations," Scholastic, LVIII (May 2, 1951), p. 22.

Wright, J. F. "State University Serves with Radio," State Government, XII (July, 1949), pp. 179-180.

Radio, Reports

Sheats, Paul H. Forums on the Air. A report of plans and procedures developed in the broadcasting of public affairs discussion programs over local radio stations. Washington, D. C.: The Federal Radio Education Committee and U. S. Office of Education Federal Security Agency, 1939. Lists 64 forums.

University Broadcasting Council. Resume of the Broadcasting Activities of Chicago, DePaul, and Northwestern Universities, 1933-1937. February, 1938. (Dittoed)

Report to the President of Michigan State University from the Committee on the Future of the University. East Lansing, Michigan: 1959. Contains a chapter on interpreting the university to its publics.

Other Sources

Bryson, Lyman. Director of Public Affairs for Columbia Broadcasting System. Personal letter. January 24, 1959.

Johnson, Kathryn (Mrs.). Producer of the Reviewing Stand, Department of Public Relations, Northwestern University. Personal letter. July 28, 1959.

Loeb, Barbara. Secretary to the producer of Invitation to Learning. Personal letter. July 8, 1959.

McBurney, James H. Dean, School of Speech, Northwestern University. Personal letter.

Moyer, Estelle K. Radio-TV Assistant, Office of Radio and Television, The University of Chicago. Personal letter. January 1, 1959.

Rosenheim, Edward. Former producer of the Chicago Round Table. Personal letter.

Sutherland, Alec. Director of Educational Broadcasting, Office of Radio and Television, University of Chicago. Personal letter. December 18, 1958.

Waller, Judith. Formerly Director of Public Affairs, Central Division, National Broadcasting System, Chicago Illinois. Personal letter.