



101
908
THS



L



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
A History of the Concept
of Public Broadcasting: 1967-1980

presented by

Lawrence E. Beery

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for
Masters degree in Telecommunication

Major professor

Date May 14, 1987



RETURNING MATERIALS:

Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

June 27
151
175

FEB 27 1994
107

FEB 07 1994

DEC 31 1993
107

FEB 27 1994

A HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT
OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING: 1967 to 1980

By

Lawrence Eli Beery

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Telecommunication

1987

ABSTRACT

A HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING 1967-1980

By

Lawrence Eli Beery

Public Broadcasting is a generic term for a growing number of public telecommunication services, but what does it mean?

It is a paradoxical term for an elusive concept. It can be defined, but the more precise the definition, the more broad the concept.

A historical review of the period 1967-80 provides context for the evolution of the term Public Broadcasting. The primary focus is a 13-year era between the two major Carnegie Corporation sponsored studies of the public broadcast movement in the United States. A prologue provides an overview of the movement to the 1967 report.

Eighteen enduring characteristics defining of the concept were identified, excluding a review of legal, academic and popular definitions.

The study is historical research with parallel analysis of certain key public policies involving problem definition and enlightenment. It has been written for policymakers and communication students.

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Linda, and my two sons,
Nicholas and Eli

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.	1
PART I--PROLOGUE	
AN OVERVIEW OF THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING MOVEMENT TO THE FIRST CARNEGIE COMMISSION AND THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967	6
PART II	
PUBLIC BROADCASTING AS ILL-DEFINED BY THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967. SUBSEQUENT INTERPRETATIONS TO THE 1980 CARNEGIE REPORT	20
The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967	20
The Altered Course.	22
The Meaning of "Noncommercial".	28
Federal Regulations Defining the Purpose of Noncommercial Educational Broadcast Stations.	31
Federal Regulations Which Promote Special Problems For Noncommercial Educational or Public Broadcasting	32
Editorializing	32
Ascertainment of Community Needs	34
Political Programming.	36
Controversial Issue Programming.	37
Fiscal and Policy Control.	39
Chronic Problems.	40
Centralism and Localism.	40

	Page
Funding and Political Insulation	42
Structure.	48
Instructional Media.	51
Selected Interpretations and Recommendations Regarding the Future of Public Broadcasting	54
The Second Carnegie Commission Report on the Future of Public Broadcasting	57
The Follow-up Report	59
The Grand Alliance	61
Educational Telecommunications and Other Perspectives	62
PART III--CONCLUSION AS DISCUSSED IN PART I AND TREATED IN PART II.	67
PART IV--EPILOGUE SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER POLICY RESEARCH	71
LITERATURE CITED.	73

INTRODUCTION

Public Broadcasting is a paradoxical term for an elusive concept. It can be defined, but the more precise the definition, the more broad the concept.

This hypothesis is a product of research that addressed the elementary but legitimate question: What is Public Broadcasting?

It also points the direction of this study, which is essentially a history of Public Broadcasting between 1967-80, the years of two major studies of the public system.

The purpose of the research was to identify distinctive properties or enduring characteristics of Public Broadcasting as the concept evolved between the 1967 study: Public Television: A Program for Action (Carnegie I), and the 1979 effort: A Public Trust (Carnegie II). Both studies were sponsored by the New York-based Carnegie Corporation.

Carnegie I first defined the term and concept of Public Television. That definition was then amended by common reference to Public Broadcasting to include radio broadcasting. Twelve years later, Carnegie II used the term Public Broadcasting throughout its study, but

introduced the term Public Telecommunications to embrace evolving communication technologies.

A review of scientific, legal, popular and academic literature reveals that Public Broadcasting remains the generic term for certain public telecommunication activities. And, the continued use of the term begs the elementary question of what it means.

An understanding of what Public Broadcasting is, based on its historical development, is of value to communication students and to policy and lawmakers who may need a frame of reference for the term.

To that end, this is primarily a historical document. It is also a limited policy research effort.

It is historical in method, as defined and developed by Kerlinger, because such research is important to the formulation of public policy. Historical research, he said, has great value because it is necessary to know and understand trends of the past in order to gain perspective on present and future directions.¹

This research also recognizes the observation of Barzun and Graff that facts never speak for themselves; they need context, which is carried by words, which are composed and edited by the writer. The historians also note that history is not only a story of what happened, but

¹Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), p. 701.

also of the substance of what happened.²

The limited policy focus of this document, which is also termed a parallel analysis, is one of problem definition. It serves an enlightenment function designed to help policymakers and students understand what Public Broadcasting is or is a product of. The rationale for the policy emphasis is explained by Majchizak, who said not all social problems are defined either precisely or appropriately enough to permit a search for causes and solutions.³

In that context, Public Broadcasting is not a social problem, although underfunding or overregulation of the system could be construed to be.

Policy issues raised by a review of the historical period 1967-80 will be noted in a brief epilogue. That discussion will be limited to a simple enumeration of topics and questions that could spark further research regarding Public Broadcasting.

The "distinctive properties" or "characteristics" of Public Broadcasting to be identified will vary from legislative terminology to multi-dimensional concepts, but all will be fundamental and enduring aspects of a movement that

²Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, The Modern Researcher, 3rd ed. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1977), pp. 40-42.

³Ann Marjchrzak, Methods For Policy Research, (California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1984), p. 16.

evolved into Public Broadcasting. In that sense, the characteristics are defining elements. Considered as a collective concept, the characteristics form a constitutive definition of Public Broadcasting. A constitutive definition defines a term by substituting other words or concepts for it, according to researchers Wimmier and Dominick.⁴

The fundamental limitation to this study is that it is not a comprehensive history of Public Broadcasting from 1967-80; it is a selected history.

There are already several chronologies of the history of the public system, legislative histories, and research focusing on educational or instructional broadcasting.

This research provides a history of the concept of Public Broadcasting that is expressed in the historical contexts of events or developments that reveal enduring and defining aspects of the public system, as it was known through 1980.

It begins with a prologue that provides an historical overview of the public broadcasting movement to 1967 and Carnegie I, and continues with definitions, interpretations and issues through 1980 and Carnegie II. A brief epilogue that focuses on further policy research topics follows the conclusion.

⁴Roger D. Wimmer and Joseph R. Dominick, Mass Media Research, An Introduction, 2nd ed. (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1983), p. 11.

The thesis has been drawn from extended research by the author and was reduced to its present text as a result of discussion with the thesis director.

PROLOGUE

AN OVERVIEW OF THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING MOVEMENT TO THE FIRST CARNEGIE COMMISSION AND THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

The term "public broadcasting" did not have specific meaning or even general recognition in the United States until after the 1967 publication of the report and recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on educational television, Public Television: A Program For Action, and the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. Prior to that legislation, and between 1922 and 1967, developments in the educational radio, educational television, and in the visual instruction movements culminated in the organized effort to secure federal support for broadcast programming that would be largely "alternative" in nature to what was then being broadcast by the licensed commercial radio and television stations.

Defining public broadcasting prior to the 1967 Act requires a review of specific events and relationships which developed between 1922 and 1967. The review will provide context to the 1967 Act and will point out philosophical and structural origins of a movement which became Public Broadcasting.

Laissez-faire development of the broadcast industry in the United States allowed commercial interests to successfully initiate broadcast stations in the AM and FM (radio), VHF and UHF (television) respective frequencies before the educational interests of the country.

The licensing system for allocation of broadcast frequencies to radio and television station applicants under laissez-faire conditions was managed by a government administrative agency (first the Federal Radio Commission, later the Federal Communication Commission).

Through the authority of administrative law, given by Congress in the Communication Act of 1934 and related statutes, the FCC had wide discretionary power to encourage the development of the nation's communications services under the mandate of "public interest, convenience, and necessity."

The role of the federal government in the development of educational broadcasting is substantial. The FCC, the Office of Education of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, as well as various acts of Congress, contributed significantly to the development of educational broadcasting.

The FCC gave identity to a loose federation of educational broadcasters when it defined the term "noncommercial educational broadcasting station" in 1938. In subsequent rulings, the FCC recognized the importance of the potential

II, almost all were connected with American land grant colleges and state universities. They succeeded because they were fulfilling a well-defined need: each was integrated into an ongoing educational program. Radio, a historian claimed, was regarded as an obvious means of delivering education (much of it funded by the Morrill Act of 1862 and the 1887 Hatch Act) to rural areas.⁶

At the same time the pioneering university broadcasters were experimenting with and utilizing radio broadcasting as a teaching aid, a parallel education movement was evolving that would later extend the uses of radio and television as supplements to the schools' established curriculum: audiovisual education.

According to one historical review, beginning with lantern slides and stereographs in the 1880's, "visual instruction" developed by 1910 to where some schools had begun to adopt films for instructional use, and by 1913 Thomas Edison predicted that it would be possible to teach every branch of human knowledge with the motion picture; by the 1920's old theatrical films, advertising films, government films, welfare films, and health films were being integrated into classroom activities and the concept

⁶Robert J. Blakely, To Serve the Public Interest: Educational Broadcasting in the United States, with a Forward by McGeorge Bundy (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1979), p. 53.

of visual aids was growing.⁷

To briefly summarize, the educational broadcasting movement seemed concerned with the over-the-air broadcasting to schools and the general public; the audiovisual movement concentrated on classroom use of a variety of audio and visual media.

By the mid-1950's the popularity of television had prompted a variety of groups to apply for educational television station licenses: universities, community corporations, state agencies and school boards. This variety of station management is important to this study in that it marks the beginning of direct citizen participation in the development of community television broadcast services.

The role of the federal government's substantial involvement in the development of broadcast services has already been noted. This involvement is particularly well illustrated in the Jan. 26, 1938 Federal Communication Commission (FCC) adoption of the rules governing noncommercial educational radio standards. Each of these stations was required to furnish a nonprofit and noncommercial service. In addition to the new rules, the FCC allocated 25 channels between 41,000 and 42,000 kilohertz for the

⁷Paul Saettler, A History of Instructional Technology (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1968), p. 21.

exclusive use of this new class of stations.⁸

For the first time in United States history, then, there was a federal agency-defined group of noncommercial broadcasters with their own frequency allocation.

Along with this recognition by the federal government came the burden of responsibility to develop noncommercial educational broadcasting in the United States. The educational broadcasters had competed with commercial interests to gain special consideration at the federal level and prevailed.

Coupled with the educational broadcasters' original vision of radio broadcasting's potential to supplement curriculum and augment community education, and the philosophical and practical success of the land grant college and university extension service broadcasts to rural society, the federally-defined classifications of noncommercial educational broadcast stations represent the elementary and substantive aspects of our pre-1967 definition of public broadcasting.

Following the emergence of television as a medium in 1948, educational broadcasters began to form associations (for example, the National Association of Educational Broadcasters; the Joint Committee on Educational

⁸Federal Register, III, 364, Jan. 26, 1938. The term noncommercial educational broadcasting station meant "a high frequency broadcasting station licensed to an organized nonprofit educational agency for the advancement of its educational work and for the transmission of educational and entertainment programs to the general public."

Television, which represented seven national educational organizations; National Citizens Committee of Educational Television, etc.) and struggled to unify in order to initiate favorable rule making before the FCC. Part of the unification process was to fashion a definition of themselves.

In 1949, 22 directors or managers of educational stations and an equal number of advisors, public representatives and foreign guests met at the University of Illinois to think solely and systematically about the mission and strategy of educational broadcasting in the United States. This seminar became the first of the Allerton House Seminars, and in its final report, Educational Broadcasting: Its Aims and Responsibilities, educational broadcasting was defined to include AM and FM radio, television, and facsimile (transmission of images by slow-scan TV), and expressed the notion that educational broadcasting in a democracy was an essential part and a supplement necessary to both education and public communication.⁹

One effort to initiate legislation occurred in 1951 and involved the reservation of television channels for non-commercial stations. The action followed an increase demand for television licenses after WW I and after FCC

⁹Blakely, To Serve the Public Interest: Educational Broadcasting in the United States, p. 10.

authorities elected to "freeze" license applications pending a revision of frequency standards. Hearings on reserving educational channels resumed Oct. 12, 1950, and the organizations appeared to make their case.¹⁰

To prove that educational broadcasters had the ability to improve upon commercial programming, a good example of what commercial stations were broadcasting needed to be collected; a content analysis of a major market. Out of the JCET strategy meeting of December 30, 1950 came the decision to survey TV programming then being offered in New York City, the nation's largest metropolitan area.¹¹

The educational television phase of the FCC hearings lasted from November 1950 to January 1951. Seventy-six witnesses (71 supporters of the educators and 5 opponents) filled 2,600 pages of records.¹²

The Third Notice of Further Proposed Rule Making, issued by the FCC in early 1951, set aside 209 channels for noncommercial use. These were tentative proposals, but a

¹⁰Federal Register, XV, 6049. Cited by George H. Gibson Public Television: The Role of the Federal Government, 1912-76 (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977), p. 72.

¹¹JCET Minutes, March 22-23, 1951, p. 46 (NAEB Washington Office). Cited by Robert A. Carlson in "1951: A Pivotal Year for ETV," Educational Broadcasting Review (December 1967): p. 47.

¹²Federal Communications Commission, Official Report of Proceedings, In the Matter of: Amendment of Section 3.606 of the Commissions Rules and Regulations, Docket 8736 et al. (Washington, D.C.; Ward and Paul, 1950-51), pp. 15743-18337.

year later on April 14, 1952, the FCC issued its Sixth Report and Order, which ended the "freeze" on television license applications and provided a new Table of Assignments. Noncommercial television allocations totaled 242 (80 VHF and 162 UHF); an increase over the original proposal. The educational broadcasters had won their struggle for television channel reservation.

Another effort came in 1962 with the goal to gain federal support to build new stations through the Educational Television Facilities Act (Public Law 87-447), which was the first direct federal aid to noncommercial broadcasting. (Indirect aid had come with the 1958 National Defense Education Act, a matching dollar program to promote the purchase of educational equipment.)

In 1962, the educational broadcasting movement unified again during two national conferences on long-range funding. That effort led to the formation of the 1967 Carnegie Commission.

These struggles indicate another defining element of public broadcasting prior to Carnegie I and the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967; the ability (for at least a short period) to unify, and with assistance from interested outside parties, initiate successful rule making before the regulatory agency (FCC) which had the authority to make decisions that affected its structure and/or services.

The Carnegie Commission's 1967 report on educational television, Public Television: A Program for Action was the

result of the perception of many ETV leaders that although their broadcasting stations were growing in number (particularly in the UHF range) and becoming diverse with programming for over the air broadcasts as well as with audiovisual delivery systems, a long-range financial plan for educational television had to be developed.

C. Scott Fletcher, who became director of Educational Television Division (ETS) of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB), said in early 1964: "We must take immediate action to investigate the financial structure that supports all aspects of educational television station activities, and we must move toward development of a plan for financial stability."¹³

By this time, "all aspects" included activities regarding local stations, potential state and regional networks, communication satellites, instructional television libraries, instructional television fixed service,¹⁴ the increasing relationship between educational institutions and the federal government, and finally, with new technology involving video recorders and random-access

¹³Senate, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Hearings on S205, 87 Congress, 1st Session.

¹⁴Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS) was the brain child of the FCC, and it involved setting up a system for transmitting to a small number of preselected or fixed receivers rather than to the community at large. Such a system, it was believed, would relieve the anticipated demand for most broadcast channels than were available. Gibson, Public Broadcasting: The Role of the Federal Government 1912-76, p. 90.

retrieval systems.¹⁵

Clearly, educational broadcasting's potential and its complexity was increasing with each year. The major factor limiting its growth and experimentation with public services was financial weakness.

Recognizing this, the First National Conference on Long-Range Financing of ETV, was organized and held during December, 1964, in Washington, D.C. According to one historian, more than 260 people attended representing educational stations in the country.¹⁶

The activity at the conference led to the formulation of eight mandates; one of which suggested that, "Immediate attention should be given to the appointment of a presidential commission to make recommendations for educational television development, after intensive study of a year

¹⁵Random-access retrieval systems consists of a number of individual learning stations--each furnished with a chair, small desk, TV monitor, headsets, intercommunication system, and other ancillary materials (audio recorder, typewriter, slide projector, etc.). As the student needs information, or a particular program, it is fed to him through one of the open channels in the system. Wood and Wylie, Education Telecommunications, p. 63.

¹⁶Report of the First National Conference on Long-Range Financing of ETV, p. 34. Cited by John E. Burke, in "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967--Part I: Historical Origins and the Carnegie Commission," Education Broadcasting Review vol. 6, no. 2 (April 1972): p. 113. (It is also important to note that the conference was partially financed by a \$65,000 grant from the U.S. Office of Education.

or more.¹⁷

That proposed commission developed into the 1966 Carnegie Commission on Educational Television; a commission privately financed through a \$500,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and was presidentially endorsed.

The commission published its findings and recommendations in the 1967 report: Public Television: A Program for Action, the Report and Recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. It defined the structure of educational television. In 1966, according to the report, there were 124 educational television stations on the air. These included: 21 school stations, 27 state stations, 35 university stations, and 41 community stations. The stations, it said, were owned and operated by nonprofit organizations, carried no advertising, and received most of their programming from the National Educational Television (NET) organization.

The Commission separated educational television programming into two parts: (1) Instructional Television, directed to individuals in the general context of formal education and (2) Public Television, which was directed at the general community.

The Carnegie Commission also made the following comment regarding broadcast television programming (in

¹⁷Report of the First National Conference on Long-Range Financing of ETV, pp. 11-22.

general, in the United States in 1966).

All television, commercial television included, provides news, entertainment, and instruction; all television teaches about places, people, animals, politics, crime, science. Yet the differences are clear. Commercial Television seeks to capture the large audience; it relies mainly upon the desire to relax and to be entertained. Instructional Television lies at the opposite end of the scale; it calls upon the instinct to work, build, learn, and improve and asks the viewer to take on responsibilities in return for a later reward. Public Television, to which the Commission has devoted its major attention, includes all that is of human interest and importance which is not arranged for formal instruction.¹⁸

The preceding paragraph contains a major element of our pre-1967 definition of public broadcasting; the notion that instructional and public television are not the same as commercial television and that they are "alternative" services to commercial television programming.

The Commission, it should be noted, did not include an explanation of why it deleted educational radio broadcasting from its discussion regarding the future of educational broadcasting. Apparently, the focus of the research was television, and perhaps this was a reflection of the obsession of the new medium by the American public.

Prior to the publication of the Carnegie Report, a Second National Conference on Long-Range Financing of ETV was organized and held March 5-7, 1967. Based on interviews with those attending the conference, one historian

¹⁸Public Television: A Program For Action, The Report and Recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, Copyright by Carnegie Corporation of New York, (New York: Harper & Kow, Publishers, 1967), pp. 21-22.

said the purpose was to review and react to the report and to make recommendations for further action. The major rationale and importance of the conference was the forming of a consensus among the educational broadcasters on the recommendations of Carnegie I, so that any legislature proposals created as a result of the Commission's recommendations would have a legitimate basis.¹⁹

In summary, a concept of Public Broadcasting prior to 1967 must include the following defining characteristics: a loose federation of educational broadcast stations and instructional audiovisual associations that slowly developed the ability to unify and to successfully obtain "special consideration" status from an administrative government agency; that had a common vision of the importance and potential of telecommunication services to American society; that incrementally developed a structure with links to federal, state, and local government; and which were the recipient of strong support from all levels of society, and particularly from a few dedicated individuals and foundations.

This federation of educational broadcasting stations grew to number 124 by 1967 and was "nonprofit" and "noncommercial" in nature. These terms developed through the FCC rule making process of establishing a special class of licenses and were reinforced through the Facilities Act and through the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

In addition to these characteristics, the pre-1967 definition must include the 1949 self-definition that suggests educational broadcasting in a democracy was essential part and necessary supplement to education and public communication.

PART III

PUBLIC BROADCASTING AS ILL-DEFINED BY THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967. SUBSEQUENT INTERPRETATIONS TO THE 1980 CARNEGIE REPORT

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967

It is generally recognized that the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-129, 81 Congress, an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934) was the most significant noncommercial broadcast legislation in the history of public broadcasting. One author suggested that the 1967 Act marked the beginning of Public Broadcasting's modern history.²⁰

The legislation was a compromise between House and Senate bills and was signed into law Nov. 7, 1967, only eight months after introduction. The 1967 Act was thus signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson the same year and with the same session of Congress that initially reviewed the Carnegie Commission's 1967 report. Johnson was a strong supporter of legislation that advanced education and even suggested a "great network of knowledge" was

²⁰Steve Millard, "The Story of Public Broadcasting," Broadcasting, November 8, 1971, p. 30.

desirable for the country.²¹

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 contained three parts. Part I extended the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962 (a three year, \$38 million dollar package). Part II established the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (a nonprofit publicly chartered corporation). Part III authorized \$500,000 dollars for a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio to determine how much and to what extent federal aid should be allocated to develop it.

The 1967 Act amended the Communications Act of 1934 in several ways which are relevant to a search for defining characteristics of Public Broadcasting. First, it enunciated a Congressional Declaration of Policy regarding the federal government's firm commitment to supporting noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes.

Secondly, in addition to this commitment, Part IV, Subpart C, Section 397 of the Communications Act, as amended, provided some relevant definitions:

Section 397

(5) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(7) The term "noncommercial educational broadcast station" means a television or radio broadcast station, which (A) under the rules and regulations of the Federal

²¹Congressional Record, CXIII, 29320,29382,30198.

Communications Commission in effect on the date of enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is eligible to be licensed or is licensed by the Commission as a noncommercial educational radio or television broadcast station and which is owned and operated by a public agency or nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association or (B) is owned and operated by a municipality and which transmits only noncommercial programs for educational purposes.

(9) The term "educational television or radio programs" means programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes.

It is also important to note that Section 399 of the '34 Act, as amended at the time, stated that no noncommercial educational broadcasting station could engage in editorializing or support or approve any candidate for political office (these issues will be addressed later).

Finally, it should be noted that the term "public broadcasting" did not appear in the language of any statute beyond the title of the '67 Act. The source of this term brings the discussion back to the strategy meetings of the 1967 Carnegie Commission, which will be addressed in the next section.

At this point, public broadcasting had not been legislatively defined as a specific term, only in terms of "noncommercial educational broadcasting."

The Altered Course

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 is significant for another reason beyond the official support of the federal government for noncommercial educational broadcasting, the formation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the

extension of the Facilities Act, the authorization to study instructional media, the ambiguous legislative terms, the failure to allow editorializing, or the failure to provide long-term funding for the new Corporation. The 1967 Act was significant because it may have altered the philosophical course of educational broadcasting development.

The name of the 1967 Act is, to some degree, symbolic of the way Congress embraced the conclusions and recommendations of the Carnegie Commission; not by agreeing with every specific recommendation, but with the philosophical orientation of the Carnegie Commission that perceived the mission of noncommercial educational broadcasting in American society to be an "alternative" program service to the established commercial stations.

The first sentence of its report states: "A well-financed and well-directed system, substantially larger and far more pervasive and effective than that which now exists in the United States, must be brought into being if the full needs of the American public are to be served."²² This was a central conclusion, and all of its recommendations were designed accordingly. The commission further explained:

If we were to sum up our proposal with all the brevity at our command, we would say that what we recommend is freedom. We seek freedom from the constraints, however necessary in their context, of commercial television. We

²²Public Television: A Program for Action, The Report and Recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, p. 3.

seek for educational television freedom from the pressures of inadequate funds. We seek for the artist, the technician, the journalist, the scholar, and the public servant freedom to create, freedom to innovate, freedom to be heard in this far-reaching medium. We seek for the citizen freedom to view, to see programs that the present system, by its incompleteness, denies him.²³

The notion of an "alternative system" to commercial broadcasting was clearly established. In doing so, the commission coined the term "Public Television" to distinguish between its main topic and Instructional Television and Commercial Television.

Why the term "Public Television" was used is subject to some debate. Commission members admitted that the name troubled them from the beginning, and that it sounded too forbidding; it called to mind the schoolroom and the lecture hall; and many individuals would be frightened away from educational channels.²⁴ The commission, on the third

²³A strong rebuttal to the coining of the term "public broadcasting," and to this statement specifically is made by Robert J. Blakely in his book, *To Serve the Public Interest: Educational Broadcasting in the United States*, pp. 170-178. He says, "What is missing in this eloquent summary? The producer, the educator, and the 'public servant' are all considered. But missing is the explicit inclusion of the citizen's freedom to do more than 'to view, to see programs'. Missing is his freedom to learn by practicing the government of his affairs, private and public, by his own use of 'this most far-reaching medium'." The Carnegie report does not include the concept of television as the people's instrument to present grievances, to be heard and seen, to explain, to express, to use television as a means of communication in action to pursue the most serious personal and social goals. He also agreed that the term "public television" was "a name without a concept." This latter view taken from Les Brown, *Television: The Business Behind the Box*, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1971) p. 319.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 15.

page of its report, said it intended to deal with educational programming directed toward the general public. It would propose further study of instructional television in formal education settings.

However, the second Carnegie Commission, A public Trust (1979), states: "A new term, Public Television, was introduced to dramatize the emphasis on programming for general enrichment and information as well as for classroom instruction."²⁵

Wood and Wylie point out another reason or rationale for the term "Public Television." They suggest that because the Carnegie Corporation had earlier in the century almost single-handedly guaranteed the establishment of the concept of free public libraries around the country, that it was obvious that the analogy between free public libraries and free public television was to be emphasized by the adoption of the term.²⁶

Finally, Burke points out that there were three major policy problems that the 1967 Carnegie Commission had to deal with: instructional broadcasting, networking versus local broadcasting, and the government's role in the financing of public television. His research showed that the exclusion of instructional broadcasting from the

²⁵A Public Trust: The Report of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting, 1979, p. 35.

²⁶Donald D. Wood, and Donald G. Wylie, Educational Telecommunications, (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1977) p.65.

Commission's final report was a decision that was made early in the development of the project. Two reasons were given for this: (1) the educators on the commission felt strongly that the instructional aspect of broadcasting needed re-examination because it had thus far not proven itself, and (2) the commission felt that the task of dealing with both "instructional" and "public" television, as they defined them, would prove to be too great a project.²⁷

Clearly, it can be seen that the development of an "alternative" broadcast network was greatly aided by the emphasis given to the general interest programming part of educational broadcasting by the 1967 Carnegie Commission.

The goal of that Carnegie Commission seems to have been to get an approved educational broadcast system in operation in the United States, and the enactment of legislation to authorize government support of educational broadcasting.

Achievement of these goals through the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 may have led to an altered evolutionary course for noncommercial educational broadcasting in the United States. As we have seen, the incremental steps through which noncommercial education broadcasting developed were made up of FCC rulings and Congressional actions, and were taken to develop the

²⁷Report of the Second National Conference on Long-Range Financing of ETV. Cited by Burke, Part II, p. 184.

potential educational aspects of noncommercial broadcasting--not to develop a media of mass communications. Historically then, the emphasis had not been on the development of an alternative service to commercial broadcasters, now was there a drive to establish a large national structure beyond that necessary to interconnect the stations.

The two national conferences on the long-range financing of educational broadcasting showed that the common drive was to get more money for educational stations, perhaps federal money.

Therefore, following the passage of the 1967 Act, the chronic or enduring problems of what was recognized as Public Television began to emerge. The public system had a name, but no identity. Douglas Cater, who worked as President Johnson's assistant on the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, remarked in 1972:

In retrospect, we were overly optimistic to believe that public broadcasting in the U.S. would find its own identity. Too little account was taken, by the Killian (Carnegie) Commission, the White House, or Congress, of the frailties of the system we were seeking to nurture. It was hardly a system at all, but rather a variety of broadcasting arrangements bearing a common name and yet widely differing in structure, financing, concept of role, and degree of independence.²⁸

These differences have, of course, led to a variety of interpretations of what public broadcasting was or what it

²⁸Douglas Cater, "Public TV: What hope for progress? The politics of public TV," Columbia Journalism Review, July/August 1972, p. 10.

should have been.

The Meaning of "Non commercial"

As indicated earlier, the term "public broadcasting" does not appear, beyond the title of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, in any of the legislative history of the Communications Act of 1934. Branscomb suggests that: "Policymakers have deliberately declined to define public or noncommercial broadcasting functions very explicitly for fear of opening the Pandora's box of programming control--an issue fraught with First Amendment concerns and connotations."²⁹

For whatever reason, the term was not legislatively defined. The only source for one was the 1967 Carnegie Commission; a definition which excluded instructional broadcasting and public radio.

However, there were several definitions to come out of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 which have already been shown: nonprofit, noncommercial educational broadcast stations, and educational television or radio programs.

The term "nonprofit" was explicitly defined. The terms "noncommercial" and "educational" were open to interpretation. The attorney also suggested that while it

²⁹Anne N. Branscomb, "A Crisis of Identity: Reflections on the Future of Public Broadcasting," in The Future of Public Broadcasting, ed. by Douglas Cater (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976), p. 9.

seemed clear that the noncommercial educational stations were not to operate at a profit or program explicit advertising messages, "substantial inroads toward commercialism have been made in the attribution of support from commercial sources, in the solicitation of funds on the air for the support of the station, and in the carriage of nostalgia programming containing commercial announcements.³⁰

Regarding commercial credits, 47 CFR 73.621 (d) note 1 provided at that time that: "the person or organization furnishing or producing the program, or providing funds for its production, shall be identified by name only." Efforts within the Public Broadcasting Service by 1980 sought an FCC ruling allowing the use of corporate logos along with name announcements before sponsored programs; the idea was to encourage program sponsorship and increase quality programming.³¹ James Lopes, president of KCET (TV) Los Angeles, announced that he was going beyond corporate underwriting and was considering having his station sell time for commercials that would be "institutional in nature." The announcement, he admitted, was made in reaction to a proposed 25 percent budget cut by the Ronald

³⁰Ibid., p. 13.

³¹"PBS proposal to allow corporate logos gets first OK," Broadcasting, (November 3, 1980) p. 71.

Reagan administration.³³

Solicitation of contributions for the station's own benefit was permitted by law to a limited degree. 47 CFR 73.621 note 4 stated that "credit announcements during 'auction' broadcasts may identify particular products or services, but shall not include promotion of such products or services beyond that necessary for the specific auction purpose." The "auction" this ruling applied to was the popular form of money raising for community owned stations where consumer products and services, which have been donated to the station, were sold to call-in bidders. The amendment allowing auctions certainly weakened the prohibition of commercial uses of stations by noncommercial educational broadcasters.

The final inroad toward commercialization of noncommercial stations was in the area of nostalgia programming containing commercial matter. An FCC informal ruling, WBJC-FM, 40 FCC. 2d 936 (1973), permitted the use of old commercials whenever the program concerns radio history or whenever the old commercials were an integral part of the nostalgia appeal of the program. The commercials were also acceptable if they were for products or services which were not longer available to the public.

³³Branscomb, "A Crisis of Identity: Reflections on the Future of Public Broadcasting," p. 10.

Federal Regulations Defining the
Purpose of Noncommercial
Educational Broadcast Stations

Federal Communication Commission regulations are another source of enduring characteristics or elements of noncommercial educational broadcasting that will help establish a more complete definition of post-1967 public broadcasting.

During 1967-80, Title 47 CFR 73.621 governed the licensing of television channels. It states, in part:

(a)... noncommercial educational broadcast stations will be licensed only to nonprofit educational organizations upon showing that the proposed stations will be used primarily to serve the educational needs of the community; for the advancement of educational programs; and to furnish a nonprofit and noncommercial television broadcast service.

(b) Noncommercial educational television broadcast stations may transmit educational, cultural and entertaining programs, and programs designed for use by schools and school systems in connection with regular school courses, as well as routine and administrative material pertaining thereto.

Branscomb suggests that it is clear the FCC Commissioners had an overriding concern that the reserved television channels be used for educational purposes. She also believed it was apparent that something more than strictly educational and instructional programming was contemplated and quotes former Commissioner Hennock as saying educational stations could:

...supply a beneficial complement to commercial telecasting. Providing for greater diversity in television programming, then will be particularly attractive to the many specialized and minority interests in the community, cultural as well as educational, which tend to be bypassed by commercial broadcasters speaking in terms of mass

audiences.³³

This notion is supported by the FCC's Sixth Report and Order (17 FR 3909, 1952) hearings on the reservation of noncommercial channels. The FCC stated that it had taken into consideration evidence of the potential of educational television both for in-school and adult education, and as an alternative to commercial programming.

Federal Regulations Which Promote
Special Problems For Noncommercial
Educational or Public Broadcasting

Federal regulations and agency rules present confusing issues to those determined to define or trace the concept of Public Broadcasting in terms of post-1967 Communication Act developments. To that end, five areas will be discussed briefly: editorializing, ascertainment of community needs, political programming, controversial issue programming and fiscal and policy control.

Editorializing

As stated earlier, Section 399 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, declared that: "No noncommercial educational broadcasting station may engage in editorializing or may support or oppose any candidate for political office."

Burke, in his historical/chronological account of the events leading to the passage of the Public Broadcasting

³³Branscomb, "A Crisis of Identity: Reflections on the Future of Public Broadcasting," p. 10.

audiences.³³

This notion is supported by the FCC's Sixth Report and Order (17 FR 3909, 1952) hearings on the reservation of noncommercial channels. The FCC stated that it had taken into consideration evidence of the potential of educational television both for in-school and adult education, and as an alternative to commercial programming.

Federal Regulations Which Promote
Special Problems For Noncommercial
Educational or Public Broadcasting

Federal regulations and agency rules present confusing issues to those determined to define or trace the concept of Public Broadcasting in terms of post-1967 Communication Act developments. To that end, five areas will be discussed briefly: editorializing, ascertainment of community needs, political programming, controversial issue programming and fiscal and policy control.

Editorializing

As stated earlier, Section 399 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, declared that: "No noncommercial educational broadcasting station may engage in editorializing or may support or oppose any candidate for political office."

Burke, in his historical/chronological account of the events leading to the passage of the Public Broadcasting

³³Branscomb, "A Crisis of Identity: Reflections on the Future of Public Broadcasting," p. 10.

Act of 1967, concluded in an observtion about the Act itself, that the anti-editorializing part of the legislation was a basic "flaw" that weakened the Act.³⁴

Going further, Washington attorney Daniel Toohey suggested that Section 399 was probably unconstitutional. He said the original purpose of the section was to "prevent Congress from creating a monster (public broadcasting) that might someday turn on its creator. Therefore, to achieve its own self-protective ends, Congress simply legislated away a significant part of educational broadcasters' right of free speech."³⁵

Ten years later, on Oct. 6, 1977, in an apparent effort to right a possible wrong, the Office of the White House Press Secretary released a message from President Jimmy Carter to Congress. Known as H.R. 9620, the message was a series of proposals designed to "strengthen our Public Broadcasting System and to insulate it from political manipulation." One of the specific proposals of the bill was to encourage journalistic independence of the public broadcasters by permitting them to editorialize and to participate in the free marketplace of ideas.³⁶

³⁴Burke, "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967--Part III, pp. 265-266.

³⁵Daniel W. Toohey, "Section 399: The Constitution Giveth and Congress Taketh Away," Educational Broadcasting Review 6 (February 1972): p. 36.

³⁶President Jimmy Carter, in a message to Congress, released October 6, 1977, by the White House Press Secretary, p. 7.

Carter's bill was not accepted, and the legislation that passed, Public Law 950567 (HR 12605), represented a compromise between the goals set out for the public broadcasting system by President Carter and an alternative drafted in Congress.³⁷

Senator Harrison Schmidt, R-N.M. is reported to have said regarding editorializing for public stations, "This is a completely inappropriate authority for public broadcasting, and we shall do everything we can to assure that the House position does not prevail."³⁸

Ascertainment of Community Needs

The Communications Act of 1934 (Public Law 416, 73rd Congress), as amended, is the statute through which Congress exercises its jurisdiction over interstate communication by wire or radio. The statute also created the Federal Communications Commission as an administrative agency to regulate communication by wire or radio in the public convenience, interest, and necessity. In this capacity (during the 1967-80 period) the FCC licensed broadcast stations for three-year periods, after which time the broadcaster applied for a license renewal.

Because of this procedure and because of the licensing period, the stations were actually "public trustees"; the

³⁷Congressional Quarterly, vol. XXXIV 1978, p. 492. This legislation became the Public Telecommunications Financing Act of 1978.

³⁸Ibid., pg. 995.

government allowed successful applicants to own a station, but it entrusted a portion of the electromagnetic spectrum to use for the trustee's business, which had to be operated in the "public interest".

After the FCC published the Ascertainment Primer (27 FCC 2d 650, 682) in 1971, commercial broadcasters followed a suggested procedure when applying for an initial license, or a renewal: (1) interviewing of community leaders by station management; (2) a general survey of the public in the geographical area served by the station; (3) a statement of need ascertained by the two surveys; and (4) a statement of programming designed to serve those needs.

In the early 1976, the FCC adopted ascertainment requirements for noncommercial educational or public broadcasting stations, and their procedure became similar to commercial stations.

The fascinating point to this particular discussion involves an alleged conflict between the ascertainment requirements for noncommercial educational or public broadcasting stations and the Carnegie Commission's interpretation of the mission of public television as an "alternative" service to the commercial programming in the United States. Branscomb explains:

Actually, the entire concept of alternative programming is in conflict with the basic requirement that all licenses operate as public trustees. Indeed, if the commercial licenses were meeting all the needs of the community, then there would be no need for alternative programming. Furthermore, if a noncommercial educational license is "a public trustee," then these licenses should

be required to ascertain the problems, needs and interests of all of the citizens in the community and to design this programming service to serve all of those ascertained needs.³⁹

Political Programming

There may be another conflict which contributes to some confusion regarding regulations covering political programming for noncommercial educational or public broadcasting stations.

The Campaign Communications Reform Act of 1971 amended Section 312(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 and authorized the FCC to revoke broadcast licenses "for willful or repeated failure to allow reasonable access or to permit purchase of reasonable amounts of time for the use of a broadcast station by a legally qualified candidate for federal elective office on behalf of his candidacy." The Act required that commercial licenses make time available at their lowest unit rate. Since noncommercial stations did not have advertising rates, the FCC permitted a charge by noncommercial stations for production services but not for time.

The possible conflict arises because the Campaign Reform Act required noncommercial educational or public broadcasters to not fail, if asked, to provide time or reasonable access for federal candidates, but Internal

³⁹Branscomb, "A Crisis of Identity: Reflections on the Future of Public Broadcasting," p. 19.

Revenue tax regulations (Section 4945) prohibited nonprofit educational or public noncommercial broadcast stations from participating or intervening in any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

Toohey, Marks, and Lutzker commended on this dilemma and suggested that because tax regulations (between 1967-80) permitted charitable organizations to analyze, study, research, and disseminate legislation so long as the organization did not advocate or campaign for the attainment of any particular legislation or attempt to influence passage or defeat, and because Section 399 of the 1934 Communications Act prohibited noncommercial educational or public broadcasters from either endorsing or opposing a particular candidate, "it is likely that the interpretation finally given the Internal Revenue Code will be compatible with the objectives of the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971."⁴⁰

Controversial Issue Programming

There may also be ambiguity in federal statutes that hinder a clear definition of public broadcasting following the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

This conflict or confusion is in the area of controversial issue programming by noncommercial educational or

⁴⁰Daniel W. Toohey, Richard D. Marks, and Arnold P. Lutzker, Legal Problems in Broadcasting: Identification and Analysis of Selection Issues (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1974), p. 152.

public broadcasting stations. The statutes involved are Sections 315(a) which stated in part, "Nothing... shall be construed as relieving broadcasters... from the obligation imposed upon them under this (1934) Act (as amended) to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." Section 396(g)(1)(A) was intended to insure that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which was not a broadcast licensee and therefore not subject to FCC jurisdiction, would use public funds to promote programming that was consistent with the philosophy of the Fairness Doctrine.

The Fairness Doctrine (13 FCC 1246) of 1949 and later the Fairness Primer (29 Fed. Reg. 10415) of 1964 were attempts to clarify the handling of editorials and controversial issues of public importance by American broadcasters.

The problem was that "objectivity" and "balance" were terms that were highly ambiguous in Section 396, and the phrase "programs or series of programs" could be broadly interpreted.

It would seem that noncommercial educational or public broadcasts, while they were required by law to be fair and present balanced programming, had very ambiguous but strict guidelines to follow. While commercial broadcasters had the FCC's efforts to clarify the Fairness Doctrine, the CPB had little clarification.

Fiscal and Policy Control

During the 1967-80 historical period, three major entities beyond Congress and the present exercised substantial fiscal and policy control over noncommercial educational or public broadcasting: (1) the broadcast licensees--through their diversity in ownership, structure, and philosophical orientation. (2) The Federal Communication Commission--through its specific licensing authority and its broad authority to provide for an integrated communications system for the nation (see Section 1 Communications Act of 1934, as amended). No other federal agency was given specific regulatory authority over noncommercial licenses. (3) The Corporation for Public Broadcasting--The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 created the CPB as a funding agency designed to receive funds from Congress and to dispense them to other entities to develop and to promote programming sources.

Limited control and influence also was influenced by: Public Broadcasting Service--The CPB, within its authority under Section 396(g) (1) (B) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended to develop a system of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs, developed the Public Broadcasting Service. National Public Radio--which developed a program production, distribution and interconnection system for noncommercial educational radio states.

The point of enumerating these three is to provide contrast to the 1967 Carnegie report that envisioned a single agency (CPB) that would retain policy and fiscal control.⁴¹

Chronic Problems

There appears to be several chronic problems or issues that continually resurface in discussions of noncommercial educational or public broadcasting. This thesis cannot provide extensive historical background into these problems/issues, but it can generally outline them as they are definitional aspects to noncommercial educational or Public Broadcasting following the Carnegie I report and passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. The four problems/issues to be reviewed include: localism and centralism, federal funding and political insulation, structure, and instructional media.

Centralism and Localism

The Carnegie I report suggested that local stations would have three primary sources of programming: from national production centers, key stations, and their own local productions.⁴²

The stations would be interconnected, and the local stations would have the option of either immediately

⁴¹Public Television: A Program For Action, p. 3.

⁴²Ibid., p. 5.

rebroadcasting programs, delaying their broadcast, or not broadcast them at all. The Commission's report indicated that localism was the heart of the proposal, and that like a good newspaper, "the local stations will reflect the entire nation and the world, while maintaining a firm grasp upon the nature and the needs of the people it serves."⁴³

At that time, a new agency in the executive branch was created called the Office of Telecommunication Policy (OTP). Congress authorized OTP to oversee the use of broadcasting channels assigned to federal government use and to advise the president on electronic communications, including cable television and domestic satellites. Clay T. Whitehead was its director, and during a 1971 speech to the National Association of Educational Broadcasters he said that the CPB was too much of a "centralizing authority" for public broadcasting, that it was contrary to the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act's emphasis on localism, and that long-range funding was in the distant future if public broadcasting remained structured as it was.⁴⁴

Whitehead may have been reacting to the public affairs programming produced nationally through CPB and delivered to local stations (by PBS) for rebroadcast. His notion was that such centrally produced programming was eroding local

⁴³Ibid., p. 87.

⁴⁴Slay T. Whitehead, "Local Autonomy and the Fourth Network: Striking a Balance," Educational Broadcasting Review 5, No. 6 (December 1971).

service to American citizens. He called PBS an emergent "centralized, national network."

Millard points out, however, that centralization and national networking are not the same thing.

"Centralization is a way of operating, a structure; it was clearly unacceptable to those who framed public broadcasting's charger. National service, on the other hand, defines a kind of reach and impact; it is absolutely fundamental to the goals those who initiated this new medium hoped it would reach."⁴⁵

Funding and Political Insulation

Money has always been an important, if not critical, factor of public broadcasting, noncommercial educational broadcasting or instructional broadcasting. Earlier in the thesis, it was briefly noted that early radio laboratories had trouble existing because in some cases they had no real sources of income. The early collective efforts of the noncommercial educational broadcasters led to the organization of the National Conferences on Long-Range Funding, which led to the Carnegie Commission that proposed federal aid for public broadcasters. Before that, there were the specifically directed funds provided by the federal government through the Facilities Act and by the Ford Foundation and others. In addition to being nonprofit, the stations

⁴⁵Steve Millard, "The Story of Public Broadcasting," p. 36.

were noncommercial; they were not revenue generating enterprises.

Douglas Cater, in 1972, expressed his conclusion regarding the chronic money problem: "One fact of life seems to me fundamental: the political predicament of public broadcasting is inextricably tied up with its economic plight."⁴⁶ He then went on to discuss a progress report by Wilbur Schramm and Lyle Nelson of Stanford which showed that the average public broadcasting station was, in 1971, worse off financially than before the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act was passed and federal support granted.

The essence of the issues regarding funding and political insulation for noncommercial educational or public broadcasting was how much control the federal government would develop over the system if it provided operational funding.

It might have been natural that the 1967 Carnegie commissioners feared that sponsorship might lead to control, and therefore decided to ask Congress to fund public broadcasting through an excise tax on television receivers sold in the United States, rather than receive funds on a year-to-year Congressional appropriation. To provide political insulation, the 1967 Commission also recommended the formation of a federally chartered, nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation empowered to receive and disburse governmental

⁴⁶Steve Millard, "The Story of Public Broadcasting," p. 36.

and private funds to develop programming.⁴⁷

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 approved the creation of the proposed corporation, and it became known as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). The Act did not approve the excise tax idea for revenue gathering and the CPB was funded by annual appropriations. The public system, therefore, gained part of its national structure, but did not avoid the Congressional review process or escape the effects of world politics.

President Johnson, who can be given a great deal of credit for aiding the passage of the 1967 Act, could not keep his promise to support the corporation and propose long-term financing for the public system, perhaps because the United States' entanglement in the Vietnam War and its escalating costs. However, noting the need to study the matter further, he proposed short-term funding in a message to Congress.⁴⁸

Later, Richard Nixon's administration was reported to have intimidated public broadcasting through the actions of Clay Whitehead and the OTP office. In 1972, Nixon vetoed a bill authorizing an appropriation for the CPB of \$155 million for two years (\$65 million for 1973 and \$90 million for 1974). The reason for the veto was his perception that

⁴⁷Public Television: A Program for Action, pp. 8 and 36.

⁴⁸Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Lyndon Johnson 1968-69, Book I, document 54.

the public broadcasting system was no longer really serving the local stations; it was too centralized. He then asked Congress for a one-year extension of \$455 million.⁴⁹

As a result of the veto, and because of the political and financial pressure placed on the public system at this time, the Station Program Cooperative SPC was created. Also created was CPB's Task Force on Long-Range Funding of Public Broadcasting. This task force took the administration's feelings into consideration and came up with a five-year plan.⁵⁰

Nixon, dismayed over the fact the Senate Watergate hearings were carried in prime time by the public system, and its announcement of intentions to broadcast any impeachment hearings should the president go on trial, let the draft legislation go unattended.⁵¹

Only after efforts by Senator Magnuson, Clay Whitehead, White House Chief of Staff Alexander M. Haig, Jr., and other aides did Nixon announce he would support long-range funding legislation.⁵²

In August 1974, when Nixon resigned and Gerald R. Ford became president, two bills had still not been acted upon.

⁴⁹Blakely, To Serve The Public Interest: Educational Broadcasting in the United States, p. 205.

⁵⁰Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Report of the Task Force on Long-Range Financing of Public Broadcasting (Washington, D.C.: 1973).

⁵¹New York Times, Jan. 10 and 16, 1974.

⁵²New York Times, July 17 and 21, 1974.

One was the Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1974 (Senate bill 3825, 93rd Congress, 2nd Session), which supported the notion of multi-year appropriations for public broadcasters. The bill allowed them to plan years in advance, and at the same time provided insulation from government interference through reactions to programming decisions.

The other bill was the Telecommunications Facilities Act (Senate bill 93-4223), which extended the Educational Broadcasting Facilities Act for five years and authorized demonstrations of health, education, and social services programs transmitted by cable and domestic satellite.

In 1975, President Ford submitted to Congress a White House bill (Senate bill 94-893) on financing public broadcasting. On New Years Eve, 1975, he signed into law the Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-192). Advance funding was awarded: \$78 million for 1976, then \$103 million for 1977, \$107,150,000 for 1978, and \$120.2 million for 1979.

A few months later, the Educational Broadcasting Facilities and Telecommunications Demonstration Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-309) was passed. Through that legislation, Congress authorized \$30 million in 1977 for the broadcasting facilities matching program and \$1 million for the nonbroadcast demonstration program.

There was little complaint regarding the 1976 Facilities and Telecommunication Act. There were, however,

several points raised about the 1975 Public Broadcasting Financing Act. Blakely reports five limitations or drawbacks to the legislation. First, the final act did not preserve the very important feature of combined five-year authorization and appropriation; appropriations were to be provided in separate legislation. Secondly, by requiring CPB to submit an annual report to the president, and by requiring separate appropriation, Congress was treated CPB as a government agency, which the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act specified it should not be. Third, the act was not really long-range (funding), just mid-range. Fourth, even if appropriations equalled authorizations, the amounts provided were well below the documented needs of the public broadcasting system. And fifth, to receive maximum appropriations the system would have to raise money in advance from nonfederal sources at a \$1 to \$2.50 formula, which the public system could find hard to meet.⁵³

Other observers felt the public system needed reappraisal. When James R. Killian, Jr. resigned from the CPB board in 1975, he promoted the idea that another Carnegie-type study of public broadcasting was needed. The idea was advanced by others and the next year the Carnegie Corporation was approached with the idea. They, in turn, set up a task force to study the possible directions for

⁵³Blakely, To Serve the Public Interest: Educational Broadcasting in the United States, p. 210.

such a second commission. In June, after the task force report was studied, the corporation announced the formation of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting.⁵⁴

The second Carnegie Commission issued its report in 1979 but failed to initiate any legislation. The Commission issued a supplementary report in July 1980 which advanced a plan for a public cable network. That report generally received a cool reaction and, again, initiated no legislation. These two reports will be discussed in detail in a following section.

Finally, money problems and politics continued to be a priority issue with public broadcasters. The Feb. 16, 1981, issue of Broadcasting magazine reported that the new Reagan administration was considering a 25-percent reduction in the CPB budget for fiscal 1982, and perhaps further reductions after that.

Structure

The total number of noncommercial educational or public broadcasting stations licensed in the United States in 1978 was 280. Twenty-six percent of them were licensed to community organizations, 27 percent were university owned, 40 percent owned by a state authority, and seven

⁵⁴A Public Trust: The Report of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting, p. 3.

percent licensed to local authorities.⁵⁵

As noted before, this federation of broadcast stations was brought together through collective efforts which culminated in their obtaining "special status" before the FCC, which created a special class of stations called "noncommercial educational" stations.

The effort to obtain federal support led to the passage of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act. The Act was essentially legislative enactment of the recommendations of the 1967 Carnegie Report, with some exceptions.

Following the passage of the 1967 Act, a structure of educational or public broadcasting began to emerge.

The 1967 Act established the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, a fifteen member nongovernmental and non-profit corporation which had the general responsibility to diversity and expand programming production, develop systems of station interconnection, and expand the system of stations. It received and distributed federal and private money to meet those goals, primarily through a variety of types of grants: Program production grants for general interest programs that merit national distribution and to support specific programs of regional or local interest; Program development grants to stations that need funds to plan, research, and/or produce pilot programs for a proposed series; Community Service Grants to stations

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 329.

to be used for purposes of their own choosing; Station Program Grants given to stations to increase the number of programs they can purchase through the Station Program Cooperative; PBS interconnection grants to PBS to pay for expenses for interconnection; National Public Radio interconnection and programming grants to public radio; Minority training grants; Research grants; Cooperative Grants for the Arts; and Task force and project funding for long-range planning and policy reports.⁵⁶

The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) managed the distribution of programs over a delivery system furnished to CPB. It was a representative organization of the public television stations, was governed by two boards (one of managers of public stations and the other lay members of the local stations, was governed by two boards (one of managers of public stations and the other lay members of the local stations' boards) and it has its own staff. It received funds from the CPB and operated under contract to it.⁵⁷

This national structure encompassed state (state university and state Department of Education) networks, regional public networks, and of course, the particular local structure of each station.

⁵⁶Wood and Wylie, Educational Telecommunications, pp. 101-102.

⁵⁷Public Broadcasting Service Factsheet, undated memo, circulated July 1974. Cited by Wood and Wylie.

The structure also incorporates an interconnection system through the use of satellite technology in addition to the standard ground delivery system.

Instructional Media

Following the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and the subsequent acknowledgement that the term "public broadcasting" excluded "instructional broadcasting" and "commercial broadcasting," and following the consensus that the general mission of the new public broadcasting system was to provide an "alternative" programming service outside the immediate focus of the leaders (both legislative and CPB) of the public broadcasting movement, the instructional media movement stalled.

However, one of the recommendations of the first Carnegie Commission was to continue study to improve instructional television.⁵⁸

One of the three parts of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 was an authorization of \$500,000 for a comprehensive study of instructional television. The six-point finished report, presented to Congress in 1970, failed to generate any legislation.⁵⁹

⁵⁸Public Television: A Program for Action, p. 3.

⁵⁹To Improve Learning: A Report to the President and Congress of the United States, Commission on Instructional Technology, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1970.

With the new terms and categories of programming of the 1967 Carnegie Commission, and the emphasis on "alternative" "public broadcasting" programs, the instructional educational aspect of "public broadcasting" (education programming not arranged for formal instruction) began to diminish. Wood and Wylie traced the demise of the sequential series programs which built upon one another and thus enabled the program to get into great detail regarding a specific topic.⁶⁰ By 1975, there were very few of these programs broadcast to the general public.

It might have been that the continued emphasis of public broadcasting on cultural and public affairs programming caused some ill-feelings among the legislatively defined federation of noncommercial educational broadcasters.

The Congressional Declaration of Policy regarding public broadcasting state, in part, in Section 396(a)(1) of the Communication Act of 1934, as amended by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 "that is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes;..."

To meet this goal, the CPB in 1974 authorized a study of the role of CPB in the relationship between public broadcasting and education. The task force, an advisory

⁶⁰Wood and Wylie, Educational Telecommunications, p. 117.

council to CPB, submitted its report to CPB in 1975; it included eleven basic recommendations based on the general premise the the CPB should become involved in formal education.⁶¹

Reactions were cool toward the recommendations because many educators did not perceive that CPB was the appropriate agency to resolve the complex problems of developing strong instructional programming, even though it was legally empowered to do so.⁶²

Coupled with the fact that CPB philosophically was not instructionally oriented, and the recommendations were not a program for action which allowed room for alternatives or amendments, there was little instructional broadcast development on a national scale between 1967-80.

⁶¹Public Broadcasting and Education: A Report to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from the Advisory Council of National Organizations. (Washington D.C., March 1975), pp. 6-9.

⁶²James A. Fellows, "Public Broadcasting and Education: Much Ado About Everything," Public Telecommunications Review, July/Auigust, 1967, p. 6.

Selected Interpretations and Recommendations
Regarding the Future of Public Broadcasting

Certainly an important defining characteristic of the term "public broadcasting" (following the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and subsequent interpretations of the term to 1980) has been the interjection of the word "telecommunication" in interpretations and definitions.

The word telecommunication is derived from the Greek, tele, meaning far off or at a distance. Communication is derived from the Latin, communicare, which means to make common, or held in common. Conjoined, in English form, the term means to operate or communicate across or at a distance.⁶³ Generally, the term is applied to the near instantaneous or high-speed exchange of information from one point to another, from one point to several points; or from several points to one point and possibly from several points to several other points.⁶⁴

This section of the thesis will explore the use and meaning of this term in legislation and in reports regarding the future of Public Broadcasting (or noncommercial educational broadcasting).

The Public Telecommunications Act of 1978
 (PL95-567)HR12605

The Act contained three parts: Title I--Construction and Planning of Facilities; Title II--Telecommunications Demonstrations; and Title III--Corporation for Public

⁶³Eric Partridge, Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English, (New York: Greenwich House, 1983), pp. 112 and 834.

⁶⁴T. Muth, J. Reagan, J. Sexton, and V. Skelton, "Telecommunications in the U.S.: A Historical Sketch," paper assembled for use in TC-120: Telecommunication in the U.S., Department of Telecommunication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. (Mimeographed), 1976.

Broadcasting.

For the facilities program, the Act authorized appropriations of \$40 million for each of the fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. The Act also transferred the program from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of Commerce. Eligibility for grants under the program were extended to include nonprofit services.

The Act authorized \$1 million annually for fiscal years 1979-81 for nonbroadcast public telecommunications demonstration projects, in which public broadcasters were to experiment with new technologies and services.

Finally, Title III authorized \$180 million for fiscal 1981, \$200 million for 1982, and \$220 million for 1983 for the CPB. It also required the public system to raise \$2 for every \$1 in federal funds that it received (down from \$2.50). Other sections required the public broadcast system to institute a uniform system of accounting.

The 1978 Act is relevant to our discussion not only because it was the last noncommercial educational or public broadcast legislation passed during our 1967-80 review period, but because with the authorizations came Congressional language that broadened the scope of responsibility of the CPB. It also contained provisions that sought to promote the achievement of large social goals that went beyond educational services.

The development was seen by Blakely to reflect the trend in government thinking away from traditional

over-the-air broadcasting to what was known as the "wired nation" concept where everyone was "linked" by wire or satellite technology.⁶⁵

It also marks a change of legislative emphasis. The Educational Facilities and Telecommunications Act of 1976 authorized \$30 million for facilities and only \$1 million for the nonbroadcast demonstrations the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) were most interested in.⁶⁶

This emphasis on nonbroadcast services and facilities can be seen in other parts of the 1978 Act: Eligibility for grants under the facilities program is extended to nonprofit educational and cultural organizations primarily engaged in public telecommunications, and Title III broadens the scope of CPB responsibility to include public telecommunications technology, entities and services.

The 1978 Act defines "Public Telecommunications facilities" to be "apparatus necessary for production, interconnection, captioning, broadcast, or other distribution of programming, including but not limited to..." cable, cassettes, discs and others.

"Public Telecommunications entity" means "any enterprise which is (A) a public broadcast station or a

⁶⁵Blakely, To Serve the Public Interest: Educational Broadcasting in the United States, p. 219.

⁶⁶House of Representatives, Report 94-772, 92nd Congress, 1st Session.

noncommercial telecommunications entity; and (B) disseminates public telecommunications services to the public."

"Noncommercial telecommunications entity" means any enterprise which "(A) is owned and operated by a State, a public agency, or a nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association; and (B) has been organized primarily for the purpose of disseminating audio or video noncommercial educational and cultural programs to the public by means other than a primary television or radio broadcast station..."

"Public telecommunication services" means, in addition to broadcast programs, "related noncommercial instructional or informational material that may be transmitted by means of electronic communications."

These definitions are very important to defining non-commercial educational or public broadcasting following the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. The significance lies in the fact that the term "Public Telecommunication entity" encompasses "Public Telecommunications services," which includes both "Instructional" and "Public" broadcast services as envisioned and defined by the first Carnegie Commission prior to the passage of the 1967 Act.

The Second Carnegie Commission Report
on the Future of Public Broadcasting

In 1979, the Carnegie Corporation issued its second report on public broadcasting--A Public Trust: The Report

of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting. It reported public broadcasting's financial, organizational and creative structure to be fundamentally flawed. It also generally encompassed the concept of public broadcasting as an alternative service by stating, "The outcome of the institution of public broadcasting can best be understood as a social dividend of technology, a benefit fulfilling needs that cannot be met by commercial needs."⁶⁷

Carnegie II recommended the replacement of CPB with the Public Telecommunications Trust, a very powerful national authority, whose responsibilities would be to insulate programming decisions from government interference, administer activities to improve public service, and to disperse federal funds.

The Program Service Endorsement, it said, could be another statutory organization and would underwrite a broad range of television and radio productions and explore new applications of telecommunications technology.

The amount of federal funding for public broadcasting would have to be increased substantially, it added, with general revenues as the principal source, and the establishment of a fee on licensed uses of the electromagnetic spectrum, to help offset the necessary increase of funds.

⁶⁷A Public Trust: The Report of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting, p. 11.

In addition, the report outlined the goal of identifying what television and radio could teach best, and then developing programming to maximize that capability.

Finally, the 1979 Carnegie Commission perceived public broadcasting of the future to be: noncommercial, independent, telecommunicational, formally and informally educational: with a strong editorial purpose, and with constant attempts to set standards of excellence and to define a pattern of programming unattainable in commercial broadcasting.⁶⁸

The Follow-up Report
to the Second Carnegie Commission Report

In mid-summer, 1980, the Carnegie Corporation published Keeping PACE With The New Television: Public Television and Changing Technology.

This report recommended that the public broadcast system, through the CPB, establish a new, national, nonprofit pay cable television network for performing arts, culture, and entertainment (PACE). The report claimed that the satellite-delivered network would be consistent with the legislative directives of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act and that it would be self-supporting by the mid-1980's.⁶⁹

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 25-32.

⁶⁹Sheila Mahoney, Nick DeMartino, and Robert Stengel, Keeping PACE With The New Television: Public Television and Changing Technology, p. 45.

One of the six objectives in proposing the pay cable network was to structure a nonbroadcast service that improved the chance of survival and success of the primary broadcast service. Another objective was to devise a financial and organizational structure capable of withstanding the rigors of the marketplace, while maintaining the integrity of public television's noncommercial mission.

The authors believed that the network would be a major bridge for public broadcasting into the new technology of the future. They also believed that CPB was the most logical vehicle to launch such a network because its nonprofit status would provide the necessary context for development, in addition to making it consistent with statutes regarding "public telecommunication entities," which it would become, according to legal definitions of the 1978 Act.⁷⁰

Finally, the authors predicted that commercial interests would not immediately establish an arts pay cable channel because of the perception that there was not a large enough audience, nationally, to support a cultural pay cable channel.

However, the report was released in mid-summer 1980, and by October, Stanley Marcus reported that the demand for cultural programming was growing. By December, Detroit Free Press columnist Mike Duffy reported the existence

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. xi-10 and 39.

or development of several cultural/arts cable channels.⁷¹

It should also be noted that this third Carnegie Report also embraced the notion of public broadcasting as an "alternative" programming service to established commercial fare. In regard to public broadcasting starting the new network they said:

The most compelling reason for this partnership has to do with public television's fundamental mission: it came into being to satisfy a void in the marketplace that commercial television had abandoned. PACE must come into being as a noncommercial cable service--perhaps only one of many--but a significant and influential new element in the industry.⁷²

The Grand Alliance

In reaction to the PACE proposal, Lawrence Grossman, then president of PBS, suggested the formation of a grand alliance between public television and the U.S. performing arts and cultural institutions that would result in increased cultural programming.

This "alliance," he said, would be supported by the formation of a new corporation and the sale of its stock to performing arts and cultural institutions, public TV subscribers, and to school districts.⁷³

⁷¹See: Marcus, "The Viewers Verdict--So Far For Cable TV," and Duffy, "Can Public TV Stop The Bleeding?" in bibliography.

⁷²Mahoney, DeMartino, and Stengel, Keeping PACE With the New Television: Public Television and Changing Technology, p. 45.

⁷³Broadcasting 99 (September 29, 1980): p. 33.

Although the CPB was unable to issue any shares of stock under Section 396(f)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, PBS, an arm of CPB, might have been able to do so.

Grossman, in announcing his plan, did not indicate if the new corporation could seek tax exempt status. Under Revenue Rule 64-175, 1964-1 (Part I) C.B. 185, a corporation organized for the purpose of promoting dramatic arts qualified for exemption as an educational organization.

Other rulings applied to other programming areas, but the 1980 IRS regulations would have probably allowed exempt status to the "educational" service corporation.

It is important to note that telecommunication services of a nonbroadcast nature are not a part of Grossman's plan.

Educational Telecommunications and Other Perspectives

In 1977, Wood and Wylie published their book, Educational Telecommunications. In the first few pages they define several terms: Educational Telecommunications, Public Broadcasting, Instructional Telecommunications, and Educational TV.

This was done for two reasons, they said. First, traditional definitions of the terms were misleading, ambiguous and open to too much interpretation. Secondly, telecommunication technology had developed beyond the terminology of "television" and "radio." Most importantly, they said, if readers were to understand what was being

said, both author and reader would be required to begin with the same definitions and thus the same frame of reference. Their overriding definition was Educational Telecommunications, followed by sub-definitions:

Educational Telecommunications (ETC), noncommercial television and audio transmissions of purposeful, broadly educational, communications--whether for specific classroom objectives or for general enlightenment.

Public Broadcasting is all that is of human interest and importance which is not at the moment appropriate or available for support by advertising, and which is not arranged for formal instruction.

Instructional Telecommunications (ITC) means direct instructional uses of television and related electronic media for specific teaching/learning applications in any formal educational or training institutional situation.

Educational TV (ETV) means a sequential, organized series of presentations having a specific body of content, usually designed primarily for noncredit viewing at home but often viewed additionally in the classroom.

The authors claimed their definitions had a tendency to reinforce the concept that there were few clear distinctions and classifications among the various types of educational telecommunication applications in the United States.

They sum up their feeling regarding the future of the traditional noncommercial educational broadcasting with this statement:

The peculiar place that noncommercial media holds in America's educational system is still ambiguous and perhaps a reflection of America's pluralism. Many questions have yet to be answered about the role of informal adult education in society, the purposes of formal schooling in our institutions, the general cultural needs of our citizens, and the overall issue of the role of free media in our unique political system. Until these issues are resolved, the roles of public broadcasting and instructional media never can be determined with any degree of

finality.⁷⁴

Editor Glen Robinson in 1978 expressed disappointment that public broadcasting had been neither innovative enough nor enough to admit that it had a role in education, or in providing public services.

He cautioned that, "at the point where public broadcasting found itself replicating the work of other social service agencies, it will have outlived its usefulness." However, he also warned that the failure to innovate with new services meant to wither away with the notion of alternative programming.⁷⁵

Robinson also noted that the failure of public broadcasters to embrace new telecommunication services was largely the result of institutional bias; they were a product of the philosophy of "broadcasting" and were not service oriented in the new telecommunication perspective.

One other perspective is worth noting. Branscomb, a communication attorney, reached the conclusion that the problem with defining Public Broadcasting was that the process "begins as philosophy, but finds its expression in

⁷⁴Wood and Wylie, Educational Telecommunications, pp. 5-6 and 340.

⁷⁵Glen O. Robinson, Communications for the Future: An Overview of the Policy Perspectives for the 1980's, ed. Glen O. Robinson, with a forward by Joseph Slates, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978), p. 491.

the law."⁷⁶

In summary, a concept of Public Broadcasting after 1967 must begin with an understanding that efforts to secure long-term financing resulted in a narrowed perspective of public programming. Public Broadcasting programming was not appropriate for advertising sponsorship and was not appropriate for formal instruction; it was to be alternative to commercial fare and formal instruction.

The 1967 Act may have altered the philosophical course of educational broadcasting development. Because formal educational programming was just developing, it was considered by some decision makers to not have proved itself. It was considered a possible legislative liability.

The incremental steps through which noncommercial education broadcasting developed were made up of FCC rulings and congressional actions, and were taken to develop the potential educational aspects of noncommercial broadcasting, not to develop a media of mass communications.

Recommendations based on a study of instructional or educational broadcasting that were financed by the Act were ignored.

The Public Telecommunications Act of 1978 attempted to redirect development in new educational telecommunication demonstrations, and Carnegie II's supplementary report

⁷⁶Anne Branscomb, "A Crisis of Identity: Public Broadcasting and the Law, Public Telecommunication Review, February, 1975.

addressed new technologies.

However, the concept of public broadcasting as an alternative mass media service has prevailed, causing chronic problems as the differences between commercial and non-commercial broadcasting evaporate with communication industry deregulation, case law, and FCC rulings.

CONCLUSION AS DISCUSS IN PART I
AND TREATED IN PART II

Complexity leads to confusion in defining Public Broadcasting after 1967. Indeed, one almost has to define the term by date, historical perspective, or by personal interpretation. Clearly, the term did not refer to the same services in 1920 as it did in 1967, or in 1980.

The purpose of this research was to identify distinctive properties or enduring characteristics of "public broadcasting" between 1967-80, as the concept evolved between Carnegie I and II. It was a search for a definition of the concept.

This could easily be accomplished by simply stating the definition of "public television" as proposed by the first Carnegie Commission. This "alternative" definition, however, would be too traditional or limiting in its projection of what the public system was, or what its various service were during that period, or even today.

The fact is, in 1980 there was no universally accepted definition of Public Broadcasting that completely explained what it was. Some individuals, and to some extent the federal government, referred to this public service as "noncommercial educational broadcasting." Others used the

terms defined by the first Carnegie Commission:

"Commercial, Public and Instructional Broadcasting." In 1978, Congress began to use the term "Public Telecommunications," and two years before Carnegie II, Wood and Wylie defined the public system as "Educational Telecommunications," which related definitions of: Public Broadcasting, Instructional Broadcasting, and Educational TV."

Beyond the Carnegie, legislative and academic definitions of Public Broadcasting, this research identified through historic review certain enduring properties or characteristics of the public broadcast movement after 1967. In brief, they include:

(1) Ambiguous legislative terminology; (2) The general consensus to an "alternative" broadcast service to commercial fare; (3) Confusion over the meaning of "alternative"; (4) Confusion as to what "noncommercial" means; (5) An inability to editorialize; (6-7) No long-range funding plan, but Congressional authorizations and appropriations; (8) Confusion regarding operating as a "public trustee" with the same requirements of commercial stations regarding controversial issues and political decisions; (10-14) Substantial disagreement over issues of centralism/localism, structure, instructional media, and funding with political insulation; (15) The interjection of the term "telecommunication" in interpretations and in legislation regarding the public system, as an

acknowledgement of new communication technologies; (16) A system composed of four basic types of licensees, each having their own particular interpretation of what they are, what they need, and what they are going to do in the future; (17) A diminishing ability of the system to initiate legislative plans or build a consensus to a plan; and (18) the persistent threat or possibility of budget cuts by Congress or presidential administrations.

These enduring characteristics provide an awkward anchor to any definition or concept of Public Broadcasting. While they are ever present, the characteristics are dynamic in nature and are incrementally changing.

An accurate frame of reference, then, to what Public Broadcasting is, must include at least these essential elements, along with an understanding of their dynamism and evolution in American society.

Because of that necessarily collective perspective, Public Broadcasting is an elusive concept.

It is also a paradoxical term because an accurate and precise definition requires a very broad view, instead of a limited and narrow boundry of consideration.

The paradox exists because as a concept, Public Broadcasting must carry with it the 18 enduring characteristics--its defining "baggage."

In addition, one must conclude that specific definitions of Public Broadcasting or subdefinitions (i.e. Wood and Wylie) may not stand the test of time because of the

changing meaning of some of its defining characteristics, particularly "noncommercial" or "alternative service."

The term Public Broadcasting, then, might best be used as an umbrella concept for specific telecommunication services, and best understood by analogy.

For example, the following original simple analogy is proposed to provide a frame of reference for the concept of Public Broadcasting as it evolved between 1967-80.

The umbrella concept of Public Broadcasting is like leaves on a thriving tree. Limbs are the 18 identified defining issues/characteristics. Main branches are the evolving telecommunication services: public noncommercial, educational-sequential, and instructional learning. The trunk is law. Roots are philosophical anchors that rationalize the need for a public communication system. The sap, the life blood of the tree, is the human element: the system's leaders, support foundations and corporations, lawmakers, and society.

Consider such a tree growing and changing in an American democratic setting, buffeted by winds of technology.

EPILOGUE

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER POLICY RESEARCH

Majchizak defines policy research as the process of conducting research on, or analysis of, a fundamental social problem in order to provide policymakers with pragmatic, action-oriented recommendations for alleviating the problem.⁷⁷

This historical study intends to draw abstractions from public policy documents, as explained in the the introduction. It serves an enlightenment function only, but suggests many research questions and policy topics, including:

(1) A classic policy study would be to explain why Carnegie I lead to specific legislation and Carnegie II did not.

(2) Noncommercial stations are becoming more commercial. Trace that development.

(3) In light of the 1986 Tax Reform Act, define the limitations of "nonprofit" and "tax exempt status" for

⁷⁷Ann Marjchrzak, Methods for Policy Research, p. 12.

Public Telecommunication services.

(4) Similar to number 2; the differences between commercial and noncommercial stations is blurring. Explain the legal rationale behind the changes.

(5) Why did policymakers reject (in 1967) an excise tax to support the public system?

(6) What alternative financing options for Public Telecommunication services have been reviewed by Congress since 1980?

(7) Trace direct presidential influence in Public Broadcasting development.

(8) Trace the editorializing activities (or lack of) of noncommercial television and/or radio stations.

(9) Survey Public Broadcasting station managers for consensus areas of concern.

(10) Analyze technological advances in UHF frequency manipulation.

(11) Explore the rationale for the public system's existence.

LITERATURE CITED

A Public Trust: The Report of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting. New York: Bantam Books, 1979.

Barzun, Jacques, and Graff, Henry F. The Modern Researcher. 3rd edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1977.

Blakely, Robert J. To Serve the Public Interest: Educational Broadcasting in the United States. Forward by McGeorge Bundy. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1979.

Branscomb, Anne W. "A Crisis of Identity: Reflections on the Future of Public Broadcasting." in The Future of Public Broadcasting. Edited by Douglas Cater. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

Broadcasting. "PBS proposal to allow corporate logos gets first OK." (Nov. 3, 1980).

Broadcasting. "Commercials may be answer to public broadcasting cuts, says KCET's Lopes." 100 (Feb. 9, 1981).

Broadcasting 99 (Sept. 29, 1980), p. 33.

Brown, Les. Television: The Business Behind the Box. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.

Burke, John E. "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967-- Part I: Historical Origins and the Carnegie Commission." Educational Broadcasting Review 6 (April 1972): 105-119.

Burke, John E. "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967-- Part II: The Carnegie Commission Report, Development of Legislation, and the Second National Conference on Long-Range Financing." Educational Broadcasting Review 6 (June 1972): 178-192.

Burke, John E. "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967--Part III: Congressional Action and Final Passage." Educational Broadcasting Review 6 (August 1972): 251-266.

- Carlson, Robert A. "1951: A Pivotal Year for ETV." Educational Broadcasting Review, December 1967, pp. 47-54.
- Carter, Jimmy. Message to Congress. Released by the White House Press Secretary October 6, 1977.
- Cater, Douglas. "Public TV: What Hope for Progress? The Politics of Public TV." Columbia Journalism Review, July/August 1972.
- Commission on Instructional Technology. To Improve Learning: A Report to the President and Congress of the United States. Washington. D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1970.
- Congressional Record. CXIII.29320.29382.30198.
- Congressional Quarterly. Vol. XXXIV 1978.
- Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Report of the Task Force on Long-Range Financing of Public Broadcasting.
- Duffy, Mike. "Can Public TV stop the Bleeding?" Detroit Free Press, 10 December 1980, sec. C, p. 7.
- Federal Communications Commission, Official Report of Proceedings, In the Matter of: Amendment of Section 3.606 of the Commission Rules and Regulations, Docket 8736 et al. (Washington D.C.: Ward and Paul, 1950-51), pp. 15743-18337. Cited by George H. Gibson, Public Broadcasting: The Role of the Federal Government, 1912-76 (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977) p. 74.
- Federal Communications Commission. Official Report of Proceedings, In the Matter of Amendment of Section 3.606 of the Commissions Rules and Regulations, Docket 8736 et al. Washington D.C.: Ward and Paul, 1950-51.
- Federal Communications Commission. Report of Proposed Allocations, January 15, 1945 mimeographed (1945). Cited by George H. Gibson, Public Television: The Role of the Federal Government 1912-76, p. 54. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
- Federal Register. III, 364, Jan. 26, 1938.
- Federal Register. XV, 6049.

Fellows, James A. "Public Broadcasting and Education: Much Ado About Everything." Public Telecommunications Review July-August, 1967.

Gibson, George H. Public Broadcasting: The Role of the Federal Government 1912-76. New York: Praeger

House of Representatives. Hearings on HR8031, 87 Congress, 2d Session.

House of Representatives. Report 94-772. 92nd Congress. 1st Session.

JCET Minutes, March 22-23, 1951, p. 46, NAEB Washington Office.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research 2d. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

MacLatchy, Josephine H., ed. Education on the Air: Second Yearbook of the Institute for Education by Radio. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1931.

Mahoney, Shelia; DeMartino, Nick; and Stengel, Robert. Keeping PACE With The New Television: Public Television and Changing Technology. New York: VNU Books International, 1980.

Marjchrzak, Ann. Methods For Policy Research. California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1974.

Marcus, Stanley. "The Viewers Verdict--So Far on Cable TV." Panorama, October 1980, pp. 42-45.

Millard, Steve. "The Story of Public Broadcasting." Broadcasting (November 8, 1971): pp. 30-36.

Muth, T.; Reagan, J.; Sexton, J.; and Shelton, V. "Telecommunication in the U.S. Department of Telecommunication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. (mimeographed), 1976.

New York Times. Jan. 10 and 16, 1974.

New York Times. July 17 and 21, 1974.

Public Broadcasting and Education: A Report to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from the Advisory Council of National Organizations. Washington, D.C., March, 1975.

- Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States.
Lyndon B. Johnson 1968-69, Book I. Document 54.
- Public Television: A Program For Action, The Report and
Recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on
Educational Television. Copyright by Carnegie
Corporation of New York. New York: Harper & Row,
Publishers, 1967.
- Rivers, William L., and Nyham, Michael J. Aspen Notebook
on Government and the Media. Praeger Publishers,
1973.
- Robinson, Glen O. "Communications for the Future: An
Overview of the Policy Agenda." Communications For
Tomorrow: Policy Perspectives for the 1980's. ed. Glen
O. Robinson with a forward by Joseph Slater. New York:
Praeger Publishers, 1978.
- Saettler, Paul. A History of Instructional Technology.
New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1968.
- Senate. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Hearings on S205.87 Congress. 1st Session.
- Toohey, Daniel W. "Section 399: The Constitution Giveth
and Congress Taketh Away." Educational Broadcasting
Review 6 (February 1972): 32-39.
- Toohey, Daniel W.; Marks, Richard D.; and Lutzker, Arnold
P. Legal Problems in Broadcasting: Identification and
Analysis of Selected Issues. Lincoln: University of
Nebraska, 1974.
- U.S. Congress. Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol.
XXXIV.
- Whitehead, Clay T. "Local Autonomy and the Fourth Network:
Striking a Balance." Educational Broadcasting Review
5 No. 6 (December, 1971).
- Wimmer, Roger D., and Dominick, Joseph R. Mass Media
Research: An Introduction. 2nd ed. California:
Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1983.
- Wood, Donald N., and Wylie, Donald G. Educational
Telecommunications. Delmont: Wadsworth Publishing
Co., Inc., 1977.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293006821320