

EDUCATION
ON THE
AIR ...
RADIO AND
EDUCATION
1935

EDUCATION ON

THE AIR . . . AND

RADIO AND

EDUCATION · 1935

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTH AN-
NUAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION
BY RADIO . . . COMBINED WITH THE
FIFTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY OF THE
NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON RADIO IN EDUCATION

EDITED BY LEVERING TYSON AND
JOSEPHINE MACLATCHY



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
PRESS . . . CHICAGO · ILLINOIS

COPYRIGHT 1935 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED · PUBLISHED DECEMBER 1935

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO PRESS . . . CHICAGO · ILLINOIS · U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

ORDINARILY the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education holds its annual Assemblies in selected centers, while the Institute for Education by Radio is conducted each year at Ohio State University. The programs of the Assemblies of the Advisory Council deal primarily with the administration and the larger social and governmental policies of radio education, while programs of the Institute emphasize the techniques of educational broadcasting.

Although the audiences to which the two annual meetings appeal are different in total, a substantial number of the membership attend both meetings. For this reason and for the further reason that policies of radio education and its techniques are interdependent, the managers of the two enterprises felt that an occasional joint meeting would be desirable. Consequently, the Fifth Assembly and the Sixth Institute were united in a joint meeting at Ohio State University during the current year. The results were interesting and satisfactory.

This union has resulted in a single volume of the proceedings for 1935 to be added to the four preceding volumes of *Radio and Education*, the Assembly's annual proceedings, and the five preceding volumes of *Education by Radio*, the annual proceedings of the Institute.

An examination of the contents of the volume discloses the fact that critical policies and interesting and significant educational techniques were freely discussed by competent people.

It is becoming apparent as the years pass that the proceedings of the Assembly and the Institute constitute indispensable records of the vivid pioneering years of radio education, and an accurate mirror of the rapidly moving events of the period.

L. T.
W. W. C.

v

CONTENTS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION BY RADIO COMBINED WITH THE FIFTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION

NATIONAL ASPECTS

RADIO AND THE FUTURE	<i>Raymond Gram Swing</i>	3
RADIO'S PART IN THE CREATION OF AN INTELLIGENT ELECTORATE	<i>Robert A. Millikan</i>	10
THE MICROPHONE IN POLITICS	<i>William Hard</i>	16
BROADCASTERS' INTERESTS IN EDUCATIONAL RADIO	<i>Philip G. Loucks</i>	25
RADIO IN RELATION TO EDUCATION	<i>Anning S. Prall</i>	29
PLEASE, MR. RINGMASTER		35
DEMOCRACY AND THE RADIO	<i>Herman G. James</i>	45
THE RADIO OF THE FUTURE	<i>Stanley High</i>	56
EDUCATION BY RADIO	<i>William A. Orton</i>	63

ADMINISTRATION

IF I RAN AN EDUCATIONAL STATION	<i>Judith C. Waller</i>	71
RADIO INTERPRETING EDUCATION	<i>Agnes Samuelson</i>	82
LEGISLATIVE AID FOR STATE RADIO	<i>H. B. McCarty</i>	91
THE FACILITIES OF EDUCATIONAL RADIO IN OHIO	<i>George W. Rightmire</i>	99
EDUCATION BY RADIO IN OHIO	<i>B. O. Skinner</i>	102
A STATE UNIT OF RADIO EDUCATION	<i>J. H. J. Upham</i>	104
THE UNIVERSITY OF THE AIR	<i>Morris S. Novik</i>	112
SAFEGUARDING EDUCATIONAL RADIO	<i>A. G. Crane</i>	117

VARIETIES OF BROADCASTING

RADIO PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN	<i>Frederick L. Redefers</i>	129
BROADCASTING IN THE AMERICAN HOME	<i>Mrs. B. F. Langworthy</i>	144

CONTENTS

TECHNIQUES OF PRESENTING DIALOGUE	<i>Allen Miller</i>	149
PROBLEMS OF PROGRAM ORGANIZATION	<i>Conyers Read</i>	158
WISCONSIN TEACHERS' ROUND TABLE	<i>Harold A. Engel</i>	165
ORGANIZING LISTENING GROUPS	<i>Tracy F. Tyler</i>	168
WOMEN ORGANIZE TO LISTEN	<i>Mrs. Harold Vincent Milligan</i>	183
ORGANIZING RADIO JUNIOR-COLLEGE GROUPS	<i>George R. Bryant</i>	191
TECHNIQUES CLINIC	<i>Merrill Denison and C. L. Menser</i>	199

REPORTS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR	<i>Levering Tyson</i>	215
REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES:		
Art	<i>René d'Harnoncourt</i>	234
History	<i>Elizabeth Yates Webb</i>	238
Labor	<i>Matthew Woll and Spencer Miller, Jr.</i>	261
Land-Grant College Radio	<i>H. Umberger</i>	262
Library Co-operation	<i>Ralph A. Ulweling</i>	265
Parent Education	<i>Sidonie M. Gruenberg</i>	265
Spanish	<i>Frank Callcott</i>	276
Vocational Guidance	<i>Harry D. Kitson</i>	277

RESEARCH AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

STUDIES OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE	<i>Tracy F. Tyler</i>	281
A TECHNIQUE FOR MEASURING ATTITUDES AT THE ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL LEVEL	<i>Frederick B. Davis and Calvin J. Nichols</i>	283
RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL RADIO		288

APPENDIX

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION		295
ORGANIZATIONS CO-OPERATING WITH THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION		300
PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION		302

CONTENTS

PUBLICATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	303
STATISTICAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE NUMBER OF RADIO LICENSES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD	304
ROSTER OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION BY RADIO COMBINED WITH THE FIFTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION	306
INDEX	315

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE SIXTH ANNUAL
INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATION BY RADIO
. . . COMBINED WITH
THE FIFTH ANNUAL
ASSEMBLY OF THE
NATIONAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL ON RADIO
IN EDUCATION . . .

NATIONAL ASPECTS

RADIO AND THE FUTURE

● RAYMOND GRAM SWING
EDITOR OF "THE NATION"

THE subject assigned to me is so large as to make it possible for me to say almost anything I can think of about radio except what it is in the present. I seem to be precluded from criticizing, and perhaps it is just as well. Radio is in its infancy, and infancy is a poor time to decide what character the adult is going to have. Infants and little children are notoriously self-centered and unsocial. We are beginning to be wise on that score, and there is a definite movement against trying to re-form the nature of little children by spanking them. I am sure that the same truth should apply to radio. Those who consider themselves enlightened look at children from the children's point of view and try to sympathize with them as they face their problems. The problems of radio are no less difficult, and the persons responsible for the radio at the present deserve our fullest sympathy and comprehension, rather than chastisement.

If, however, I possess that sympathy, as I trust I do, I still feel free to describe the present status of the radio in this country, if only to show where the future starts. It seems to me that radio is about at the stage of the moving pictures at the close of the era of throwing custard pies. I do not mean that radio programs are all custard-pie throwing, any more than pictures in the early melodrama days were all devoted to the misuse of pastry. But there was a time when the value of drama was flouted by Hollywood, and the technique of its presentation was a matter of superb indifference. I am not satisfied with the Hollywood of today, but I should say it was approaching adolescence. The radio is not so old in years or experience. It is still further, it seems to me, from recognizing the scope of its

potential service, and it has not reached the stage where it is consciously training itself and its personnel for that service.

One reason why it is failing in this respect is that it does not know as yet just what its own future will be. And in all candor, whatever my subject, I do not either. All I know is that we have in the radio a special kind of a social instrument, more powerful, more intimate, more promising, I should say, than any social instrument since the development of printing. It definitely is an instrument of the masses, and it looks as if it might become the greatest social coherer of all the modern inventions. That you will recognize at once as both a benefit and a danger. We have all been alarmed by the use to which the radio has been put in Germany, Austria, Italy, and Russia. If we have sense, we shall be equally alarmed by the power which it has given and may give certain individuals in this country. I hope I do not cause anyone offense if I say that I regard the creation of the type of man of which Father Coughlin is an example as a liability of the radio, not an asset. But for my part I am jubilant over the great piece of luck that Father Coughlin, the child of broadcasting, should be a bad broadcaster. For, I say, if he is able to attract the following he enjoys with bad broadcasting, what would he be able to do if he were a good broadcaster? By bad broadcasting, I mean that he harangues the microphone, and a good deal of his passion and his thought never leaves the room where he is speaking. The microphone is first of all a medium of intimacy and of direct, personal contact. And if you shout and orate at a man in a small room, he will not listen to you as he would if you speak to him quietly and personally. The microphone is not a substitute for a meeting hall, and the listeners are not people gathered into a vast invisible audience. That is the usual picture, but it is all wrong. The microphone is the doorhandle into a man's living-room, and that man and family are never part of an audience. They never feel the presence of other listeners. They have only the one visitor coming into their home, the speaker. Thus, good broadcasting lies in underemphasis and in nuances, in irony, in

all the delicate arts of conversation, and not in the explosions of the dramatic harangue.

Now the radio in the future will pass through a phase of political abuse. We may as well make up our minds to it. We are living in a period of rapid, often violent change, and the radio has come on the scene with almost uncanny timeliness. You have often been told, I am sure, that when the Nazis in Austria planned their *Putsch* last year their first act was not to capture the cabinet nor the central government building, nor even an armory. They descended on a radio station, and having killed the men who withstood them, they went to the microphone and told the people of Austria a lie. That is both sinister and terribly significant. In all the countries where oligarchies are in command the radio is a priceless ally. A medium that is suitable for the dissemination of truth and knowledge is equally useful for the dissemination of distortion and mendacity. You may have the comfortable feeling that in America, at least, the radio will not be used in that way. That is not my subject tonight, or I should make an attempt to shake your easy confidence. All I will say is that the only way you can save America from the political abuse of the radio is to be eternally vigilant for the freedom of speech, by which I mean freedom of speech, not your freedom to say what you believe and the suppression of the opinions of somebody else.

It is my own impression that the immediate political future of the radio is not particularly pleasant to contemplate. Certainly it is not in Germany, Italy, and Russia. And unless we can guarantee the survival of democracy in America, it will not be here. But looking further ahead, I find it hard to be pessimistic. That is, I do not believe that human beings can long live without liberty, and that no matter how dark the eclipse of liberty may be, it will be only temporary, taking a long-range view. So that the ultimate future of the radio, I hope, is bound to be in an atmosphere of freedom.

It is more difficult to forecast the future use of the radio than it is to forecast its mechanical future. I am not qualified to speak about the mechanical possibilities. I make certain as-

sumptions, which a man with technical knowledge might not dare to express. I assume, for instance, that the radio will be perfected so that music and speech can be transmitted so well that the ear cannot distinguish between mechanical reproduction and the real thing. I assume, too, that television will be perfected in the same way, so that the eye and the ear can both combine to receive perfect communication. I assume that before the twentieth century has past a man will be able to sit in his own home and attend sports, theaters, moving pictures, watch Congress in session, and be present at any event of widespread interest. Whether he will be able to do this over long distances, so that the whole world is brought into his living-room I am not ready even to assume. That is day-dreaming and it is not appropriate for a layman to discuss these matters. But what does occur to me is that the radio may turn out to be the great bulwark of the home, and so undo all the influences of that great destroyer of the home, the automobile.

To come to our treatise, however, what is the future of the radio, not its mechanical future, but its service, its subject-matter? Here, of necessity, we must be vague. We do not know what society will look like in fifty years, but we do know certain principles. Whatever is of general interest will become the subject-matter of the radio. No doubt people will play with this perfected radio first of all, and do all kinds of sensational and adventuresome things with it. But the novelty of the perfection and powers of radio will wear away, and it will then shake down to its real services. By that time, of course, the chaos of the air will have been put into real order. By chaos I mean the lavish duplication of the same kinds of programs, and the resultant sacrifice of facilities and time which ought to be devoted to giving variety of subject-matter. There will be available for any considerable section of the public whatever it wants at some time during the day. There will always be music, beautiful music or merely amusing music; there will be education; there will be fun and relaxation. Quite soon, I believe, our radio companies will move in the direction of widening the choice of subject-matter. Even before the instrument is perfected, they

will have to if they hope to keep their jobs. And then will begin what will be, broadly considered, adult education: but it will be the education of discovering the world in which we live, the education of interest as against the education, if I may so call it, of personal aspiration. I do not mean there will not be some straight instruction, too, though it must of necessity form no greater part of the whole than it does in the society of the time. The tremendous usefulness of the radio will make it a natural prey for all those who want to get at it to better mankind according to their own particular scheme of things. And the powers in charge of the radio will have a hard time to restrain them. They will have to hold off the reformers, and they will have to insist that the function of the radio is not to uplift but to interest human beings. There may be universities of the air with the visible and audible professor virtually entering one's home; there might even be elaborate laboratory experiments performed as it were in a million parlors. But this will not be the main function of radio, which will be not to instruct but to bring things to life. And whatever else the radio becomes it will remain for all time a personal contact—a point to bear in mind in all critique and planning. Programs must be devised for their potential effect on individuals, not masses. And though the radio is the greatest mass instrument ever invented, it can never reach its fullest powers without recognizing the individual nature of every listener. That is why there will have to be the same diversity of subject-matter and the same provision for variety of taste as you have in the life of any city, state, or nation. Today, of course, we have hardly begun on diversity. We shall grow into it naturally, not because radio companies grow more enlightened, but because out of sheer self-interest they will have to do something to draw in and hold that part of the public—the thinking part—which will not respond unless met on its own level of intelligence. The radio service is not to be keyed to them, any more than it will be to any other single group, but it must ultimately embrace them. It must if it is to be the instrument of the whole life of the nation. Unless it is the instrument of the whole life of the nation it will—I almost

said—it will die, but of course that is silly, as it will not die, and it inevitably must become such an instrument. The best in the nation will be found in the programs of the future, as well as the average.

In the future, with a wide range of choice for listeners, with the whole gamut of national events and amusements to choose from, with access to the most exciting knowledge there will, too, be a technique of presentation of which little is known today. Broadcasting is an art not only in the mere use of tone and inflection, but in the assembly and presentation of ideas for communication. It is slightly different from any other art of communication. I repeat, it is essentially the art of being personal. That implies a particular ability to formulate ideas simply, to phrase them clearly, and to deliver them directly, all three standards not essential in writing, or in making speeches, or communicating in any other way. Today, of course, we have no accepted standards of broadcasting at all as we have, say, standards of acting or standards of writing. Some broadcasters are ranked first rate, but they are to a certain extent mysteries. No one can formulate readily what the essentials of good broadcasting are, and wherein the good broadcaster has this or that factor to an unusual degree. But in the future nobody will be allowed to broadcast who has no special ability in that activity, so that the bulk of the broadcasting will be done by excellent broadcasters. By that I do not mean they will be just pleasing and intimate and mellifluous. I mean that they will have, first of all, the minds of good broadcasters. I am not thinking of news commentators. I mean every one given time at the microphone. Some scientists will be used chiefly as broadcasters. Some educationalists will be recognized as having the special gift of suiting the microphone and television apparatus. There will be a special kind of broadcasting interpretation for all departments of life. There will be recognized broadcasters just as today there are artists in any other field of communication. I know of no country which has recognized this simple and obvious truth. In Europe, where I am fully familiar with broadcasting, and I think in this country, though my experience here

is considerably less, a person gets to the microphone because of his name, or an organization he represents, or an office he holds, and is oftener than not notable for any reason on earth other than because he is a born broadcaster.

Sometimes there is a bit of luck. In England, for example, Sir Oliver Lodge, who happens to have made some of the basic discoveries of the radio, proved to be a remarkable broadcaster, with the unique gift of making things come to life. He had the gift of intimate communication to a fine degree. Every bit of his thought and feeling passed from him through the microphone into the individual room where there were listeners. It was as though this scientist, having helped create the radio, set up a standard of the manner in which use was to be made of it. In time there will be an assembly of broadcasters of stature. And a man of prominence in some field but no broadcaster will have no claim to ruin fifteen minutes on the radio any more than he has a right now to inflict a badly written manuscript on your favorite magazine, or to act in a Hollywood film. Until broadcasting has discovered and developed and trained the minds which are inherently useful to it, none of us can have a faint conception of what broadcasting in the future will be like. It is not going to be awful; it is going to be one of the most interesting and enjoyable things in life. And while I am not at all sure we shall have the so-called "commercial radio" in fifty years, it is not the commercialism of the radio which upsets me today, and to which I ascribe all its shortcomings. Much of the advertising over the radio is also in the pie-throwing era, and it is going to improve simply because advertisers will learn more about human beings and how to captivate them. But it is not advertising as such that spoils the radio.. It is spoiled by uninteresting, unskilful, uninspired, unintelligent broadcasting, and that is simply because the radio has not yet discovered itself. It has not had time yet to discover itself. I do not reproach it. I see that the job of creating the radio and giving it its start has been too vast, too complicated, too urgent, to provide the time for philosophizing. After all, radio is not a building, erected according to blue prints. It is something organic,

which grows with its own life, character, and nature. And something alive usually begins to turn its thought inward and decide about itself not during infancy and childhood, but in early maturity. In the long run, I insist, the radio is going to be something impellingly interesting, because that, it seems to me, is its destiny. It will become so, not because some broadcasting executive decides to make it interesting, but because being a thing of life it must fight to survive, and it will die unless it subordinates everything else to this one central function of being interesting. In other words, I am a confirmed optimist about the radio. I believe in it; I believe, if you please, a hundred times more in its future than I do in its present. I believe that that future will hold many dark and unhappy phases, particularly in the political realm. But in the end, because it is the one most personal of all the social instruments, the one which can be personal with the largest number of individuals, the radio will perform a service the magnitude of which we are able only barely to guess. Now, I have not been put up here today to tell about my personal philosophy of life. But you will condone it, I hope, if I say that I do not revel in the idea that the world some day is going to be a better place to live in—in the usual sense of good and bad—but I believe that evolution is toward an increase of the scope and the intensity of the sheer interest of being alive. And because I believe this, I am bound to believe that the radio is going to make one of the greatest of contributions to the greatest number in that evolution.

RADIO'S PART IN THE CREATION OF AN INTELLIGENT ELECTORATE

● ROBERT A. MILLIKAN

PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION

IN THE utterly confused state of public thinking through which we are now passing, when the permanence of our American civilization itself is being threatened as never before, it is desirable that a group interested in finding the proper place of

radio as an educational instrument should go back to a few fundamentals which have been established and upon which all our future advances in social organization clearly must rest. Surely one of these is that no society that tries to rest fundamentally upon ballots rather than upon bullets can continue permanently unless the emotional approach to life, and particularly to voting, can be replaced in large measure by the rational, scientific mode of approach.

It is not necessary to distinguish between good emotions and bad emotions, for wherever emotionalism is the dominant influence determining behavior there must prevail in the last analysis "the law of the jungle." The king of the jungle imposes his will simply because he has the desire and the power to do so, and in such a situation a change in government is possible only by the process of the appearance of some new king who successfully contests the power with the old king, destroys, and replaces him.

The picture is necessarily one of eternal war, revolution, and practically complete suppression of individual freedom. It is the picture of all despotic governments throughout human history. The philosophy underlying it is dominant wherever despotisms exist today, whether they call themselves communist, fascist, or nazi. These differences are trivial in comparison. That philosophy made the great war. It believes in war and in change by revolution. It continually preaches war. It is preparing new wars today.

Now, a few hundred years ago, after the advent of modern science had begun to spread the rational, scientific mode of approach to life more widely throughout the world, a diametrically opposite philosophy of life and of progress, namely, a philosophy of freedom, began to become more widely spread than it had ever been before. This philosophy refused to recognize the law of the jungle as the ultimate goal of man's development. It refused to believe that an endless succession of despots bringing about changes in human living and thinking by the crude process of slaughtering those who dared to disagree or by forcibly warping the minds of the new generation into a pattern

laid down by and in the interest of the group in control could properly be considered "progress," however great its technical governmental efficiency might be. The aim of this philosophy of freedom was to establish a form of society in which all ideas were completely free and in which changes could be brought about through peaceful balloting processes instead of by sanguinary revolutionary processes.

It is altogether obvious that between these two philosophies of freedom and of despotism there is no possibility of compromise. One cannot compromise with the bandit who is trying to shoot one down and who sincerely believes that he is the agent of destiny to do the shooting. One must somehow disarm the shooter before a basis for the judicial settlement of differences can be established. That is why President Wilson's phrase, "a war to make the world safe for democracy" was no idle phrase. It was, rather, the penetrating expression of a profound truth. Our forefathers fought for their liberties and those of their children. We fought for them, as we thought, in the Great War, and influences at work in the world today warn us that we may have to fight for them again. In Europe it has in recent times been a losing fight, this fight for liberty, and it may be a losing fight here in America unless we can teach the voter to fight now with the ballot—which, thank God he still has—before it is too late. And this is where the place of the radio in education comes in.

But before I attempt to make an estimate as to just what that place is, let me first indicate what is just now the most important general educational job to be done. In spite of the ominous warnings we have as to the way liberties have been and are still being lost in Europe, it is not foreign influences that are those most subversive in this country at the present time, but rather those that have been created by our own weaknesses, in particular by the subserviency of our legislatures to the pressures of vocal minority groups that have intimidated our lawmakers into voting them special privileges seriously inimical to the interests of the country as a whole, and that, if continued, ultimately will destroy our free institutions.

It is not alone the serious unbalance in our Federal budget that these bonus rackets of one sort and another have brought about. This in itself is, indeed, something exceedingly disquieting, for even if we could get our budget balanced next year, we have already loaded since the war a tremendous, a wholly unnecessary, and an iniquitous burden of taxation upon our children which it will take them decades to discharge. The bonus payments alone are now about equal to the total annual expenditures of the Federal government prior to 1914, and they are mounting year by year by leaps and bounds.

But this is the least of the damage done by this attack upon the fundamental principles of sound ballot government. It is the decay of self-reliance, the disintegration of the American character, the spread of the habit of getting one's feet in the Federal trough because every one else's feet are there, the destruction of public confidence in the integrity and effectiveness of our democracy that is the most ominous sign of the times in America. If one wishes some other judgments than mine as to how serious the situation is, let him read Henry S. Pritchett's article in the March *Atlantic* on "What's Wrong with Congress" and Newton D. Baker's article in the January *Atlantic*, "The Decay of Self-Reliance." I commend those two articles to every intelligent citizen of the United States.

Again, if one's eyes are not entirely closed, one cannot fail to see another ominous sign of our times in the influence that the completely irrational, wholly emotional harangue of the demagogue is having in our country today. He may be a sincere enough demagogue, for the most disastrous of the demagogues is often the wholly emotional, completely irrational fanatic fighting for "the right" but ignorant of the forces actually at work, incapable of correct analysis, innocent of the existence of either physical or economic laws and how they work, promoting schemes which can actually only bring disaster upon those whom the fanatic is sincerely trying to help. The most horrible inquisitions and other social scourges have been created by sincere fanatics. The rapid growth of the demagogue and of the emotionally controlled group which supports him is one

of the most disturbing signs of our times, and these are apparently using the radio with great effectiveness. In a free society he should have the right to do so, but perhaps this suggests the necessity for a real educational use of the radio, also.

These are the sort of influences that must be offset if our democracy is to survive. Can it survive anyway? I do not know. Certainly, there is more doubt about it in thoughtful minds than has ever before existed in our history. But this I know, that if it survives, it will be because all the educative forces in the country set to work with all the available agencies to develop a more high-minded, a more rational, a more intelligent general electorate than seems to exist today.

What are these educative forces that touch most largely the whole population of the United States? They are, first, the secondary school, for 85 per cent of the youth of America of fifteen years of age is in attendance in the secondary school today, and the intelligent, rational influence that can be exerted by the secondary-school teacher, wholly outside the field of his specialty, is enormous; second, the church, for one-half the whole population of the country is embraced in the membership of the church which has been supposed to educate only the heart, but which can and should educate the head also; third, the newspaper, for we are a nation of newspaper readers, and the press is the most effective adult-education agency available, and it is doing a fine job just now; fourth, the radio, for nearly every one either owns or at least listens to the radio more or less regularly.

How can these forces create a more intelligent general electorate than exists in the United States today? In a great variety of smaller ways, but chiefly by driving home at every opportunity two great fundamental principles of all rational living as well as of all good citizenship.

The first of these is, if one is himself insufficiently informed to have a rational judgment upon a subject upon which he must make a decision, whether it be a question in physics or engineering or law or finance or government or economics, he will steadfastly refuse, if he is a rational and an intelligent person, to

act on the basis of any hunch or any inherited prejudice or any emotional harangue. Instead, if the issue has to do primarily with physics, for example, he will go to some physicist and ask him this question. Will eleven-twelfths of the most high-minded, capable and informed physicists in the country agree in the answer to this question? If so, there is not one chance in a thousand that that joint judgment will be wrong and the intelligent man will act upon it.

There will be questions, of course, on which there will be no such unanimity of judgment, but if one once tries this procedure, he will be amazed to find how many of the questions that actually come up can thus be given an answer, for most of these questions have to do with such things as levitations or perpetual-motion machines, or their economic equivalents. If there is some disagreement among the high-minded, competent authorities, and yet if action is necessary, the rational inquirer must of course take the judgment that he believes to be most competent. Obviously the same procedure is equally applicable to the fields of law, engineering, government, finance, economics, or anything else. Crudely put, if one has the toothache, let him go to the dentist, not to the barber.

But there is one further rule that is even more important if we are to develop an intelligent electorate; namely, our fathers bequeathed to us a representative government not a pure democracy, and in a representative government it is for men, rather than for issues, that one is in general supposed to be voting. What are the rational rules for voting for good men? They are even simpler. The job of government is so enormous and so complex that any governor's main job is to select assistants and to delegate to them responsibility. If a governor selects as assistants only men who are recognized by their fellows in their fields, be they lawyers, doctors, physicists, economists, or financiers, as the most high-minded, competent, and experienced men to be found, no matter what their political affiliations may be, and no matter whether they speak his particular shibboleths or not, he is a good governor; elect him. If he does not do this, he is a bad governor; defeat him. These are the great underlying principles

that we must get into the minds and consciences of our whole electorate if our democracy is to survive, and one of the jobs of education by radio is to spread them to every radio listener in the United States.¹

THE MICROPHONE IN POLITICS

● WILLIAM HARD

POLITICAL ANALYST AND JOURNALIST

SOME years ago the penetrating and scintillating President of Wisconsin University, the Honorable Glenn Frank, asserted in a public speech on the air that radio would be the death knell of demagogues. Demagogues, he intimated, were emotional and oratorical and hollow. The microphone, he intimated, required coolness and accuracy and ratiocination for the impressing and convincing of listeners. Accordingly, he argued, the microphone would exalt the profound thinker and would ruin the rabble-rouser.

I do not know what President Frank thinks of this argument now. I have been told in some apprehensive reactionary quarters that the rabble-rousers on the air seem at this moment to be getting the better of it. My own view is that once more all predictions as to the revolutionary nature of radio are being frustrated.

Radio was to revolutionize education; it has not done so. It was to revolutionize politics; it has not done so. In my judgment it cannot do so. Radio is nothing but an acceleration in time and an enlargement in space of the vibrations of the human mentality. The human mentality remains inexorably the same. The principles of politics remain just what they were in the days of Aristotle or in the days of Machiavelli. I think that we would go faster in our analyses of radio if we would once for all dismiss the theory that radio is anything more than a new combination and permutation, with advantages and disadvantages, in the numerals which constitute the good old human sum of life.

¹ This address was broadcast from California over a coast-to-coast network by the National Broadcasting Company.

One of the advantages that it gives us in politics in the United States is a more rapid dissemination both of what can be said on behalf of any given national administration and of what can be said against it. Thus perhaps, if the people who are talking against it are better talkers than the people who are talking on behalf of it, an administration which could otherwise have lasted eight years might be happily shortened to four. This would be a quite considerable saving of experimental time for a busy country. And why not?

The assumption is that the outcome of a national election might hinge on skill in talking. But this is no novelty. Elections hinged on skill in talking in the agora of Athens in the era of human culture which we are taught most to admire. The pages of Thucydides would seem to indicate that quite a lot of electioneering talking was done, both by rabble-rousers and by respectable platitudinous bores, in the course of that longest and grandest excuse for peace conferences, the Peloponnesian War.

The remedy which the bores might then have embraced is the same remedy that they are free to embrace on the air today. They could learn to talk. If the rabble-rousers improve the oratory of the defenders of conservative principles on the air next year during the presidential campaign, they will have accomplished an enormous public service. If, in the contest with the rabble-rousers, the advocates of capitalism are obliged to forget the text of the Constitution and are obliged to address themselves to the texture of human existence, what a gain! What an advance, both in usefulness and in entertainingness!

For myself, I sincerely, hopefully look forward to the moment when the political competition on the air will revive among conservatives the eloquence that they once had. It is not obligatory that a conservative should be unendurably dull. Henry Clay was not; Daniel Webster was not; James G. Blaine was not. I would be almost willing to contend that when a mode of thought becomes dull, its dullness proves its decline toward a deserved death. Life is interesting.

In other words, I venture not to fear but to applaud the con-

test which next year's politics will develop on the air of the United States between the protagonists of many different economic philosophies. I contend that it is right that the liveliest of next year's economic philosophers should attract the largest audiences. Radio will merely enable them to do it with greater rapidity and with greater repetitiveness. Our only concern should be, I think, to try to see to it that the radio auditorium is fairly and impartially open to all personages and all causes of any important national bulk.

That private ownership of radio has substantially provided that sort of auditorium to date is, I think, evident. Not long ago I was talking with Father Coughlin on this point. The subdivision of it that we were discussing was telephone lines. Now I dare say, though I speak only from surmise, that Mr. Gifford of the American Telegraph and Telephone Company does not agree with Father Coughlin's economic program in every particular. Mr. Gifford may be happy to know, however, that Father Coughlin profoundly approves of his policy in the matter of telephone lines for radio broadcasts. Those lines are leased just as fairly and impartially for broadcasts by Father Coughlin as for broadcasts by Mr. Hamilton Fish. Mr. Fish, by the way, complains voluminously that he was eliminated not long ago from the announced program schedule of a little bit of a local station in New York City. The only result of the elimination, however, was that Mr. Fish was spared the trouble of composing another speech for the broadcast which he delivered a few days later on a national chain from coast to coast. Nobody in our public life—under the rank of President—expands himself on the air from coast to coast more frequently than Mr. Fish. But to go back to Father Coughlin: Father Coughlin is unalterably opposed to governmental ownership and operation of telephone lines. I did not dare to say to him, but I venture the thought here, that Mr. James Aloysius Farley might not see the value of leasing telephone lines to Father Coughlin quite so clearly as Mr. Gifford sees it. To Mr. Gifford it means more revenue and a gain. To Mr. Farley it might mean more woe

and a loss. Father Coughlin prefers to trust to the greed of Mr. Gifford rather than to the idealism of a government.

All so-called rabble-rousers with any competent instinct for self-preservation must agree with him. It is private telephone lines and private microphones that give the leaders of the so-called populace their chance on the air. And, since private ownership is desired also in immutable principle by all thoughtful conservatives and reactionaries, we may assume, I think, that this unusual unison of radical and respectable thought will preserve private ownership and operation of radio for a period which at any rate will include next year's presidential unpleasantness.

It is not to be concluded, however, that difficult problems in radio operation will thereupon be avoided. On the contrary, I think that such problems will arrestingly emerge, and it is to them that I now wish respectfully to direct your attention.

But perhaps two of these problems will suffice for us here. One of them is the problem of paid time. In the intervals between campaigns the radio stations generally put statesmen on the air free, as attractions, as entertainments. During campaigns, however, they generally treat the statesmen as commerce. This may be because the statesmen are then running for paid jobs. But a better reason is that otherwise—and if the statesmen did not have to pay for their time—there would be nothing but statesmen on the air. Accordingly, it is a custom to charge them for time during campaign periods. When I say that the statesmen are charged for time, I mean, of course, that the campaign contributors of the political parties which have nominated the statesmen are charged for the time.

But this, I ask you to note, gives a certain arbitrary advantage to the political parties which have the most and best campaign contributors. A few years ago the party with this advantage was the Republican party. The Republican party was in power. Now it is the Democratic party. Campaign contributors, broadly speaking, are people with more money than they need for their tradesmen on the first of the month. Such people are singularly open to pressure and to fear. Nothing is

more cowardly, as they say in Washington, than a million dollars, except two million. Wealth will contribute to the party in power even when it thinks that the party in power is trying to ruin it.

It makes no difference, though, to my argument here whether it is the Democratic party or the Republican party or some other party that is out in the financial lead. That party will be able to go into the radio-time market promptly and pre-empt the most and best hours. It will be able to congest the air beforehand. It will be able to give itself the most advantageous as well as the most numerous air positions for angling for votes.

This difficulty is amply appreciated by broadcasters. It is a double difficulty. On the one hand, it is difficult indeed to refuse to sell time to a political organization offering legitimately to buy it. On the other hand, it is dangerous as well as difficult to sell the time to a political organization when the result is a possible disadvantage to other political organizations which perhaps may some day be even more powerful.

Let us put the matter into specific form. Let us suppose that Senator Wheeler, of Montana, runs for the presidency next year on a third-party ticket with the backing of Senator Long and of Father Coughlin. Now it is evident that Senator Long and Father Coughlin are not amateurs in money-raising. They will have funds—some funds—for their ticket. It might happen, nevertheless, that their funds were small in comparison with the numerical strength of their followers and the general social popular importance of their movement. Would it be fair to condemn them, because of their relative poverty, to a tiny fraction of total political radio time while perhaps the Republican and Democratic parties, supported by a sudden surge of really aroused and alarmed wealth, were occupying an almost monopolistic dominance of the ether?

And what would be happening meanwhile to our good old stand-by friend, Mr. Norman Thomas? He and his Socialist party will certainly have no money to speak of—or to speak with—in the next campaign. Is lack of money to deprive him of the chance to try to show the people that in his opinion

Senator Long and Father Coughlin, as well as Mr. Roosevelt, and as well as Mr. Hoover and his successors and assigns, are betrayers of the co-operative commonwealth of man?

I wonder thereupon if this problem could not be solved in part by establishing a certain amount of free time for all political parties during a national presidential campaign and by then letting the parties compete financially for the rest of the time that the broadcasters are willing to relinquish to political programs. The free time should be divided between the political parties with an eye to favoring the financially weaker parties. The paid time would naturally get sold out in a manner which would favor the financially stronger parties. I tentatively suggest that some such solution of this first problem might be developed into being feasible.

The second problem has to do with the maintenance of a maximum of competition on the air. By "competition on the air" I mean both the competition between radio stations and the competition between radio in general and other forms of publicity for statesmen and their policies. Freedom of the air in the United States today is substantially maintained; and it is maintained in realistic fact not by any legislation but by the multitudinousness of radio-station ownership. If any one station tries to close its air to certain ideas, there is almost always some neighboring station which, under a different and competing ownership, can be persuaded to give those ideas an opportunity to reach the ears of listeners who like the ideas in question—and who buy advertised articles. Competition and commerce combine to give us in this country the largest known freedom of the air; but this freedom can be impaired in strict proportion as competition is impaired. It is not a freedom that is produced simply by a private ownership. It is a freedom that is produced by competitive private ownership.

I think, therefore, that some limit should be placed to the number of radio stations that can be assembled together under one operating control. I think that some limit should be placed to the number of radio stations which can be controlled in their political policies by the head of one organization. I am willing

to be accused on this point of striving artificially to prevent bigness. I am perfectly willing so to strive. Unless we artificially curb certain sorts of bigness in this country, our economic freedom, already greatly curtailed, will be utterly lost either to private monopoly or to public governmental monopoly. Similarly, but even more emphatically, I contend that it is necessary to be on guard against excessive bigness in all forms of the transmission of thought. Thought on the air, I say, must be kept intensely competitive in order to be kept vigorously free; and I conclude thereupon that a limitation of the number of radio channels that can be occupied by one ownership should be enacted and enforced.

Next, I think that a little special attention should be given, in this matter of competitive radio, to stations that are owned by newspapers. There are now more than one hundred such stations. Mr. Hearst is accumulating a whole group of them. Now newspapers, in the preservation of liberty, have a different function from the one that is properly discharged by radio stations. Radio stations are properly essentially neutral conveyors of all varieties of thought. Newspapers can properly have editorial policies; and, from the editorial point of view, they are often outrightly propagandist institutions. This is legitimate—and even admirable—for them. We all admire an editor who states his views and states them forcefully and who makes his newspaper a formidable engine on behalf of some variety of economic and political opinion. But is such a man, saturated with editorial conviction and dedicated to propagandist activity, the best possible sort of man for the controlling of a properly utterly neutral forum of opinion such as a radio station?

Moreover, and in any case, the radio station and the newspaper are rival forms of approach to the public mind. Competition is diminished when the two are mingled. Competition is enhanced when the two are separated. The key to the perpetuation of our free institutions, I continue to maintain, is the enhancement of competition. I conclude accordingly that the tendency toward newspaper ownership of radio stations should be legislatively checked.

In sum, then, I venture to submit the proposition that the microphone in politics is beneficial to politics if it is kept free and that the maintenance of freedom is not a negative task. A planned economy has to be planned; but freedom, its alternative, has also to be planned. Our government should resolutely see to it that the conditions necessary for the maintenance of freedom on the air are devised and put into force. The American radio system, I think, is good. It can, I think, through the deliberate furthering of its own free nature, be made even better.

MR. KALTENBORN (Columbia Broadcasting System, New York):

As usual, Mr. Hard has been most stimulating and has thrown several challenges into the arena. He suggests setting aside a certain amount of free time for politics on the air and for election campaigns including the parties having little money. He prophesies a danger in increasing the control of radio stations by newspapers and wants that limited legislatively. He objects to bigness in radio as in other things, and he has challenged certain widely held concepts giving opportunity for vigorous discussion.

MR. TRACY F. TYLER (National Committee on Education by Radio):

I was much interested in Mr. Hard's suggestion relative to the provision of free time for the discussion of political questions. I should like to know the reactions of commercial broadcasters to this proposal. Mr. McCarty has told something of a similar plan used in Wisconsin.¹ I am interested to know whether the commercial broadcasters think it practicable to furnish time for such purposes.

UNKNOWN QUESTIONER:

There are certain varieties of values to which Mr. Hard does not take exception, notably, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. I wonder if he would be as energetic in his defense of legislation in monopolization of the telephone lines in the United States if they were not under the Federal Communications Commission. That is merely a comment, not a question.

MR. KALTENBORN:

Since that comment is addressed to the absent Mr. Hard, the chair will be glad to recognize any one who desires to reply for him.

MR. TYLER:

I think Congress gave a substantial answer to that question when it appropriated \$750,000 to investigate the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

¹ See p. 93.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

MR. RANDALL (Chicago Civic Broadcast Bureau):

May I welcome Mr. Hard into the company of those who hold that the utilization of public broadcasting channels should be determined in some other way than by entrusting it unconditionally to people who operate transmitting machinery. There are two examples in Mr. Hard's talk. He suggests, in the first place, that during presidential campaigning the control of certain hours on the chief channels shall be taken out of the hands of transmitting companies and placed in the hands of some arbiter who would assign some time to the political candidates having less money and less prestige. That would require intelligent management by somebody. Any rules to the effect that the most time should be given to those candidates least able to buy commercial time would certainly not be self-interpreting. There would have to be some responsible agency to execute them; that is, to manage the traffic and assign certain hours to certain speakers. In this country, the agencies which do that under governmental authority are commonly called broadcast licensees. So it all simmers down to the question, Who shall be licensed to control the channels, why, and for how long? Mr. Hard apparently has come to agree with us in preferring that a chosen few newspapers should not control too much time on the air channels to the exclusion of other persons not less worthy or competent. He has clearly indicated that the purposes to which the great channels of broadcasting communication in the United States are put, are far too important to be left to the preferences or the business interests of those companies which have electrical transmission for sale.

MR. TYSON (National Advisory Council on Radio in Education):

During the reading of Mr. Hard's paper I was reminded of discussions during the conferences which Mr. Hoover, while he was Secretary of Commerce, held at Washington, from 1922 to 1925, before the decision was made that we should have commercially supported radio in this country. It was my good fortune to attend many sessions of these conferences. If my memory serves me correctly, the argument in those conferences which carried most weight was to keep away from the just-mentioned problem—broadcasting in this country was to be characterized by freedom of speech. President Crane has argued for partial governmental control of radio in this country and advanced as his main argument the preservation of freedom of speech;¹ Mr. Hard argues in behalf of a commercial system to preserve freedom of speech. I maintain that such similarity of purpose from divergent approaches is one potent sign of the interest in this question which still keeps a lot of us working in radio. We cannot answer the questions involved now; we cannot decide this question in a single meeting. It is going to take a long period of struggle and thought and, in my opinion, that is one of the reasons why Commissioner Prall hopes that educators and broadcasters may come to some agreement²

¹ See pp. 117 ff.

² See p. 36.

and not continue to talk at cross-purposes. Nobody would want a government-controlled system in this country if it would mean a system similar to that of Germany. I do not believe anyone attending this conference, whether commercial broadcaster or educator, is satisfied with the present American system, but where is the middle path down which we can all walk? Perhaps it is too early to reach a decision. I think it is, for there are too many basic social questions yet to be solved.

MR. KALTENBORN:

How interesting it is to see two men as well informed as Mr. Crane and Mr. Hard, equally and sincerely interested in the preservation of that fundamental of democracy, freedom of speech, coming to opposite conclusions as to the best means of preserving it!

BROADCASTERS' INTERESTS IN EDUCATIONAL RADIO

● PHILIP G. LOUCKS

MANAGING DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

THE topic assigned to me is the broadcasting industry's interest in educational broadcasting, but I hope I may be pardoned if I take some liberties with this assignment. I want to make a statement, ask a question, and suggest the answer.

Broadcasting stations are licensed by the Federal government under a law which imposes squarely upon the owners of stations the obligation to operate in the public interest, convenience, or necessity. The application of this legislative standard in actual administration of the law requires that individual station owners accept full responsibility for all of their programs. They are answerable directly to the government, and they may not delegate this responsibility to anyone else. They accept this responsibility willingly; and there never has been, nor is there now, any disposition among them to avoid it. This is an essential fundamental principle underlying our American system of broadcasting—a system based upon private ownership of stations and competitive operation, a system which differs basically from systems which obtain in most other countries. But no other system can be harmonized with our current conception of democracy.

Chairman Prall, in a recent radio interview, evaluated our system of broadcasting when he said: "My feeling is that we have made more definite progress under our peculiarly American system of private competitive radio programs than has any other country in the world. There is full freedom of speech on the air in America. That is not the case in other countries where the government, and of course the party in power, controls the radio. He stated that the Commission "may not censor what is said on the air." He continued, "that is right and proper, for you can readily see the political consequences if any governmental agency were invested with such bureaucratic powers while any one party is in the ascendancy." Then he said that "the fullest possible use of radio as an educational medium has not yet been found."

Now I believe every student of government who will take the time and effort to study seriously the American theory of broadcasting will agree with his statement. And I am equally sure that broadcasters and educators alike will agree that the fullest possible use of radio as an educational medium has not yet been found.

Giving consideration always to the audience as a whole, broadcasters are now co-operating and always have co-operated with representative organizations interested in the broad fields of labor, agriculture, governmental affairs, charity and civic welfare, religion, news broadcasts and interpretation of current events, public health, music, drama, and general entertainment, and have encouraged a fuller understanding and appreciation of American ideals and constitutional government.

What broadcasters have learned from fifteen years of experience in these fields, they have applied to their efforts in the field of education by radio. For example, they have learned that education by radio must not only conform to the technical limitations of the medium but that educational programs must appeal to the greatest possible audience. They have learned that educational programs must not only reflect the interests and ideals of the American people as a whole but that they must recognize the varied interests and ideals which have de-

veloped in different sections of the country. They have learned also that there is a difference between the functions which can be effectively performed by national networks and community stations. These are some of the general principles which broadcasters have evolved out of their experience with educational broadcasting.

Broadcasters have disagreed, and will continue to disagree, with those educators who would have the Congress change the basic allocation principles set forth in our law. Nevertheless, they have gone forward consistently and constructively with the development of educational broadcasting, which fact is recorded in the hundreds of thousands of words of testimony, presented by representative educators and broadcasters, in the report of the hearings held before the Federal Communications Commission last fall. This record shows that broadcasters have always exhibited a willingness to develop educational broadcasting; not only have they built up and successfully presented educational programs of their own, but in many instances successful programs have been devised and presented through co-operation between educators and broadcasters.

The hearings before the Federal Communications Commission revealed that educators are not in agreement among themselves with respect to the application of radio to education. Furthermore, educational interests are not so closely organized as are the broadcasters. This renders a unified and co-operative approach to the whole question more difficult, but organization is far less important than general understanding and agreement upon the question.

In producing and presenting educational programs broadcasters have had certain definite objectives. Such programs, they believe, should supplement and not supplant our vast publicly supported system of formal education. Educational programs should widen the horizons of the classroom; inspire and inform all classes of people; and stimulate appreciation of art, literature, music, and science.

Let me summarize my statement. Broadcasters alone have the responsibility under the law for what goes on the air. They

have found certain principles peculiar to radio which must be observed in the successful presentation of educational programs. They have built and presented successful educational programs of their own and have co-operated successfully with groups of educators in presenting other educational programs. They have followed the objective that education by radio must be interesting and unbiased as well as democratic in its concept and supplementary in its purpose. They are co-operating and are willing to continue to co-operate with educators. While they have found some disagreement among educators with respect to radio in education, they have found that there is also general agreement among them that more adequate programs could be developed through closer co-operation.

Now let me ask the question: I shall ask it by paraphrasing the language of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. How can the fullest possible use of radio as an educational medium be ascertained? I can suggest the answer only in a general way. Those of you who understand the processes of broadcasting and education must supply the details.

The answer will be found, I believe, in the working out of a plan for co-operative action which contemplates, on the one hand, the utilization of the fifteen years of experience accumulated by the broadcasters and, on the other hand, the application of the knowledge of those educators who have familiarized themselves with practical broadcasting problems. Upon this foundation could be erected a practical working laboratory in which broadcasters and educators could work harmoniously with a view to coming to practical agreements and solutions. Perhaps, at the beginning a single community could be chosen for this experimental work, using individual stations as the laboratories. The knowledge of administration, presentation technique, and the content of educational programs acquired in this single experiment could then be applied throughout the land. As programs of tested worth and merit are devised, and it is found that they will attract and hold large audiences, they should be offered to nation-wide audiences. In other words, if

representative broadcasters and educators can reach an agreement upon the establishment of some such experimental laboratory, pool their knowledge of educational broadcasting, and each group accept its fair share of all responsibility, then, I believe, we will be able to find the method by which "the fullest possible use of radio as an educational medium" can be made. Indeed, a plan embodying most of these principles has been developed by Mr. Miller, of the University of Chicago, and while I am at this time without authority to commit my Association to this plan, I believe it deserves careful study by all of us who are interested in this important question of education by radio.

RADIO IN RELATION TO EDUCATION

● ANNING S. PRALL

CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION

AT THE outset let it be understood that I am not an educator, nor am I by any means an expert in the art of radio broadcasting. As I understand it, for a long period of time the educational groups of the country and the broadcasting industry have worked diligently, though unsuccessfully, to develop a plan whereby the facilities of broadcasting might profitably be used for educational purposes.

Having no official connection with the educators or the broadcasters it may be safe to assume that my place in this picture, and that of the Federal Communications Commission as well, is somewhere in between the two groups. You have my assurance now that we are ready to co-operate fully with you and to contribute as far as possible to the final and complete development of a definite, practical, and workable plan for the extension, expansion, and modernizing of education by means of radio broadcasting. That there is a fertile field for such modern methods in this direction is unquestioned; that a time more opportune to put it into effect has never presented itself; and that the universal demand for a broader use of radio for educational purposes increases as time goes on and as modern

mechanical improvements mark the progress of the possibilities of radio and make its application to greater educational uses possible.

In addressing you on the influence of the radio upon education, there are two important aspects which I would have you consider. The first is concerned with radio and its educational implications upon the large mass of our people, living through the problems of their everyday life under our democratic institutions. The second aspect has to do with radio and those educational values that will aid the school in reaching fuller and more adequate modern objectives.

The great founders of our government recognized, from the very beginning, the supreme importance of education in a democracy such as ours. They appreciated that where the people themselves directly determine governmental policies and elect the representatives who are to carry them out, the quality of community life will not rise above the educational level of the average citizen, his intelligence, his understanding, his ideals, and the wisdom of his decisions.

If education were important in those early days of town-hall meetings, when we were but three million people, living along the Atlantic coast, when communities were relatively sufficient unto themselves, and when voting power was restricted to the few, how much more today is education significant! Forty fold have we grown in population! From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, the busy descendants of many nations have developed a wide diversity of resources, have built up a broad variety of industries. Widely scattered though we are, we have become closely interdependent and necessary to one another. The dust storms beyond the Mississippi leave their withering trace within the kitchen of the housewife in the east; the destructive floods that work havoc with the cotton fields of the south spell idleness to the mill hand of New England. Never before in our history has there been so much need for that broader education, so essential to a democracy, which shows itself in the good-will of its citizens, their clear thinking, their understanding, their tolerance, their social

sensitiveness to the needs of others, and their social responsiveness which will make for the upbuilding of our national life. When you consider further that, in these days of universal suffrage, these important educational values have to be the possession not merely of the limited few but of practically all, it must be evident that no narrow conception of educational objectives or methods will meet our modern needs.

We point with pride to the tremendous growth in the number of those who attend our public elementary schools, to the great decrease in illiteracy, to the increased registration in our secondary schools, colleges, and universities, as evidences of our loyalty to democratic traditions. But our hopes for tomorrow must be built on educational foundations far broader and far more secure. For a century and more, education has been closely—too closely for our national welfare—limited to the schools; the school has been identified too exclusively with the scholar, and the scholar with the teacher and the book. We have trusted too narrowly to the three R's, and particularly to the printed symbol, to develop the thinking, social-minded, understanding citizen who is to take an active part in the solution of the many complex problems that confront us as a nation. We have overlooked the many who are not scholastic. We have left almost entirely out of the picture that large multitude of men and women beyond the compulsory-school years, who must find their learning in the everyday experiences of life.

It is only within comparatively recent times that forward-looking educators have insisted that we must, in fact as well as in theory, consider the educative process to be lifelong, extending far beyond the school years, going backward into infancy and forward into adolescence and adulthood. Fortunately, there has come to us, as if to meet this broader need, a voice vibrant with the personality of the living teacher, the voice of radio. It speaks to all: to the mother busy with her household tasks; to the worker pausing for his noon-day meal; to the young, to the old; to the solitary recluse, to the family circle; to the rich, to the poor; to the scholar, to the unlettered; in remote mountain hamlet, in crowded city tenement; everywhere

radio sends alike its friendly human greeting. I would compare it, in its educational influence, with the press, but the press falls far short in universality of circulation, it lacks the directness of appeal; the press depends upon the printed symbol and falls short in the variety of radio's avenues of expression. Whatever the human interests may be, be they civic, political, religious, social, musical, dramatic, literary, current news, sports—everywhere radio brings us relaxation, growth, enrichment, recreation in the best sense of the term. It enlarges our circle of acquaintances to include the President himself; it broadens our sympathy for fellow citizens in remote parts of our country; it enlightens our understanding of important public questions and clarifies our thinking in relation to them; it is an immediate aid in helping us reach decisions. Who would appraise the educational value of radio to the citizens of this great republic! It has raised the cultural level of a nation by making the best in music and the literary arts an influence in every home. It has made of California a next-door neighbor of Maine. On numerous public occasions of national importance it has given us back the effectiveness of the old town-hall forum; it has brought one hundred million within the magic spell of the speaker's voice.

If such is the magnificent educational service of radio to a nation out of school, radio promises almost equally significant aid to the school itself in its search for those larger modern objectives of citizenship already referred to. Quite generally throughout our country the school is trying to break away from its overemphasis of the traditional three R's. It is accepting more and more as its legitimate responsibility the so-called "cardinal objectives" concerned with health, worthy use of leisure time, vocational guidance, worthy home and community membership, increased emphasis on the creative arts. Scan the daily programs of our broadcasting stations, and see how closely these cardinal school objectives are paralleled by the numbers broadcast over the radio. Many a radio program reads like a page from the curriculum of a progressive school. This should not surprise us, for the school and radio as institutions have much in common. Both must need study their clientèle, must

know and appeal to their interests; both build success upon activity and personality; both seek vital life relationships; both are at their best when they pulsate with human interest. I would not have you infer that I exalt the radio above the school, for, after all, education is much more than a listening process. But there are times when appreciative and discriminating listening is appropriate even within school hours. Since radio can afford to put on the air only the ablest talent and outstanding authorities, we have the assurance of something worth listening to. The school does well to tune in directly; it is doing so more and more. Many a teacher will tell you that in this way her pupils have learned to love good music, have become interested in important civic questions and current news items, and have later discussed them with profit.

There are those who show concern because the schools have not made more general use, during school time, of the truly remarkable educational opportunities so generously provided. I would assure them that it is not a matter of pure obstinacy on the part of school people, of failure to know and to appreciate. School curriculums and time schedules are not yet sufficiently flexible to permit the ready and easy use of radio programs. That so many schools have surmounted these obstacles is a tribute not only to an appreciation of the high quality of the service, but also to the ingenuity of school administrators. My experience with school men over a long period convinces me that they do genuinely appreciate the value of educational radio service in school hours and they will increasingly find the way to secure for their students those great radio influences that make for better human relationships, that give the school greater relevancy to life outside, and that contribute toward an enriched curriculum. For the excellent quality of the educational programs and for the helpful manuals provided by our broadcasters, the schools are deeply grateful.

But whether the school tunes in or not, it still has the fundamental obligation of recognizing radio as an important recreational and educational factor in the out-of-school life of the pupil. The modern teacher uses these outside radio contacts as

dynamic factors in the classroom proceedings. Songs, chorals, instrumental and orchestral music, current news items, civic discussions, dramatic moments in history, journeys in geography, drama, literature, science, and a thousand and one matters of human interest relate themselves quite naturally to the activities of the modern classroom. Interesting students' reports and fruitful discussions arise from them. The wise teacher uses them as the basis for developing standards of taste in listening to the best in radio offerings.

In the field of parental education, especially as it relates to the health, the bringing up, and vocational guidance of children, the radio is peculiarly able to re-enforce and extend the efforts of the school. Radio programs bear eloquent witness to the all-compelling interest of parents in their children; they speak with the highest authority; they bring the influence of the school directly into the home. The better understanding and more intelligent parenthood will lead inevitably to the increased effectiveness of the educational product of the school. It remains for the school in turn, through constructive criticism, to aid in improving the quality of this radio service.

Such, then, are the educational values that radio makes possible to the school, to the home, and to the citizenry of these United States: understanding, tolerance, good-will, a cheerful cultured life, social sensitiveness and social responsiveness to broad human needs.

At the educational conference arranged by the Federal Communications Commission, to begin in Washington on May 15 of this year, divergent views for harnessing education with radio will be presented for consideration. Let us do our share to bring to a successful conclusion the work of this conference. It is apparent to me that educational groups, anxious to support a practical plan having the sympathetic co-operation of the broadcasting industry plus the full and complete backing of the governmental agency which I represent today, cannot fail in this effort to offer the people of our country a real demonstration of education by radio by means simple, certain, and successful.

PLEASE, MR. RINGMASTER

● AN OPEN LETTER FROM A RADIO LISTENER

READ BY LEVERING TYSON

Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Commissioner:

Allow me to congratulate you on your new job. Perhaps you do not realize it yet, but by giving you complete regulation of the broadcasting of the nation, President Roosevelt and associated congressmen have made you ringmaster of the world's greatest circus.

Of course, you have had experience in politics, which is essentially circus business. Before you got this new job, you spent a lot of time barking in front of side shows and putting down red carpets and rolling them up again. Still, things like that are really "small time" compared with the job of ringmaster of the greatest show on earth. I realize that the new Communications Act, which gives you power to regulate almost everything except the profits of broadcasting stations, is a dandy whip. But before you start cracking it high, wide, and miscellaneously, perhaps you will not mind listening to a few words of friendly advice from somebody who has been a customer of the broadcasting circus from the time it was a little one-ring show.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Ringmaster. I am not trying to tell you how to run your job. I know you are capable of giving us a bigger and better radio show than ever, and I certainly hope you are going to do it. The only reason for this letter is that you have always worked back stage in circus business. I suppose that once in a while you have stood in a corner of the radio arena and listened to a couple of the acts. But I know you have not been a steady customer of the broadcasting show as long as I have. For the past nine years, I have sat in the same box seat, under the big top. I may not know much about the inside of the circus, but I do know it from the audience side. And after all, it is the customers you have to please if you are going to have any customers.

I realize some of your problems, too. I understand the trouble you are going to have with your concessionaires, that is, the broadcasting stations that make up your circus. Naturally, they want to make money; if they do not, they are going to quit the show. And naturally, each one of them wants to make more money than the next fellow. That is the reason they are competing so violently, but they seem to have a peculiar idea of what constitutes competition.

When the radio circus had only one ring—back in the days when a three-tube receiving set was a luxury—I had a fine time listening to the show. But it kept on expanding. Nowadays, almost everybody can hear all three of the network rings and several small platform shows besides, no matter where he is sitting in the tent. Now, what happens? Why when one concessionaire stages an acrobatic act in his own ring, the people who are running the other two rings and the smaller platforms seem to think they have to give the customers the same thing at the same time. Speaking for myself, I have the three rings and two local platforms to choose from—five stations from which I get excellent reception, twelve months a year. But with all five stations insisting on putting on the same acts at the same time I get a trifle dizzy.

Most likely you have read over the fine print on one of the licenses you issue to your concessionaires. I know you make them get new ones from time to time, just so they will behave, but the part I am talking about is always the same. It says something about licensing the station to operate in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Of course, necessity is not important, except in emergencies, but the public interest and convenience are mighty important, every day. And it is not interesting nor convenient for you to let the clowns, whom they call comedians, occupy all three rings of the radio show at the same time. I like the acrobats that people refer to as dance bands, but I am only mildly interested in hearing them all over the arena, at any given time. As for the trained seals that go under the nickname of “crooners,” why

let them monopolize three rings and two platforms simultaneously? That is not convenient for the public.

I like some high-class entertainment once in a while, such as the pageants and living statues that my friends call "classical music" and "drama." But there again, I do not like to have all five of my stations airing this kind of thing at the same time.

Then there are the freaks—you know, the mixed up things, half-man and half-animal, that go under the name of "variety programs." A lot of them are good listening. But do you know, Mr. Ringmaster, that half the time there is so much variety going on in your broadcasting circus that I cannot tell one of the "fifty-seven" from the next?

Education and religion are part of your show, too. A good many of your customers would like to hear more of these two acts—and not have them interfere with themselves by simultaneous competition.

And of course there are the newsboys. I was sort of glad to see your concessionaries open up and let them in on a regular basis. Now, if you would only stop them from all hollering their extras at the same time, everything would be dandy.

Do not get the idea that I am knocking your circus. It is a swell show, as I said before, and it is getting better all the time. But I have a silly idea. Perhaps it may help you do a better job as ringmaster.

You know, I am just crazy enough to believe that by a little bit of study and a whole lot of hard work you could arrange your broadcasting circus so that the customers would like it more than they do now. Suppose that when the center network ring is putting on a pageant of classical music, the left-hand one were busy with a freak variety show, and the right-hand one were bothering with one of those clown comedians. Then one of the local platforms could be turned over to a newsboy, or even to education while the other one was airing a crooning seal.

Perhaps that is not an ideal set-up, but I guess you get the general idea. You see, we fellows in the customers' seats are funny. Some of us like one thing and some another. And it is sort of strange, but none of us like too much of the same thing, all at the same time.

You know, I can remember away back in the fall of '26 when the circus first came into national prominence. It only had two network rings then. Both of them were run by a group of concessionaires headed by the Radio Corporation of America, doing business as the National Broadcasting Company. It was not so much trouble routining the show in those days, because it was easy to keep the two rings doing different things at the same time.

Then a third ring was added, run by the Columbia Broadcasting System, heading another group of concessionaires. About that same time two or three local platforms came into the picture, so far as most of the audience was concerned. And since then we customers have been breaking our necks twisting our ears from one part of the arena to the next, trying to find something we wanted to hear. But whenever we try to find it, there is either too much of it or none at all.

Just suppose, Mr. Ringmaster, that you decided to split up your rings and your platforms into certain definite classifications. Suppose you told all the concessionaires who were putting on shows in the three network rings that they were in Class I—and that each of them really ought to arrange to stage a different sort of entertainment at any given time.

Then suppose you classified your two local platforms and all concessionaires like them as Class II. And ask them if they would please put on a different sort of show from any of the network rings at the same given time.

Of course, there is another class, the minor concessionaires that run around the outside track of the arena. Let us call them Class III. They might offer a real local service, without duplicating any act which was being heard from the three network rings or the two local platforms.

Naturally, we customers know about the advertising angels who subsidize most of the bigger and better acts that your concessionaires stage for us. Why should we not? Have we not bought their tooth pastes and automobiles and gadgets for years, just to show our appreciation?

But why should these angels quarrel with our idea, any more than your concessionaires should? Believe it or not, Mr. Ring-

master, this is an idea in which everybody wins and by which nobody loses.

If your three rings and your two platforms carry five separate types of entertainment at the same time, something is going to happen to the circus. Five things, to be exact. First, the people who stage your acts are going to know exactly what type their competition is. That always helps, when you are planning a show. Second, there is going to be less foolish competition. We shall not have performers of the same kind breaking their necks to outdo each other in the same stunts. And somehow, when fewer people break their necks, everybody is benefited. Ask the insurance companies, and the policyholders who pay the premiums. Third, public-service programs, dealing with religion, education, economics, politics, government, and so forth, should get a square deal in the allotment of time, especially in the evening hours. Fourth, each individual station would have a balanced variety of programs during the course of the day or evening. Fifth, the customers will be better pleased. Of course, such a reshuffling is going to take a lot of effort on somebody's part. But what is the use of a new deal if you cannot reshuffle?

And what in the name of goodness do you think is the reason for that shiny new whip of yours? Crack it, for goodness sake, in the listeners' cause. And when you crack it, make it mean something. Make it do good. It seems to this listener that a proper distribution of different types of performances on a single station and as between stations is far more important, so far as listeners are concerned, than the allotment of some compulsory percentage of time to any one or more classes of service that the broadcast showmen try to give.

Probably the best thing to do with this letter is to file it. Waste baskets also make good receptacles for letters like this. Unless, of course, you have an ambition to be the best ringmaster of all time and really do a job the customers will like.

Wishing you all kinds of ambition,

I remain (for the present),

A RADIO LISTENER

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

MR. CHARTERS (Ohio State University):

We have four considerations before us. First, plans for educational forces to join as proposed by Mr. Prall; second, a plea for educational forces to cooperate with broadcasters as suggested by Mr. Loucks; third, the opportunity for some interpretations and statements to be answered by Mr. Ringmaster, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; fourth, an opportunity for you to declare your points of view.

MR. McCARTY (Station WHA, Wisconsin State Station, Madison):

I should like to ask Mr. Prall in more detail about the hearing soon to be held at Washington. Shall our representatives be expected to be in attendance one day or longer? What is the plan? We should like more information.

MR. PRALL:

The interests of the group largely will direct the course at that conference, but it will probably last two or three weeks. It is open to those from all parts of the country who are interested in the subject. Just how far we will get is problematic. To just what extent the speakers will direct their thoughts we do not know, but the idea is to develop, if possible, as a result of that conference some definite concrete plans to assist education by radio.

MR. McCARTY:

Is it the plan that representatives of broadcasting stations will attend the conference?

MR. PRALL:

Yes, we expect broadcasters to attend. It is to be under the direction of the broadcasting division of the Commission.

MR. CHARTERS:

Will it be in the nature of formal hearings?

MR. PRALL:

We expect there will be an attendance of two hundred to four hundred people, and if they are fortunate enough to get places on the program, they will be called upon to express their views. I think we shall limit the time of each speaker because we do not propose to make it a forum of speech-making.

MR. CHARTERS:

Anyone who is interested should be there the first day to see what happens?

MR. PRALL:

Yes.

MR. CRANE (President, University of Wyoming):

I cannot refrain from commenting upon the statesmanlike address and the treatment this subject had from Mr. Prall. I wish particularly, as a school-

master and as a student of public welfare, to commend the breadth of his view regarding the function of radio. Radio is something more than a school device; the sooner school people take cognizance of that fact the better. Radio is a means of communication, and its conservation for public use is as important as the conservation of free speech, free thought, or free press. It is, as he has said tactfully, the instrument which can form America into a great town meeting. It has such tremendous possibilities for public use that my recommendation to a group of school men is that we enlarge our views of the function and value of radio from that of a mere extension of the formal school to its public uses.

I wish to commend Mr. Prall's enlarged view of school education. Certainly, students of the schools today are assured that education must broaden, must be more in touch with life, must be better adapted to the changing conditions which confront our students, and where can you find any better stimulus to school teaching and any truer means of connecting the students both at home and in school with the great world around them than radio. We have, if we can learn to use it in its greatest breadth, one of the most useful instruments for making the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" work, and it is exceedingly gratifying to hear the Chairman of the Federal Communication Commission voice such sentiments.

A question which is puzzling me is, How can the Commission expect to conserve this great public use of radio, to realize the great possibilities of public welfare of radio, if public use must be a gratuity and not a right? Mr. Prall has suggested possible types of public service; he has suggested that as we proceed in the use of this we are going to find greater, more varied activities. Mr. Tyson has reported that already we are getting demonstrations of wider and more valued uses of radio, but the problem which puzzles me is, if broadcasting is to be complete with all the independence and all the freedom and all the safeguards, how can this freedom be maintained if it is dependent solely upon the good-will of commercial broadcasters who are necessarily and inevitably dependent upon advertising? How would our public schools proceed if they were dependent wholly upon the good-will of anyone, upon a limited group of people, or upon any industry, no matter how well intentioned those people were? My question is, How can we expect to conserve this great instrument for the public welfare if the privileges we get must be gratuitous?

MR. PRALL:

I do not know that I can answer the question, but it seems to me that how this infant radio grows will depend entirely upon the people of our country, especially those interested in the particular subject, education, in which the members of the Assembly and Institute are concerned. The proper development of this great instrument should be attended to basically by the persons who are interested in education. Whatever other uses may develop for radio will depend largely upon those who are interested in its future. Radio is new,

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

and its uses are developing rapidly. I learned only about a month ago that one of the broadcasting companies had invested \$10,000,000 in a new plant only at its completion to find it was useless. Changes had come so rapidly that the plant was obsolete when finished. Opportunity is knocking at the door today of educators and of those interested in education by radio. I believe the Commission is strongly inclined to do everything possible to help them develop this idea. From conversations I have had with broadcasters, I believe they, as an industry, stand strongly in favor of the proposal.

Educators must take a strong interest in it; and I might add that just as long as their groups work independently of each other, they are going to get nowhere in the educational development of radio. If they will but get together with a united front, I am sure they will be successful.

MR. CRANE:

I am not sure that I have as clear an answer as I might have. For example, the broadcasting companies generously and frequently have given time for educational programs. It is a fine public service, and we appreciate it, but must we depend for this great public use of radio upon somebody giving it to us at their expense? It costs them money. It means a conflict sometimes between the hours that could be sold for advertising. It is not fair to broadcasters to ask them to carry this great public service, and so I ask the question, How are we going to have the use of radio to the schools and homes and to the public if we must depend finally on the good-will and generosity of people who have their own business at stake?

MR. RIES (Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio):

The managers of Station WLW do not feel that we are being forced by educators to give them time. We feel that we are extending our audience and enlarging the value of our services by presenting educational programs to succeed programs which may be commercial. If an individual comes to us with a program idea which may be educational, but which will attract listeners, he has a sympathetic ear. We believe we are enhancing the value of our program service to our audience. In other words, we do not feel that the educator is asking for something which we are giving him or his institution. If his idea is worth presenting on the air, we are glad to do it although it may cost us money.

MR. CRANE:

You are generous in disclaiming any credit or generosity to education. You say you are doing it because it increases your listeners. Does that mean then that things educational and things for the welfare of the public get on the air when they meet your approval? In other words, a public program must be judged by you as to whether or not it is going to add to the number of listeners to your station.

MR. RIES:

Let me ask you this question, If you were managing a broadcasting station that had as many potential listeners as our station has, would you put on the air a gentleman who wanted to reach the men who were writing doctors' theses in veterinary medicine?

MR. CRANE:

I doubt if I would, sir. I would not blame you at all if you said, "That is not of sufficient interest to our audience."

MR. RIES:

Where are you going to draw the line? That is what you are asking, and I am asking you the same question.

MR. KALTENBORN:

I wonder if Mr. Crane has not brought out a distinction that exists in reality—demanded as a right. I believe that educators have a definite right to demand certain things from radio stations. They ask, and when the requests are reasonable they are conceded; when they are unreasonable in the opinion of the station manager, sometimes of other officials, or sometimes of the Federal Communications Commission, they are not granted. I think you must bear in mind that behind the debate for the educators that ask and stations that grant or refuse stands the Federal body whose function it is to see that the uses of the allotted wave-length are for public convenience and in response to public needs, so I believe your distinction from gratuitous right depends upon a broad policy as expressed by the Federal Communications Commission.

MR. RANDALL:

Does not this interesting discussion between President Crane and Mr. Ries throw the spotlight on this as being the ultimate question that we have to answer, To whom should the final decision be left as to what is and what is not to go on the air of the public broadcasting channels? Shall it be public institutions organized and financed for public purposes, or the private advertising industries which it has been found necessary to accommodate on these public channels as a means of raising funds? Ultimately the Federal authorities must decide to whom this final selection of program material is to be left.

MR. PAGE (Station WLS, Chicago):

It seems to me that this last discussion overlooks one of the most important points in the selection of program material. While it is true that the program executive is the one who holds the pencil, it is equally true that the audience of listeners makes the final decision. Unless the program builder is closely

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

enough in touch with the audience to interpret the likes and dislikes of the listeners, and act effectively as their agent, he cannot continue to hold his place.

MISS JOHNSON (American School of the Air, New York City):

May I suggest that educators among themselves do not agree as to what is to be taught in certain subjects. They do not agree, for instance, in the science which should be taught in school. How are we going to find other people who will agree?

MR. BUCKLEY (Board of Education, Cleveland):

It seems to me the last question is the one which is paramount in our minds. Our youngsters ask us if the best antiseptic on the market is such and such. An Englishman stated that his countrymen desired to have such decisions made by intelligent persons. In our country, when experts disagree, we refer the question to the great democracy of ignorance. Such a view of democracy is based upon the assumption that it is safe and right to drink poison when advised over the radio to do so, provided a majority vote to try it. It would seem that where a question of health is involved, in spite of the power of money to control advertising, intelligence should be the deciding factor with respect to such programs over the radio.

MR. RANDALL:

Is it not equally true that the President of the United States does not really decide anything? What he decides to do is, in the last analysis, what he believes the majority of people in their wiser moments want him to do. So, is that not rather a distinction without substance?

MR. KALTENBORN:

I would say that it is a distinction of real substance. It is absolutely true, I think, as you say. I have found it so in my contacts with a succession of presidents as political correspondent. They are not the agents that we commonly think they are. They are responsive to a thousand influences from man to man. They make decisions which represent the junction of the forces playing upon them, and each is a successful or unsuccessful president in accordance with these forces. I should say that in broadcasting he is successful or unsuccessful in proportion as he can interpret the silent demand of the audience.

MR. RIES:

One way we go about determining that demand is to go from door to door asking to what station they are listening. When we find one of our programs down the line of interest from what it was previously, we tear it to pieces. If we can determine why it has lost its audience appeal, at least part of it, we proceed to rebuild it. That is one way we decide what we shall broadcast and what we shall not. When a program gets too far down the list, we quit broadcasting it.

DEMOCRACY AND THE RADIO

● HERMAN G. JAMES

PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH
DAKOTA

IN THE consideration of the radio as an essential factor in a democracy, the task would be simplified considerably if the latter concept lent itself as readily to definition as does the former. Whether we regard radio from the scientific angle as an instrument for sending and receiving messages by means of electric waves without wires, whether we look at it from the economic viewpoint as a means of communication, or from the purely social aspect of a new method of information and entertainment, almost everyone is in essential agreement with everyone else as to what is meant by radio.

Not so with democracy. Not only is there no scientific concept of democracy upon which the experts can agree, but, in spite of the fact that the term is one of the most widely used in our present-day speech and writing, there is nothing approaching even a majority agreement in popular usage as to what are the essential elements involved in the concept. Etymologically speaking, it is true, the concept is simplicity itself, the rule of the people. But immediately the field is wide open for divergencies of opinion as to what is meant by rule, and what is meant by the people. Nor do we find ourselves much assisted by the more intricate definitions attempted by political scientists, for there are about as many attempts at definition as there have been political scientists; in fact, if the truth be told, a great many more.

It is not my purpose to add another to the already overlong list of attempted definitions, first because I have little confidence in my ability to define the term satisfactorily to myself, and none at all in my ability to frame a definition which will be accepted by others. The attempt to do so would only open up the subject for irrelevant argument, and we would soon get off the main track, which for this discussion is the place of radio in relation to certain aspects of the problem of democracy.

As a matter of fact, although in a general way the popular concept of democracy, in spite of having a certain common underlying feeling or conviction, is incapable of definition, it may be approached by the back door, so to speak, by concentrating on some of the things that are recognized as not being compatible with democracy.

Outstanding among these denials of democracy is the suppression of freedom of thought and speech. And, as freedom of thought has no practical significance except in its manifestations through speech, writing, or other overt act, we may confine ourselves to these manifestations of thought. Thought itself, of course, may be stifled, if not in the existing generation, in the generations to come by skilful training and propaganda, so that liberty of teaching may be an essential factor in the preservation of liberty of thought, even though the thoughts of a particular individual may be beyond the control of any human power. Indeed, in any given situation, where any considerable or even appreciable portion of the population theoretically or actually clothed with political power is incapable of independent thought, the denial of liberty of teaching or preaching may amount to a denial of liberty of thought for those in need of enlightenment. But as a rule, the concept of liberty of expression, through speech or writing or through concerted action, is looked upon as a denial of the rights of the person speaking, writing, or acting, rather than of those who might hear or read or see these manifestations.

It is evident that even in circumscribing our field of discussion by limiting it to the particular denial of democracy involved in abrogating or restricting freedom of expression, we have not eradicated controversial elements. Since no one can maintain that freedom of speech demands the absolute right of every individual to say anything anywhere under any and all circumstances, there are at once projected into the picture varying conceptions of the manner in which this absolute freedom or complete license can properly be limited. But it does not seem necessary or desirable for the purposes of this discussion even to enter upon this controversy. For the particular kinds of

limitations on free speech with which this paper will deal, are, I believe, limitations which all of us will recognize as incompatible with democracy under any concept.

From the point of view of denial of, or serious limitations upon, freedom of speech, then, it seems obvious that a good part of the civilized world of today is not operating under a democracy, no matter what the particular machinery of government may be or whether the so-called system is sovietism, fascism, or a dictatorship under the direction of a king or a president. Russia, Germany, Italy, the Balkan states, Austria, Turkey, Japan, and all the rest have as their foundation stone the denial of freedom of speech and writing.

Not only is a large part of the modern world operating under a plan which denies democracy in that particular aspect, but the movement in that direction has been appallingly rapid in recent years, in fact, ever since the war to make the world safe for democracy, ironical as that seems. If, as is true, freedom of speech was denied in czarist Russia, and in Turkey under the sultans, as much as in Russia or in Turkey under a dictator, the same was not true in imperial Germany, in Italy under the limited monarchy, or even in Japan in the era of growing liberalism prior to the World War. The abrogation of free speech is of the essence of dictatorships, and dictatorships are as numerous now as they were in the periods of absolutism that preceded the American and French revolutions.

But you will say, of course, that while we have to admit that absolutism and denial of freedom of speech are spreading in the world as a whole such a situation is unthinkable in this country of liberty. I myself believe it is, and I certainly profoundly hope that it is. Those of us who lived through the period of the World War, however, will have no difficulty in recalling that during that period liberty of speech was all but dead; and what happened in 1917 and 1918 may happen again, devoutly as we all may pray that none of it will be repeated.

Here, no doubt, some one will rise to say that all rules are off in time of war, that national safety transcends all other considerations, and that just because democracy has no place in

war it does not mean that any permanent departure from democratic principles can be argued from their suspension during such critical times. With that point of view I am in complete agreement. But it may not be amiss to point out, that just as there are many persons today in this country who believe and argue and act as though the existence of a national emergency like the present depression justifies and indeed demands a departure from the long-accepted constitutional principles upon which this government was founded and under which it has lived its hundred forty-six years, so there may be persons who believe that an emergency like this may justify the abrogation of the right of free speech upon the same principles. Indeed, there are such persons. My belief is that they are not many and that they are destined to diminish in numbers rather than to increase, but the situation is hardly such as to justify us in dismissing it by saying it is simply unthinkable.

I am free to say, therefore, that in my opinion the danger of government interference with liberty of speech and of the press is remote, though not non-existent. But there is another element in the situation which is of most recent development, and which is our primary concern here today. And that is radio.

Now radio has certain peculiarities that put it into a unique class. Essentially it is true to say that radio has an unlimited field of operation with a limited field of origin, and both of these characteristics stamp it with a nature entirely different from anything that has gone before.

No newspaper or chain of newspapers can reach in a year as many different people as can be reached in one broadcast of a national hook-up. No silver-tongued orator holding forth every night for a year to capacity houses of ten thousand people each can be heard by as many people as can listen to one local broadcast in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, or any of the other cities with a million people or more, in one evening.

Therein lies the wonder of radio, and therein lies its power for good or evil. It multiplies ten thousand fold the opportunities for bringing the message of true friends of the nation to the homes of the nation. But by the same sign it multiplies

ten thousand fold the opportunities for demagogues and enemies of the people. On the other hand, if the voice of protest against unwise action of the government can reach through the radio millions where formerly it could reach hundreds, so can the voice of the government seeking to justify its action reach millions instead of thousands. The rise of the demagogue, one of the spectacular phenomena of America today, is the direct result of the radio.

There would be real reason for rejoicing in this situation perhaps if it insured greater discussion of public questions and a larger audience for both sides, on the principle that out of a multitude of counsellors comes wisdom rather than confusion. Even though the appeal of the demagogue is bound to be stronger than the appeal of reason, especially in times of stress and strife, and therefore the thousand-fold multiplication of the audience of the demagogue cannot be offset by an equal or even proportionate multiplication of the audience of the voice of reason, so long as the number of those who listen to rabble-rousers is greater than those who will listen to reason, that is an absolutely inescapable situation in a democracy. If the basis of fundamental common sense in a democracy's constituents is too weak, there is no ultimate hope anyway. Anarchy or dictatorship is the only alternative.

Unwilling to accept that philosophy of despair, we must face the fact that the progress of science as exemplified in the radio has again outrun the progress of wisdom in human relationships. But we cannot for that reason turn back the wheels of scientific progress and abandon the radio, any more than we can abandon the machine for hand labor or the airplane for the oxcart. Our only hope again is that education, used in a broad sense of knowledge how to live, will advance rapidly enough to prevent the instruments being placed at the command of ignorance, by which I mean to prevent passion, prejudice, and selfishness from engulfing our whole society.

That inescapable danger, however, is not the one I have in mind. The danger that seems to me more immediate and much more remediable arises from the second fundamental character-

istic of radio, namely, the definite limit to the means of origin. There is no theoretical limit to the possible number of speakers, authors of leaflets, articles, or books, or even newspapers and magazines, through which conflicting views as to governmental policies or social theories can be promulgated. Theoretically at least, there is in these agencies safety in numbers. But there is a definite limit in theory as well as in practice to the number of broadcasting stations there may be, to the time available for broadcasting, and to the total of listeners that can be reached by any one station. By its nature the radio is a monopoly. That situation has long since been recognized nationally and internationally.

From this characteristic of radio flows the fact that there is no guaranty in the ordinary provisions concerning liberty of speech in our constitutions. A platform speaker or a soap-box orator must be hushed by police or mobs if he is to be denied the freedom of speech. A book or pamphlet must be suppressed by active measures. But a radio address may be impossible with or without active intent on anyone's part simply because there is no room on the air, paradoxical as that no doubt sounds. Radio programs, in other words, are licensed, and their maximum is physically limited; and so without any denial in the ordinary use of the term, there is no such thing as freedom of speech on the air.

That is the problem of radio, and, of course, it has many ramifications besides the fundamental question of freedom of speech with which we are here concerned. But of these other questions, such as the type of program which should be permitted or encouraged or enforced, we cannot now take account.

So far, the presentation has been permeated by the point of view of interference with free speech by the government. It must be obvious that under a system whereby the stations are government-licensed—and there is no other possible system because of the monopolistic character of radio—the possibility of censorship or suppression by governmental action is a real possibility. Much of the opposition to government ownership and operation of radio takes its stand on the danger or even

certainty of censorship and government propaganda under such a plan, and no doubt the temptation would be greater under such a system.

But there is another aspect of this matter of freedom of speech as related to the radio. Propaganda is not the monopoly of the government. If the government could for all time absolutely assure us against interference with free speech by the authorities, that would be only a partial safeguard. There are in addition the Scylla of vested interests on the one hand and the Charybdis of selfish radicals on the other. The malefactors of great wealth and the professional agitators and their bemused lieutenants are masters of propaganda, and the radio is the realized dream of the propaganda maker.

There is in my opinion just as much danger to our liberties in the insidious or blatant propaganda, according to their kind, of these enemies of the public as there is in government propaganda. If they undertake to monopolize the definitely limited facilities of the air for their own purposes, there may be no alternative to governmental censorship. Or even if the facilities of the air are monopolized for the more or less harmless purposes of legitimate commercial advertising, there is still the inevitable result that the information of the public is left to the agencies of a government, whose particular administration at any given time is inescapably colored by partisan political considerations. I say nothing of the denial of opportunities for education uncolored by the flavor of commercialism, for important as that consideration is in the general picture of radio, it bears only indirectly on the question of free speech. Primarily that denial constitutes a limitation on the freedom of learning, in itself a basic aspect of democracy, as we have seen, and therefore a vital phase of the relation of democracy and the radio. But right now we are looking at the problem from the point of view of the individual or agency that has something to say and cannot say it over the most potent means of communication because the physical possibilities are limited.

Where then shall we turn for aid in our dilemma? The traditional solution of a free-for-all fight and may-the-best-man-win

is obviously inapplicable in a situation where the best man may not even be allowed to enter the ring. The principle of the survival of the fittest will no doubt prevail in the long run with civilizations, nations, and forms of government as with individuals, no matter what we may try to do about it. But in this particular contest, under the peculiar attributes of the radio as an instrument of democracy, the fittest may conceivably be denied entrance until irremediable damage has been done.

To me the answer seems fairly obvious. If in human affairs there is no individual or agency that is wholly and absolutely without selfish reactions, there are obviously some that are in their very nature less tainted with such an admixture of motives than are others. In theory and in fact, such are the educational institutions of the country.

It is unnecessary for me to enter into a lengthy discussion of the qualifications of educational institutions as impartial seekers after truth. I am well aware that some educational institutions have been charged with being the hirelings of big business. Today there is no one who is unaware of the fact that some educational institutions are charged with being hotbeds of radicalism, communism, or any other "ism" that happens to stand for the worst of human follies in the minds of the persons so making the charge. Nor am I unaware of the fact that it is possible to assert that this or that institution is the political tool of some unscrupulous demagogue.

A calm dispassionate estimate of the situation, however, would show that with all their real and imaginary shortcomings in these opposing directions educational institutions constitute the only hope for unbiased, unselfish considerations of public questions. That they are in their very nature more inclined to view matters objectively than either private business, governmental administrations, or crusaders of any type, is not merely theoretically true, it is actually true. Indeed, if we deny that, then not only is education a *fata morgana*, but all human progress and even human salvation are dreams that need not even be pursued any longer.

So I am forced to the conclusion that the fundamental and

sufficient safeguards against the dangers inherent in radio to free speech and through it to democracy lie in the safeguarding of a decent proportion of the facilities of the air to such educational institutions. Whether all of them are used or not, whether those that are used are used in the most efficient and effective way or not, whether the group of listeners is large or small, the fundamental consideration is that these facilities should be definitely and lastingly protected against encroachment either by the political administration that happens to be in power or by the special interests of those with or without property. Better a silent hour, or many silent hours, if need be, than a pre-emption of facilities that would prevent the shedding of as much light as possible by disinterested educational agencies wherever such light becomes available.

MR. VOGT (Workers Education Bureau of America, Detroit):

I want to express my appreciation of this paper by President James. He has brought out an idea which, I think, is of fundamental importance and one of the main reasons why our educational institutions, as far as possible, should hold their broadcasting privileges. Some years ago when a university president asked my opinion regarding the desirability of abandoning the university station because a neighboring commercial station had greatly improved its facilities and had invited the university to close its station, I said by no means because the time may come when university stations will be sources of freedom of speech. I think there is that trend today throughout the United States.

But Mr. James gave some impressions which I think might be modified. He did not seem to think there were many dangers threatening the freedom of speech. In my opinion, it is highly important that the group interested in education by radio should guard jealously the rights of free speech that the ideas, germinating here and there, as to how welfare can be improved throughout the American commonwealth should have a fair share of representation. The future of our educational institutions is closely related to the preservation of that right.

MR. MILLER (University of Chicago):

I believe myself to be as staunch an advocate of free speech as anyone. It seems to me, however, that some of the arguments here presented apply to relative freedom in co-operation with commercial radio stations and those controlled by educational institutions rather than toward the more general dangers of censorship.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

If I may cite an example, the University of Chicago has been broadcasting over commercial stations for nearly thirteen years. In that time we have been as free, if not more free from censorship, as would be possible in a state university where the legislature may become excited by radical expressions over the air emanating in the name of the university.

MR. RANDALL:

It may be pertinent to remind the persons engaged in this discussion of Mr. Loucks's remark that the government holds the licensee of the station responsible for every word that is broadcast, whether it is from an educational institution or not. That being the case the University of Chicago will meet with censorship from the licensees whenever the licensees meet with censorship from the government.

MISS WALLER (Central Division, National Broadcasting Company):

I might suggest to Mr. Randall that he become conversant with the facts before he makes the statement that the University of Chicago programs will be censored when the licensee meets with censorship from the government. In the first place, the government has never interfered with the program material of a radio station so long as the material is not obscene or profane and is truthful in character. We have been broadcasting the Round Table from the University of Chicago over the National Broadcasting network for the past two years. There has never been a script written in connection with this program. Each thirty-minute program is entirely determined by the speakers. The only knowledge which the broadcasting company has of the program is its subject. Even at times when the statements made by some of the participants of the Round Table have bordered on libel, the program has not been cut, but the University has been allowed to stand or fall on what was said. If, of course, someone has been attacked, we have permitted the attacked person the privilege of the network to answer the charges. This for instance was done last February in connection with the broadcast on the World Court in which Mr. Gideonse attacked Father Coughlin, and at Father Coughlin's request we granted him time on the same network the same night to answer the charges. We have never attempted in any way to censor a University of Chicago program, and I cannot conceive of any circumstance arising which would call for censorship of any kind.

MR. BARTLETT (Station WSYU, Syracuse University):

There are substantially two kinds of censorship. In one, the station may require the speaker to write out and submit to its program department what he has to say. In this way the station may "blue pencil" some of the remarks if it considers them to be libelous. Since the station is legally responsible, no one can much blame it for such a rule. A station even here will make exceptions to individuals it considers "safe," or perhaps better said "responsible persons." The other kind of censorship is exercised by the program director

of a station when he refuses to allow certain people to broadcast. In this case they are not even given the opportunity of submitting a script. This refusal may be based on the claim that their material "lacks public interest" (for example, I recently censored a script titled "What Makes Lath Marks in Your Plaster" for that reason) or because the station does not approve of the opinions held by the person applying. The latter is a much more dangerous type of censorship. It is not so easily proved (the reasons for not allowing an individual to broadcast are many), and since it is the most effective type of censorship known, it needs the greatest consideration by radio people.

MR. BRACKETT (University of South Dakota):

There is one question involved here that is rather outside the censoring in advance of what is to be said in a broadcast. I think President James had that in mind, and the idea was suggested recently by David Lawrence. Suppose we have as large a chain broadcast as possible on some public matter—political, educational, or otherwise—more or less controversial. The person who speaks over that chain presents his side only. I do not think we can have such a broadcast unless it is one-sided. Now, as written out, in most cases there would be nothing to be censored, nothing to be cut, yet only one side of a controversial question would be discussed. The problem of how it is to be answered still presents itself. Many such national broadcasts are not answered. If they are answered at all, they have to be partially answered by the newspapers in different parts of the country. No general and complete statement of the other side is possible in most cases. I do not know whether people are reading newspaper editorials any more, or whether they are getting their ideas from broadcasts and the so-called "news reels" of the movies. I do not know whether or not the general public is thinking independently on such questions. A national broadcast on a controversial matter of that kind, it seems to me, is similar to putting all our newspapers under one management and publishing one newspaper throughout the entire country. What can be done? Surely we ought not to leave the responsibility to answer or to give the other side even partially to the local newspapers?

Also, there is propaganda, perhaps not intentional but real, which influences the thinking of millions of persons. At present there is no adequate way to meet it, and the influence of these gigantic and one-sided broadcasts is increasing.

THE RADIO OF THE FUTURE

● STANLEY HIGH

NEWS COMMENTATOR, NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY

THERE are at least three particulars in which the radio of the future ought to resemble the radio of the past and the present. In its status as an institution, I believe that the radio of the future in the United States ought to continue to be free and that it will continue to be competitive; in its program content, it should continue to be looked upon, primarily, as entertainment.

The people of the United States owe a debt, of which they are not even dimly aware, to the present fact of a free radio. I know that it is customary in certain academic and generally uninformed circles to insist that radio is not free. A little search after the facts, however, will soon dispel that illusion. I can, for example, give my own testimony. I have been regularly on the sustaining programs of the National Broadcasting Company for four years. The news material I have handled has been highly controversial. I have not been limited to the facts, but I have had a free hand to state my opinions. The mail I have received is best proof that those opinions have not always been generally acceptable. And yet, in four years, the officials of the National Broadcasting Company have never censored a speech of mine by even so much as the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." Mr. Kaltenborn, whom I have never discovered hesitating in the matter of opinion, could doubtless give the same testimony.

It is important, I think, to realize that there is no other country on earth where such freedom of radio expression exists. Even in Great Britain—I might say especially in Great Britain—you not only have to be the right person to get a chance on the air; you have to say the right things. And the officials of the British Broadcasting Company are the sole and final judges of what ought to be said.

In my opinion, the preservation of a free radio is essential not only for radio, but for the future of American democracy. What is the most significant contemporary political development in

American life? Is it not the increased inarticulateness, on political issues, of the American public? Thomas Jefferson once remarked that our democracy would survive so long as our people stayed in the country. When they move to town, said he, political discussion will no longer be so easy and political enlightenment will decline. Well, we have done what Jefferson warned us against. We have moved from the country and the small town to the city, and the result which Jefferson feared has been in the making. Politics, increasingly, fell into the hands of a small oligarchy. The average citizen not only refused to take much of an interest in political questions; he actually began to abhor the whole business of politics.

And then came radio. The result is that—in the past five years—the old town-meeting, cracker-barrel atmosphere has been restored to American political life. The American public has flipped a button, and the issues before the nation have suddenly been planted at its firesides. You may not like Father Coughlin or Huey Long or General Johnson. You may be bitter against the “My Friend” speeches of Mr. Roosevelt, but the fact is that they represent perhaps the healthiest political sign of the times. The seventy-five thousand telegrams received on May 6 by the Senate on the bonus bill may all be wrong. But if we believe in democratic government, they represent an increased alertness to public questions which is all to the good.

It is altogether possible that when we emerge from these parlous times we will find that our American democracy has a wider popular support at its base than ever before in the last seventy-five years. And for this widening of the foundations of our political structure we have a free radio chiefly to thank. Whatever we may do to radio in the future, I cannot believe that we will alter its status as a free institution—serving to make opinion—yes; but the servant of no particular opinions; an agency for political expression—yes; but not an agency of politics.

In the second place, I earnestly hope that radio will continue to be competitive. The healthiest thing about radio in the United States, at present, is the fact that there are two great

broadcasting companies. Let the government take over radio, and you would have, here, a sag in radio operation that would bring us, not first-rate programs, but phonograph records such as those with which the British Broadcasting Company whiles away so many hours. As it is today, radio in this country is a race for the best between Columbia and National Broadcasting Company. One reason we get so much of the best is because if one company does not provide it the other is sure to. And both companies depend for their reputation on the share of the best which, in the course of a year, they are able to secure.

Then, I think the radio of the future should continue to be, primarily, entertainment. Right now, there is a considerable difference of opinion among so-called intellectuals on that point. I do not believe that there is any difference of opinion among the rank and file of the radio audience. To the average family-by-the-fireside listeners, radio will be worth while so long as it is entertaining, and cease to be when it is not.

I think I understand the reaction of our intellectuals to this. Here is radio—a new and powerful social force. In the end it is bound to do something to our civilization. We are not sure just what. But knowing that, the normal reaction among many high-minded people is that it ought to be taken over, forthwith, and made the servant of their high-mindedness. The reformers think it should be the instrument of their reforms. The educators think it should furnish the spotlight for their all-too-obscure pedagogy. The ecclesiastics look upon it as the means by which faith will be revived. And the result is that, from dawn to dark, the door to the office of every radio official echoes to the knocks of good people with plans in their brief cases for the microsalvation of the world.

And the unfortunate fact is that when these people discover that radio officials look upon their primary business as something entirely different, they go off in a huff and become advocates of governmental control or something else equally absurd. Now, I would not want to underestimate the importance of radio to these good people and their divers good causes. Radio has been and will be an aid to reform. It has been and will be a

means of education. It has been and will be a force for the strengthening of religious faith. But none of these things is its primary function. Its primary function is that of entertainment. When it ceases to be that, it will cease to be of use—not only to the entertainers, but to the educators, the reformers and the ecclesiastics as well. If serious matters on the air have a large listening audience, that is not due, primarily, to the serious matters, themselves. It is due to the fact that radio, as entertainment, has built up a huge listening audience. And education on the air gets a following because of the entertainment on the air that it would never get in its own right.

Now, I think I understand part of the impatience of, let us say, educators toward present-day radio broadcasting. They labor under the academic impression that to be profound one must be dull; that the fact of one's popularity is, of itself, proof of one's cheapness. Educators are not showmen. In general, they are not even interesting. They are irked by the insistence of program managers that they descend, so to speak, to the street level. They favor government control of radio in part because they have the feeling that with the government running radio these standards of what is interesting would be abandoned—as they probably would be; and that, then, educators could have all the time they wanted to have and be as uninteresting as they wanted to be.

Well, I think the radio of the future will not have any less education in it than at present. It will probably have more. But what it has, will be decidedly more interesting. Educators will provide the facts and let the dramatists put on the show. Whoever runs radio it is true, I think, that our present educational programs provide no evidence that educators should run it. And educators, if they are as public spirited as they assert themselves to be, will be wise to put themselves in the hands of those who know the language of the public and the dramatic ways and means for enlisting its interest.

But there is another side to this picture of the radio of the future. That is the side which has to do with the broadcasting companies, and the individual station owners, but particularly

the broadcasting companies—for they set the pace for the nation. The future of radio, in the last analysis, is in their hands. If the government—in the end—should take over radio your thanks will be due, not to the so-called vision of the agitators, but to the shortsightedness of those who now control radio. That, at present, there is a considerable measure of shortsightedness among them is, I think, very true.

If you were to drop in, tomorrow morning, on the owner of a radio station or the executive of a radio company and ask him about the future of radio, you would probably be told many things of interest. You would be told about television and the mechanical wonders that are just around the corner. You would be told of what radio has done by way of bringing this and that into your homes. But as to the more important—the far more important—matter of the content and tendencies of the radio of the future you would, I think, be told very little.

The fact is that the big aim in radio, at present, is not to plan for the future, but to produce for the present. Those who run radio have their days too crowded with the radio of the present to give more than scant and sketchy attention to the radio of the future. Within little more than a decade these executives have been swept, by radio, into a new world. It is a world of mystery. They are only half aware where they are and not aware at all of where they are going. Today's program! That's the big thing. Yesterday's program is water over the dam. Tomorrow's program is a bridge to cross when they come to it.

You know, it is a remarkable fact that radio companies are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars every year experimenting for the improvement of mechanical technique of radio. They are getting tomorrow's gadgets ready for use. But they are spending very little, if anything, experimenting on program technique—getting tomorrow's content ready for our use. In the field of mechanics, radio operates on the basis of long-time planning. In the field of program it operates on a day-to-day, hand-to-mouth basis.

As I say, this may be because radio is such a new thing. As yet there are no precedents and little enough experience to go

by. But that—far from being an excuse for a lack of vision—ought to be the reason for it.

And no one can say that radio—as a business enterprise—is not run on the most acceptable basis possible. Radio companies have their efficiency engineers. There is business precision in every department. In so far as radio is merely another profit-making industry, no one could find fault with it.

But it is evident that radio is more than a profit-making industry. It is a public-service institution. That is why I believe that the greatest peril to private radio in the United States is not in the program department, but in the business department. To the degree that the business office is supreme over the enterprise—to that degree radio is due for trouble. And if the dividend makers were really shrewd, they would see that radio is likely to be most profitable when it shows least concern for the profits.

Today, however, the business men who have money in radio in the United States are worried and jumpy. They have this new toy. It is proving to be a very profitable toy. They are quite aware that it is a toy which may, eventually, be taken away from them. Radio strategy, therefore, is now largely a matter of meeting each new attack by last-minute and panic measures, rather than by taking time out to make long-time plans for radio which would make its position—as a social instrument in private hands—invulnerable. Radio, today, is not looking to the future. It is defending the present. Well, you will say, what is to be done about it? I may never be asked to make a speech like this again, so I shall take full advantage of the opportunity. There are several things which, as it seems to me, might constructively be done.

In the first place, our radio companies, which have plenty of mechanical engineers and efficiency engineers, need a few aspiration engineers. Men and women whose business it would be to give a periodical accounting of the way in which radio is discharging its social and moral responsibilities. These individuals would not be anchored to a desk in New York or Chicago or San Francisco. They would be itinerant evangelists of tomorrow's

radio. They would keep in constant touch with America—outside its big cities as well as in them. They would be expected to have plenty to say on the way in which radio was or was not contributing to the betterment of American life. And there would have to be some assurance that what they had to say would be listened to by the management—including both the cashier's and the sales departments.

In the second place, the various radio companies should get together and either jointly or separately establish boards of radio review. These boards would be made up of individuals who knew something about radio, on the one hand, and something about America, on the other hand. No program—commercial or sustaining—ought to be allowed on the air without the approval of this board. I can imagine nothing that would be more salutary for the reputation of radio than for the news to get out that a big account had been turned down because its program did not meet the high standards of the board of review.

In the second place, there ought to be not only a program but an advertising board of review. This board would have as its function the approving, first, of the product to be advertised; and second, of the manner in which the advertising is presented. Again, I think it would have a decidedly salutary effect upon the reputation of radio, as well as upon the advertisers of reputable products, if it became known that a broadcasting company had turned down a fat contract because the product to be advertised did not measure up to radio requirements.

The National Broadcasting Company, as I know, already has a board which passes on the advertising content of programs. This board, I understand, has exerted a good influence in a number of directions. But it seems to me that the effectiveness of any of these groups of review will be seriously impaired if their members are paid employees of the broadcasting companies. They can hardly be expected to have—as employees—either the detachment or the influence necessary to make their findings effective.

Then—and I see I am getting a lot of committees started—there is a very definite place in every large-sized community for

a local radio council. This council could be composed of representatives of the churches, the schools, the woman's clubs, the chamber of commerce, and the like. Its purpose would be, first, that of local critic for local and chain programs. In such a capacity its conclusions would be of value to the national board of review—on all chain programs. In the second place, this local board would have as its function the development of a discriminating radio audience. It would publish, each week, a list of programs, graded and classified as to taste and age. Its work, in this regard, would, I think, greatly increase the intelligence of the radio audience and make it far easier to avoid the bad and hear the good on the air.

Finally, I believe that every large radio company in the United States ought to have a well-financed department of program planning. In the current year—this department would be experimenting with the programs for next year and the year after that. It would give experimental broadcasts to special groups; make surveys; appraise new ideas; in short, have the task of preparing the broadcasts of tomorrow. Such a trial-and-error department would give to radio a hold on the future which—without it—it will never have.

EDUCATION BY RADIO

● WILLIAM A. ORTON

SMITH COLLEGE

INDUSTRIAL civilization often has been compared to the monster of Frankenstein. The comparison is hardly fair—to Frankenstein. After all, Frankenstein was a very capable scientist who had a pretty clear idea of what he intended to produce. The result was not completely in accord with expectations, but accidents happen in even the best-regulated families. Imagine, however, an engineer even more capable than Frankenstein, working away at a superb and colossal scientific structure, and being visited, let us say, by a naïve inquirer from Mars. The visitor marvels at the beauty, the intricacy, the precision of the workmanship, and finally says he: "That is a

wonderful piece of machinery you have there, Mr. Engineer. What is it for?" And the engineer replies: "What is it for? How should I know? Why bring that up? I have been much too busy to worry about such theoretical and unpractical questions. I have not the faintest idea what it is for."

Such an engineer, one would think, could hardly be found outside the walls of a mental hospital; and yet that is somewhat the fashion in which American broadcasting was allowed to develop. The scientific work, performed largely under the auspices of certain great commercial companies, was and is superb. But it is not the business of any board of directors to discuss ultimate issues of public policy and national culture; and the whole technical equipment was perfected and put into operation without any serious consideration of the social purpose it could or should serve. Mr. Merlin Aylesworth has told us that when the National Broadcasting Company was incorporated nine years ago, its purpose—to quote his own words—was "to act as an indirect sales-promotion agency for the radio manufacturing industry." The pioneer stations KDKA and WJZ went into action for the obvious reason that unless there were something "on the air" the public would have no incentive to buy receiving sets; but they did not conceive of themselves at the outset as a branch of the advertising business. The offers of the advertisers to buy time, and the subsequent discovery that here was a new and independent source of business profit, were something of a surprise—though it is not recorded that any tears were shed over it. When I hear people talk of the resulting broadcasting situation as the "American system," I cannot avoid lifting an academic eyebrow. It may be American, but it is not a system. It is a highly competitive, heterogeneous, uncoordinated, unanticipated, extension of the reign of ballyhoo; and while I would not for a moment suggest that it is anything less than perfect in its social function, I can only remark that its sublime suitability to our national needs is not the result of any planned purpose, but of sheer and unadulterated good luck. A faith in this genial destiny of good luck is in fact the last residue of that school of thought known as *laissez faire*.

The notion of letting everyone go his own way, in the comfortable faith that the way he found it profitable to go would coincide “naturally” with the way he ought, in the general interest, to be going, is now pretty definitely outmoded. It was useful while it lasted. It let loose an incredible burst of energy and inventiveness in the economic sphere; it gave an unprecedented stimulus to scientific and technical innovation. It also provided governments that had forgotten how to govern with the assurance that government was really unnecessary, and it allowed interests that had no intention of submitting to control to argue that control was socially undesirable. But now all the talk is of planning—economic planning. We realize that unless we conceive our economic structure as a whole, and take reasonable care to see that the various sections fit together, the concern may fall to pieces. It is a difficult task, but we are all thinking of some way to set about it.

But in regard to the culture, the intelligence, and the morale of our democracy, we still believe for the most part in the genial destiny of good luck. We believe—or we act collectively as if we believed—that so long as elementary educational opportunity is provided to our young, we shall get a democracy adequate to the immense problems of this modern age without doing anything special to secure it. So we expose our youngsters to the commercial stimuli of a mechanized culture—to the syndicated comic strip, the “funnies,” the commercial movie, commercialized sport, commercialized radio (“Just run and tell mother to be sure and buy a can of Mumbo-Jumbo, then tear off the label, write your name and address on the back, and we’ll send you a Thingumatite. Now listen to the adventures of Colonel Boop-a-doop and the bold bad kidnap gang”)—and we assume that out of all this they will “naturally” develop intelligence, morale, and a sense of values equal to the demands modern citizenship will make upon them. Are we not a little too optimistic?

It was my privilege last year to make an extensive tour of nazi Germany. I need not describe in detail the immense energy and the great ingenuity I saw directed not simply to the molding of public opinion, nor to propaganda, as we under-

stand propaganda, but to the creation and maintenance of a certain national morale. The process, as you know, is, on the whole, overwhelmingly successful, and the strength and solidarity of the new Germany is largely the result of it. The method, of course, is authoritarian, as in Russia and Italy, and the ideals are in many respects the antithesis of our own. But I brought back one definite conviction. If the few states that still cherish personal liberty and individual freedom as supreme ends would show one-quarter the devotion to those ideals that the dictatorships show to theirs, we should have no further anxieties about the future of democracy. If we wish to maintain for democracy a morale as high, an idealism as powerful, as is being reached under the European dictatorships, we shall have to take this entire question of our national culture more seriously than we have ever yet dreamed of doing. Do we really value democracy enough to make sure that our people are adequately equipped for it? Do we really believe in freedom to the point of training our people to tell good from bad, true from false, right from wrong, as free people must be able to do? Does it look that way at present?

Like most of my readers, I have been in close touch now for a good many years with the efforts of non-commercial groups to utilize the radio for purely cultural purposes; and I must confess that I go away from meetings such as this with a deep and bitter sense of humiliation. It is not that the difficulties have been so great and the accomplishment, on the whole, so slender. That was inevitable. It is rather that as an educator—and in the course of a fairly long life, I have worked at about every kind of educational activity there is—as an educator, I ask myself why it is that education so often finds itself in the rôle of a beggar: going to the commercial broadcasters hat in hand—or should I say, manuscript in hand?—asking humbly for the gift of a little time; going to congressional hearings, asking for permission to plead its cause; going to the Radio Commission asking for a little protection—and discovering that while vested rights grow up naturally about a commercial enterprise, they somehow fail to cohere about an enterprise that does not talk

money. There is something paradoxical in the fact that while this country was by a long lead the first in the world to take seriously the great task of elementary education, nowadays when the educator seeks a chance to carry on the good work, what opportunity he gets must be asked for and received as if it were a hand-out.

Certain gentlemen in the state and federal legislatures profess to be much concerned about the alleged growth of radical sentiment in the youth of this country. They propose to stop it by passing laws about taking oaths and saluting flags. This week in England and throughout the Commonwealth of Nations they are celebrating the jubilee of King George. Does anybody suppose these millions of people, young and old, all over the world, are loyal by force of law? Does anyone imagine that this enthusiasm for His Majesty, and the British tradition that he stands for, rests on the compulsory observance of some sort of ritual? No, my friends, you do not get loyalty by force of law. Loyalty laws engender a reaction that far more than neutralizes their ostensible purpose. These gentlemen who are so worried about the alleged decline of patriotism in American youth should ask themselves if perhaps there is not some reason for it nearer home than Moscow. Perhaps these young people are in some way disappointed in their hopes of their country. Youth is naturally idealistic. Perhaps their government is not showing enough idealism to encourage them. Or is it we older teachers who are the real culprits? We train the young, so far as we can, to put the abiding spiritual satisfactions of life higher in the scale of values than any merely economic ends; and apparently some of them believe us and expect to find their government acting as if we were right. Well, if they listen to the radio they get a shock—especially of a Sunday evening, when young thoughts are rather prone to turn to sacred things.

The criticism implied here is not directed mainly to program content—or even to program sequence, which is at present a confusion of desolation. I am not unmindful of the many excellent programs on the air—some of the best of them under commercial sponsorship. I know, too, how some of the program

directors are almost torn in pieces between the demand of the advertisers for what will sell the goods and the appeal of the finer things for which they would like to be responsible. That struggle has caused many a headache—and many a heartache—inside the commercial studios. The point that concerns us, as educators, is at once more specific and more fundamental.

We know, as teachers, that one of the prime requisites of fruitful teaching is the establishment of a right relation between the pupil and the institution: because that relation will enter into, will color, everything that is attempted there. When I was a little boy, the free elementary school was a sort of jail. That is how many of us felt about it, in spite of the best the overworked teachers could do. To begin with, it was usually ugly; it was in a crowded section, with seldom any trees or grass or flowers about it, very little either within or without that was beautiful. We worked at our tasks because we had to, and when we were through we got out and ran away as fast as we could with a deep breath of relief. Now we are changing all that. Some of the finest buildings in America are among the new public schools. Some of the most devoted public service in the world is performed in and about them. Some of the happiest communities on earth are to be found any day of the week inside those walls and gardens. The mind-set of the pupil toward the institution is put right at the outset, and as a natural result new vitality is imparted to the whole educational process, new horizons open themselves naturally.

Contrast this with the work we are attempting in adult education by radio. Your listener, let us say, starts off on a Saturday afternoon with the opera—and is informed by the mellifluous Mr. Milton Cross, in the middle of Wagner's *Tristan*, that "Listerine kills all varieties of disease germs." Perhaps he believes it (I mean, the listener) and perhaps he does not. The type of listener who will sit through *Tristan* is likely, I am afraid, to be a bit of a skeptic. Later on, if he persists, he will hear a good deal of excellent jazz, some very entertaining vaudeville, perhaps a good concert orchestra, a certain amount of news (not, I fear, very fresh nor always very edifying) and

an intermittent panegyric in praise of certain timepieces, patent medicines, canned foods, cosmetics, chewing gum, and “what have you”—all of them very excellent articles, no doubt. To all of it our listener turns a somewhat skeptical, or mildly amused, or slightly exasperated ear: or else he turns the dial. Then suddenly, at half-past ten, if he is still listening, he is required to transform his entire mental attitude into that of an attentive, open-minded, thoughtful, and receptive listener to a lecture sponsored by the National Advisory Council. This complete transformation of his mind-set demands altogether too much. No matter how good the lecture is, you cannot suddenly plunge your listener into the fruitful mood of education after his long immersion in a stream of de-education—for there is such a thing as de-education, and the majority of our adults are continually being exposed to it. The prestige of education has now a hard fight to maintain itself alongside the prestige of de-education; and it is an open question whether the same type of institution can be made to serve both purposes by fits and starts.

Then next morning our listener reads in his paper—on the radio page, curiously enough, not the educational page—that broadcasting is a part of the “show business” and that the trouble with these educators is that they cannot master the art of showmanship. He says to himself, “Well yes, that lecture was pretty good; it did seem a bit dull, though”; and next time he wants (if he does) to be edified, he will tune in on the broadcasters’ advice to people who do understand radio showmanship—yes, to the picturesque gentleman from Louisiana, or the gifted orator from the Shrine of the Little Flower. None of us educators can compete with that; and if that is the thing to be required of us, we must look elsewhere for encouragement.

No, ours is not an appeal to the mass mind. We must beware of any pressure that would make it such. We must make difficult demands, we must raise our banner higher than the hoardings and the sky signs. We appeal to the minorities, to the latent initiative and idealism of the American people, to all those for whom mere salesmanship—whether in economics, in politics, or in religion—is not good enough. We must ask all those who

are in earnest about the preservation of democracy—and I include specifically the great commercial broadcasters—to join in our effort to keep our people fit for it. We must ask them, as soon as the present study of program-area reception is completed, to join with us in a study of the programs themselves. Let us explore, on the widest possible basis of co-operation, how to make the most of the fine things we already have, how to enhance the prestige and the appeal of what is already available. And out of that exploration, let us strive for a permanent organization—excluding none who will co-operate—that will devise further opportunities—yes, and call for further sacrifices and for public support—in the cause of our national culture. And let us not do this as those asking for a privilege. We are not asking a privilege, we are offering one—the privilege of standing for what we stand for, of building with us a better civilization.

ADMINISTRATION

IF I RAN AN EDUCATIONAL STATION

● JUDITH C. WALLER

CENTRAL DIVISION, NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY

LET us not presuppose the impossible, because I would not, and I could not, run an educational broadcasting station. Naturally, this may surprise you, and your first question is, Why not?

One cannot run or manage a business or a radio station in which one does not believe, honestly and whole-heartedly. I shall attempt to show you why I do not or could not believe in an educationally owned radio station, and, therefore, why I could not run one. Do not misunderstand me: I am not saying I do not believe in education or radio education but in a station educationally owned.

Let us suppose, in the first place, that the radio station I have been asked to run is owned by a college or university in a city with a population of over three hundred thousand. We have a 1000-watt transmitter, which would be the average power unit, and undoubtedly must share time with one other, if not two or three other radio stations, but we still have six or eight hours a day to fill, with the possibility of more. This make-believe station in a city of this size must compete for an audience with the other radio station or stations in the same city or within the listening area of our radio public. We must build a program whose quality is comparable to that of the programs being put on by other stations. At least one of these stations undoubtedly is commercial and affiliated with one of the national networks and has access, therefore, to excellent sustaining as well as commercial programs, and, in addition thereto, derives considerable remuneration from the commercials. Therefore, we are confronted with definite standards in programs, and to meet

this competition on a basis of quality we must count on a cost of \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year, the income on from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 a year at 5 per cent.

Few colleges or universities are so endowed that they can set aside that much money, the income from which is not to be used except to maintain the radio station, so some other means of financing the station must be found. If the university is a state institution, the state may, undoubtedly will, contribute toward its support, but hardly to the extent necessary to meet the figures just mentioned. If the university or college is privately owned or endowed, is it conceivable that any philanthropist will be found willing to drop \$75,000 or \$100,000 each year into the running of a radio station, especially when he can see no tangible returns for his money? So, under our present system of radio control, with which I am fully in accord, the only other means of meeting the budget figure is to sell time. This brings us to the next reason why I do not believe in an educational radio station.

In order to sell time on any radio station, large or small, educationally or commercially owned, we must guarantee a consistent listening public, built up by means of a well-rounded program, entertaining, informative, and stimulating. If the station is a new one, the first programs will have to be more than a little unusual: the music a little better, the comedy a little funnier, the drama more finished, and the informational or educational programs more interesting. If these things are not considered, we cannot hope to wean the public away from their already favorite stations, and if we have no audience, we cannot hope to sell time, so the definite source of revenue on which we had counted to finance or complete the financing of our station will be cut off.

To suppose, for the sake of the argument, that we succeed in establishing ourselves on a firm basis with our audience, we now set out to sell part of the six or eight hours assigned to us, in order to pay for the type of sustaining programs which we feel we must schedule to justify our owning a station as well as our endeavoring to hold our public.

Our time is naturally split up throughout the day, perhaps

two hours in the morning, three in the afternoon, and two in the evening. Being an educational station we feel called upon to set aside some of what we consider our best hours for some of our educational programs. We must not sell all of our evening hours to the advertiser, who is only willing to entertain the American public and his family, not to educate them. On the other hand, the advertiser who is willing to buy our time is equally desirous of capturing and holding the attention of the head of the family and his family, and insists that the evening hours are the best for his purpose and those he must have. So the battle begins, and we are fast arriving at the same problems as those that confront our commercial competitors, changed schedules or loss of revenue, and red columns in the ledger instead of black.

What is the answer? Commercial stations are blamed for moving programs, censoring copy, barring certain speakers from the air to appease the whim of their advertisers. Most of that criticism is pure bunk, but just how should I, as a director of an educational radio station with instructions to keep within my budget and with a definite feeling of obligation to my public, proceed? Have I answered the second point?

In the next instance we must face the actual building of the program, without which there is no station. We have just stated that we must have a little better entertainment as well as informative material if we are to keep our audience; this presupposes the talent must be professional in character.

It is difficult even in a city the size of St. Louis to find talent that compares at all favorably with what the stations of New York and Chicago, and perhaps San Francisco and Los Angeles, can offer. Frankly, at present there is little excellent professional talent anywhere in the country outside of those four large cities. Programs employing live talent, therefore, would have to be augmented with electrical transcriptions of superior quality. They, of course, would be better radio programs than any put on by local talent.

Turning our thoughts inward, What could our university or college offer in the way of entertainment? Generally speaking, only a mediocre music school as well as a fair school of speech

and dramatics; nothing else. Could the average students turned out from the music school compete with grand-opera and concert artists as well as the best of the popular singers? No, only the exceptional ones. Is that comparable to what the commercial station is broadcasting, and would what they offer suffice our listening public? I hardly think so. So how shall we build our program of entertainment in a city with a population of three hundred thousand?

Let us turn from this large city, and suppose this radio station is in a community of, say, not to exceed one hundred thousand population—probably not over twenty-five or fifty thousand—and let us see if the case is radically different. We still have a 1,000-watt transmitter, and we still must share time with several other stations—some commercial, and others, perhaps, religious. Our costs should be about the same but, for the sake of the argument, let us say we could run this station on \$50,000 a year or even \$25,000 a year, the income on \$1,000,000 or \$500,000 at 5 per cent. We have determined not to sell any time locally or nationally; that would be debasing our institution and corrupting our public! We have decided to devote ourselves purely to educating the public—they have so demanded. (Every survey shows that to be true, and in the face of that knowledge the commercial stations continue to broadcast entertainment!) First and foremost, where are we going to get the money needed? It is not sitting in any treasury or any strong box just waiting to be used for that purpose; there is no special fund no matter where we search for it. It just is not there. Can you imagine any university or college considering setting aside that much money for radio, or asking for an endowment to take care of it, when endowments are so badly needed for financing the actual running of the college, the professors' salaries, scholarships, and the like.

Since our funds are curtailed to the point where we have no money to speak of for programs, what money is allotted must go toward operation expenses, tubes, power, maintenance of the transmitter, microphones, and all studio equipment. We must fall back, therefore, on the faculty and students for our radio

programs, and here our woes begin. And they are many, almost impossible even to itemize here.

If we are seeking adult programs from the faculty—our subject-matter must first be considered—only those topics with a wide popular appeal may be broadcast if we are to retain our public. We, of course, can build a limited number of programs for school consumption, but our problems are similar. If we can find subjects for either the school or adults, these problems arise: Are the teachers or professors good speakers? Have they voice personality? Are their programs stimulating? Do they provoke participation? Have these teachers the time not only to prepare their classroom lectures but to write or prepare the material which is to be broadcast? Can they be called upon to fill fifteen or twenty minutes once a week during a quarter or semester? Has the professor of speech time to devote to helping train professors and students alike for effective radio speaking? Dramatics undoubtedly also falls in the speech department; has the head of that department the time, as well as the knowledge of radio, to build and produce programs of high caliber in that field, comparable, let us say, with the Lux-theater program, *Roses and Drums*, or the dramatization put on by the American School of the Air? We are taking for granted, of course, that most educators are quite convinced by this time that little in the way of formal education may be broadcast if we want to build and retain an audience which will justify our use of the time and wave-length allotted to us. We know that we must keep abreast of the times, and instead of giving our public a mass of data which is not easily assimilated over the radio, we must give them information in such a manner as to stimulate their thinking, while holding their attention, be that listening group in school or at home, child or adult. This certainly cannot be done by long, arduous lectures either from the classroom or the studio. The approach and manner of presentation are entirely different in each instance, for only a few professors have given radio enough thought to sense this situation. This necessitates, of course, an extra load on those who do appreciate it and makes them more in demand. Sooner or later this causes

unrest, dissension, and an antagonistic attitude toward the whole subject of radio. Naturally, no allowance has been made in time, and there is no money to pay for this additional load, as we have none for programs. Under the circumstances we must do the best we can: pick the subjects which we believe are of wide interest, try to interest the members of the faculty who, we believe, could broadcast well, and hope the others have not too deadly and monotonous voices and that enough members of the faculty may be found willing to carry on week after week, month in and month out, without proper compensation.

We shall try to build something worth while in the way of entertainment programs from the existing music and dramatic departments, and trust to luck we have interested friends and organizations in the community to help fill out the daily schedule. Our task is extremely difficult and our programs, at best, scarcely more than mediocre. What are we accomplishing? We cannot be building good-will in the community; our audience must be extremely limited unless our station is in a purely agricultural section of the country where its chief purpose is to present such information. I cannot see that we are getting anywhere or fulfilling our obligation to the Federal Communications Commission—that we operate in the interest, convenience, and necessity of the public.

If you are responsible for the radio station in your community, you must feel you are being successful in discharging your obligation not only to the university or college but to the public. You must believe that the type of program that is broadcast from your station is building good-will not only in the community but within the school itself. Do you imagine for a half-second that your students or professors during the leisure time afforded them want to spend it listening to another lecture or to some brother faculty member expound his theories, which, it is not within the realm of too lively an imagination to believe, differ radically from his own?

We talk about university and college professors as if they were beings set apart—not humans, even as you and I—but I refuse to believe that the majority of them are not as fond of a

little amusement, good comedy, a well-acted play, good music, both light and classical, as the average listener. Who has invented this myth? Who has built up this grand belief in the divine right of education? I for one would not want to presume to be the Lord High Everything Else in this connection; so, I would not want to run the radio station built upon those policies.

Then, if your answer to me is, "We do not suppose for a minute that we can reach the majority of radio listeners with the types of program we are desirous of broadcasting from our university-owned station, but there is an audience that wants quality programs, educational material, and general information on many topics, those are the persons we are hoping to satisfy." Why not be honest with ourselves and face the facts? Are they not being given excellent music, fine lectures, splendid drama, and news from all parts of the world? I know they are. One has only to read a week's listings of cultural programs to confirm the truth of this.

Why, in the first place, does a college or university want to own and operate a radio station? Why was it ever thought of, and under what department does it function? The answer to each is, publicity and service. It wants to broadcast not only to send out authoritative information but also to advertise the name of the college or university throughout the country wherever the station reaches; to create good-will; to set parents thinking in its terms that more young people may be brought to its portals; to stimulate the pride of its alumni to more boastful arguments, thereby persuading them to increase their support, to induce promising athletes to come to the institutions, more and more to build the name and reputation of their Alma Mater. Do not misunderstand me; the ambition is laudable. I am not for one minute seeking to ridicule or knock the idea. Colleges and universities must stimulate thinking among their alumni and the people of the community and state in order to exist. I repeat, I am not attacking the objective but the method.

Can an educationally owned radio station, insufficiently

financed, hope for an instant to build good-will anywhere, even among its alumni? Mediocre programs, dull and uninteresting, cannot compete with those put on through commercial stations where plenty of money is available to give the public a program excellent in quality. The comparison would bring a feeling of shame rather than pride among the institution's friends and perhaps, also, a touch of bewilderment as well as resentment that badly needed funds were being dissipated in such a manner. How much better it would be to spend all the money available for radio on the programs which might be broadcast over a popular commercial station with a large listening public, thereby being able to build infinitely better educational and informative programs which cannot fail to catch and hold the attention of the audience. Working co-operatively, the commercial station would be only too glad to grant and uphold the necessary time provided the program can build and hold an audience. One excellently conceived and produced educational program presented over a commercial station by a college or university will do more toward publicizing and building good-will for the school than two, four, or eight hours of mediocrity. One excellently conceived and well-produced educational program could be presented over an educational station as well, but what would happen to the other hours in the day and the week?

In closing, let me say that I have the greatest respect and admiration for those directors of educationally owned radio stations who have been making valiant efforts to build good programs on limited budgets; I marvel that they have been doing and are doing as fine a job as they are. More power to them! I do not believe I could do it.

MR. PETTEGREW (Station WOSU, Ohio State University):

The use of local talent in the arrangement of good programs was mentioned by Miss Waller as out of the question. This is not always true for in the Columbus area the station which leads in popularity devotes the best listening hours of the evening to programs composed entirely of local talent, because they carry more interest. I should say from my personal opinion that they are much better than any sustaining network programs at that hour. Miss Waller mentioned comparisons on the question of drama. The specific pro-

gram she mentioned was the Lux theater. I have heard two of those programs on which, as is their custom, movie stars were featured, and I am quite confident that I could take a group of amateurs and completely back those programs off the map, for the actor in question was no actor at all. He had been built up purely on publicity because he appealed to women. The play to anyone who understood drama was a complete "flop."

The question I am leading to is, Why cannot a professor be built up? If he is a nationally known authority, why cannot he be helped along in some of the things he needs and be built up to the audience just as a radio star is built up? I think Miss Waller agrees with me that some radio stars are certainly not particularly talented. I have heard lots of them who would not qualify as singers or even crooners, but purely by publicity they have been built up to appeal and they have appealed.

Now about the questions of interest, convenience, and necessity—I do not think these are always of as great concern to the commercial-station manager as Miss Waller would indicate because I certainly have heard programs which would not be of interest to me or to my family and which would certainly not be convenient for me to listen to, and of no necessity at all. The famous "blood-and-thunder" children's programs may have interest to a certain group of children, but are they convenient to us when they take children away from their best play hours which they need out of doors, and when they work them up to such an emotional pitch that they cannot sleep when they go to bed? They are not necessary. Another thing, a commercial station might be benefited from good college programs if the programs could be developed along commercial lines. I know for a fact many commercial stations include educational programs in their daily or weekly or monthly schedules simply to make the programs look dignified to the inspector or some one in authority who perhaps might glance at the log or year's report later on.

MR. PRICE (University of Minnesota):

One speaker before this conference has said that any form of radio control, operation, and organization which is different from the one now in vogue in this country is incompatible with democracy. I do not know how the speaker arrived at that conclusion, but I think there is no evidence for it whatever. It is a bold and hardy person, I think, who would state here that we have a more democratic form of organization than they have in the British Isles where they have a totally different form of radio than we have here. It should not be put on the basis of organization. If the American people, knowing what they have, choose this form of organization for their radio, that is their business. If they prefer to have their programs come in accompanied by boresome advertising to which they have to listen or turn off the radio until the program gets better, that is their privilege.

The second fallacy is one based on the theory of quantity. We are told that

the educational stations have no place on the air—although the air does not belong to private corporations at all—because they do not appeal to a large enough group. Now that same argument would mean that the *Atlantic Monthly* has no business in the United States mails in comparison with the *Police Gazette*; the *Boston Transcript* and the *Kansas City Star* have no place in the United States mails in comparison with *True Confessions*. That is fallacious reasoning. Now I would not abolish the *Atlantic Monthly* and *Harper's* for a moment; they have their places. I think there are levels of taste in the radio-listening public as in the reading public. I think that a station that frankly appeals to a small and limited audience has just as much right to that small and limited audience of listeners, relatively speaking, as the *Atlantic Monthly* has to its readers.

MR. DARROW (Ohio School of the Air):

We cannot logically compare the breadth of the magazine field with the radio because anyone can start a magazine, and as long as he can keep it going, it is his business. In radio we are dealing with a limited field. I do think radio stations, therefore, are under the necessity of serving their territory more completely than any magazine is under obligation of serving its reading public. I have been out of patience with college stations that have assumed that because they are college stations they do not need to provide programs for all ages and all kinds of people. Since the number of radio stations is limited, it puts an obligation upon every radio station, college and otherwise, to serve at least a fair share of the people all the time. We should not have had as many of them die if we had done this.

MR. KALTENBORN (Columbia Broadcasting System):

Miss Waller has outlined the immense expense involved in the operation of a station.¹ I wonder if that expense might be curtailed if educational stations would combine in an effort to produce high-quality electric recordings and then use them, not on one station, but over a series of stations? Is that not a possible answer to the question of expense for outstanding educational programs that have proved successful? It seems to me that this is a great opportunity for educational stations which has not yet begun to be realized by their overseers.

MR. GRIFFITH (Station WOI, Ames, Iowa):

I may say that if the reader will turn back, somewhere in Volume I, in the proceedings of the Institute, he will find that I made such a recommendation² and was promptly silenced by a great number of people who said that was not the way to do it. I have put a great deal of thought on this question, and I believe that something of this sort is possible.

MR. KALTENBORN:

Does not the electrical transcription answer every purpose and overcome objections concerning disrupted schedules? It can be put on at any hour of the

¹ See pp. 70-71.

² See *Education on the Air*, 1930, p. 251.

day? European stations are far ahead of American stations in their uses of electrical transcriptions. We should reorganize our opinions of them, or at any rate our smaller stations should use them. Electrical transcriptions are well suited to the purposes of smaller stations.

MR. WHEELER (Station W1XAL and Tufts College):

There are all kinds of electrical transcriptions being prepared at the present time. I listened to many recently, and was unable to decide that some of them were transcriptions until I was told. I have investigated them at stations in New York and on special broadcasts, and I am of the opinion that there should be no feeling against electric transcriptions as such. Many musicians oppose them because fewer persons are employed, and there are other reasons suggested against them. Many objections have been raised against a national broadcast chain, and in my opinion, the transcriptions offer a satisfactory solution of some of them.

MRS. NEAL (Station WGAR, Cleveland):

By means of the radio in my automobile while driving to the West Coast recently, I had occasion to become familiar with many programs that were being broadcast from numerous stations all across the country. I was amazed to hear many terrible programs in those sections known to us as the prairies, the desert, and the mountains of the west. When the programs were purely local, that is, not over the networks, they invariably consisted of recordings and local advertising, nothing that would lure any listener to the radio. The variation in time has, of course, something to do with this for many of our good programs are broadcast at inopportune times for western stations. Besides, many smaller stations cannot afford paying the line charges, which in long distances, such as one finds out west, become oppressive, and so they use recordings, usually old records, at that. With this in mind, it would seem that the way to serve educational broadcasting best throughout our entire country would be by means of recordings which could be sent from one station to another, or sold at nominal prices, similar to Victrola records. Since there are millions of idle people throughout the country, untold numbers of whom would be willing to make good use of this time to become better educated if just given the opportunity, it is to be regretted that there is not a central distribution committee which could aid in distributing such recordings, and act as a clearing house for good educational programs.

MR. GRIFFITH:

I want to thank all of you for having been here, and I wish especially to thank Miss Waller. I think she could run a good educational station if she had a chance. We will let her learn the business where she is, and then hope she will spend her declining days in running one.

RADIO INTERPRETING EDUCATION

● AGNES SAMUELSON

IOWA STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

IT IS not fantastical to say that widespread public education is essential to the security of our republic. Our forefathers established the public school in recognition of this truth. Nothing has happened to shake the faith of our people in universal education as the only sure guaranty of our free institutions. Our history is replete with pronouncements, documents, and laws emphasizing the integral place held by education in our social structure. In this task of educating everybody the school must continue to be the indispensable agency.

Important as it is, however, and impossible as it is to substitute anything else for it, it must be re-enforced and supplemented by other agencies if universal education is actually to be achieved. This is especially true if education is looked upon as a process continuous with life and not simply as an organized program which begins automatically at the age of five and ends abruptly at the age of twenty-one. The school lays the foundation of our education, while libraries, newspapers, magazines, radio, museums, travel, study groups, and many other means are available for continuing education throughout life.

The invention of the printing press brought books, formerly the luxury of the few, within the reach of the masses. Its effect in bringing about the democracy of learning is beyond description. Just try to imagine what this modern world would be like if all printed matter were removed and printing presses stopped. The situation would be inconceivable.

The radio has multiplied the possibilities for further universalizing knowledge. Who will discount the influence of a mechanism over which thousands of programs are broadcast daily from some five hundred stations to an audience of over fifty-six million people? That the radio is bound to affect education both within and without the schoolhouse in a most profound way is inevitable. The challenge is to be as inventive in

the use of this new tool as in its creation to the end that the maximum public good will result.

There appear to me to be two obvious aspects to this problem of educational broadcasting. Since my voice is only that of a layman in this field venturing to speak before professionals, my remarks need not be taken too seriously. When the ancients were in search of wisdom they consulted the oracle; we moderns resort to questionnaires. It will not take you long to discover that this paper is the opinion of an amateur in the radio field and based neither upon inspiration nor investigation. What first-hand experience I have had in educational broadcasting through the courtesy of the Iowa stations and the inquiries which I have been able to make as an extra-curricular activity during a strenuous legislative session have intensified my interest in this frontier in which you are pioneering and all of us are concerned.

These two aspects have to do with the use of the radio as an instrument of instruction within the schoolroom and as an agency for interpreting education to the listening public. Both require new techniques. The one is a scientific task for the experimenters to master; the other is a policy-making program for statesmen. It requires that people become more sensitive to the importance of radio and more articulate in its development as a cultural medium.

To adapt the radio to the classroom is no simple task. Its use as a tool of instruction is not as easy as turning on the dial. The problem of fitting it into existing procedures and of correlating it with working programs is extremely complicated, as you well know. While the techniques are not yet perfected, they are advancing far beyond the fumbling and amateurish stage, thanks to such notable experiments as those being conducted in Ohio, Wisconsin, and elsewhere. When the whole story is gathered, it will be found that much more headway can be reported than is generally realized. The radio already has ceased to be a novelty. That it will give the teacher a new and powerful teaching aid is only a matter of time just as in the case of the sound film and television. As you determine the procedures, you are tackling a new problem in modern education for which

there is no answer in the back of the book. Some day the progress achieved will be as conspicuous when compared to the present status as the modern textbook is an improvement over the New England primer.

When it comes to the art of broadcasting to the fireside, the problem is not simply that of speaking before a microphone. One thing is sure. Academic methods cannot be carried over successfully from the learning situations of the classrooms to the listening situations in hotel lobbies, highways, ships at sea, homes, or wherever people happen to be listening to a radio tuned in on whatever happens to be on the air at that time. Here the people are merely exposed to information and are not engaged in the pursuit of study. Hence a different style is required. Information must be popularized in order to be universalized. Technical terms have to be explained, details made vivid, and the entire material spiced with human interest and news value. While this may involve more showmanship than is characteristic of educators, it would be a mistake to turn the job entirely over to feature writers. Education has a contribution to make to radio just as radio has a contribution to make to education. The alpha and the omega are that the broadcast must be interesting. There are no other hard and fast rules. Like any other public speaking the gist of it all is to have something to say and to say it in an interesting way.

Here are one or two examples in point. The value of the diagnostic test is better understood when its use in instruction is compared to that of the X-ray in medical diagnosis. Interest in the subject of modern trends in education is capitalized when the discussion is treated as "streamlining education." The comparison between beautiful styling and character is easily caught. That research is as important in refining the procedures in education as in improving the motor vehicle carries over to the lay group, whether it be a service-club luncheon meeting or a radio audience. The whole story of the development of education from the hornbook to the modern primer can be made vivid by showing the contrasting changes in life around us in the same period of time under such a caption as "Then and

Now.” On the one hand, concrete illustrations of which the following are suggestive might be used: once the candle, now the electric light; once the Indian trail, now the hard-surfaced highway; once a bag of asafetida worn around the neck to ward off disease, now serums, vaccinations, and cod-liver oil; and once corkscrew curls, now permanent waves. Paralleling these, such educational developments as the following might be listed: once jawbreaking words in spelling, now words most commonly used in life; once the dunce cap, now the intelligence and achievement tests; once the long backless wooden benches, now the adjustable seats; once the names of the bones of the body, now emphasis on health habits and hygiene. This presentation can be made as interesting to any adult audience as an old-fashioned spelling or cyphering match.

Whether as much progress has been made in this direction as in schoolroom broadcasting, we are not prepared to say. To those of us who are trying to hold education level in these days of turmoil, it offers intriguing and far-reaching possibilities. We have all seen how the Century of Progress served to popularize science. If we in education have the same imagination and ingenuity, we can show that the school is a house of magic. Music lends itself especially well to interpretation. It might not be possible to treat all subjects as effectively, but much could be done to show what modern education is about and how the school is keeping pace with these times of social change.

The importance of popular education in connection with the fight against tuberculosis has been pointed out in these words: “The discovery of popular education as an instrument of preventive medicine, particularly by the pioneers of the tuberculosis movement, is comparable in importance with the discovery of the germ theory of disease. Popular education is no less important now than in the pioneer days of the fight against tuberculosis.”¹ This is certainly as true in the case of education.

In spite of the handicaps much is being done through national, state, and local broadcasts. The National Education Association has pioneered for four or more years through the

¹ Winslow, C. E. A. *News Bulletin*, Iowa Tuberculosis Association, March 28, 1935.

co-operation of the National Broadcasting Company and under the leadership of the radio chairman, Miss Florence Hale. The United States Office of Education now has radio time. A few states are experimenting, and many local stations give time to various educational, social, and cultural broadcasts.

We sent an inquiry to state departments of education to discover what was being done on a state-wide level. We asked also for comments as to the importance of the radio in educational interpretation. The findings show that the programs now in operation are sponsored mostly by college and university stations over which state departments and state educational associations are given regular periods. Many local programs are reported. Like our school system, they are quite decentralized. They are not co-ordinated in a definite program to show objectives, needs, practices, and achievements, but they doubtless are effective in reaching surrounding areas.

As far as we can find any basis for drawing conclusions, our experience in Iowa may be considered as rather typical. Through the courtesy of Mr. W. I. Griffith, director of Radio Station WOI and member of the Vocational Education Department of Iowa State College, the Department of Education, Board for Vocational Education, Iowa Congress of Parents and Teachers, Iowa State Teachers Association, and other state educational agencies have regular broadcasting periods at Ames. This station is open to all welfare organizations with constructive, non-partisan programs to present. It is fast becoming an all-Iowa educational station. It has done some broadcasting directly to the schoolrooms, especially to the high-school classes. When our state-wide music day festival given at the state fair last year was under preparation, directions for learning the songs to be sung by the all-Iowa high-school chorus were broadcast directly to the glee clubs from Ames. Announcements covering important educational events are always made. Radio book clubs are sponsored.

Station WSUI at the State University of Iowa at Iowa City is equally generous with its time, but is not so centrally located and does not have so large a coverage of territory. Much has

been done over this station in broadcasting college-credit courses. It has also done some valuable work in connection with radio clubs in parent education in co-operation with the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station.¹

We have been invited repeatedly to speak over the commercial stations of our state, and they use our materials freely. We keep them on our mailing list. Invitations to broadcast educational talks for parent-teacher associations, patriotic and safety groups, women's clubs, and other organizations on their time are frequent. Responses received indicate that these programs are listened to rather widely.

The replies from the state departments were practically unanimous as to the importance of a definite program for educational broadcasting to be administered by the national, state, and local governmental agencies. It was emphasized that these programs should be organized to include worth-while and interesting educational material and should always be free from propaganda.

What prompts us to look into this problem is the urgent need of lay spokesmen for education. While we who are charged with leadership cannot escape responsibility and have no inclination to do so, the times demand as never before that there be a mobilization for understanding and a program of action among the rank and file of our people. The schools belong to the people. They battled them into existence in times even more precarious than these through which we are passing. They must not take them for granted now. The task of keeping the public properly informed is gigantic, but so also is the scope of the radio. The weapon is just as powerful as the task is enormous.

If this seems to be rather general, let us talk in more specific terms. On April 1, 1935, the Federal Office of Education announced that the emergency in education is fully as extensive this year. The release set forth the startling fact that more than one-eighth of the children of the United States are in school districts without sufficient funds to operate schools the custom-

¹ Ojemann, Ralph H. "An Investigation of the Iowa Radio Child Study Program," *Journal of Home Economics*, XXVI (January, 1934), pp. 24-25.

ary school term. This is the financial crisis in education in a nutshell. What if this authentic information were broadcast over every station in the land this week? It could be easily supplemented by facts as to the situation in the areas served by local stations. Would it be helpful in making the people more conscious of the way children are being shortchanged educationally? of the risk to democracy if the schoolhouse door is closed? It is neither accidental nor incidental that the development of our great nation has paralleled that of our great school system.

On April 26 of this year, the Honorable John W. Studebaker, United States commissioner of education, released a proposed plan for a nation-wide community youth program. On April 30, he explained this plan over a nation-wide radio hook-up. Of course there is no record to be had of the number of people who actually heard his talk, but there was a potential audience of nearly half of our population.

Many more examples are easily cited. What if accurate information could be given in a regular series over the air as to the way schools are supported in other states, the progress being made in improving teachers' qualifications, how the content is being related to life situations, the way textbooks are being improved, and the part libraries play in universal education? The three-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the American secondary school offers the strategic opportunity to dramatize interest in the local history of every high school in the land.

Such a program cannot function unless a reasonable amount of time and funds be made available for educational broadcasting. You know full well the import of the commercial phases of this problem. Governing policies should be established which would assure worth-while programs whatever the sponsorship. Common and vulgar entertainments, wild and extravagant advertising which borders on racketeering and quackery should not be tolerated. It is reassuring to read the official warning given by Mr. Prall, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in which he proposes the elimination of radio programs having harmful effects upon children. Every

parent should applaud him for that. When people organize to solve this problem, they can do it just as they are making headway in the case of the movies.

Radio has it in its power to relieve the cultural and educational depression if given a reasonable chance to do so. Why is this conference not the logical group to take the leadership in charting the course for the future in helping to work out an American policy which will provide also for cultural and educational broadcasting? Planning should enter this field so that progress in the conservation of our radio resources may be comparable to that in the conservation of our natural resources. Let us have air utilization as well as land utilization. Of course it is one thing to point out the problem and quite another thing to solve it.

I cannot close without congratulating you upon your efforts to master the science of educational broadcasting and to develop the art of radio broadcasting in American education. Your pioneering will eventuate in an American pattern in due time. Meanwhile we can and must pool our efforts to see to it that education does not, like Ignorance in *Pilgrim's Progress*, "come hobbling after" everything else.

MR. PETTIGREW:

One immediate problem which presents itself in regard to a national chain of educational broadcasters is that most educational stations do not have full time—probably wisely so—and any national hook-up of any of these broadcasters would involve the same amount of time on the air and the same hours. If a national hook-up would mean that those stations would have to reallocate their time, this would involve time arrangements with commercial stations, disrupt the plans of the stations, and disarrange local schedules. This confusion presents, I believe, the major problem against the proposal.

MR. BUCKLEY (Board of Education, Cleveland):

Such a plan could be used in broadcasts in medicine and law, and is no reason why one of the institutions on an educational chain should not put dramatics on the air.

MR. BOLANDER (Columbus):

In listening to the discussion here it seems to me that radio is losing sight of the service that it can render to art education. I do not think that the subject of art, so common to all of us in everyday life, has yet been brought

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

into radio as it should be. For some years, as a member of the American Art Museum Directors Association, I have been trying to compile a book to serve as a guide for the Radio School of the Air in art, history, and science museums. The idea of putting musical reproductions on the air, I imagine, is about as irritating to an expert in the musical field as to put a print before an artist who is used to looking at original paintings. I think the best time for records is in the morning when musicians are not at their best. I believe that if we can put a little art with music and show the relationship of those two subjects, even if records must be used because of the lack of expert talent, it would be much more inviting to those who listen. I feel that expression should be made here to show your interest in that field. I would like to learn now of any experiences you have had with art on the air in your various cities to incorporate in this bulletin on museum behavior, which will soon be ready for print.

MISS JOHNSON (American School of the Air):

I am much interested in this. I believe that although art is a visual subject, there is a place for it on the air.

MR. HARRIS (Fort Wayne Public Schools):

I am principal of a school at Fort Wayne, and I want to commend the art program broadcast by the Ohio School of the Air on Friday. This year five hundred pupils have listened to the program each week, and much enthusiasm for art has been developed. During one vacation about half of the pupils listened to the art programs over radios in other communities, and wrote their reports when they returned to school.

MR. GRIFFITH:

May I add my bit to this discussion by telling of the art-appreciation course over WOI, which is now in its fifth year. Shortly before the course starts fifteen or twenty colored prints of the masterpieces to be discussed are sold at a small price to the prospective listeners who wish to purchase them. The lectures are devoted to particular masterpieces. We have had flattering responses both from persons who have used the prints and from those who do not have the pictures before them.

MR. WHEELER:

That is being done by W1XAL in an art course. The prints are in the hands of all who wish to pay one cent per print or one dollar for one hundred and fifty pictures in advance. Copies of the talks are available at ten cents each, or one dollar for the set of twelve. The art series has been one of the most popular courses which have been broadcast by this Boston station.

LEGISLATIVE AID FOR STATE RADIO

● H. B. McCARTY

STATION WHA, WISCONSIN STATE STATION,
MADISON

LET us look at the title, "Legislative Support for State Radio Service." Mind you, this does not read "How To Get Legislative Support for State Radio Service." Although as a bachelor I feel well qualified, even anxious, to give advice to parents on how to raise children, as a station director I feel not at all qualified to give advice to others on how to get station support. I am merely reporting some developments in the Wisconsin Plan, and I am not advocating our plan or our methods for others.

Recently the general budget bill for the state of Wisconsin was reported out of the Joint Finance Committee and was submitted to the legislature for consideration and action. The total budget for the biennium, the two years beginning July 1, 1935, is a little more than \$50,000,000. Of that amount, there is a total of \$24,126,000 for education. Now I want you to try to get a picture of those figures: \$24,126,000 for education; that is, for state aid to elementary and high schools, for maintenance of the University of Wisconsin, the nine state teachers' colleges, the mining school, and Stout Institute. That does not include the item for radio education, for the operation of WHA, at the University, and WLBL, at Stevens Point, operated by the Department of Agriculture and Markets. How much is allowed for these items? For operating the radio station at the University the amount is roughly \$20,000 for the first year and \$22,000 for the second year, \$42,000 for the biennium for radio service through WHA, as contrasted with a total of \$24,126,000 for education as a whole. That is .17 of 1 per cent, less than one-fifth of 1 per cent, less than one-five-hundredth part of the education total. This small share is set aside for radio service which embodies inspirational programs for tens of thousands of school children, courses of study for thousands of adults and young people not in school, information and guidance for Wisconsin farmers, extension of university courses direct from the class-

room, daily counsel for homemakers, governmental reports and discussions, unprejudiced interpretation of current affairs, and a host of other services.

Is \$20,000 a year too much for all that? We do not think so. Governor LaFollette does not think so. He has given assurance of his full support. As yet, the legislature has not been called upon to consider this particular item. We had expected that by this time we would be able to report on hearings or inquiries in which questions and attitudes of the state legislature would be revealed, and arguments presented in support of our appropriation. No such hearings have been held. I can give you, however, some of the principles which, in our judgment, solidly support a state broadcasting service as a legitimate function of state government, meriting legislative and administrative backing. I cannot give you any magic words that will convert every legislator into a radio enthusiast. I cannot give you any advanced techniques in lobbying or persuasion. This, after all, is not a lesson in salesmanship, or how to sell your state legislature on the value of a radio station. You would not want that. Even if I could give it to you, it would look trivial beside the picture of a service that grows and expands and develops because of its own inherent health and vigor, because it can demonstrate its reach and compensate for its costs. Watch Wisconsin people when you talk to them about the costs of state radio service, watch them smile, and watch that smile spread when you show that the cost of operating WHA at the University is less than one cent per year per person in the listening area—not in the entire state, just within the area reached—less than the tax on one quart of gasoline per year for each person. Watch that smile of a grateful taxpayer, and you will know that cost is not a real obstacle in the progress of radio education. If you demonstrate a scope of service and a range of benefits and economies available in no other way, the cost appears trifling. As a matter of fact, you begin to feel foolish if you are discouraged by costs; they are so ridiculously low in comparison with the extent of public services, services that are unusual and are, I repeat, available in no other way.

Take, for example, our daily broadcast known as the State Capitol Program. Every week day, except Saturday, at 1:30 p.m., from a special studio in the capitol we present one of our legislators in a discussion of current legislative affairs. He speaks to his constituents back home, to the people of the state generally, on matters that are of immediate concern to him, and he speaks without restriction as to political party or personal slant. He speaks frankly and freely, and if he wants to attack the administration, there is no one to stop him. If someone out in the state wants to take issue with a legislator or supplement his remarks, there is the Citizens' Forum offering him the same opportunity. Political equality, minority rights, true democracy—these principles are here represented in high degree, in a program that could originate and be fostered in a state only by a publicly supported station.

How are speakers chosen? By general invitation and announcement, and by our Mr. Engel who circulates in the legislative chambers three or four times a week, making known the available periods and scheduling talks. There is opportunity for all. No one has ever been refused time on the air, and no legislator or state official has ever suggested any improper use of the facilities. Programs are scheduled two weeks in advance, and a bi-weekly bulletin listing the schedule of speakers and topics is sent to all legislators. In this way they may keep in touch with the utterances of each other. It is a common practice for a group of legislators to be gathered about a receiving set in the lounge of the Assembly Chamber listening to a fellow member on the air at one-thirty, before the session begins at two o'clock.

By our schedule for the week of this conference, I find that Assemblyman Peter Hemmy spoke on "Conservation"; Assemblyman Peterson gave his views on "The One-House Legislature"; Senator Morley G. Kelly summarized "Legislation up to Now"; Senator Harry Griswold discussed "State Affairs"; and Senator Roland Kannenberg gave a résumé of legislative activity for the week. The topics for the next week included "Safety Legislation," "The Six-Hour Day," "Safeguards of Legislation," "Old-Age Pensions," and "The Labor Disputes

Act.” Here, we believe, is a unique public service. Here is a step toward closer communication and better understanding between the people and the officials they elect. Here is an instrument of integration, a device for developing responsiveness between the elected and the electors.

Let us take another example of a service provided only by a publicly supported non-commercial radio station. I have reported before on our program of political education known as the “Wisconsin Political Forum,” but I mention it again as a public service available only over a publicly supported radio station. Last fall, for the second time, the facilities of Wisconsin’s state radio stations were used in the primary and election campaigns. Generous portions of time were given equally to all political parties, without favor and without cost. Democrats, progressives, republicans, and socialists shared equally, and independent candidates bearing other party names were given time on the air. This practice has been observed in state elections since 1932. At all times there has been a fine spirit of co-operation and accommodation displayed by the political parties and their campaign managers in the division of time. Major groups have been quick to acknowledge that the smaller and numerically insignificant groups should have access to the public over the radio. Members of the executive committee delegated to draw up plans have referred repeatedly to this commendable spirit. The principle of fair dealing and minority representation has been well established in Wisconsin.

Here, we believe, is promise of enlightenment and economy in the conduct of political campaigns. Here is further evidence of political equality and the security of minority rights, a service properly falling within the function of state government and richly deserving of legislative support.

Now these functions are, of course, quite outside the usual concept of an educational station as a school station. Too many think of an educational station as an electrical school-teacher or a mechanical lecturer, as a machine with spectacles on. When we hold to such a narrow notion, we get to talking about the lack of appeal of teachers in general, the dullness of radio educa-

tion, the duplication of other educational services, and the necessity for popularizing education. That education will never win a popularity contest we thought had been settled long ago. Surely, let us have human interest, and showmanship, and all that, but let us not fool ourselves. Education will still lose the race for popularity. Let there be listener surveys—that is fine!—but do not let any station director think that he is satisfying educational needs by measuring popularity or fulfilling listeners' demands. Radio service built solely upon listeners' demands will merely cater to existing standards. It will neglect the fine opportunity for improving tastes and lifting levels of information and appreciation.

Recently I heard Assistant Superintendent Buckley, of Cleveland, tell that eight thousand school children, boys and girls from ten to twelve years of age, paid 25 cents each to hear a concert by the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra, that they listened in such utter silence and with such rapt attention that you could hear a whisper, that they thrilled to the music, that the conductor was amazed at their attentiveness and understanding. Did they demand this concert? Not until they had been prepared for it; not until they had been led up to it by careful preparation and cultivation. No, our finer sensitivities and desires are less articulate than the others. So, let us agree again that the school and the theater cannot properly be matched in competition for popularity. The ultimate worth of a school or church cannot be measured solely by the number of those who attend. Let us get off the quantity standard.

Of course, it is encouraging to us to know that during last semester a total of more than forty-three thousand school children each week heard the broadcasts of the Wisconsin School of the Air. It is gratifying to know that we had more than fourteen thousand course enrollments in our Wisconsin College of the Air. Here, in the first instance, are thousands of boys and girls whose only musical training, for example, comes to them by radio from the University, when Mr. Gordon presents his weekly program over WHA. Out of a registered group of more than seven thousand school children in the intermediate grades

about the state, more than five hundred came to Madison the first Saturday in June for the Second Annual Radio Music Festival. They met their radio instructor in person and sang under his personal direction. Observers have been thrilled by these two public demonstrations of the effectiveness of radio as a mass teaching medium. This kind of thing, we say, is gratifying. Similar encouragement comes from the motivation given to thousands of boys and girls in stimulating new interests and activities in nature study, in reading, in history, in geography, in news, and other subjects.

Likewise, we gain increasing confidence in the rightness of our purpose and the necessity of our enterprise from the testimony of the students enrolled in our College of the Air, whose radios at other points on the dial do not give them what they want. Here are housewives, farmers, stenographers, young people out of school, and unemployed people whose only challenge and only opportunity for continuing education come from the offerings of their state-owned radio station; and they want more of such services. They want education and opportunities for cultural improvement in the evening after working hours. They cannot understand why we cannot broadcast at night. They want literature and other programs of inspiration and information in the evening when they can listen, instead of a surfeit of comedy and dance rhythms.

This service, we affirm, is a function of the state, properly deserving financial support from the public funds. The responsibility cannot be shifted to private interests, any more than we can expect a prosperous merchant to pay the expenses of the public schools in his community, though for a time he may be willing to do so.

As I say, we gain confidence from these evidences of service to the people of Wisconsin. More especially are we assured by the cumulative effect, the spread of influence of finer programs, the widening interest, and the more intensive listening. A mail analysis, for example, for a period of two weeks in December, 1934, shows more than twice the number of inquiries and requests which were received during the corresponding period in

1933. That is an increase of 108 per cent in communities heard from and 112 per cent in number of reports and requests.

We are encouraged, too, when we observe the awakening of interest in our own faculty and the readiness to meet the opportunity and obligation of radio. Whereas we formerly dealt with individual faculty members in making program arrangements, there is now departmental awareness and responsibility. On its own initiative, the Department of Education this past year organized and developed a series of programs, a weekly roundtable discussion for teachers, parents, and others interested in new educational methods and techniques. The Department of Economics planned and presented a series of special radio lectures three times a week on current economic problems. These are developments on a group basis, not individual, and with the growth of this feeling, we anticipate an abundance of faculty talent.

There is also, of course, an abundance of student talent, good talent, too. Students are given training in apprenticeship positions, in radio speech classes, and in participation in our present broadcasting schedule of nine hours daily. Naturally, the student body of more than eight thousand at the University of Wisconsin includes a wealth of talent in dramatics, music, writing, and other phases of radio.

We are assured by these developments that we are on the right road, and that there is no need to turn back or turn aside. We are further supported in our stand for publicly supported radio service over a powerful state station when we see the costs of distributing such service through commercial outlets. There is now before the legislature a proposal by a group of ten stations in Wisconsin. This plan would give distribution to our programs over these stations for a total of three hours daily. The estimated cost is \$60,000 yearly for telephone toll lines, with nothing included in the bill for program production. Even with such a network, all of the ten stations together would not give complete state coverage; yet the annual cost for telephone service alone would be three times as much as the total cost of operating WHA nine hours daily for one year.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

We are assured also by the growth and improvement in physical facilities and plant for state radio service in Wisconsin. For eight days beginning May 25, we held open house in our new studios—studios and offices into the construction and furnishing of which there have gone more than \$25,000. We have three studios, our own pipe organ, a control room, five offices, and a large reception room, all attractively furnished. Most of this has been made possible as a state-work project under the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, but there have been other contributions. The regents of the University, although WHA is not on the University budget, have contributed \$5,500 for materials and furnishings. It has not been easy to get money, but we have few complaints. We have secured what we needed when the need could be demonstrated.

We feel, in this as in other instances, that radio as a public service can be adequately supported by public funds, that the Wisconsin legislature will approve the budget item for radio, and that the service, under the most critical analysis, can prove that it is a proper and wise expenditure of public money. As advocates of education by radio, we have only to keep before us a big concept of true public service. Our chief hazard is mental. It is the result of inertia, of the inherent conservatism of educators, of the lack of foresight and daring. We must not be discouraged or detoured by obstructions left or tossed in our path. In our judgment, the only way out is straight through.

MR. KALTENBORN:

Mr. McCarty presented to us a stimulating and hopeful picture of what is being done and what can be done by public-service stations.

MR. BUCKLEY:

Standing between the commercial station and the state station, it should be possible for me to speak from a disinterested point of view. Has the program of the Wisconsin station interfered with that of commercially owned stations? If not, then should the larger funds available from the national government make it possible to broadcast a program of the type outlined by President Crane? Should not such a program bring the finest type of enlightenment and culture to the entire nation without conflicting with the best interests of the commercially owned station?

MR. CRANE (President, University of Wyoming):

I understand the rest of the public system was assigned a sufficient number of channels to make no greater interference with the present broadcasting system than could be made by that number of channels, and it varies. We estimate that 10, 15, or 20 per cent of the present channels would be ample for a Federal public system, nation-wide, including its substations and local stations, and the only interference with commercial stations would be that as a listener you would have the option to turn the dial. Commercial programs would still have from 80 to 90 per cent of the channels, but I, as an American listener, would have the option of turning to either the public program with the assurance that it was put out for the public welfare without any suspicion of it being dominated by advertisers, or I could turn to any other program coming to us through advertisers. I think there would be no more interference than that.

MR. BARTLETT (Station WSYU, Syracuse University):

Would it be possible to carry the plan proposed by Mr. Crane into effect without disturbing any existing facilities?

MR. CRANE:

That is possible, and we have been so advised by technical advisers. I do not raise the question and am not inclined to face it personally. If some such plan is possible, that is, to give a public-service station facilities without disturbing present broadcasters, it would be highly desirable; but if it is not, the maximum disturbance would be an amount no greater than if a great broadcasting agency wanted a couple of free channels.

THE FACILITIES OF EDUCATIONAL RADIO IN OHIO

● **GEORGE W. RIGHTMIRE**

PRESIDENT, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

OUR purpose is to consider the question of education by radio. Educational institutions, such as Ohio State, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Oregon, and probably others, which have broadcasting stations under their own control really have a great deal of responsibility. The Federal Communications Commission has always been cordial toward the needs of the Ohio State University station. In Oregon they broadcast all the time; there is no limit. They have the whole twenty-four hours. At Ohio State we have had all the time we could well use. We have got about what we wanted and that has enabled us to go forward;

it also has placed a mandate upon us to present some kind of constructive program. For a number of years we have been provided with a director and a staff, and everybody in the University has been cordial, always ready to co-operate. We have no money to hire talent; it is all voluntary and practically all inside the university. We have carried on what we think of as a constructive program. We have done a good many things. Recently we are broadcasting from the classrooms out over the state; we are conducting lessons, especially in romance languages, for classes organized out over Ohio. People are listening in, making use of the broadcasts from the recitation rooms in Ohio State University as a lesson for the occasion. We are developing in that field.

More recently we have developed what is called the Emergency Radio Junior College. I think that is an institution that has sprung up in practically all the states, supported by the United States government through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. We have been sending out programs from the University for the people assembled in these junior colleges organized under emergency conditions. That organization has been functioning very effectively and sympathetically, and it has been making an impression on the state. At the present time there are nearly fifteen hundred students registered in the radio junior colleges of Ohio. So there is considerable interest in that feature of the work which our broadcasting station has made possible.

Further we use the broadcasting station in co-operation with the other Ohio colleges, whether on a private foundation or public foundation. It is not unusual to find at WOSU the president of Ohio, Miami, Bowling Green, or Kent state universities or any of the other thirty-five colleges in Ohio, broadcasting whatever he thinks best in reference to his own college for the information of the people of Ohio. We have attempted to extend the use of our broadcasting station in many directions.

Now we are not satisfied—nobody in this country is satisfied—with the entire program that we call the educational program. There is a good deal to be done and to be worked over.

We think of education generally as formal; classroom procedure should always be observed. But in broadcasting we are experimenting with new educational procedures. What should this education that we broadcast be? I have had some correspondence with an Englishman, living in London, whom I met several years ago. From time to time I have sent him a few of our programs selected here and there. His reaction has been more favorable than it was in the beginning. He believes by such programs we can get somewhere in education by radio; we are encouraged to go forward on our present program.

We not only work through the station itself but through the Bureau of Educational Research, headed by W. W. Charters assisted by an able staff. They have become interested in research in radio education, and for several years on Mr. Charters' staff there was one of the most brilliant young men we have had the honor of graduating at the University, Mr. Hillis Lumley. Under the Payne Fund he carried on research in a most aggressive and novel fashion for three years and finally ended his work by the publication of a stimulating volume entitled *Measurement in Radio*. Measuring the audience effect is a most difficult task about which we know comparatively little, but it is something we feel we want to know about when we stand in front of the microphone. We were looking to Mr. Lumley as a kind of radio research genius. Probably most of you know by this time that he met a most tragic fate last summer; for on one of his walks through Glacier Park he disappeared, and nobody has heard from him since. We mourn the premature passing of Hillis Lumley, with his acute brain and his inquiring genius in this field of radio research.

For five years, under the leadership of Mr. Charters, there has been held at Ohio State University the Institute for Education by Radio. I looked again yesterday over the five volumes that mark the publication of the discussions and the papers that have been presented at those meetings; and as I turned the leaves of one volume after another, I was convinced that we have made great advances in our thinking about the possibilities of education through the use of the radio. Our programs

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

have been progressing, getting more and more detailed, having the general outline pretty satisfactorily worked out. The University has been proud indeed to have this activity sponsored by the Bureau of Educational Research. We have been happy to have gathered annually on our campus persons interested in education by radio from all over the country. It is an added privilege this year to have the members and friends of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education meeting in joint session with the Institute for Education by Radio. We welcome you sincerely! We know about your activities of the last four years, your objectives, and what you have been accomplishing. You are enthusiastic pioneers.

It is a great pleasure to me as a representative of Ohio State University to welcome the representatives of the various groups and organizations concerned with radio in education and the representatives of the Federal Communications Commission. Ohio State University through its independent station is trying to carry forward. We feel the responsibility under our conditions of working out a progressively significant radio program for educational purposes. We feel a mandate to that effect. This meeting carries the greatest significance for the forces combining to give maximum body and method to education by radio.

EDUCATION BY RADIO IN OHIO

● B. O. SKINNER

OHIO DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

ADVERTISING business is willing to spend immense amounts of money in radio broadcasting. Radio advertising does have an effect because if an advertiser were not getting returns, he would not do it. This seems to me to be all the proof we need that education by radio may be made to produce results.

The various difficulties in the way of education by radio remind me of a story I heard recently which illustrates what our trouble is. An old fellow and his wife went to a circus and sat down in front of the lion act. A few minutes later a woman,

with red tights and red turban, came in with a short whip. At her command the lion jumped up on a tub, jumped through the hoop, and finally the young lady placed a block of sugar between her teeth and the lion came up and took the sugar. Everybody applauded except the old gentleman. His wife said, "Henry, don't you think that is wonderful?" Henry said, "I don't see anything wonderful about it. I could do that." A gentleman sitting in front of him turned around and said, "You could do that? Then let's see you." And the old gentleman said, "All right, but first I want you to get that lion out of there." That is the difficulty that we are facing in radio communication. There is a lion in the road and nobody to take him out. The trouble as I see it is further illustrated in a statement made by someone a few years ago when he said, "There are no uninteresting things; there are only disinterested persons."

The greatest need in the state of Ohio, as I see it, is a need for money, a reasonable amount of money to pay for talent which will be effective. Nobody ought to be permitted to go on the air unless he has something to say and can say it well. There is too much at stake.

The Ohio Radio Education Association is making an effort to raise funds and establish an interest in two things: building up listening audiences and producing interesting, worth-while programs. There are many others in Ohio and neighboring states who have a deep interest in this. The only thing we lack now is money to go ahead. We hope something will be able to bring the money to us so that this Association may be, we hope in Ohio, an example for the remainder of the states.

We have in Ohio twenty broadcasting stations. We have the most powerful station in all America within the confines of Ohio and over that station our School of the Air has been broadcasting; thus, we can serve many states. In addition to that we have the use of the short wave which seems to be almost limitless in its distribution. Each of the twenty radio stations is doing some work in education, but four of them have set themselves definitely to the task of allotting some of their time in an attempt to establish real educational radio programs. There are

in Ohio seven million citizens and one million three hundred thousand school children. We hope that you may help solve the question of radio in Ohio so that our children may have better opportunities than they have ever had.

A STATE UNIT OF RADIO EDUCATION

● J. H. J. UPHAM

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

IT IS unnecessary to discuss more than briefly before this audience the chaotic conditions existing in the field of radio activity. The rapid development and great improvements in radio transmission and radio reception have resulted in a general popularity that can be paralleled only by the automobile, and even in that comparison the latter runs a good second.

The public recognizes in the radio great opportunities, with a minimum of exertion, for entertainment, the hearing of the latest items of news interest, educational addresses, and perhaps may be intrigued to hear of the health values of various yeasts, special types of shoes, the great advantages of certain coffees, gasolines, and the like.

Commercial interests were quick to recognize the great possibilities of presenting what is in effect a person-to-person appeal; at first the novelty made people listen to almost anything, but as the audiences became more sophisticated varied methods of capturing and holding the attention have developed with the frank interjection of the advertising matter or, more subtly, by merely the sponsoring of the program. Entertainment at first appeared to have the greatest appeal and low comedy and jazz music filled the air. There has come, however, the realization that the radio audience is now as complex as the public and that programs must be set up to attract the attention of as many different types of hearers as possible.

Probably musical offerings predominate; at almost any time of day or night one may hear any and all kinds; the younger listeners may tune in on their favorite "crooner" or their choice

of jazz bands, or the more mature select the finest types of orchestral compositions.

Low comedy is still with us, but literary offerings of excellent quality are provided in increasing numbers. Political and educational programs are receiving more and wider recognition.

Broadcasting stations like newspapers depend for their revenue on advertising; the circulation of the newspaper may be fairly well shown by concrete proof, but the size of the radio audience of any given station can be assumed only from the power of the station and the probable appeal of the programs offered. The fact that there are more educational institutions in this country than in any other country of the world indicates the wide desire for self-improvement, and this has led to the increasing recognition of the fact that educational topics have a definite place in rounding out a broadcasting program of wide appeal.

Educators and educational institutions were quick to recognize the great possibilities of radio education and have cooperated freely, and an increasing number of institutions of learning are actively entering the broadcasting field. Following the example, perhaps, of European countries, the attempt has been made to organize education by radio on a national basis, but conditions in this country differ greatly from those abroad. Our larger territory with the varying cultural and ethical conditions and traditions of the East, South, Central, North, and West make a centralized national control impractical. A regional organization would seem most desirable, but with our political subdivision into states, our general reaction to the thought of an organization is on a state basis.

While recognizing that the radio knows no state boundaries, the idea has been growing that in Ohio a definite plan should be inaugurated to foster education by radio, to correlate the various broadcasting activities, and to study and endeavor to evaluate the interest in educational topics so as to have better data to offer the broadcasting interests as to the importance of educational offerings. To this as a natural sequence would be added the systematizing of the educational work, the securing

of better programs, and organizing the securing of audiences, individual and in groups.

Ohio has many advantages for its selection as an experimental state. Its area is of a size and character to allow for thorough covering by radio. It is well populated and its population is well distributed in urban, suburban, and rural districts. It has a relatively large number of broadcasting stations, one of which rates as the most powerful in the country. Further, it has a large number of educational institutions as evidence of the wide interest of its citizens in education and self-improvement.

Two years ago, therefore, after a meeting of the Institute for Education by Radio, a meeting was held of some forty persons representing the various interests of educational institutions and the matter of forming an organization was thoroughly discussed. As a result of this meeting the Ohio Radio Education Association was formed, and plans of organization policies and methods of procedure were outlined carefully. Because of her interest in the subject and her wide acquaintance and contacts in the radio field, Mrs. M. E. Fulk was appointed Organizing Director and, subsequently, the Managing Director. The Attorney General of Ohio guided the organization through the necessary legal mazes, and permission was granted to establish an office in one of the committee rooms during the recess periods of the legislature.

Eight trustees were secured. A concession to human nature was made in confining membership on the board to persons who could not be regarded as having any personal financial interest in grants that might be made. The persons invited to serve were selected with a view to having every field of human interest represented, so far as possible, by nationally known men and women of wide experience. They serve without compensation and at considerable personal sacrifice. Mr. Taber is Master of the National Grange. Mr. Selby is a retired business man who gives much of his time to helping educational and philanthropic enterprises. Mr. Chapple is director of public relations of one of the outstanding business organizations in the country, which spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on radio programs,

and he is on the air, himself, every week over a coast-to-coast network. Mr. Argetsinger is general counsel of another great corporation. Mr. Bush is president of the Ohio Institute, a research organization, and supervises the work of the Home Owners Loan Corporation of the Federal government in three states. Mr. Skinner is Director of the Department of Education of the state of Ohio. The late W. O. Thompson, president emeritus of Ohio State University, consented to serve but died before the board was organized. Mr. Vinson, president of Western Reserve University, was elected but illness forced his resignation. I was asked to serve on the board because, as a member of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association, I am familiar with the radio activity of health programs carried on by that organization and also direct the health broadcasting programs of the Ohio State University. There are four vacancies on the board, and these will be filled in course of time by qualified men and women. In as much as the function of a board of trustees is to insure the safety and wise expenditure of funds, it is not necessary, of course, that they should be experts in radio. The experts will serve on committees and will conduct activities.

As I said before, the main objective is to develop audiences for educational programs, not merely programs related to formal education, but all programs that can be considered as educational in any true sense. It does not matter whether these programs are broadcast by the publicly owned station at Ohio State University or by the commercial stations that have given such splendid co-operation to Ohio educational institutions and groups.

For example, we expect to make sure that every listener can secure advance announcements of all good programs. There is no publication at present that gives listeners the whole daily educational bill-of-fare. This has led to careless listening where there might as well be planned listening. If we managed our physical diet as we do our radio diet we would simply sit down each day and wait to see what the neighbors or the tradesmen bring in. Most of us, I think, would rather plan our listening.

Many of us do, to some extent, by running over the radio columns in the daily newspaper and noting the outstanding features. But, in general, the radio audience needs more adequate announcements and also some printed material to supplement the programs.

There are over a million radio receivers in Ohio homes and schools, yet the total circulation of literature sent out in connection with the fine programs broadcast over national networks by the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education probably is not over a million a year.

If Mr. Chapple of our Board were here he would tell you that he never puts a commercial program on the air without having an audience of millions waiting for it. He builds his audience by promotion methods well known to business men. Educational programs need just as intelligent and persistent promotion. Even the concerns that get such a tremendous response to offers to give free samples of cosmetics and cathartics will tell you that they never go on the air without adequate preparation of the audience. The interest is manifest and only leadership is needed; that leadership can be supplied by such an organization as the Ohio Radio Education Association. Through it, program announcements would be sent to the state officials and through them to the members throughout the state by means of official organs and local meetings. Groups of members would thus be gathered, and programs not only heard but opportunity given for discussion.

Through the channels thus created, reports of the local reaction to the programs may be gathered and analyzed for the information of the broadcasting stations and those sponsoring the offerings. Instead of what may be considered as, at present, shooting in the dark, much useful information would be gathered as to what has succeeded and what has failed, and so point the way for better efforts thereafter.

Many of us have worked hard on the preparation of educational programs and have been left wondering how much good was accomplished. Co-ordination of such efforts on a state basis would certainly be a great aid because through the announce-

ments by a state-wide responsible organization audiences would be assured. This would not interfere with the offering of individual programs; on the contrary, they would fit in the plan well and be greatly benefited. The Ohio Radio Education Association does not seek to dominate the broadcasting field in education but rather to co-operate with all existing activities, promote others, and endeavor to further their efforts by assurance of interested listeners.

You are all familiar with the difficulties in securing publicity for routine educational programs, or even for those of exceptional interest. Many, doubtless, scan the radio lists published in the daily papers; they see merely the names of the speakers, but no hint of the subject and little or no general appeal. With the possibility, however, of sending information of such programs, personal notes as to the speakers, and the like through official channels to the thousands of students in our colleges and universities, to the members of the faculties, to over a million club members and fifty thousand members of the Ohio Grange, better results would seem to be assured.

These are not new methods but merely those of modern successful commercial activities working through systematic publicity. We as educators have not always been as co-operative as would seem advisable for our own good; nor have we always fully appreciated the great importance of publicity.

Our first duty naturally is assumed to be in the classroom, to be followed up by technical contributions to learned societies and scientific journals. The number of individuals reached through these channels is necessarily limited, and perhaps the attacks on our educational institutions and the hammering down of legislature appropriations are due largely to lack of information and misinformation as to the character and extent of the great services really rendered. The radio offers a great opportunity of personal contact if the attention of the desired class of listeners is secured.

The Ohio Radio Education Association could also function in another way. Many organizations have written letters asking help in the production of programs. It is hoped that an

expert may be added to the staff who could co-operate with local groups or with broadcasting stations. The latter are often generous in offering time to speakers on educational topics, as even from a selfish point of view it pays them to give a diversified and rounded-out program. They have, however, to put on a schedule of offerings every fifteen minutes for from six to eighteen hours a day so that their material is often hurriedly selected, ill assembled, and not always carefully supervised. Not infrequently they consciously put on programs they know to be inferior for no other reason than that the local educational organizations do not always know how to present their material or train their talent. This, followed by the gathering of reports, as planned by the Ohio Radio Education Association would aid materially in sensing the reaction of the public with resulting better meeting of the public demand in the character of programs desired.

The Ohio Radio Education Association could well foster another activity, which is a part of the general education of the public but would be more effective if a systematically planned program arranged by a central body through the co-operative effort of the various educational institutions on current civic problems. I will quote a statement of one of the members of the Board:

We are passing through one of the most important crises in our nation's history. Proved economic theories are being discarded and new experimental theories are being accepted. Values of intangible assets are being threatened with annihilation. All of the discussion upon these subjects has been partisan and not very profound.

The average age of mental intelligence is about fifteen or sixteen years. It is my suggestion that the Radio Education Association should undertake the presentation of a series of educational talks upon civil government, common ordinary business economics and the experiences of history, particularly American history, with respect to events similar to those now occurring. These talks should be graded to the average intelligence with a gradually increasing profundity, and should be non-partisan but truly educational and absolutely correct.

The sole aim of these talks should be to apprise the people of historical facts with respect to depressions, economic crises and economic events; these

economic laws which have been proven to be steadfast and the meaning of the federal constitution, as applied to them.

. . . . These educational talks must be fair, honest and non-partisan and not aimed at any party or group.

I believe we shall be led out of our intellectual morass only in this manner, and the great educational foundations can do no greater good than to bring about an understanding by the great majority of people of these facts and of the evidence to prove them.

The funds that have made possible the survey of the state and the organization of the Ohio Radio Education Association have come from one national organization and several individual donors. The national organization, acting in the spirit of the national philanthropy that finances its work, has given a considerable sum in money and has also contributed services of members of its staff, but has left the Ohio Association entirely free to establish its own policies and run its own affairs. The total amount spent so far is about \$10,000.

The trustees decided that funds for the development of its activities should be secured from some national philanthropic organization, if possible, and that after an experimental period of three to five years such work as had demonstrated its value should be continued through contributions from Ohio sources.

The trustees themselves maintain personal contact with interested philanthropies. They do not leave this highly important matter to salaried promoters nor to persons who have a personal financial interest in grants. The results so far have been encouraging, and a permanent organization is hoped for. A member of the board of one of the largest of American philanthropies has met with the Board and his interest has continued unabated.

So, we look forward optimistically to the future. Raising money is not easy work. Philanthropists look more critically into applications than they did in more prosperous times. On the other hand, they realize, as we all do, that what the United States is suffering from is not the lack of resources but a state of mind, and that the human voice is the most potent instrument for changing a state of mind. If the Ohio Radio Education Association should fail, for lack of educational or financial support, we should still feel that our effort was worth while for we

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

have demonstrated that there is a desire for the development of the higher uses of radio. We have reason to believe, however, that we are going forward to the second phase of our work, the development of audiences for educational programs.

MR. TYSON (National Advisory Council on Radio in Education):

Am I correct in believing that the Ohio Radio Education Association first attempted to organize a state unit for educational programs? If so, I should think the audience would like to ask quite a number of questions. I would like to ask Mr. McCarty whether the Wisconsin set-up is at all similar to the Ohio plan. In the organization of your station do you have anything that corresponds to this arrangement?

MR. McCARTY:

Not an all-embracing supervising body. We have at the University a general committee which brings in interests from the outside and represents our state boards, but we do not have the laymen represented so well as Ohio does. We are taking steps in that direction, and I think within a year we shall have something interesting to report.

MR. TYSON:

Do you depend on usual methods of building audiences? Have you not attempted to develop an audience check?

MR. McCARTY:

We have taken no steps at all in general surveys.

MR. TYSON:

Are there other questions to ask Dr. Upham? I think this is one of the most significant developments of building educational programs and their various adjuncts. Dr. Upham has pointed out one of the big difficulties and problems in that radio broadcasting cannot be confined to state borders which in this country, speaking in a broadcasting sense, are mere political divisions.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE AIR

● MORRIS S. NOVIK

STATION WEVD, NEW YORK

I WELCOME the opportunity extended to me by the Conference Committee to tell you some of the difficulties of Station WEVD and some of our experiences because, in a sense, we have been pioneers in a definite field. We have undertaken

this task because we believed there was an urgent need for it. We have realized that other stations in other parts of the country are trying to solve similar problems under even greater difficulties.

WEVD was reorganized two years ago for the purpose of maintaining an open public forum for the discussion of political, social, and economic questions of current interest, and for the encouragement of general mass education covering every conceivable subject of public interest and necessity. We undertook a job in New York City that was vast and distinctive in its scope. We could not compete, even if we wanted to, with the hundreds of men and women at the recognized schools of learning and universities in and around New York City, and with the thousands of leaders in various educational, artistic, and cultural movements.

We therefore started as a station that would introduce a pioneer idea, that of the open forum and old town-hall meeting, rather than be just an educational station in the usual sense. While our ambition has always been to give an opportunity for the fullest expression of freedom of speech, while we have always relied upon the John Deweys and the Hendrik Van Loons to be the backbone of our programs, we nevertheless understood, if we were to get anywhere, we should have to do it through the medium of the old town hall. We had as competitors four major network stations, and twelve other small stations, each having more time than we had. We found in spite of the fact that we were sharing time with three other stations, in spite of the fact that we were only allowed from eight to nine and ten to eleven in the evening, we still were able to be pioneers in a distinctive field. Because of that, we should like to call your attention to some of the things we have accomplished.

We have called upon the social mindedness, the social conscientiousness of people like Dewey, Kilpatrick, Van Loon, Broun, Woollcott, and Fannie Hurst. I mention these persons because, though leaders in their respective fields, they have helped us to organize the University of the Air. Believe me that when we gave our programs the title "the University of

the Air," we did not know there was a College of the Air and a School of the Air.

For two years we have been giving courses, not in the conventional classroom manner, but general educational courses listed under the heading "Education in the Changing Social Order." Men came each week to give fifteen minutes of their valuable time to listeners, and we hoped that there were one hundred thousand, possibly two hundred thousand, who listened within the actual hearing distance of WEVD. We called on leading psychologists of New York to organize talks in psychology and psychoanalysis. Each of these outstanding persons appeared on network programs and received considerable money regularly for his time, but each came to us without even being reimbursed for his taxi or car fare. This unusual co-operation has continued for two years.

In organizing the 1935 sessions of the University of the Air we felt that educational emphasis on the town-hall idea was important. Chancellor Chase, Dewey, and other men of high caliber were present, and the keynote of that particular third session of the University was that while WEVD served New York we wanted to do something more than set the pace for the stations of New York City. The new idea which we proposed was the use of a recording machine by which good transcripts of speech were produced. Guided in the general undertaking by Mr. Tyson, we communicated with stations throughout the country, told them of our programs and general plan and that we did not want remuneration for our work; all we asked them to do was pay for the actual cost of recording which we calculated to be the nominal figure of two dollars. In other words, we were ready to supply this service without any recognition or mention of WEVD or the University of the Air, and we proposed to inaugurate a weekly program. We were amazed to find that from thirty to fifty stations refused to accept the offer because their budgets would not allow \$30 to broadcast a series of fifteen programs. We were ready to pass even that obstacle, and started an organization to raise the necessary funds to make it possible for educational stations to use our recordings.

To prove our belief in freedom of speech we have allowed several worthy persons whose speeches were barred from commercial stations to broadcast from WEVD. We were the only station in the country that extended its facilities to a prominent health authority, who recently was barred from delivering his speech on a network. He delivered the canceled speech over WEVD in the exact manner he wanted to. We extended our facility also to a city official who was booked to deliver a speech on an important issue, but later was refused the privilege, the local station justifying its action with the excuse that it was against the interest of the Federal Communications Commission. I bring out these points only because I think it is necessary, while we are meeting in an educational conference, to bear in mind that in some localities there are educational, non-profit stations doing useful and important jobs.

In our struggle for greater recognition we have been able to secure from the Commission an increase of power from 500 watts to 1,000 watts, and we tried to get more time. We appealed to the Communications Commission, and, I think, we presented a fairly good case. I shall present to you here not our case but the report of the examiner of the Federal Communications Commission:

Station WEVD has been operated as an open forum, devoting its facilities to the discussion of all views and differences of opinion on important questions of public interest, and to programs of cultural and educational nature. It is a non-profit organization. The income from the station is used for the extension and improvement of the station. The policies of the station are formulated by its board of twenty-five directors, while the immediate management of the station is in the hands of an executive committee consisting of seven members.

The program service rendered by Station WEVD appears to be meritorious and designed to be of particular interest to listeners in the New York and Brooklyn metropolitan areas. Approximately 57 per cent of its time is devoted to sustained programs and 33 per cent to commercial programs. All of its evening hours after six [o'clock] are reserved for educational and cultural broadcasts.

One of the outstanding regular educational features of the station is the University of the Air in which groups of authorities on particular subjects are invited to participate in well-organized and planned adult educational

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

programs. John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick, Hendrik Van Loon, Heywood Broun, Fannie Hurst, and Alexander Woollcott are among those participating in these programs. Other authorities on the subjects of literature, drama, art, and music have broadcast over this station concerning their particular subjects within the past two years.

Daily religious services are conducted over this station by the Brooklyn Federation of Churches, and from time to time sermons and lectures are delivered on the subject of religion by religious leaders. The station facilities are made available for discussion of all local governmental problems, and representatives of all political parties participate in these discussions.

The facilities of Station WEVD are available, free of charge, to social, welfare, economic, and religious organizations, and fifty of such organizations have used the facilities of the Station within the last year, including a number of Brooklyn organizations.

The applicant proposes to devote the additional evening hours after six [o'clock] to an extension of its educational and cultural broadcasts if this application is granted. It proposes to extend its University of the Air program from its present fifteen-minute schedule, four times a week, to two fifteen-minute periods, one in the early part of the evening and one later, six times a week.

The examiner concluded his report with the following statement: "The applicant is fully qualified in every respect to operate its station on an unlimited basis. The programs broadcast by Station WEVD are generally meritorious, and the tentative programs appear to be of the same high type." The examiner mentioned certain minor technical objections which we think can be eliminated, and we hope that we shall be given the right to full time on our wave-length.

In conclusion, I beg to state that a small station which only imitates the larger stations and devotes itself whole-heartedly to grabbing up the business which the larger stations discard has no right to live. If a new station is to justify its being, it should show courage and imagination; it must be ready to experiment; it must help to raise the general level of the intelligence of its listeners; and it must fill a new need. I think during the past two years that Station WEVD has lived up to its opportunity.

SAFEGUARDING EDUCATIONAL RADIO

● A. G. CRANE

PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

WHY should it be necessary to sell radio to college authorities? To one alert to the possibilities of universal communication, this is a foolish question. Radio, with its tremendous values, should sell itself. Professors covet audiences and radio offers millions of listeners distributed nation-wide. Why need to convince faculties of the values of broadcasting?

While we are asking questions, let us propound some harder ones, and the answers may clear the minor puzzles. Why did the American people permit an instrument so vital to popular government as instantaneous and universal communication to be seized and devoted exclusively to selling goods, making all other uses subordinate and incidental?

In spite of America's boasted aggressiveness in business fields, as a nation she has been exceedingly slow in realizing and visioning values in the realm of social welfare. During the early years of radio development, everyone's attention was centered on material progress. The noise of the dollars jingling drowned the few feeble voices proclaiming in the wilderness the public-welfare values of talks to the nation's firesides. America was pre-occupied, ignorant, and neglectful of intangible social services. It has required the chastening of calamity to force America to study social science.

A new instrument, little understood, unappreciated, still experimental, offered free entertainment. The novelty, the thrill of getting far-away stations satisfied the fans who played with the new toy. If advertisers gave us free programs why pay for them? It is not surprising that we failed to realize the importance of the new gadget, especially as its public utilization immediately required public expense and, though support by advertising cost many fold more, the tax was hidden, and each listener fatuously thought the other fellow paid it. School administrators, always pressed for funds, not only had to convince themselves of broadcasting values, but also had to convince

trustees, legislatures, and faculties of the worth-while values and that the services of broadcasting came within the purview of the universities. Only recently are demonstrations at hand showing a true field of service for broadcasting, which includes an extension and amplification of services already established in university practice.

During the period of experimentation, academic faculties which ventured into the new field failed to appreciate the limitations of the new medium and the new technique required to hold an unseen audience. Often, too much was expected of the new instrument and failures in extending conventional classroom lectures to radio listeners brought discouragement, particularly in the face of rising costs to keep pace with invention, discovery, and development. Obsolescence of equipment, added to unsuitable programs, and the difficult task of learning a new technique caused the abandonment of many promising stations. Try to teach any university faculty any new tricks if you wish to test the strength of academic inertia, of tradition, habit, and convention.

Today the few remaining university stations have demonstrated the public service of radio in programs to the public and private schools; in public forums; in promoting public business; in general health instruction; in enlarging, amplifying, and extending adult education; and in making available the results of research. If we had been able to envision at the outset what we know today, at least a share in the air would have been reserved for exclusive public use.

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

What is needed today is a plan which gives promise of conserving for public purposes a share in the air. The present American system of broadcasting is an almost incredible absurdity for a country that stakes its existence upon universal

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

The National Committee on Education by Radio, a body representing great national educational agencies, has studied this situation for four years and now presents a definite, concrete plan to save a share of facilities for public use and to give the listeners who pay the bills a larger and freer choice of programs. The National Committee on Education by Radio proposes a plan which, it is hoped,¹ will receive general discussion, will serve as a rallying point for those who desire to use this great radio agency as an instrument to advance and unify a mighty nation.

Of all principles safeguarding American institutions, the one affording the greatest protection is freedom of speech. Without it freedom of thought is nullified. Freedom of speech includes freedom of the press and freedom in all means of communication. America has zealously defended freedom of the press, even to the point of permitting excesses and abuses rather than to

¹ See pp. 23-24.

attempt the dangers of the slightest censorship. America has recognized the same principle in maintaining the right of communication free and untrammled for all citizens using the United States mails. Postal facilities have been extended to every citizen, to the remotest hamlet, to the rural population, even at the expense of annual deficits in order to protect the right of universal communication. Telephone and telegraph have been made public utilities and common carriers of communication. Their service is open to all citizens who wish to pay for the service. The right of uncensored communication is the essential expression of free speech. Without free speech and free discussion a government of the people cannot endure. It is the bedrock of American institutions.

Radio broadcasting is the most potent of all forms of communication. It is instantaneous, universal, speaking to literate and illiterate alike. It calls a nation on instant notice into a great public town meeting. If freedom of the press and of the post office, of telephone and telegraph are essential to freedom of speech, radio is many times more vital. Public use of this communication marvel of the century must be preserved to insure America's freedom of speech. It must not be permitted to come under the control of any limited body of men or special interests. It must remain under public control for public welfare. It is not a question of the character of the private control however honorable and decent. America cannot safely entrust the means of universal communication exclusively to any private control, as such control must be governed by the limitations of available time, available channels, and the necessity for producing profitable income. The speaker and the other members of the National Committee bear no antagonism toward the commercial stations. We appreciate the job they have done and are doing, but we also are fully cognizant of their limitations. They must make the business pay, and in the final analysis the decisions which they make are governed by the balance sheet.

The National Committee on Education by Radio proposes a plan for preserving an adequate portion of limited broadcasting facilities for public use as a protection to free speech. The National Committee is not attacking commercial broadcasters.

They have done a remarkably fine piece of work in many ways. The commercial stations have often been and are still offering many of their facilities for educational and non-profit broadcasting. These favors are appreciated, and the plan proposed by the National Committee has been carefully framed to cause the least disturbance, the least possible hardship to present broadcasters. In fact, the establishment of a parallel public-broadcasting system would probably relieve commercial broadcasters from many embarrassing demands and requests for broadcasts of non-advertising character. The protest of the National Committee on Education by Radio is not against advertising itself. To promote the sale of worthy articles is commendable, but America's freedom of speech for all men and all parties must not be consigned to the inevitable censorship of a broadcasting system dependent upon advertising revenues for its existence. The plan proposed by the National Committee on Education by Radio is for the protection of free discussion, free dissemination of ideas, universal enjoyment of the best America produces in culture, entertainment, and information.

The plan asks only for a portion of radio channels, leaving the major part of the limited available band for use of private commercial interests. Is it unreasonable for the public to reserve one-fourth of the facilities of the air for public use if merchandising still retains three-fourths? The National Committee is not unappreciative of the many fine things put on the air by the private broadcasters. Advertising of superior articles is commendable, but stations wholly dependent upon the revenues from merchandising can give only incidental service to public welfare and inevitably when public welfare conflicts with advertising revenues the cash receipts must win. Such censorship is dangerous to public welfare.

The new plan proposes to place the operation and control of a public system under national, regional, and state boards made up of leaders in American welfare carefully selected and safeguarded against vicious influence of political or private propagandists. Under these boards would be the technical operators of stations and the managers of programs.

The public system, supplementing but not supplanting the

present private system, would give greater freedom of choice to the listener who, under all systems, finally pays the bills. By a turn of the dial the listener could enjoy a constructive public program or the alluring charms of Crazy Water Crystals, the merits of Pepsodent or the latest scheme for selling something.

The public system would permit broadcasts by master teachers to the public schools stimulating teachers and pupils, connecting even the most isolated with the best in music, literature, information, and entertainment. State stations already have demonstrated that broadcasting improves school instruction. There is the answer to the statement made during this meeting that educational and public stations were impossible because there was no money. Today \$3,000,000,000 are spent on education. There are scores of universities in America that probably could have found \$50,000 or \$100,000 or more if necessary for the operation of a first-class public radio station if they and the people were convinced that such service was acceptable and valuable. Mr. Skinner, if I remember rightly, said from this platform Monday that there were one million three hundred thousand children in the schools of Ohio. One penny a week for each of those children would raise as much money in the state of Ohio as is now available for public broadcasts. Is it not worth while to consider the point that there is money for such a thing as this if America wants it and if we can demonstrate its values and methods of procedure? If general broadcasts to public schools should increase the effectiveness of school expenditures 5 per cent, it would give values worth \$150,000,000 annually on the \$3,000,000,000 education bill of the country. Private as well as public schools are equally interested in broadcasting values. Neither public nor private schools are likely to permit even the least objectionable advertising to enter.

By assuring affiliation with the national system for all non-profit stations, the local poverty of program material will be enriched by national hook-ups. All the genius of America would be available for all. The public system would maintain experimentation and research in broadcasting technique to make this

great agency, which intimately enters American homes, the most useful for public welfare.

The following is a formal, terse outline for an American system of radio broadcasting to serve the welfare of the American people:

The National Committee on Education by Radio, concluding four years of study and investigation, recommends to the President, the Congress, and to the People of the United States a plan for an American system of radio broadcasting to serve the welfare of the American people.¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ Adopted by the National Committee on Education by Radio, March 25, 1935. The Committee is composed of representatives of the following groups: National Association of State Universities, National Association of Educational Broadcasters, National Catholic Educational Association, National University Extension Association, National Education Association, the Jesuit Educational Association, National Council of State Superintendents, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and the American Council on Education.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

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

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

I should like to comment briefly on certain aspects of the plan in view of various comments which have been made during the conference. Since both public and private schools will be included in this plan, unless there is a reversal of the long-established American custom, advertising of the most commendable article will not be permitted in the broadcasts to the public schools.

We have been told that the cultural centers of American radio are Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. Under the proposed plan the talent so abundant in those four centers could be drafted and made available for the entire United States. This would safeguard the right of affiliation of hook-up and the right of participating in the benefits of the public, which would assist local stations now working under the handicap of poverty of program material. Such a system would stimulate the formation of educational stations and public-welfare stations of all sorts serving one particular locality. This would give America a threefold system of broadcasting: first, the present one open to those wishing to pay the price; second, the government system; and third, the local stations. Such an opportunity would go far toward protecting this vital thing we call freedom of speech, far toward protecting the voice of the minorities so that all sides of controversial issues may be heard.

If we had available a clear and convincing demonstration of the values of broadcasting, we never should have reached the present condition. Fortunately, we now have some rather clear illustrations of what can be done by public broadcasting stations. Mr. Engel, of Wisconsin, has placed in my hands some reports and announcements of what is being done by the Wisconsin state-owned broadcasting stations, stations which have vision, which serve a broader than mere school function, which serve the people of Wisconsin.

I have here first an announcement of programs on everyday economics—"What is wealth?" "What are current economic problems?" I should like to have heard some of these broadcasts: "The Background of the Triple A"; "The Triple A as a Permanent Structure"; "The Growing Sense of Ethics in Advertising." Here is a series on rediscovering Wisconsin. Accounts of earth's creation, as it is written in the mountains, streams, and rocks, would be of intense interest to children and adults. Here is a series on farm life and living. Here is music. Then here is a large folio of broadcasts approved by the state superintendent of public instruction and the Wisconsin teachers' association. There is a special feature introduced by the governor of Wisconsin, which brings to the boys and girls in school a sense of connection with the great world about them and makes their study real, makes it interesting, stimulates their progress. Mr. McCarty says in their experiment there, by actual comparison of radio groups and non-radio groups controlled scientifically, that they have found that radio has stimulated and speeded up the reliability of instruction 20 per cent.

The National Committee on Education by Radio believes that this plan presents a happy combination of private and public broadcasting systems—a plan that will not work undue hardship on present broadcasters, that will improve the service to the listener, and that will be of untold benefit to a nation whose happiness and very existence are dependent upon the general standards of its people. The national system, dedicated solely to public welfare, will make audible and effective the voice of a nation.

MR. KALTENBORN:

Mr. Crane has presented a definite challenge to the present existing radio set-up in the United States. He has raised questions as to why our government decided to turn over the radio facilities for the purpose of selling goods. He declared that we need a new plan. He has presented such a plan as outlined by the National Committee on Radio in Education, a certain percentage of all facilities for the use of non-profit stations as the Wisconsin station whose achievements he has cited. There is the challenge.

MR. RANDALL (Chicago Civic Broadcast Bureau):

I am not going to challenge Mr. Crane's suggestions, neither am I going to indorse them. But I am going to ask the members of this conference to re-

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

member what Commissioner Prall said: the reason why educators cannot get what they want from the Federal government is because they cannot agree in their requests. Now, I do not know who it was that invented the public-school system of America, but I am sure that if he had waited until he could get the entire educationally minded population to agree on the proper national system of education, we never would have had public schools. I could pick a lot of flaws in this particular plan Mr. Crane has given us, and I could also argue for it at great length. I am not interested in doing either, but I would like to bring out the fact that the way to get improvement in broadcasting conditions in this country is not to make a cut-and-dried plan for some system and then try and get everybody to agree on it; that is impossible. I hope the improvement we need in American broadcasting will not have to wait until we can get an agreement on this plan or any other plan. We in Illinois may want our broadcasting conducted in one way, and they in Wyoming another way. The idea that broadcasting has to be uniform all over the country is false. The only respect in which the Federal government has to meddle in broadcasting is to assign certain channels for the use of certain regions and see that other regions do not interfere. When that is done, each state can organize and take care of its own requirements, have the broadcasting it wants, and arrange the kind of financial support it wants. I hope intelligent experimentation of this kind will not be delayed by fruitless efforts to make any rigid plan for a national system of broadcasting and to get everybody to agree upon it.

MR. KALTENBORN:

We have had a plan presented; we have been told that it is stupid to get educators to agree on any kind of plan. What is the next step then? Must we give up all plans, or must we give up the educators?

MR. CALDWELL (General Secretary, American Association for the Advancement of Science):

I wonder if we can have a definite statement of the objections to Mr. Crane's plans? There must be in this group representatives of interests which have objections. If those objections can be stated definitely, we can clear the air.

MR. KALTENBORN:

I do not know that it is the function of the chairman to do that. The chief objection, as I understand it, is that the plan is impracticable; not a sufficient number of people are able to agree to it. It has been generously advertised and has failed thus far to elicit sufficient response to make it of practical importance. That seems to be the reason for its not having received consideration and for its not having gained as much attention as it might.

MR. RIES (Station WLW, Cincinnati):

If educational interests have not made the best use of the facilities already available, what are they going to do when they get what they seem to want?

MR. CALDWELL:

I asked my question seriously and with a desire to elicit specific statements of objections. We know that we do not all agree; else we never should have made the progress we have. We act on the basis of the majority of interests, and if a majority of people believe such a movement as this is desirable, we are entitled to try it. That is the principle upon which we work. I am quite aware that there has not been propagandic effort made in behalf of this movement as has been made in opposition to it. I do not know if that is right or not. I should like to know, and if at such a gathering as this there are reasons against it, they should be stated specifically.

MR. TYSON:

Mr. Kaltenborn, do you not think it is embarrassing for anyone to comment on this plan when Mr. Crane himself says that the National Committee on Education by Radio has taken four years to evolve it? It would be rather hard for you, I am sure, even as skilful and accomplished as we believe you are, to make a definite comment on a plan that has been worked out in such detail. For example, last year at the meeting of the Institute I believe that in my paper I anticipated a partial governmental parallel to the present commercial system in this country. I was prophesying, perhaps, but I visualized it as a possibility. It takes time to find out whether such visions are sound. We have had presented here a plan that has taken four years to think out. I do not believe any of us would want to say categorically, now, whether we agree or disagree with it.

MR. DARROW:

Does this plan have in mind the paying for the broadcasts if broadcasting time is obtained from commercial stations, or does the plan provide public funds to pay merely for carrying the broadcast to the microphone, or does it provide funds for making the program and paying for its transmission on the air?

MR. CRANE:

It would be futile to go into all the details of the plan. The attempt was simply to present it in outline. In general, the provision regarding the finances is covered by the statement, "the provision of funds and the allocation of suitable broadcasting channels necessary for the effective operation of the system shall be made by the Federal government." The exact details are to be worked out by experience. The public hook-ups are to be maintained and financed entirely by the Federal government; the free time is to be donated. If the government wants national time on a broadcasting station, I should say the government should pay for it and not be dependent upon gratuitous broadcasting.

In answer to the rest let me say to my knowledge this plan has not been discussed, has not been up for active consideration for months; some of the provisions have but this plan is new; this is the plan prepared by the National

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

Committee on Education by Radio, and I was formally commissioned by the Committee to give it to this group. The effort has been made to evolve a plan so simple in its principles that we might all agree upon it as a method of procedure. In following this procedure we would evolve the answers to many of the perplexing details now bothering us. A plan simple in its general outline, a parallel system supplementing public-welfare broadcasts maintained at public expense, giving affiliations and advantages thereto, and assuring them to the local private non-profit stations, the whole under the direction of as carefully selected and safeguarded boards of control as America can devise. Then we are on the road for experimentation if it is necessary. Then we can get the best results of a commercial system and a public system and a system of local stations and thereby preserve some of the values of this marvel of the century. We are offering to this group and people of America interested in preserving this method of communication a plan whereby some of the perplexing problems may be solved.

MR. KALTENBORN:

In stating that this plan has been up for some time, I merely had in mind that the allocation of a certain percentage of the wave-lengths, that general feature of the plan, which is the dominant characteristic, has been up for some time. Mr. Crane reminds us that his exposition has just recently been worked out and presented here for the first time.

VARIETIES OF BROADCASTING

RADIO PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN

● FREDERICK L. REDEFER
PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

THE expression, "Ah, woe is me!" picked from some radio broadcast and used by my niece to express a variety of moods and predicaments, seems particularly pertinent to the plight of the average parent and educator when faced with the problem of children's radio programs. For those interested in improving these broadcasts, "Ah, woe is me" expresses the feelings of confusion, perplexity, and futility that color efforts of parents and teachers.

Although there has been an improvement in broadcasts for children, dissatisfaction is general among all groups at all concerned with children's radio programs. It is this dissatisfaction from all quarters that is alarming. In resolutions, in platform pronouncements, in the organization of censorship machinery, and by other means of expressing disapproval, national, state, and local groups have registered their displeasure. Individual parents have written letters, and others have "turned the dial." The parent has yet to be found who gives blanket approval to current children's broadcasts.

With Johnsonian epithets, these orphan broadcasts have been christened the "horror hour," and programs have been described as inferior, overstimulating, appealing to low motives, exhibiting poor taste, as inculcating poor English, as exploiting immature children through advertising statements, and using unethical means to sell the sponsor's product. Even when general criticisms have been seasoned by humor and by an understanding of parents and children, radio broadcasts for children and young people remain, for the most part, a disappointment. They could be superior; they remain mediocre and average.

Because dissatisfaction prevails and criticisms are rampant, children's radio hours deserve thought and study by producers and consumers. Whatever corrective action has been initiated by this general feeling of dissatisfaction, the fruits of such action and the improvement in children's programs provide no cause for a celebration. Parents and teachers, frustrated and perplexed, are apt to accept extreme forms of action. Dials will be turned; bills for censorship, control, or ownership will be sponsored in state legislatures and in Congress. By understanding better the strengths and weaknesses of existing efforts to improve broadcasts for children and young people, future efforts may be guided and decisions made more wisely.

What have the consumers done? The programs of the various organizations and associations that are concerned with radio programs for children and young people may be described as of a "protesting" type and of a "constructive" type. These adjectives do not classify them with certainty and finality, but they serve for an analysis of what has been undertaken and for the guidance of future proposals.

Various groups and individuals have protested to radio broadcasting companies and to sponsors of the different children's programs that for one reason or another the programs were unsuitable for children. In some cases they have threatened sponsor companies with a boycott of their product and broadcasting stations with a fewer number of listeners. If one is to believe the reports of the reception of such protests, one can say that they are not well received nor are they effective.

It should be recognized that protesting as a program for improvement has many defects. First of all, the number of groups and individuals registering such protests is relatively small. If a few thousand parents report that a program is overstimulating, that Johnny will not eat his supper because he wants to listen to the program, it can be concluded that something in the nature of that program appeals also to a large number of children whose parents do not protest. Certain types of protests would indicate a good, catchy program for the children of the vast, indifferent multitude.

Another defect of protests and platform pronouncements is that they are vague and express little agreement as to the specific nature of the complaint. To protest against all programs for children without naming the specific reasons does not help the broadcasting station. Furthermore, protests contradicting each other are apt to nullify one another. Can the broadcasting companies be expected to re-write the radio program if the mother of a particularly excitable youngster reports the program overstimulating for her child? Should a child full of fears eliminate for all others an exciting imaginative adventure? Some protests present individual problems, and parents and teachers cannot expect the broadcasting industry to solve the problems of the home and the schools which parents and teachers refuse to face themselves. If John will not eat his dinner or study his lessons because of a radio broadcast, the problem is essentially one between John and his parents, the relationships in the home, or his interest in his studies, and is not that of the broadcasting industry. Protests involving such complaints cloak efforts to "pass the buck," an attempted transfer of responsibilities that definitely belong to the parents.

Another weakness of protests is that they often do not state clearly the action to be taken if the protest is unheeded. Some parents and groups unacquainted with the cannibalism of the present economic system have a fertile imagination that readily changes business men into missionaries. Many protests fail to recognize that children's radio broadcasts are possible because they are financed by the increased sale of products. On the Pink and Green network the red and black of the ledger is the owning and controlling agent of radio programs and should be so recognized. The profit motive toes the line so far as it is advantageous. It meets the protests of parents against the contents of programs or against the advertising fads and frills as far as it is profitable. In such a situation the protest of a few is futile against the profits from the many. Even a boycott, difficult as it is to institute and carry on effectively, is foolish from many angles.

To summarize this type of action, it may be said that under

the present system mere protests and platform pronouncements offer no promise of a way out of the present situation unless other factors change the basic nature of the problem.

Part way between the classification of "protesting" and "constructive" activities ought to be placed those of organizations that are of a semi-protesting, semi-constructive, or semi-censoring nature. Plans to publicize the acceptable children's radio programs are of this type. In 1933, twenty-one civic and educational associations in the Chicago area affiliated into a Society for the Improvement of Children's Programs. This society is concerned with "building rather than with destruction" and urges "parents, teachers and children who are really desirous of receiving more of the very good and entertaining material to center their time and attention on the good programs and send to the broadcasting stations some statements of their appreciation as well as constructive ideas for future programs." This is not a new form of association, nor is the program outlined novel. The suggestions proposed have merit, but they are difficult to carry out and have weaknesses that should be recognized at the start lest our enthusiasm blind us.

As a means for improving conditions, this society advocates listening to good programs. To determine what is good for children they had one thousand parents whose intelligence and interest were guaranteed listen for three successive times to twenty-three programs. As a result, a white list of six programs was published. Only six radio programs and only one of these occurring daily were found to be worthy of a child's time. Evidently, as far as children's radio programs are concerned, a turned dial will be the action resorted to in many Chicago homes.

Three difficulties of such a proposal of semi-censorship are quite evident. The determination of what is good is exceedingly difficult. Good for whom? is a question unanswered by most white lists. Many questions may be asked as to how is "good" determined? Was it by adult standards? Was it by adults alone? For how long should a program be listened to in order to be included in the social register of radio? Are three sessions

enough? Furthermore, such lists are for the most part inadequate for the range of interests and individual personality problems of boys and girls. For example, in the approved list of programs that the Society for the Improvement of Children's Programs places in the hands of its members, only one program occurs daily; of the others, one is nursery rhymes for young children, two are musical programs, and two are dog chats. This is a meager menu for the average boy or girl.

Is semi-censorship of this nature ever effective? Can such a list ever absolve parents from their educational responsibilities? Will the child turn the dial on the sixty-six programs after listening to one of the six? How will nursery rhymes compete with the thrills of imaginative adventure of its next-door neighbor? How will parents handle this situation of including only the good? Did your father's disapproval of the dime novel or your mother's frown at your avid reading of the "Motor Boys" avail much? Censorship and approved lists, even when such lists are liberal enough to include Buck Rogers and his rocket ships and the wonders of the coming centuries, present no solution in themselves, and in many cases they cloak the effort to pass responsibilities. Another question about such a program relates to the building of radio broadcasts. Broadcasts are not the product of amateurs—where they have been they have failed miserably. The constructive suggestions emanating from the fertile brains of parents, teachers, and children need weeding out, and the advice and criticism of those who know the radio and who are microphone artists need cultivating. Furthermore, good suggestions for better programs for children's radio hours are rare and precious jewels. A society may help, but its help will be chiefly in the constructive advice it will offer on rare occasions.

Of a somewhat similar nature is the program proposed by a committee of the American Library Association and the Child Study Association. This committee proposed to the representatives of all national organizations interested in the welfare of children the establishment of a Central Agency on Radio Programs for Young People. The primary purpose of the Central

Agency was to plan and present nationally one or more experimental radio programs for children and young people which would meet the criticisms of current broadcasts and show by example that broadcasts can be both acceptable and appealing. In this way the current programs would be challenged and improved if the experimental ones served as examples. This Central Agency would also act as a clearing house for information on current programs, serve as an advisory center of information for groups contemplating broadcasts, and give publicity to current programs through the publications of co-operating agencies. The proposal was received with enthusiasm and about eighteen national organizations, officially or unofficially, have expressed their willingness to co-operate in the proposal.

Of significance is the plan to present and evaluate experimental programs on a national scale and to offer professional advisory services for groups planning broadcast programs for children. The co-operation of so many national associations with the possibility of reaching millions of citizens promises well for this venture, but an analysis reveals that it offers no permanent solution for parents. First of all, no program, no matter how well received, no matter how carefully planned and executed, will solve the problem of the right program for every child. Nor will two, three, or four excellent broadcasts solve this problem. It would be a futile searching for the fountain of eternal youth to expect such a result. There always remains the educational problem of how the radio is used in the home. Although this is the responsibility of parents, broadcasters should also recognize their educative responsibilities; and if parents do not know how to use the radio wisely, broadcasters should resort to censoring activities within the industry to aid them. The belief, however, that such experimental broadcasts would be helpful has some validity.

The number of individuals co-operating through affiliated organizations promises well and promises ill. As an educative agency it has possibilities; as a coercive agency it is not strong even though it is impressive. The proposed Central Agency is only a clearing house and would have to work through estab-

lished organizations. Organizations are as fickle as the most overdrawn picture of a fickle woman and, furthermore, they are jealous and possess no experiential background of co-operation. Then, too, they all have fires to keep alive and other fires of their own to kindle. Even the possibility of mass protests and mass evaluations of programs through their affiliation does not solve the evasions of censorship or produce the all-wise knowledge of how to use the radio.

Activities of a constructive nature are illustrated by the programs presented by various local groups with the co-operation of local stations. These children's broadcasts are an improvement over the large national bedtime hook-ups because they have no goods to sell. They do not offer rings for package tops or first place in an athletic meet for eating health-building food. They are weak because of lack of talent, lack of radio experience, lack of financial resources to continue the programs over a long period of time, and lack of advantageous spotting in the day's program. They represent those sporadic white spots on the coat of the broadcasting industry that under statistical treatment spread themselves into an ermine cloak.

But what can be done about it? Censorship avoids the issue; protests avail little. Essentially the problem of radio broadcasts for children and young people is an educational one. Parents and teachers must learn how to deal with the problems of the radio in home relations and how to meet situations of divided opinion as to what is good. The home and the school must learn how to improve tastes while avoiding exhortations and futile, "sissy" lessons. Furthermore, the home and school must teach advertising resistance and help build the defenses of even the youngest child against all forms of advertising until that child is better able to make his decisions independently and intelligently. This is not a simple matter. The problem of the children's radio program involves the problems of child study. No rules, no single program, no approved list solves the situation parents face in the guidance of young children in the home with regard to the radio. Even should an educational utopia be achieved in radio broadcasting, even should perfect pro-

grams be presented, there would still be the necessity for solving each problem in relation to the individual child's nature and needs, and there would still be the necessity for dealing with the passivity of just listening.

Perhaps this is too large a problem for effective action in the near future. Eventually it provides the way out. Meanwhile the school could contribute more. This does not mean merely more radios in every classroom and more time given to radio listening; more of anything does not necessarily solve a problem. How the radio is to be used in the school deserves wider experimentation. Merely to put the present school or school subjects on the air is an almost negligible contribution to the improvement of children's radio broadcasts during leisure time when so many children try to escape. If the radio industry would permit and if schools would co-operate, much could be done to improve children's tastes and appreciation by a series of variety broadcasts with discussion and study both prior to the broadcast and following it. But what radio station would permit a frank discussion of advertising over the air or permit present children's programs to be caricatured or even analyzed? Perhaps this will be the major contribution of those broadcasting facilities not owned commercially. At least it presents more of a challenge than a mass lesson in geography or the mass teaching of fractions.

If essentially children's radio hours can be solved only by a broad educational program, there is the need for abundant materials to help parents, to help teachers acquire that knowledge that will make them more wise in dealing with the problems of children and the radio. Valuable material is available or could be made available in a short period of time. The question now is, by whom, for what, when, or how will it be put in use. In this, the Central Agency offers a possible solution.

What has been proposed requires a long-time point of view. To leave to the education of the next generation the solution of a problem is like offering a benediction: even opponents agree and nothing more need be said. The trouble always occurs when questions are raised as to the nature of that educa-

tion and who is to do it. On this score there is probably more agreement among all groups than is found on many problems. Disagreement, if it occurred, would be on minor issues. For this reason, education as a means for improving radio programs for children and youth offers more than appears in the suggestion.

To leave it to education always involves a long-time program of action unsatisfactory to many. For those desiring a more immediate program there is always Federal supervision, control, or even ownership. Such suggestions have merit, but why should the radio industry be singled out for punishment any more than the press or the cinema? Certainly, neither the press nor the cinema presents a picture of loveliness and beauty when viewed from the viewpoint of child welfare. How are comic strips with the trend toward advertising treated in the home? How do parents handle the problem of the objectionable moving picture? Why single out the radio industry for control? Why not? And why stop then? Such proposals are not beyond realization for those who demand immediate action.

These are some of the problems facing teachers and parents, and the situation is so complex that it is difficult to think through to a clear program of action. While many feel that "Ah, woe is me!" expresses their perplexity and bewilderment, the program of action to which they will respond may be the result of the continuation of a situation breeding so much general dissatisfaction.

MISS GOLDSMITH (Radio Institute of the Audible Arts, New York):

It seems to me it might be interesting after Mr. Redefers stimulating discussion to announce that the Radio Committee of the Child Study Association is making a survey of children's programs. This survey is not merely a discussion of the question, but it will include what we call a selected list of better radio programs for children, which will be evaluated from the standpoint of the criteria used in the selection of these programs, the age-level of the children's groups, and the temperaments of children. The Radio Committee will include among its members some psychologists who are parents. The reactions of children to certain programs will be checked. We hope that it will supplement what Mr. Redefers calls the "semi-constructive" way of looking at this program. The report will belong to the series of program bulletins which the Radio Institute of the Audible Arts is issuing, and point

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

to the better programs in music, informative talks, and the like. The Institute is a new organization founded by the Philco Radio and Television Corporation for the purpose of stimulating interest in better and more worth-while radio programs and developing larger audiences for programs demanding higher levels of appreciation.

MISS WALLER (Central Division, National Broadcasting Company):

I should like to challenge one statement made by Mr. Redefer that criticisms of programs are not well received by members of the broadcasting industry. Two years ago members of the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers called at our office to discuss with us various children's programs being broadcast at that time over the networks of the National Broadcasting Company. It was somewhat amusing to us to find that no two members of that committee of five could agree on which programs were objectionable and which were not. The meeting ended with a suggestion that a luncheon be called to which they should be invited to meet with advertisers, representatives of advertising agencies, other radio stations, and ourselves that the whole problem might be discussed in full. I am sure that much good resulted from that meeting: we, on one hand, had a better idea of the parents' viewpoint, while they, in turn, saw the problems with which we were faced.

I challenge Mr. Redefer to name any children's program now on the networks of the National Broadcasting Company that would not be acceptable from the parental point of view for children. I am sure you will find that the broadcasting companies are willing and anxious for any criticisms and objections from the listener and will at all times endeavor in so far as possible to meet them.

MR. REDEFER:

What I attempted to say was that some criticisms were not well received nor effectively handled from the standpoint of education. I referred to the recently published chairman's report of the Milwaukee teachers' association who objected to certain children's programs. I do not know which broadcasting company is concerned. The problem is so complicated that general criticisms, such as "the programs keep children awake at night," cannot be answered simply nor can they be ignored. The task is to lead the parent to state definite objections and attempt to answer them for the best interests of the child concerned. I want to put the blame in both places—the industry and the home.

MR. DARROW (Ohio School of the Air):

I have been on a "hot spot" in relation to children's programs for the last two years. Letters of protest come to my desk constantly from almost every state in the Union. The matter, however, resolves itself to this—opinion is divided. You find unreasonable educators, you find unreasonable radio-

station managers, and you cannot make a statement that is equally applicable to any large share of the group. However, I must say that many of the radio stations have been alive to the issues raised by the parents. Even before parents began to write in to me, WLW made a request to me as Radio Chairman of the National Congress of Parent and Teacher, saying, "Can't you give us something better? We are not satisfied. We should like to have something on the order of the Knights of the Round Table—if you can make it interesting and stimulating." I found the managers of other radio stations equally open to suggestion.

If we are going to get results, however, we must approach the problem from the two angles, before the microphone and in the home. I think a great improvement has come in the work before the microphone in the last year. Eighteen months ago Mr. Lumley and I found, in the first of two rather ambitious studies, that children increasingly were interested in stories of crime from the first to the sixth grade. In the sixth grade they definitely wanted bigger and better murders. Crime was of more interest to them than humor or information. In the study made recently by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, however, humor has taken the lead. We still have the many interests of children represented, but the humorous programs stand first.

In the lower grades, of course, simple programs, such as the *Singing Lady*, continue to be liked. Interest in crime continues; but I think it is gratifying to find that somehow the children either through better programs or through some form of self-development are less interested in the crime series. It is a fine thing to have programs like that of Lowell Thomas the first choice in the seventh and eighth grades. So without any apparent effort on the part of the schools the children are developing a discrimination in listening in the sixth or eighth grades.

I recently was misquoted in the press as having flayed colleges. I did criticize the colleges in one respect: if you examine the courses of study in most of our colleges, you find no indication that motion pictures are important, although Mr. Edgar Dale's report of a study in the appreciation of motion pictures is available now; you cannot find any indication that they are informing future teachers of the degree to which the comic strip is influencing the child's viewpoint; and you cannot find any recognition of the fact that the average child in America listens to the radio two and one-half hours each day. I did say that the changing of college curriculums should move faster in order to equip students to meet contemporary situations. Teachers' colleges are not doing their share in teaching discrimination of the false and the true in what children are learning through these new teaching media. We should include this instruction in the colleges and teacher-training institutions. In my experience I have found that teachers and parents together can teach discrimination and arm the children against new temptations.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

MR. RANDALL (Chicago Civic Broadcast Bureau):

There is one point mentioned by Mr. Redefer which touches a sensitive point. Why in the matter of censorship should there be any more concern with radio than with the movies and the press? I think there is a big difference there which should not go without mention. These people who conduct radio broadcasting are those who are selected to do so by Federal authority. That is emphatically not true of privately owned and conducted media such as motion pictures and the press. In that respect radio is more similar to the public schools. We certainly would not inquire whether it is proper for public authority to concern itself with what goes on in the public schools. To a large extent exactly the same thing is true of radio. Broadcasting is entirely different from the press and the motion picture in that approximately 90 per cent of the apparatus which makes its reception possible is bought and paid for by the public and used in their homes.

MR. DICKERSON (Indianapolis Public Library):

I feel that we are indebted to Mr. Redefer and to the association which he represents for this thoroughgoing study and for his excellent presentation of a problem which should be the cause of chagrin to everyone in the radio industry. I am sure the conclusions presented by Mr. Redefer are shared and endorsed by every important youth and child-study organization in the country. It seems to me that if those who are responsible for national-chain programs have one bit of the public spirit, which we have heard lauded so much here, they would not continue to be a party to the broadcasting of tawdriness and vulgarity into homes and consequently to children. The type of program at present designed to appeal to children's interest is such that no educator can be familiar with it and not protest.

We have been told that after parents and other organized groups have protested against certain programs, these have been withdrawn. Has any constructive program been substituted for these withdrawals? We have no evidence that the intelligence, artistry, and skill employed in other types of programs have been applied to those addressed to the child audience. Nothing has been done for children comparable to what commercial sponsors have done in the broadcastings of Hard, Thomas, Kaltenborn, and other news commentators, and of some great symphonic concerts.

It is mere refusing to face facts and the building up of excuses for ourselves to say that if children listen to crime stories and other tawdriness that is carried into the home, the parents and the children are to blame. The radio brings these programs into the homes, and it is responsible for the resulting attitudes and standards of taste whether they be good or bad.

If the representatives of the radio industry hold to the faith they have expressed in this great instrument of communication as a means of education and culture, and if they actually have public interest at heart, it seems to me

that they would give some considered attention to this matter of children's programs instead of pushing them aside and making light of criticism. If they have this faith and this public interest, they would apply the same intelligence and resourcefulness to broadcasting for children that they have applied in practically every other direction, instead of broadcasting those things which are contrary to every accepted principle of sound education.

MR. MENSER (Central Division National Broadcasting Company):

I think a little rationalization is what we need in this group. If we cannot talk about this subject from a rational point of view I do not know how we are going to get anywhere. As for intelligence, I have been in radio only five years—with the National Broadcasting Company. I happen to have a Master's degree, and for thirteen years I taught in several colleges which thought I was fairly intelligent at that time. I hope the succeeding years have not dampened my general intelligence too much. I have been tremendously interested in children's programs. Indeed, one of the most successful programs with which I have been connected was a children's program, in which a number of boys caught another little boy and stuffed him into a furnace, and then hammered on the outside of it. Maybe there were a number of children who did not sleep that night. I do not know—I wonder sometimes, however, what would have kept them awake if the radio had not been there to do it for them. That episode was lifted almost intact from a well-known book. You will know it when I tell you the boy put in the furnace was named Georgie Bassett. Two of the children hammering were Penrod and Sam. It was written by a notable gentleman from Indiana named Tarkington. I think it would be just a little silly for us to rise up against Tarkington for writing interesting and entertaining episodes the like of which happen every day in the backyards of America.

As for substitute programs for those taken off, let me tell you a couple of things. During this conference of which Miss Waller spoke a few moments ago, with the members of the parent-teacher organizations at Chicago, a great many programs were discussed. We happened to have the program "Old Pappy" on the air at that time, a delightful negro character who never threw mud in any one's eyes, burned any one at the stake, pulled out finger nails with pliers, or did any of the other things supposed to keep children awake. He was a delightful old philosopher who told beautiful stories, gems of children's literature. Only one or two of the women present at that luncheon knew that "Old Pappy" was on the air, and they had heard it only once or twice because their sets were constantly open to other programs at that same time. We checked our audience on Old Pappy, found that it was not substantial, and took the program off the air.

I had a more fortunate experience a few months ago in directing a Bible series sponsored by Montgomery Ward, which proved to be of tremendous

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

interest to children. There were some things that were rather dire: you cannot throw Jezebel out the window without throwing her out the window, and you cannot have Samson annihilate great crowds of people without annihilating people—we had rather successful annihilations in the case of Samson.

I refuse to believe that the programs on any of the networks, either the National Broadcasting Company or the Columbia System, or on any of the major stations are doing the harm to the youth of America which some people apparently think they are. God help the next generation if they do! I think the children in many instances are getting highly imaginative programs done in good taste, and if we develop in our children good taste and imagination, I do not see how we are going far wrong.

Mr. ZOOK (American Council on Education):

I have listened with a great deal of interest to what is being done by organizations outside the schools in the building of good programs for children. I think that these organizations are to be congratulated for what they have done, but I also believe that almost everything they are doing is a severe criticism of us educators. We have in radio just exactly the situation that we have in motion pictures. Those of us who have been identified with education have gone off to solve the problems of motion-picture theaters and radio in general, leaving our own classrooms behind us. The first obligation that any educator has in the use of either one of these two devices in education is to see what can be done with them in the classroom. I feel quite certain that we have neglected that solemn obligation, and if those of us who have to do with educational administration would organize for the purpose of using these new devices in the classroom, we could somehow or other find ways far better than we are using at the present time. In both cases we could build up the quality of appreciation by these two devices. Through them we could teach children what is good taste just as we teach in literature classes what young people ought to read. I believe, furthermore, that the educators of the country should assume much responsibility for the character of the programs given outside the classroom. In other words, it is entirely appropriate that these children's programs should be built primarily by those who are engaged in education. Until educators assume their rightful responsibility in this area, I believe there will continue to be a great deal of confusion in the whole situation.

MR. BUCKLEY (Board of Education, Cleveland):

In speaking from the standpoint of elementary-school children, viewed from the experience of some thirty years, I doubt but that there is a place for censorship of radio programs as well as movies. On the other hand, we fail to recognize the fact that false advertising, as well as crude humor over the radio, develops its own antidote. Children appreciate real humor but soon resent the effort at humor which is entirely overdone. From the variety of

programs necessary to interest large numbers with varied tastes and interests, it is necessary to teach children to recognize the superior broadcast as well as the artistic movie. After censorship has eliminated the obviously and wholly unfit, there remains the educational program of distinguishing between the crude and the artistic.

MR. DARROW:

There are certain sex differences in the choice of radio programs. In the studies we have made, the children in the middle grades have said definitely what programs they like to hear most often, and boys and girls do not choose the same things. The boys say that they would like to have more dramalogues based on stories of the lives of great men and women. That, however, ranks next to last with hundreds of girls. Their favorite additions to the present broadcasts would be songs that can be sung with the radio. In the Ohio School of the Air we have remembered this, and we are adding one melody a week that they can sing or whistle. The travelogue comes third. Children, also, want dramatizations of books they have learned to love.

Some of the radio stations have paid money generously for the making of scripts to sell through advertising, but they have paid niggardly sums to those who write the scripts for the educational broadcasts. I do not believe that is good judgment on their part. They should spend as much money on their front page as they do on the advertising feature. On the other hand, the responsibility, in the last analysis, is a responsibility shared with the parents, who should know, through reliable program listings, of the desirable children's programs. Time and time again parents tune in to something that displeases them, and they turn off the radio because they do not know of the more satisfactory programs. They need a daily list of the really good things that are on the air. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers is working this year to put into the hands of every association a calendar of the national programs that can be heard in each area so that it may be used daily. Likewise, state and smaller areas are counseled to issue such calendars of programs of narrower distribution.

The second thing that needs to be done (although I had testimony in Station WSB, Atlanta, that it is impossible) is to secure adequate evening periods assigned to the right kind of adult education—not a half-hour at the same time on all stations. I much prefer Mr. Tyson's suggestion of a three-ring circus with different sorts of programs going on at the same time. People can find what they want, and if they want "hot-cha" music, they can get it.

MR. KALTENBORN (Columbia Broadcasting System):

Recently I was asked by an attorney-general to attend a private conference at Washington to discuss radio and crime. I conducted a poll of the important radio stations in the country as to what they were doing in relation to crime. I found a remarkable amount of co-operation with police and various organ-

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

ized efforts for crime prevention, but to do a balanced job I thought I had to do something to hit radio on the head. I wrote to the parent-teacher association for information on children's programs, and I corresponded with various organizations. I could not get anything; they all disagreed. Finally, I found two or three programs which, by general agreement, were bad, and then I found they had been taken off the air. I was directed to a leading New Yorker who has specialized in studying children's programs, and I got in personal touch with him, but I could not get anything from him that would satisfy some of you. He said that the radio does present a special difficulty in dealing with the abnormal child. Such a child is easily excited and may be definitely injured by some of the programs which ninety-nine children out of one hundred would take in their stride. He said further that parents must be educated to realize that there is a difference even among their own children. Some children may listen to a program and be helped, while other children may listen to the same program and be injured. Also, there is a tremendous difference in what children of different ages can take without being hurt. That inquiry showed that there is a special problem with regard to radio programs for children, but it also showed that sweeping criticisms are unjustified.

BROADCASTING IN THE AMERICAN HOME

● MRS. B. F. LANGWORTHY

PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
PARENTS AND TEACHERS

IN MY opinion—and I fear that the radio people are not going to like this remark—one of the first things for which the home must provide is the increased admissions into the hospitals for the insane which will be the inevitable result of trying to hear something every minute of the day. We get breakfast to setting-up exercises; we send the children off to school by soap chips; we try to put them to sleep by some of the good music that comes in; then we try to listen to a lecture or two. We go on and on like that all day long.

A woman said to me a little while ago, "I do not know what can be done about the child next door; he cries all the time." "Why?" I asked. "I do not know"; she replied, "it is a pleasant place to live. It is a big one-room apartment with only the baby and his mother. The radio is on all the time, and I should think that would amuse him." I suggested shutting off the radio to

see if the baby would stop crying, and it worked. Some of us mothers are likely to cry and throw things at each other if we have to listen to something all the time. Of course, all you radio people will say to me that there is no necessity for the radio to be on all the time. I know it, but it seems to me that something should be done about it, for people will listen more attentively to one thing if it does not have to compete with a dozen other programs.

I have been trying to analyze my own and my family's attitude toward radio programs, and I find we have been ingrates, that we have not given thanks for the joy we have got out of radio. The other day we were listing the selections of music which we had heard together, and there were so many of them that we decided we were getting at least ten times as much really fine music in a week as we used to hear in a year when we had to go to the music and pay to hear it. I decided then that I am going to try once a year to write in and tell somebody how good some program is. I have been telling them how bad some program is at least once a year; fair play demands that I turn about.

The only ones we ever speak of publicly are those that come at the children's hour. It is the children's hour, of course, which every home member wants to discuss. Mr. Longfellow wrote of the lovely children's hour "between the dark and the daylight." We have no hours between darkness and daylight any more; we do not have to save kerosene or bother lighting gas, so there is no twilight hour. But there is a time, during which the children listen to programs supposedly for them, and the mothers of the nation are submerged in anxiety about their effects.

As a child I used to read avidly everything that Cooper wrote, and every night I expected to be scalped or tomahawked. I do not suppose any child now is more terrified over radio programs than I was in reading the "Leather Stocking Tales." In our family we were not allowed to read things which were not true unless they were labeled as fairy tales. We were not allowed to read Jules Verne's *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Sea*, because it was not labeled as a fairy tale and could not possibly

be true. I remember all kinds of fairy stories ending with thrills that kept me awake. I remember that my children after seeing their first play lay awake with terror all night.

In certain ways we now are not worse off than we were in those days, but the difference is just this: the danger is much more universal, much more ruthless, much more enticing, because it is much easier to listen than to read. The majority of children average two and one-half hours a day listening to the radio, and that fact alone frightens me. If we keep children in school five hours a day, pouring something from somebody else's brain into them, and then for two and one-half hours, more from the outside is poured into them, what time do they have to dream, to create? These, in my mind, are the things that rightly terrify the home-maker.

The average home has at least one radio, and I know one home where there are seven radios. This family is dominated all the time by outside influences. There is no time for home or community, for home thinking and home discussion; always there is something from the outside being brought in and pounded into the minds of its members. It is not fair to the children, or to the family spirit, to have this sort of thing going on continuously. On the other hand, the radio, if conducted correctly, can make the home the great center of recreation; you just turn back the rugs and let the children dance, or sing, or join in animated discussion on current topics. If the radio can make the home the great center of recreation, I believe we should work with it and for it and not against it.

The home is becoming a center of public opinion because of the radio. Public opinion may be good or bad, political or non-political, but most of it reaches the home. It is the responsibility and privilege of you radio people to create that public opinion—public opinion which may make or break the nation. We hear from the news commentators the news of the day. They seldom interpret it; they simply tell it, but in such a way that you do not soon forget it. You cannot get away from it whether you want to or not. You hear the President of the United States over the radio; you hear college presidents and the executives of other

great organizations. The radio is making public opinion that is going to influence the nation from the home as center. The nation is what the home is. The thinking done in the home is the ultimate thinking done in the nation. I should like to feel that the broadcasters who are making public opinion in that way are doing it with a conscientious concern for what they are doing to the home.

There are things that parents in the home can do. I do not think we have taken our responsibility seriously. Our responsibility, of course, is to teach our children discrimination. We teach them to discriminate between safety and danger, between dirt and cleanliness, between unwholesome and wholesome food, but we evade our duty to teach them to discriminate between radio programs. That responsibility is ours; what we shall do with it I do not know. You give us too much, you make it difficult for us to discriminate, and when we do discriminate you will not like it; but we must accept this responsibility you have laid on us.

In our parent-teacher groups over the country we are finding enjoyment and information in a program conducted every week through the National Broadcasting Company—a real college course in parent education. Thousands of listening groups meet and discuss those programs. If more of that sort of thing is done, it will teach the home members to discriminate.

We know that the radio is a highly educational agency and an interesting one. The responsibility of the home and that of the broadcaster is about equal. If we consistently can make the broadcaster feel our approval and pleasure over good programs and our disapproval of vulgar or unwholesome ones, together we can improve the whole field of radio.

MR. KALTENBORN:

Thank you, Mrs. Langworthy. You have stimulated us to think about a great many problems associated with radio. The thought with which you closed, safety versus purity, presents many interesting problems. You have emphasized discrimination, the essence of dealing with the radio problem. It is appalling that our children are listening to the radio for two and one-half hours each day. That certainly makes radio a much larger part of their lives

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

than most of us had supposed. I do not think many of us have realized the extent perhaps to which radio is influencing our children; it was comforting to realize that even a child can build up a sort of protective reaction to what he hears over the air. You emphasized the fact that we are getting too many impressions from the outside, and of course every educator knows the derivation of the word education, *educare*—to lead out from within, so that when the impression is coming exclusively from without it is not education in the true sense.

MR. HARRIS (Fort Wayne Public School):

I should like to comment on the fact that children listen two and one-half hours a day. We made a study in which we found pupils in the seventh and eighth grades were listening three hours a day to radio and reading newspapers one half-hour a day which verifies Mr. Darrow's statement.

MR. KALTENBORN:

The question arises from which do they get the most advantage or disadvantage, thirty minutes of newsprint or six times that amount of radio.

MR. RIES (Station WLW, Cincinnati):

Is any of that Ohio School of the Air?

MR. HARRIS:

I should say a part of it probably is during school hours, probably one half-hour would be the Ohio School of the Air and that is required of them.

MRS. GRUENBERG (Child Study Association, New York):

It will be interesting to know how the same children listen. In the studies with which I am familiar different children have been used in each; and they have not compared one type of program to another, or checked on the various types of listening.

MR. KALTENBORN:

That is an exceedingly interesting point. We have not yet had a progressive study taking a child at a certain period and carrying him through successive radio tests. It suggests that there ought to be an opportunity to make an experiment similar to that now being made on the famous twins; one could be radio conditioned and one could grow up without the benefit of radio. There are still many sorts of radio studies to be made.

MRS. LANGWORTHY:

I always wonder why we have so much faith in these children's questionnaires. Is it not true that children generally answer a questionnaire the way they think you want them to? Grown people do. I heard three or four high-school boys discussing the fact that they had just answered a questionnaire. They were telling what they had said, and I asked, "What did you really like?" They said, "Jazz music, of course."

MR. DARROW:

I think, if Mrs. Langworthy would look through the blanks that we have received in our office, she would decide they have been honest in the main. In some places a "smart Aleck" gives a smart answer, but I think we have received true answers in the majority of cases.

MR. KOON (United States Office of Education):

We who are interested primarily in organized education frequently find it difficult to distinguish between the responsibility for the organized educational use of radio and the responsibility for the general educational influence of children's programs. I wonder to what extent the investigator can depend upon the voluntary associations to set up standards for children's programs and report back to broadcasters as a means of raising the standard of children's programs. I think that might be of interest to several people here. We have both groups well represented.

MRS. LANGWORTHY:

My answer would be different from that of Mrs. Gruenberg. I represent a different kind of group. Our group is a slice of mankind, and there are many people in our group who prefer "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes." I like it myself. We get a great variety of answers from our group. Mrs. Gruenberg's group is more selected than ours. It is difficult to know what to do. It is not a simple question to us.

MR. KALTENBORN:

I suppose there are moods in which "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes" responds more to the needs of the moment than a classical symphony.

TECHNIQUES OF PRESENTING DIALOGUE

● ALLEN MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

IN THE broad sense of education, practice has evaluated dialogue beyond dispute as one of the most forceful media for critical examination of theories and principles and for the impartation of information. Socrates, as a self-appointed teacher, also appointed his natural medium of expression. Walking through the streets of ancient Athens he fostered his inclination by seeking fellow citizens who might be led to higher levels of knowledge by being made aware of their own ignorance. This master dialectician probed his chance acquaintances with a suc-

cession of brilliant questions, and while this method may have been rather painful and embarrassing to some Athenians, it brought Socrates and his teachings before many who did benefit. Of those to whom Socrates and his dialectic manner brought education, Plato was one of the first to appreciate the value of critical analysis. Thus the ends of education were attained by Socrates.

With the passing of time, education has continued to find use for dialogue. Prominent educators of our own day are using dialogue and urge its development and perfection. It has found its most active use in socialized discussions among students. These socialized discussions serve a dual purpose. They allow for experience in lucid thought and expression for the participants, and for the listeners a certain amount of information brought in simple and understandable terms.

Those in radio concerned with the most successful media of disseminating information, particularly as they apply to educational information, have turned most naturally to the pedagogical technique of dialogue. The use of different methods in presenting factual materials on the air receives more consideration than in the classroom. In radio the prime concern is holding the attention of listeners regardless of subject-matter. It is the major problem of radio. In educational features for radio, variety in subjects makes for the broader use of dialogue. Any and all techniques that give promise of effective use must be tested and, if possible, perfected for presentation of education by radio.

The basic value of dialogue as an educational technique has not lessened in any wise with the passing of time, but it has given rise to many meanings of the word. This has often led to some confusion in its use. The original Greek meaning of "dialogue" was a discussion between two persons; it soon came to mean a discussion which might include more than two persons. The Socratic dialogues were in the latter category. Dialogues may be written or they may be spoken. Dramatic dialogue in its development has become a definite form of art.

Since there are so many variations and shadings of the word,

this committee approached the task of assigning a definite meaning to dialogue for the purpose of discussion with some fear and considerable hesitation. We decided, finally, to avoid the problem for a while by substituting the word "conversation" for "dialogue" in our subject. This decision brought forth classification of speech programs in radio into three fundamental divisions: lectures, conversations, and dramatizations. We realize that objections may be raised to the effect that a good speaker or commentator is as intimately and informally conversational as possible, that dramatizations are essentially conversations, and that some forms of programs combine some aspects of more than one of our classifications. In reply we contend that the informal conversational delivery of a speech still does not permit the essential two-way quality of conversation. Likewise, while a dramatization gives an illusion of conversation, there is a fundamental difference in that a plot or story is essential. Such mixed forms as monologues, debates, and informative skits can be segregated into their component parts and classified under the three divisions we have indicated. We determined, I have said, upon an analysis of the techniques of presenting conversations. The question immediately arises regarding the strength and weakness in this program class aside from its value of variety. To understand its values and shortcomings we must compare conversations with lectures and dramatizations.

The lecture form in educational broadcasting is the most satisfactory to gain maximum content in minimum time; conversation takes second place, with dramatization a weak third. This order is reversed, however, in evaluating interest-holding qualities, as most listeners prefer a story to concentrated education. Conversation is superior to a lecture, since additional voices break the monotony of a single speaker. Conversations are most satisfactory in presenting a well-rounded view of a subject with the different sides most adequately championed.

Conversational programs, as we have defined them, may take numerous individual forms. Two basic divisions must be considered in the further classification of such programs. First, on

the basis of the number of persons participating in the conversation we may speak of a program as a "dialogue" (in the oldest sense of the word), a "trilogue," or "multilogue." Second, on the basis of extent of preparation, we find impromptu and extemporaneous speech, speech from memory, and speech read from a manuscript. These two divisions seem to encompass the major problems involved in radio "conversation." But of the two, the second would seem to be the more significant.

Memorization of speeches by persons participating in a radio conversation is too ridiculous for further consideration. Impromptu speaking holds an important place in radio. It is used in presenting first-hand pictures of unexpected news events and sports where a single reporter is employed, but there is little, if any, place for it in conversational programs. Occasionally in interviews, the person being questioned speaks impromptu. Even more rarely both participants in an interview speak without preparation, often with sad results. Impromptu speaking is neither customary in radio conversation, nor is it recommended.

Only two degrees of preparation remain to be discussed, extemporaneous speaking and reading from manuscript, and these are the two most frequently used. The greatest value of extemporized conversation lies in its spontaneity, if the speakers are chosen wisely. Clashes of opinion which occur so frequently and naturally in ordinary conversation may occur with equal naturalness in extemporaneous broadcasts. Conflict in discussion holds the attention of listeners more effectively than almost any other quality. Reading from a manuscript devitalizes the natural quality of conversation.

More difficulties must be overcome in extemporaneous conversation, however, than where manuscripts are used. Few people are able to converse smoothly and to the point before a microphone without a manuscript. Not many are able to avoid digressions and the interjection of ill-advised remarks when speaking extemporaneously. Remarks that speakers intended to make may be omitted under the stress of the moment. Timing the close of the program is difficult when major points and the summary all receive adequate attention.

Aside from these precautions the ultimate success of the program depends on the careful selection of speakers. Should each speaker be a fluent conversationalist with microphone experience, ability to express himself clearly and tersely, as well as having a genuine interest in the discussion of the topic, an extremely interesting and vitally stimulating program will result. If they cannot satisfy these requirements some other technique should be selected.

Admittedly, these are difficulties, but they are not weaknesses, in the technique. Most of them are overcome by holding a preliminary meeting of the speakers and planning the broadcast. The formulation of a topical outline insures continuity of discussion through a sequence of predetermined important points. At the same time it lessens the danger of serious digressions. Definite portions of the time can be assigned to each subdivision of the general topic. With the use of a series of timing lights to supplement the timing of outline divisions, it is quite possible to close a well-rounded discussion within five seconds of the time assigned to the program.

One need not worry about the omission of an occasional minor point. The tendency is to include too many items in a single program. The overlapping of voices can be eliminated if the speakers agree upon a signal to indicate their desire to interrupt.

The monotonous rhythmic rise and fall of inflection, misplaced emphasis, and stumbling over words, all heard so frequently in programs where manuscripts are used, are sufficient to convince the critical listener that this method is not without its problems. Here again much depends on the particular abilities of available talent. Unfortunately for educational broadcasting, so few professors are trained in effective reading. Even fewer in number are those who are experienced both in effective reading and in writing for broadcasts. Engaged as we are in the task of producing programs which employ members of university faculties, these become problems of major importance; particularly since training in these abilities requires more time and effort than most professors are willing to devote.

Briefly stated, the problem of writing conversations is that of

capturing the essential simplicity and informality of speech. This should be done without serious alteration of individual modes of expression. Variation in sentence structure differentiates speakers. The aim should be to grasp essential ideas of each speaker, putting these thoughts into writing as they would have been expressed in extemporaneous conversation. Probably the most effective way to achieve this result would be to make a transcription of such a conversation. When this has been done, the manuscript can be edited to eliminate unnecessary digressions and ill-advised remarks. Sentence structure, selection of words, and spontaneous interruptions should not be essentially altered.

In planning a conversational program, whether a manuscript is being prepared or an outline formulated, stress should be given to opening and closing discussions. The first minute or two of any program is the most critical in holding or losing the attention of listeners. The most interesting part of the subject may be introduced to advantage, even though its detailed consideration is deferred until later in the program. Since our purposes are those of education, it is not sufficient to state the problem and then to plunge into its technicalities without any explanation of underlying principles and historical background. Speakers should keep in mind that they are not addressing professional colleagues but a general audience. Efforts should be made, therefore, to orient the particular subject into a broader framework. The close of the program should consist of a summary, collecting the most important conclusions of the discussion. This allows the listener to realize the direction and importance of the thoughts expressed.

In general, speeches should never be long. The listener should have no doubt he is hearing a discussion. Sentences should be short and simple in construction. Words in common usage should be utilized, or if an unusual word appears desirable, its meaning should be evident in the context of the sentence. Speakers should be identified at frequent intervals by name so that listeners may recognize voices and differentiate between opinions. Examples and illustrations wisely chosen will prove

invaluable in clarifying difficult points and in showing the relation of the subject to everyday life. These suggestions are offered merely as general guides and not as an exhaustive analysis of the problems.

Commenting in general upon different degrees of preparation, upon their value in conversational programs, there are not many individuals who are able to broadcast a conversation well. Extemporization is by far the best method if the performers can qualify. If they cannot, programs utilizing manuscripts for conversation sometimes will be found satisfactory. If the speakers are likely to become awkward and confused in extemporaneous speech and if their reading is stilted and monotonous, conversational programs should be avoided. Regardless of the medium used to conduct the program, unless the director is thoroughly familiar with the capabilities of available talent and utilizes them wisely, the result may prove quite disastrous. From personal experience I have observed that it is the lack of adequate direction which is responsible for failure more frequently than the medium employed.

Once having decided which form of preparation to use in a conversational program, the task remains to determine the number of participants. Here, it must be observed, the difficulties increase rapidly with the number of speakers. The scarcity of talent in a university faculty, expert in either extemporaneous speaking or effective reading, has been noted. Furthermore, with the members of a university faculty specialized in their interests, as is the case, it is additionally difficult to find many of them qualified to speak authoritatively upon any common subject.

These two difficulties alone make the planning of regular programs employing many speakers impractical. My experience with the University of Chicago Round Table has convinced me that three participants is the maximum which should be considered for a regular program. The most satisfactory results in extemporaneous conversations are obtained by using three speakers. One of them is never at a loss for remarks to bridge what might otherwise become a painful gap in the program;

also, the participants are under less pressure than if two are used. As a result, more thought can be put into the formulation of remarks.

In stating this conclusion I have not mentioned the cumbersome nature of an extemporaneous conversation using more than three speakers. Here my experience has been that one or two speakers in any group tend to carry the bulk of any conversation by virtue of their greater fluency. Nor have I referred to the listeners' difficulty in differentiating between speakers.

If manuscripts are used, there are no objections to the use of two speakers. Obviously, the selection and expression of thoughts cease to be difficulties.

The nature of the question to be discussed must be considered in determining the number of speakers. In any controversial issue, and it is here that conversational programs find their greatest value, there are different points of view. Each major faction should have its appointed champion. However, it will be found sufficient on most occasions to have two extreme and an intermediate view represented.

Distress and dissatisfaction among large parts of the population have made radio the most powerful of all media for the influencing of public thought and action. The influence of Father Coughlin in the defeat of World Court ratification is a phenomenon that could have occurred at no other time and in no other way. Senator Long, of Louisiana, and Dr. Townsend, of California, have not been slow to recognize the power of radio. President Roosevelt and his cabinet have taken their turns at the microphone. Radio has become the most critical battle front of public thought.

In these crucial times the public need for authentic information has become particularly acute. With demagogues using radio to spread misinformation, it has become imperative that recognized authorities in education reach the people, through the same medium, with facts.

Consequently the balance of authorities in the subject and professional experts in the art of conversational broadcasting becomes important. Continuity of personality is of unques-

tioned value in radio. Under the stress of conditions just mentioned and in keeping with the standards of education, such continuity must be sacrificed in large part. No extemporaneous conversation, however, should be without one person skilled in such broadcasting who directs the flow of thought and prevents the discussion from becoming too technical.

No general rule can be established for the successful production of conversational programs. Conditions vary so with talent and subject that final success depends upon ingenious and wise program direction.

MR. KALTENBORN:

What is the part played by the chairman in comparison to the parts taken by their individuals in the dialogue?

MR. MILLER:

The chairman of any extemporaneous discussion is the most important person in the group and often a difficult one to select. In an extemporaneous program, such as the University of Chicago Round Table, he must assume the tasks of watching the time, keeping the other two speakers from getting too far apart in their points of view, and of serving as mediator where the other two have views which are widely divergent. He must be an extremely capable, fluent conversationalist who can eliminate gaps in the conversation. In addition, the chairman must appreciate the interests and limitations of the lay audience so he can keep the conversation on a sufficiently simple and non-technical level. It is obvious that he must be more than an interlocutor. The chairman of such a conversation should contribute original thoughts and information the same as any other member of the team. At the same time he is obliged to rephrase the technical thoughts of others in simple terminology. Obviously in discussing subjects taken from many fields as is true with the Round Table, it is difficult to find a man on any university faculty who has the breadth of interests and specialized knowledge to be able to serve as a chairman throughout any considerable length of time. We have found it necessary to sacrifice continuity of personality in this regard. Consequently, four or five men serve with almost equal regularity as chairmen. This number of men chosen from different specialized fields are sufficient for most of the subjects considered on the Round-Table programs.

PROBLEMS OF PROGRAM ORGANIZATION¹

● CONYERS READ

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

THE National Advisory Council on Radio in Education has a committee on history. The American Historical Association has a committee on radio. These two committees, consolidated for all practical purposes into one, have recently issued a preliminary report, written by Dr. Elizabeth Yates Webb, of Vassar College, which represents the result of their deliberations. This report is printed in *Radio and Education, 1934*, but it deserves much wider publicity because it makes a contribution of considerable importance to the problem of utilizing the radio for educational purposes.

The Committee has decided, and its members think wisely, to address its broadcasting to the general public. It recognizes the effectiveness of the radio in the schools and colleges, but finds its greatest potential usefulness "as an instrument for more enlightenment." There are some seventeen million radio-receiving sets in the United States and a radio audience of perhaps half the population. And more and more these radio listeners, or at any rate those who are not attending school or college, are getting what enlightenment they do get by listening. They do not in the mass read serious books or even serious magazines or newspapers. They do not attend lectures. If they do not go to the movies, they sit at home and turn on the button. Without any doubt the radio is the greatest instrument for adult education in the mass.

There is an audience, a huge audience, ready made, for anything good or bad broadcast over the great national networks. It is to this audience as a whole and not to any selected portion of it that the Joint Committee intends to address its history. But before it undertakes to decide what kind of history it means to broadcast, it asks this pertinent question: Why broadcast history? This is another way of asking, Why teach history?

¹ Printed also in *The Social Studies*, XXVI (May, 1935), pp. 299-301.

And the question needs to be asked because a great deal of history teaching, both in schools and in colleges, is not directed by any conscious purpose but is simply offered because it always has been offered, and in the old conventional pattern, because that pattern was good enough for our fathers before us. It is important to define the objective because it is clear enough that the technique must be changed if we are to convey history in any palpable form to the man in the street and at the crossroads. And it will not do to accept the alluring alternative of turning history into trite romances, startling adventures, and dramatic scandals, as some commercial broadcasters have done. The validity in history as education clearly does not lie in the repetition of droll stories, whether they happen to be true or not. The committee defines its objective as that of "developing among the American public a sense of historical-mindedness."

Dr. Webb's definition of the term is worth quoting at some length:

Historical-mindedness in the public is not a matter of gazing backward; it is the intellectual habit of thinking about present affairs in the light of the past from which they developed. It is an intellectual perspective which comes from seeing situations in their setting, an emotional equilibrium which comes from getting outside one's own limited experience. Without an understanding of how familiar ideas and institutions have grown up through adjustment to changing conditions, personal ideas and loyalties are apt to become dogmatic and emotional; and without an understanding of the foundations upon which modern society is built, personal action is apt to be made with unsound haste or with a sense of futility.

Historical-mindedness, far from making people conservative and irresponsive to change, might presumably make them less resistant to facing the facts of change and more aware of the soundness of adjusting to them. It might enable them to see that society is not static, that a cross-section of any civilization, including our own, shows a part in a process of development. It might lead to a realization of the possible range of values, qualities and choices, and of the importance of choosing consciously and wisely.¹

And so the Committee has selected its audience and so has defined its objective. It proposes to utilize the radio for the pur-

¹ Webb, Elizabeth Yates. "A Broadcasting Venture in Mass Education," *Education and Radio, 1934*, p. 202. The whole report is reprinted in this volume (see pp. 238-61).

pose of developing historical-mindedness in the man in the street and at the crossroads. A tall order!

This much is certain, that the man in the street must be reached. Whether we like it or not, conventional methods of presenting history do not appeal to him; whether we like it or not, droll stories do. It gets us nowhere to say that he should like what he does not, for he has the broadcaster at his mercy with a mere turn of the button. Somehow or other he has to be induced to listen, not once but many times.

The Committee recognizes that there are at least two factors in any radio broadcast which determine the attention of the radio listener: one is the broadcaster, and the other is what he talks about. And so the Committee maintains that the broadcaster must be selected with great care and with due attention to his ability to attract his audience and to speak to them in terms which they can understand. The average school-teacher will not do. The average college professor emphatically will not do. The lecture-platform method is out of the question. The one thing certain about radio broadcasting is that it calls for a technique quite different from the classroom technique. Probably the best method will not be found until after extensive experimentation. The important consideration is that the audience must be reached and held in a serious vein and for a serious purpose. It has been done, and it can be done without resorting to slapstick methods. But it cannot be done until we make all other considerations subordinate to the business of doing it. The Committee plainly is not interested in giving professors an opportunity to display their wares in refined and elegant diction; it is interested in mass education.

Given the broadcaster, what shall he broadcast? The man in the street is not much interested in conventional history as such. Lists of emperors, kings, and popes are apt to leave him cold. The chronological arrangement of facts past somehow does not commend itself to his attention. What does interest him is what gets on the front page of the newspapers, and this continues to interest him so long as it is on the front page of the newspapers. It may be Hitler in Germany, or Mussolini in

Abyssinia, or the Japanese in Manchuria, or the gold standard, or the New Deal, or Muscle Shoals, or the like. But there they are, and while they are there, the man in the street will listen while you talk about them. The Committee seizes upon this interest as a point of attachment for its broadcasting program. It proposes to take a current situation and project it against its historical background—to use Hitler as a taking-off point for the evolution of the situation in Germany, the Japanese in Manchukuo as a basis for a historical consideration of the problem of the Far East, and so forth. The objective is clearly not a review of current events; it is the utilization of current events as a text for emphasizing the importance of considering all social happenings in the light of the past out of which they developed. Not all current events lend themselves to this method of treatment, and only those will be selected which do; but the notion of turning the popular interest in them to the development of historical-mindedness is a distinct contribution to the whole problem of adult education and may be applied wisely in many other fields of study besides history.

It is important, of course, that sound history shall be dispensed. That aspect of the problem cannot safely be left to the broadcaster. Therefore the American Historical Association is interested. They propose to see to it that sound history is dispensed. The Committee has worked out a definite plan of cooperation between the professional historian and the popular broadcaster. It proposes to survey the contemporary world and mark those places and those problems in it which are most likely to produce front-page news. It proposes to invite competent scholars to prepare memoranda in which the salient facts in these danger zones shall be set forth in accordance with sound scholarly standards. These memoranda will be placed in charge of an executive committee whose business it will be to determine from week to week what the subject for broadcasting will be. Once the subject is selected it will hand the appropriate memorandum to the broadcaster and direct him to prepare his discourse accordingly. It will review his manuscript and approve it before he goes on the air, and, if it is deemed desirable, will

afford him an opportunity for personal conference with a recognized expert on the subject involved. That is the essence of the matter. The learned society will supply the facts; the broadcaster will present the facts in terms acceptable to the audience whose interest in the subject already will have been stimulated by the front page of the newspapers.

The Committee emphasizes the importance of cultivating the seeds sown in every possible way: by encouraging correspondence with the audience, by organizing group listeners, by inviting the co-operation of public libraries in preparing and distributing lists of supplementary reading. One can conceive of a whole system of adult education developing around a nucleus of this sort. And once the interest in backgrounds gets aroused, one can anticipate hopefully a popular reaching out for a broader understanding of the fundamentals of human culture. But the great initial problem is to arouse the interest. It must not be taken for granted as educators are apt to do, and it must not be labelled "education" as such. Perhaps it had better not even be labelled "history." Somehow these names have a forbidding aspect to the man at the crossroads.

MR. ZOOK:

This statement has been most interesting to me, for in my useful days I attempted to teach history. I am sure there are a number of questions you would like to ask Mr. Read.

MR. KALTENBORN:

Some years ago, long before radio came in, I had some experience in trying to teach history in the way Mr. Read suggested. I went to college after five years of newspaper experience and specialized in history and political science. I was irritated by the complete divorcement of present-day events from those being taught in the classroom so I conceived an idea, which I called "Teaching History Backwards," and which has been expounded ably by Mr. Read. I wrote magazine articles, newspaper editorials, and actually got educators interested sufficiently to be asked by two leading colleges to take material from the front page and make it the basis of teaching. I did not get far with the educators. They said it could not be done soundly; you could not teach the right kind of history that way. All you could give would be a smattering. History could be taught logically only by beginning at the beginning and coming slowly down the ages; that was so definite an attitude that I had to

give my plan up. I wonder if Mr. Read really believes that he could get a competent historian to gather material on Japan, put it into a folder, and then permit some commentator like myself to use the contents of his folder and say he was quoting the historian.

MR. READ:

It is important to distinguish between broadcasting and the general problem of education. I should not be prepared to advocate teaching history backwards to college classes. I do not think it is a sound method. I feel strongly, however, that remote history should be oriented with present problems. My objection to teaching history backwards is that it selects only those elements out of the past that stand in the particular pattern today. If we are going to forget our great spiritual and cultural leaders simply because spiritual and cultural considerations occupy a relatively insignificant place in our contemporary scheme of things, I think it will be unfortunate. An imperfect picture of the past and an inadequate idea of the potentialities of the human genius will be presented. That is not our problem here, however. It is to stimulate interest, to get people to thinking, to develop in them historical-mindedness. We are not going to teach them history in any conventional way: we are going to try to develop in them a sense of background, so that they can understand and appraise more intelligently the significance of contemporary events.

MR. PERRY (National Committee on Education by Radio):

May I direct attention to a new method which seems to fit here. Motion-picture companies which produce news reels cover the important centers of the world and one of them has just begun assembling important speeches made in different parts of the world into reels which can be broadcast; thus, for example, one may hear speeches by Hitler, Mussolini, and the Emperor of Japan brought together in one program. The broadcasts recorded on sound films sent to the out-of-town stations by WOR, New York, are identical with the WOR broadcasts. Duplicate prints are made from the negative film. Once such a record is made on a film it is fairly permanent. Any urgent matter can be put on telephone lines from any part of the world, brought into New York, and again recorded there on film and made available. If anybody here is interested, he may get in touch with Mr. Mark Hawley, 5 West Fifty-second Street, New York City.

MR. TYSON (National Advisory Council on Radio in Education):

The significance of this Committee's report to me is that here we have a group of professional historians who have spent considerable time in trying to relate the techniques and the demands which the radio and microphone make in the presentation of history to a lay audience. As the Council earlier began its study of how various subjects should be presented to the radio

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

audience, we organized a number of committees and went through the natural evolutionary process of assisting any group trying to do particular program job. The programs originally were presented to radio audiences by individuals who were authorities in their various subjects without regard to the demands of the microphone. The result was successful to a certain point. I thought often, and I still do, that from the standpoint of the radio technique the result was pretty horrible, and as I sit and listen to some of the programs, in my imagination I can hear the successive cracklings across the country as people turn off their receivers. However, the significant thing to me in this report is that the American Historical Association and the Council form a group of serious, professional people who have given considerable study to the demands which radio makes, and after several years of objective study they really have some constructive and valuable practical suggestions. We have present here today representatives of other learned societies and other educational groups. We have been particularly pleased that out of our group of committees this report has appeared. We think the Committee has shown how this educational job might be done. I wonder what the representatives of the other educational societies think about that. Is it a solution from the standpoint of good broadcasting and from the standpoint of good education? I think that is the issue that Mr. Read's committee has raised.

MR. CALDWELL (General Secretary, American Association for Advancement of Science):

It has been a practice for some years to put on broadcasts by the leading scientists in this country. Those have been arranged at the time of the mid-winter meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science largely in terms of those who came to the meeting and of those leaders who were willing to speak over the radio. Naturally, every one wished to hear such men as Millikan and Shapley and would have wished to hear Michelson and Thomas Crowder Chamberlain had the microphone been available in their time. There is a feeling, however, that while the personal interest in a few individuals is marked, and it is worth while perhaps to have them broadcast in order that these world characters may be heard by the people, that such a method is ineffective. As a representative of the Association, charged with the responsibilities of considering the question of what shall be the broadcasts at the next annual meeting, I want to express my personal appreciation of the guidance shown to us in the outline presented. I should like to have this committee of the American Historical Association advise us as to how we may do a better job.

May I add my word also to that of Mr. Kaltenborn. We are so scholastic now, and logically so, that we must expect criticism. In our field of sciences I imagine we shall have much more criticism than you have had in history because the nature of history has caused you to know a little more of what the human race is doing, than is true in most of the sciences. You are criticized,

and we shall be when we follow your plan, as I hope we may. We have not made the progress we desire because the men who have helped to create and organize the refined divisions of knowledge are so separated from the ordinary citizens who turn on radios that they do not see things in the citizens' perspectives. We may make as large a contribution proportionately to adult education as we shall with the science groups.

MR. WHEELER (Station W1XAL and Tufts College):

I would like to say a word about modern languages. Students in America generally are far away from the source of most European languages. The students in Paris can turn on languages easily and clearly over the long wave, and they can get a great deal of practice with talking. We must have some language broadcasts in this country either on long or short waves. I have been surprised at the amount of foreign-language broadcasting being done here at Columbus. We already have found in what we are doing at Boston that the speakers are all important. They must be native, they must speak in their own languages clearly, and they must understand the American audience. It is important that we find those people who can produce elementary material and advanced material, who can get together the best material to use, and those who can broadcast.

MR. ZOOK:

I have faith that radio is to be a new teacher in all fields including history. I, also, believe our practices in the teaching of history not only in the schools but in colleges are going to be modified greatly. The students in the classrooms are there because they must be, but the radio audience can easily dial out. Therefore it is necessary for the teacher over the radio to be sure to interest his members of the audience; otherwise he does not hold them. Instead of teaching history from a purely logical or chronological point of view, he must teach it from the point of view of the significance of the event. That, in effect, I believe, is what the radio will bring not only for the general radio audience, but, as time goes on, even for our classrooms.

WISCONSIN TEACHERS' ROUND TABLE

● **HAROLD A. ENGEL**

STATION WHA, WISCONSIN STATE STATION,
MADISON

THE wish of countless educators that the inspiration and professional leadership meted out in such large amounts at teachers' conventions could be made available in more digestible portions throughout the year now has been realized in Wisconsin. Using

the state-owned radio station WHA, the University of Wisconsin presents weekly round-table discussions by authorities on various phases of school work.

Under the leadership of A. S. Barr and M. H. Willing, professors in the School of Education, the first broadcast in the series went on the air on October 3, 1934. Each week since then, with a leader in some particular field with them before the microphone as a guest, they have provided thought-provoking discussions on school problems. Teachers hearing the programs are inspired by the clear-cut presentation of ideas to apply the new methods in their own practice.

“Problems in Classroom Instruction” forms the basis for many a school’s weekly faculty meeting. The program is broadcast immediately after school hours, and teachers gather and listen to it together. They enjoy, in their own schools, the talents of educators who otherwise would be outside their realm except perhaps at the annual teachers’ convention. They need not lose two or three days of school, spend their money for travel and accommodations in a strange city, or be wearied by overambitious programs. They listen together and apply the new ideas to the problems at hand.

The broadcasts attempt to clarify issues, summarize relevant research, state guiding principles, and suggest the implications of such principles for the improvement of practice. A wide variety of subjects is taken up, including pupil motivation, individual differences, curricular integration, discipline, educational diagnosis and pupil adjustment, activities, and the like. Listeners frequently report actual situations for discussion.

Three participants regularly staged the discussions. Two of these men carried on throughout the series. The third member was always selected because of his specialized knowledge of the subject to be taken up on the particular broadcast. At a practice session these men met and talked through the possible points to be made. These, with the cues for speakers and answers, were embodied in the finished plan before the broadcast. While those taking part in the program did deviate at times from this script, they found it helpful in covering the desired points in the allotted time to have a manuscript.

The scope of service rendered by the broadcasts is expressed by John Callahan, state superintendent of public instruction. He says, "The Teachers' Round Table has my hearty approval. No longer need the isolated school be devoid of intimate contact with the newest educational developments. As a supplement to the annual teachers' convention these programs can do much to bring about a more intelligent handling of the varied problems arising in our schools."

School men generally agree that the series meets definite needs. Another angle is expressed by Philip H. Falk, superintendent at Lake Mills who says:

No profession that purports to be scientific can be static. Because of the mere snatches of time a busy, overloaded teacher can devote to keeping up with the times, one of two diametrically opposed attitudes is easily assumed: First, be "old-fashioned," see only confusion in all innovations, and regard them as fads, and sit tight. Second, be "modern," and chase rainbows. Few teachers on the job have the combination of time, ability, and accessibility to materials to delve into any major educational problem and come up with a well-balanced conclusion based on all points of view. I think these programs should stimulate professional reading and effort by teachers, but with a tremendously improved background.

In addition to the broadcasting service, and to make the discussions available to persons beyond the service range of the radio station, each program was mimeographed and copies distributed to all who requested them. The extension division carried on this work.

These broadcasts were intended primarily for teachers in service, but they were found to be useful to other listeners as well. The Wisconsin School for the Blind found that they would "help young students decide whether teaching is a profession suited to themselves." Several state teachers' colleges had groups of students listening regularly. The state prison, which trains inmates to serve as teachers in its school, was able to "get inestimable benefit from any good 'outside' thinking, even though not immediately pertinent."

Wisconsin has pioneered in the use of radio as an educational device. "The Teachers' Round Table" is not the least of these developments. Dean Anderson, head of the School of Education, summarizes his views on the series in this way:

The teacher in the field needs constant contact with fresh developments in the field of education—particularly in curriculum content and teaching procedure. In the small communities, and not infrequently in large communities, the regular school or building teachers' meeting is a barren feast. The planning of school programs, discipline problems, behavior in the corridors and on the playgrounds constitute the bill of fare.

Nothing of greater significance than these educational broadcasts has occurred in our state to vitalize the weekly teachers' meeting. They have been a major educational contribution of the year.

ORGANIZING LISTENING GROUPS

● TRACY F. TYLER

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BY
RADIO

THE very fact that I have been asked to discuss before the members of this Institute the subject assigned to me indicates a belief that listening groups have great potential value in securing the most effective use of radio for educational purposes. To a considerable extent radio broadcasting has changed our habits of life during the fifteen years since its experimental beginnings. Before the advent of radio, those who wished to hear an address, to listen to music, or to secure the moving effects of drama found it necessary to become members of a group. The advent of the motion picture continued this practice. In fact, this getting together in groups has been characteristic of a great many of our day-by-day activities.

Group radio listening, although not unknown in America, has not been developed to any great extent. In a few parts of the country it has been carried on, however, in connection with a number of different educational projects. Considerable progress has been made in the organization of radio-listening groups in several of the European countries, notably Germany and Great Britain.

In determining the extent to which the German people have made use of group listening, I was particularly fortunate in discovering that a representative of the German broadcasting system was located temporarily at Washington. I learned from

him that listening groups were organized by the National Socialists prior to the Hitler régime. When the National Socialists constituted the opposition party, these listening groups served as a means of remodeling public opinion. The groups were organized by party agents. These agents went to all communities, created listener interest, and then formed groups. The groups were held together by regular meetings, by magazines, and by pamphlets. When the National Socialist party gained control of the government, the numerous existing listening groups were continued. They became the nucleus for the community listening for which Germany has become so well known.

More detailed information concerning the organization of the German listening groups was contained in an article, "Radio in the Reich," which appeared in the *New York Times* for March 3, 1935. From this article we learn that under the Hitler régime each of the thirty-eight party regions has a radio officer. Subordinate to these regional officers are district officers located not only in each of the approximately one thousand districts in Germany but in each of the larger cities as well. When an important speech is announced and community reception is ordered, the party radio officers see to it that every factory, public square, and school is fitted with receivers and public-address equipment. Thus, at least three-fourths of the population listen in on such occasions. Practically everything—business, traffic, social life—is at a standstill while everyone listens to the loudspeakers. The regional radio officers are in close touch with a large part of the listening public, both directly and through the subordinate officers. They have access to the management of the radio stations, and in this manner are able to obtain for listeners the type of program which best meets their needs.

Where a whole country is organized as in the case of Germany, it is possible to use the radio as a means of forming public opinion because of its ability directly to impress the entire population. According to Horst Dressler-Andress,

The German broadcasting system has proved this by its great broadcasts on state politics, by the speeches of our Leader Adolf Hitler, which were lis-

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

tened to by the entire German nation assembled before the loudspeakers in gigantic community receptions on the streets and squares, in the shops of the whole German Reich, in the factories, in the restaurants of the rural districts, and in the homes.¹

The British Institute of Adult Education has been largely responsible for the excellent development which has taken place in the formation of listening groups in England. May I present some of the ideas which have been gleaned from publications of the Institute? The major responsibility for the success of group listening lies with the leaders. For that reason, conferences have been arranged for the purpose of training persons who might lead radio discussion groups. Listening groups do not usually arise spontaneously. Their members do not come together haphazardly in response to a newspaper notice or other public announcement. The group leader is responsible for originating and probably organizing the group. Nearly always there must be a nucleus of persons who know each other or who have some common interest. A large majority of successful discussion groups have arisen as offshoots of the activities of some association which exists for other purposes than radio listening. The membership of the groups should be as heterogeneous as possible. In a well-balanced group, the leader, by studying the interests and the experience of each person, in time can procure a valuable contribution to the discussion from each member.

The British Broadcasting Corporation itself indicates its attitude relative to group listening in the following statement:

The five years' experimental work, achieved by the voluntary cooperation of the Central Council for Broadcast Adult Education and five Area Councils appointed by it, has proved that broadcasting has a contribution of importance to make in adult education. Over 1300 groups were organized during winter sessions to listen to broadcast talks. Steps have been taken to advance the work beyond the experimental stage in which the elements of pioneering and intensive propaganda has been prominent. New machinery has been devised; the Council, having in July completed its term of office and its admirable work, has been dissolved, and plans have been laid for the appointment of an Adult Education Advisory Committee to take over its functions in respect of (a) advice to the BBC on the planning of talks for discussion groups,

¹ "German Broadcasting," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CLXXVII (January, 1935), 62.

and (b) the general direction of policy as it affects listening-end activities. The Area Councils have similarly been reconstituted and increased to a total of seven, so as to provide a network covering the whole country.

This second phase of development, undefined in duration, should ultimately result in the Corporation's passing to other hands the administration and financial responsibilities in respect of all listening-end work hitherto carried by it.¹

An early experiment in the United States with radio discussion groups was carried on under the auspices of the National League of Women Voters. During 1931, twenty groups, representing nine states, were in existence. Some were made up of neighbors, two were student groups, one was a family group. In most cases, group discussion followed the radio program. The next year it was decided to expand the project. A letter was sent to state league presidents, asking them to suggest local leagues which might be asked to participate. On receipt of their replies a letter was sent out to each of the names suggested. The responsibility for organizing each local group rested with the individual leaders. As a result, ninety-one groups scattered rather widely over the country were gathered to listen. They had a total membership of eleven hundred.

As a result of an experiment which began in the fall of 1928 with a series of radio broadcasts in the field of parent education, Mrs. Jessie Allen Charters reported at the 1930 Institute that, through meeting in groups, radio listeners could be helped to develop group consciousness. She found also that a considerable number of parents' groups met in the offices of school principals or in the homes of the members. The radio programs which were presented under her direction were used as a basis for group discussion.

During the past three years, the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station has been presenting broadcasts in the field of parent education. These radio talks have been prepared especially for the use of discussion groups. Each talk has been presented twice during the week—in the afternoon through the State College station, WOI, Ames, and in the evening over the University station, WSUI, Iowa City. This makes it possible

¹ *British Broadcasting Corporation Annual, 1935, p. 62.*

for discussion groups to meet at whichever time proves more convenient. During the first year the talks were arranged in a single series; the next year there were two series; and during the present year, three—one for parents of pre-school children, a second for parents of elementary-school children, and a third for those of adolescents.

Four methods were used in the formation of the groups. The first consisted of the preparation of a four-page folder which described briefly the general plan and gave the complete schedule. Ten thousand of these were mailed about a month or six weeks before the programs began. They were sent to various persons in the state, including all presidents of local parent-teacher associations, past leaders and members of the radio club, superintendents of high schools, county agents, presidents of farm and home bureaus, and other individuals interested in child welfare. The second channel through which the plan was publicized was the occasion of the annual June convention of one thousand leaders interested in child welfare. Several announcements were made at the convention, and copies of the folder were supplied to interested persons. A third medium through which the plan was announced was the magazine of the state parent-teacher association, in the September and October numbers of which announcements appeared. Finally, the two radio stations presented a series of one-minute announcements at various times through the day during the months of September and October. The Iowa authorities believe that the use of the printed folder was the most effective of all of these methods.

Suggestions for organizing and conducting group meetings were sent to the leaders of every study club which applied for membership as a radio-listening group. In addition, they were sent a list of reading references for use throughout the course, as well as some supplementary reading material such as the pamphlets on the subject published by the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station.

In advance of each club meeting, leaders were sent some study helps, a report blank, and a copy of the radio talk. The weekly report which each leader sent to the Child Welfare Research

Station provided a channel through which the club could refer special comments, criticisms, and questions which might arise and upon which they felt the need of assistance.

An indication of the value of this series is found in a report dated January 22, 1935. At that time there were 144 local clubs with a total enrollment of 2,262 individual members. These clubs represented 62 Iowa communities.

Since February 23, 1932, the extension service of Rutgers University, the New Jersey College of Agriculture, and the New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers have co-operated in presenting radio talks planned especially for discussion by groups of New Jersey mothers. These talks have been presented over station WOR, Newark.

The New Jersey project originated largely as a result of a series of leader-training meetings. One group of leaders expressed a desire for additional help. The specialist in child training and parent education saw the possibility of a state-wide service which would bring her and the other specialists into close touch with many groups and cost a minimum of time and effort. Such a plan offered groups an opportunity to use their own initiative, while, at the same time, it insured reliable sources of information and leadership.

Three hundred twenty-seven groups, comprising 3,568 individuals, enrolled in the first series. The second, which began in October, 1932, enrolled 161 groups and totaled 1,640 members. Two short series given in January, and April, 1933, enrolled 208 and 269 groups, respectively. The fall and spring series in 1933-34 enrolled 185 and 167 groups, totaling 2,282 and 2,009 individuals, respectively. Preliminary reports would indicate a decrease in enrollment during the present year. This is due to the fact that the station officials have found it necessary to change the broadcasts to a morning hour. For obvious reasons home-makers find it more difficult to participate in radio study groups in the morning than in the afternoon.

Four radio talks are given on consecutive weeks under the plan in effect in New Jersey during the present year. The fifth week's broadcast is devoted to answering questions sent in by

the various groups. The talks are given from 9:45 to 10:00 each Tuesday morning. New Jersey parents attribute the success of the project to the fact that the groups were organized through the efforts of the State Congress of Parents and Teachers, with the co-operation of the various local parent-teacher associations.

The Indianapolis and Minneapolis public libraries have reported experiments in group listening. In the former city, forty persons interested either in education or other community-welfare activities were invited to form a listening group. They met twenty minutes in advance of each broadcast, listened to the radio lecture, and then engaged in discussion. The pre-lecture period was devoted to a fifteen-minute presentation of the background and other interesting information concerning the speaker. Referring to the occasion upon which the group listened to an address by John Dewey, the Indianapolis librarian states: "Following the radio talk, we had thirty minutes of as pointed and stimulating discussion as I have ever listened to. This meeting was a complete success."

The plan which the Minneapolis authorities expect to inaugurate in the fall involves the installation of a radio in an upper room of the library where a class can gather without any disturbance to the reading rooms. The room will be used for certain fixed program series, particularly one on international subjects presented by the University of Minnesota station, WLB. At each period an instructor interested in the subject under discussion will be provided. Anyone interested in the broadcast will be invited to be present.

Last spring an experiment in group listening was carried on by the Buffalo Museum of Science. There was no organized group. Anyone who wished might join, whether for the entire period or for a single session.

Beginning in October, 1934, the college of education of the University of Wisconsin has been carrying on by radio a teachers' round table. Each Tuesday afternoon from 4:00 to 4:30 members of the education department discussed some pertinent problems of classroom instruction. This program has been pre-

sented through the facilities of state station WHA, Madison. A number of high-school principals in schools which are equipped with radio use these broadcasts as a basis for weekly teachers' meetings. Mimeographed copies of each discussion are available for the review and reference of those who request them. Approximately eight hundred copies are distributed each week. Preliminary reports show that the principal of the school generally leads the discussion; that an interesting use is being made of the broadcasts; and that a continuation of the series next year is desired.

The University of Kentucky has been carrying on an interesting experiment in group listening. The authorities wished to locate radio sets in relatively inaccessible parts of the state. In selecting the locations for the listening centers, rather extensive publicity was given to the plan. The most appropriate places were selected from the flood of applications which came in. Centers have been established in a variety of places—community centers, schools, and general stores. Most of the centers are in remote locations in the mountains. The assembling of the audience falls almost entirely upon the director of the center. In mountain schools, of course, one or more classes or the entire school listens. In addition, the students are encouraged to bring their parents. The mere knowledge that the set is there and that it will be operated at specified times is usually sufficient to bring out a large group in the case of the general-store and community-center locations. The listening-center director is expected to keep informed concerning the worth-while features that will be broadcast and to maintain a bulletin board for the purpose of informing the listeners.

Radio home-makers' clubs have just completed five years of operation in Oregon. The programs have been broadcast by the publicly owned station KOAC. The clubs meet for the purpose of listening to the "Family Life" series of programs which are broadcast every other Tuesday afternoon from 3:00 to 3:30. On alternate Tuesdays, between club meetings, supplementary lectures, to be listened to individually, are broadcast. Two or three home-makers may constitute a club. During the present

year the average number of listeners per club has been thirteen. A membership greater than fifteen or twenty, however, is believed to retard general participation in discussion.

The use of a form letter, accompanied by an announcement of the series, was found to be the most effective means of obtaining listening groups. The letter was sent to all former radio-club officers, to presidents of parent-teacher associations, to presidents of federated women's clubs, and to various individuals who had made inquiry about the program.

Other means used to stimulate the formation of listening groups included radio announcements during the home-economics programs; printed announcements in the schedule of programs for the station; news articles in the state parent-teacher association magazine, the *Oregon Clubwoman*, and the newspapers; and announcements made to nursery-school teachers in their training school. In one case a home-demonstration agent assisted in organizing groups in her county. In one county, a parent-teacher-association chairman assisted in organizing groups. A great many home-demonstration agents announced the service at advance meetings for parents held in their respective counties. A majority of the groups have been sponsored by parent-teacher organizations.

All officially enrolled clubs are sent detailed programs, supplementary material, and report blanks. The clubs meet at 2:30 for preliminary study. At 3:00 o'clock they tune in for the broadcast. The radio lecturer uses the first ten or fifteen minutes to answer questions that have been sent in by club members. He then devotes the remainder of the half-hour to the topic announced for the day. At the conclusion of the broadcast, the clubs consider questions provided on the program outline. Questions which the members wish to have answered are sent to the station. An indication of the value of this service is found in the fact that 24 of the 37 clubs enrolled this year were members last year.

An Emergency Radio Junior College has been conducted in Ohio, using the facilities of the Ohio State University station WOSU. Contacts were made in various localities with individu-

als who might serve as discussion leaders, or, as they were generally called, "radio teachers." These radio teachers got in touch with recent high-school graduates who had been unable to attend college. These people were able to direct the teachers to other interested individuals. In small communities where the radio teacher was probably well known, some house-to-house canvassing was employed. Personal letters were used in some cases. The attention of the general public was attracted by talks at granges, clubs, and similar organizations. The aid of ministers and leaders in social work was solicited. Newspaper editors in most counties gave helpful publicity. Thus the groups were formed. The local leader was careful to organize the group in such a way that there would be no hesitation about meeting in the respective homes of the listeners. This gave the meetings a certain social value. Every time one of the group meetings is held, publicity is given through the news and society columns of all of the principal county papers. By this means, new members who might be interested in these discussions are attracted.

The Kansas State Congress of Parents and Teachers has a radio chairman who is interested in the organization of group listening. A report received from her about the middle of April states that through her efforts 106 listening groups were meeting regularly. In every case excellent leadership is provided and, as a result, there is worth-while discussion.

Some valuable suggestions concerning the organization of various types of listening groups have been made by Mrs. Elizabeth Watson Pollard. She has found that suitable times for adult groups vary greatly. Groups of young parents generally choose evening meetings. Parents of older children prefer the early afternoon before school is dismissed. In unmarried groups, evening, late Sunday afternoon, or lunch time is more satisfactory. Adult groups prefer to meet about once a week with a broadcast for each meeting. Their sessions should be long enough for them to complete their discussion each time. The program should be so planned that there would be a brief discussion before the broadcast and a long discussion following it.

I have attempted to give you a sketch of the various group-

listening projects with which I have been in contact. There may be others which have not been sufficiently publicized to make it possible for me to find out about them. Comparatively speaking, it would appear that we have very little group listening in the United States. It is not necessary for me to tell you the reasons for this. Mr. Tyson has outlined them in an admirable manner in his foreword to the pamphlet, *Group Listening*. He enumerates three difficulties: the lack of an intelligent system of radio program planning in the United States, the existence of several time zones, and the lack of audiences of certain clearly defined types.

An interesting fact which developed from the study was that a majority of the projects were being carried on through the use of programs presented from non-commercial radio stations. The reason for this situation is not hard to find. Listening groups require specially arranged talks. The broadcast must be presented at an hour when it is convenient for the members of the groups to listen. This hour must be maintained unchanged unless the groups themselves suggest that a different hour will be more satisfactory.

The problem of obtaining and holding a desirable hour for broadcasting programs has been a major difficulty in the case of groups which have depended upon the facilities of commercial stations. The director of one project presented over a powerful commercial station has aptly stated that, "when groups of women gather to hear a program from the college and then find that their program has been changed, sometimes under circumstances that do not allow sufficient time to reach all study groups by mail with a notification of the change, it is not strange that their interest in the program falls off."

If American broadcasting is to remain predominantly commercial, some means must be established to give the people themselves control over the hours best fitted for group listening. It appears that no other method will enable listeners to make the most effective use of local, state, and national educational authorities.

Radio discussion is an effective means of bringing adults to-

gether and centering a sustained interest around a particular problem. It provides fresh interest, brings to the group a person with prestige in his field, adds to a feeling of the importance of the study because many others are also listening, and provides general information where printed material is lacking. In the case of such projects as the listening centers in Kentucky, it brings timely information to persons who find it impossible to be served by daily newspapers and other avenues of information available in the more fortunate localities.

The sincere interest, earnest effort, and human understanding on the part of the group leaders are some of the most important factors in the success of group listening. Where it is impossible to pay discussion leaders, it is often difficult to get the right kind of persons. Though it is not essential that group leaders be trained, it is highly desirable. Untrained discussion leaders attempt to fall back on traditional question-and-answer patterns. Interesting problems raised in the radio talk are often disregarded by the leader who has the out-moded recitation type of program in mind.

Groups of individuals who find it impossible to have a trained leader may achieve success by building their work around the presentation made by the radio speaker. In this way, even though lacking trained leadership, many groups are able to secure a great deal more benefit than by listening individually to the talks.

The first consideration in the organization of a group is that there be no selfish motive of any kind. Self-improvement and nothing else must be the entire purpose. The leader is the most important member of the group. Most groups will be organized through the efforts of an interested leader. Personal contact is the best means of securing a sufficient number of individuals to constitute a group. From the experience of a majority of those who have been engaged in group-listening projects, however, it appears that form letters or printed or mimeographed leaflets have been highly successful. The important thing is to have the announcements reach the individuals who may be interested.

Every known method of publicity, including announcements over the radio, should be used wherever possible.

Groups, if they are to be most successful, should be organized on the basis of a common interest in a particular subject and for the purpose of listening to a specific series of broadcasts. Each of the individual members of the group must put forth his best efforts. Persons interested only in passive listening should be discouraged from enrolling. For example, difficulties have been reported in cases where a discussion group was held in a library or museum without any formality of membership in the group. That type of listener is frequently discouraging to the discussion leader. An official of the Buffalo Museum of Science reported that "persons frequently used the listeners' room merely as a place to rest after a trip around the museum had given them 'museum fatigue.' Some, I suppose, even used the room as a place to keep warm when the winter winds blew."

Materials should be provided and made available to the group leaders in advance of each broadcast. These materials should include references to publications (books, magazines, pamphlets, and the like) available in the local libraries. They should include questions for discussion. In addition, each leader should be provided with as clear an outline as possible of the duties of group officers.

Some means for communication between the groups and those in charge of the program should be maintained. This may be accomplished by having the groups send in their answers to each problem. These answers can be summarized and discussed over the radio. The director of one of the most successful of the listening-group projects reached the conclusion that "this part of the program seems to be very helpful in developing a feeling of belonging to a radio club and provides each group with a variety of approaches to the problem—a service which they seem to value very highly."

Finally, it seems unnecessary to state that a successful project of group listening involves the provision of the necessary machinery for making periodic check-ups of the extent of the listening audience and the adaptability of the material which is being broadcast to its needs.

MR. BARTLETT (Station WSYU, Syracuse University):

Will you make a recommendation as to the most desirable number to have in a listening group? The groups vary, I know, from three to three hundred.

MR. TYLER:

I think that in almost any educational project, whether the radio were included or not, the same rule would apply. If you have too large a number, you have a few people doing all the talking. Ten or twelve seems a better size than a larger number. If there are too few numbers, you do not get all the desired variety of points of view.

MR. TYSON:

Does anybody know to what extent the listeners to Father Coughlin and Senator Long have organized into groups? The National League of Social Justice, or whatever Father Coughlin calls his followers, has entered into active political life recently. Might that not be a demonstration of a kind of group listening which may be active in this country soon? I think that the same thing is likely true of some other chain broadcasts such as Mr. Poling's Sunday afternoon radio conferences. I know a great many groups of young people who meet together on Sunday afternoon to listen to that broadcast.

MISS JOHNSON (Columbia Broadcasting System):

Do you not think that one reason Father Coughlin has so many listeners is because listening to the radio on Sunday afternoon has become a habit? I find that is true in the small town where my home is. Everybody listens to the radio on Sunday afternoon whether they are calling or out driving.

MR. TYSON:

Do they meet in groups to listen to many Sunday afternoon programs?

MISS JOHNSON:

Not any more than they would get together socially, but I notice that whenever such groups do meet the radio is always on. Even if they are not paying any special attention to it, when it is time for Father Coughlin to come on, every one stops to listen.

MISS WALLER:

The program of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers on Thursday afternoons was planned to help parents solve many problems in the upbringing of their children. In fact, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Parent Education Chairman of the National Congress. It is the hope that the program is being listened to by organized groups throughout the country, and while we have had no definite tabulation on the number of such groups which are receiving the program, we do know, for instance, that Kansas has 107 listening units. We expect to broadcast a similar program starting next fall and trust that it will find a widespread and waiting audience.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

MR. TYLER:

Many of the states organized groups for listening to one program, then another, and so on, and Kansas had been doing this group listening prior to the particular series mentioned by Miss Waller. Kansas not only has listening groups in parent-teacher organizations but in women's clubs. It seems that the people in the Middle West like to get together that way; whereas in more densely populated areas it is more difficult to get groups together or, at least, to get reports about groups. In my opinion and that of authorities in New Jersey, the early experiment of the New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers would have been ahead of almost any of them had it not become necessary to change their program to nine-thirty in the morning, an impossible hour from the standpoint of home-makers.

MR. NOVIK (Station WEVD, New York):

Is it fair to say that organized listening groups are common in Germany because radio ownership is proportionately smaller than in this country? What right have we to expect the average program to have a large audience unless we have a specific organization? Instead of getting their main speaker to come to each community, they can organize a series and concentrate to hold local chapters. Why should we expect the average woman to ask two or five women to her home unless there is some reason for the periodic meeting when there are so many radios and so many opportunities to listen to radios?

MR. TYSON:

I agree that it is futile to organize for the sake of organization. The English situation as it was several years ago is extremely interesting. One reason for the development of group listening in Great Britain was the tax on receivers and the general lowering of incomes of the average British citizen after the war. It was a matter of economy. If any family was lucky enough to own a receiver, the members invited in their neighbors, the members of the union, or the members of the church or guild; thus, as I understand it, the system of group listening started originally for economic reasons. There is no use for us to get excited about organizing merely for the sake of organizing; but if the Kansas ladies can see an advantage in organizing, that is fine; apparently they do. The idea is growing all over the country, and as definite purposes to use radio that way appear, they should be developed.

WOMEN ORGANIZE TO LISTEN

● MRS. HAROLD VINCENT MILLIGAN
CHAIRMAN, WOMEN'S NATIONAL RADIO COMMITTEE

HUMORISTS are fond of depicting the average club woman in one of two fashions: either as a grim-faced, angular woman, striding through life as a Carrie Nation, or as a plump, none-too-clever woman whose great moment comes when she gives a tea for a visiting poet. As a matter of fact, there is no such thing as an average club woman. There are now too many organizations, containing correspondingly different members, to think in terms of any one type. Women have become "joiners"—a prerogative formerly exercised by men—and the national societies which have developed in the past fifty years undeniably have made an important contribution to the life and progress of this country. Certainly the enfranchisement of women in 1920 had a direct bearing upon the history of the United States, for it has been freely acknowledged that women's votes were the determining factor in the past two presidential elections.

The realization, therefore, that women are now turning their interest to radio, and have organized to obtain higher standards, has occasioned much comment in the press. Up to the time the Women's National Radio Committee came into being there was no central woman's organization to co-ordinate the groups interested in radio as a social force. We learned that many did not even know there was a government agency set up to exercise jurisdiction over radio broadcasting in this country.

Some of us who had heard radio programs discussed at meetings, mostly unfavorably, decided to find out whether the dissatisfaction was confined to the Middle-Atlantic states, or whether other sections of the country reflected the same views. Letters were sent out, inviting key women to state confidentially their opinion of the situation. We found that thinking women everywhere were agreeing that radio had not lived up to its potentialities; furthermore, there was a feeling that with the

increase in the number of programs sponsored by advertisers, standards had become definitely lower.

The pioneer in the movement for better radio programs was the National Federation of Music Clubs. You may recall that early in 1933 Mrs. Elmer James Ottaway, who was then the president, in a report to the National Council of Women expressed her views on jazz, crooners, and the "maids, minors, and morons" who at that time were writing most of the "fan" mail to studios, and to her astonishment found herself on the front page of practically every newspaper.

A movement for better radio was inevitable. The faint rumbles which were beginning to be heard all over the country, sooner or later, would have become a single loud blast which could not be ignored. The organization of the Women's National Radio Committee simply hastened the union of interested groups, and actually may have prevented hysterical action. At present, the Committee represents more than ten million women. Allowing for duplication, we would be conservative in claiming twelve million, but we prefer to underestimate our strength and therefore state that the organizations combined contain ten million.

Every type of woman in every walk of life may be found in its membership, and I think I am safe in saying every religious denomination is represented. Educational, patriotic, civic, philanthropic, welfare, fraternal, cultural, religious, business, professional, and social groups are among our affiliates, and of course many of them contain vast numbers of the home-makers of America whose good-will radio advertisers ardently desire.

The largest single group is the Council of Women for Home Missions, which has approximately five million members. The various Jewish women's organizations total almost a half-million. Other religious organizations are the National Woman's Conference of American Ethical Union, Catholic Daughters of America, and two large Mormon groups, the National Woman's Relief Society and the Young Women's Mutual Improvement Association. The leisure-time program of the National Woman's Relief Society has been cited as a model for many

years. Its young people's activities are perhaps the best planned and supervised in the country.

The patriotic groups in our ranks belonging to the defense council are the American Legion Auxiliary—that active arm of the American Legion, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Service Star Legion. The other side of the picture, the pacifist view, is upheld by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The president of the American Association of University Women, Miss Meta Glass, is a member of the Board of the Advisory Council on Radio in Education. We are proud of our close relationship with this association and its official representative, Mrs. Howard Vernon, also a member of our Executive Committee.

The place of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in the club world is too well known for me to discuss its activities at this time. There are few sections of the country which do not have at least one federated club. The branch of work in which Mrs. Poole, the president, is especially interested is the American Home Department, and radio, of course, is a vital part of family life today.

Another well-known organization within our membership is the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. While it is associated with prohibition in the minds of most people, the Union has an active child-welfare committee and a broad educational program. Its newest activity is a radio committee, which is in close touch with the Women's National Radio Committee headquarters. Mrs. Ella A. Boole who is internationally known as the president of the World W.C.T.U. is on our Executive Board.

The National Federation of Music Clubs, of which I already have spoken, is interested primarily in music in radio, and was the first organization to become affiliated with the Committee. You probably read in the newspapers this progressive association's plea for the subsidizing of music by the government and the appointment of a minister of fine arts. When it is borne in mind that more than two-thirds of all radio programs are

musical, the interest of the Federation in our work is readily understood. Several distinguished professional groups, the Medical Women's National Association, the National Association of Women Painters and Sculptors, the Osteopathic Women's National Association, and Zonta International, are affiliated with us.

The International Sunshine Society and the Shut-In Society have brought joy to thousands of shut-ins who are their members; and because radio plays such an important part in the lives of these unfortunates, both organizations are keenly interested in our work. Incidentally, we conducted a quiet survey among shut-ins last fall to determine their reactions to radio, and particularly to learn whether they are disposed to accept everything that comes along the air waves without comment, or whether they are as critical as others to whom radio, perhaps, does not mean as much. We found their standards are as high as any other portion of the listening audience, and their comments equally illuminating. As would be expected, they particularly enjoy broadcasts of a religious nature, and ask for more church music.

I spoke of the fact that women are becoming "joiners." A fraternal organization which has a membership of a half-million is the Supreme Forest Woodmen Circle. The Circle has a well-planned program for its junior members, and a model home for its aged.

Another organization with a broad social-welfare program is the Association of Junior Leagues of America. The Association was founded thirty years ago by Mrs. Mary Harriman Rumsey in order that young debutantes might make a useful contribution to the society in which they live. Diet kitchens, nurseries, hospitals, and clinics everywhere have hundreds of these earnest young women competently contributing valuable services on a volunteer basis. In most instances they have taken special training courses in preparation for the work. The Association's secondary program is its Arts and Interests Department, and we are happy to be one of the organization's "interests."

I wish I had time to tell you in more detail about the splendid

work every one of these groups is doing in its own field. Many of them are handicapped by reduced budgets, but continue to work quietly and modestly, accomplishing a great deal of good without the blaring of trumpets. It is the courage of just such women as will be found in most of these organizations which is maintaining the morale of our country in these difficult times. The home-makers among them are the peace-time soldiers of the country who are fighting the destructive elements which threaten the security and happiness of their families. How can these women make intelligent use of the radio?

We have been urging them, through their leaders, to organize listening groups locally. These units may contain members of one club, or be composed of presidents of several groups. Some are interested in one field of work—a study of local government, child welfare, or music appreciation; others meet to listen to talks related to the work of the national organizations with which they are affiliated. Some listening groups are composed of women who never before have been interested in becoming a part of any club, but wish to interest themselves in a cultural movement to keep abreast with the times. We are glad to send them lists of programs which we believe will be of special interest to them. Each unit has its chairman and secretary. When the members meet, they have notebooks and pencils in hand and have had preliminary discussion concerning the program they are going to hear. After the broadcast, they eagerly pick up the points developed by the radio speaker or listen to a talk by some local leader on a different angle of the same subject, perhaps an opposing view. Music is correlated with courses in music appreciation, and is the inspiration for papers on many different musical subjects.

It is easier to listen to a serious talk in a group than individually, apparently, as women tell us that during the day radio must compete with their busy thoughts as they perform routine tasks, and it is easier to plan and work against a background of music. When the family is assembled in the living room at night there are other distractions. The family gathers

in the living room to converse, read, play games, and relax. Music is a better background for various other interests than anything else, and the serious-minded woman who wishes to listen to a special talk must shut her ears to other voices in the room, or contend with the grumbling of the other members of the family who are not interested in that particular program. On the other hand, a group which gathers for the express purpose of hearing an address will give it respectful attention and get the most out of it.

Unfortunately, we cannot gauge accurately how many of these units are actually in operation today as a result of our efforts. Many of them simply pick up the idea and proceed to develop it without notifying us. However, before many more months will have elapsed we expect to have more exact data on our listening groups, as we have decided these ready-made units can help us by serving also as reporter groups.

We have assigned as the first project a tabulation of all the programs sponsored by advertisers on local stations. The information specifically requested is: day, hour, station; whether local or affiliated with a network; if so, which; type of program; sponsor; product advertised; reaction to advertising; typical advertising statements; review of the program and comments. You readily will appreciate that this will give us much valuable information concerning what is being presented on radio stations all over the country. The data are confidential of course. Only when a report comes to us of something which is offensive or so misleading that it is dangerous, shall we take steps, and the Federal Communications Commission will be notified.

Thus the woman who listens with a purpose will become a much more discriminating listener, and will develop a keener appreciation of the better programs radio has to offer. Poor programs have a negative value, in that they offer contrast to the finer ones. When we speak of good programs, we do not mean necessarily only symphonic music and educational talks. We incline toward the opinion that every program has its audience. Good dance music has its place in our family life, and radio would be dull indeed if we did not have current events, news

commentators, comedy, drama, music, and other lighter features to bring us relaxation. We do maintain that comedy can be clean without losing its flavor and that too much forced or inane humor can become deadly dull.

At present the amateur hour has become a source of complaint because it is overdone. In New York City there are now Jewish and Italian amateur hours, as well as the many in English that are heard on all the networks. The reaction is setting in already, and I predict that by midsummer the amateur hour will be merely an unpleasant memory.

For many years, radio has been left largely in the hands of men. It is true that broadcasting companies have capable women in executive positions, but they take their orders from men. The presidents and vice-presidents of the three networks are men; heads of organizations which pay for advertising programs are men; and in every related branch of the industry, the people who are doing the actual directing are men. Whenever we make this statement, we are sharply reminded of the Margaret Cuthberts, Bertha Brainerds, and Judith Wallers of radio, and told about brilliant women in advertising agencies who are doing splendid work. That is true, but in every instance these women are accountable to some superior and are not given absolutely free rein. If they were, some of the present objections to radio never would have arisen.

There has been an awakening of interest on the part of women in the past year. Instead of regarding the receiving set as a sound box which can be turned off and on at will, women are thinking seriously about the effect radio will have upon the generation now growing up. The public has become conditioned, through many years of wrong practices, to regard the radio as a substitute for the vaudeville stage and the theater more than any other branch of the arts. If there had been no concert halls, no Carnegie nor Metropolitan, and only light entertainment to turn to, we would have become a nation with lower cultural standards than any other in the world. Similarly, to permit radio to become just another transmitter of so-called "popular entertainment" is a mistake which will have far-

reaching detrimental effects. The serious programs are all too few in number, and the public, already conditioned to lighter features, is not appreciative enough of programs which are really good. If there is a gradual increase in programs having a cultural value, a real appreciation of better programs will ensue, and we will have a more balanced ratio between lighter and serious programs.

This is one of the things we hope to see ultimately. It does not mean—I hasten to add—that radio will become “high-brow.” There still will be something on the air to suit every taste, but there will be more programs of lasting value.

The first step in this mass movement toward better radio already has been taken. Women are organizing to listen. The next step probably will be that they will become more articulate. We urge them constantly to write to radio stations and to express their opinions of programs good and bad. We tell them it is simple courtesy to write if they enjoy them, and their duty to explain why, if they do not.

It must be said in justice to the radio industry that the presidents of the three networks and of the National Association of Broadcasters have displayed a spirit of co-operation which is truly commendable. The outlook in radio is brighter than it was a year ago. The fact that Mr. Prall, the new chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, is as desirous as we that broadcasting shall reach the highest possible plane gives us the hope that we may look confidently forward to the time when radio broadcasting will be compatible with the ideals most of us have for an American standard of culture.

MRS. GRUENBERG:

I have had more than twenty years' experience with another medium in which women have been interested, children's movies, which when we first began were as new as radio is today. I remember that the first fear of parents about this entertainment feature resembled present-day parents' fear about the radio. Children's books illustrate what can be accomplished through constructive efforts. As I look back twenty years and see the improvement in children's books, in artistic qualities, legible type,

contents which entertain as well as instruct, I realize the vast magnitude of the task accomplished, and I am hopeful about this new infant. I feel that most constructive efforts will come from analyzing particular opportunities. I for one really have faith in the seemingly slow process which does not seek headlines and does not cause quite so much stir. I have worked that way with groups of men and women for a long period, and I still have faith in it. I hope all of us concerned with radio programs for children will choose the slower, steadier way rather than panic censorship and mass approval.

ORGANIZING RADIO JUNIOR-COLLEGE GROUPS

● GEORGE R. BRYANT

SUPERVISOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION IN OHIO

THROUGH the co-operative endeavor of the faculty of Ohio State University and leading public-school men of Ohio, the Ohio Emergency Schools Administration has been able to add radio education to its many-sided program. We have found, in dealing with adult education, that the more approaches one can make to enlist the interests of those who should participate, the better the chances of success. It is a truism, which hardly needs repeating here, that adult education must be sold. Public, tax-supported education is bolstered by tradition and compulsory-attendance laws, but adult education is not.

Perhaps our commencement exercises, which are held at the completion of the eighth grade in many places, and always at the completion of high-school and college courses, have given the idea to many that education in any organized sense is completed at these times. Perhaps, too, the sense of futility that arises when one attempts to transfer some of the training secured in studying about Caesar's conquests in Gaul to problems related to a constantly changing democratic social order has frightened many away from further education. At any rate, most of adult education must be sold; those who participate seldom request it until they have participated in it.

What I have said about adult education, as a whole, has a bearing on the question upon which I have been asked to speak.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

It has been necessary also to "sell" radio junior-college education in Ohio. Mr. Charters told me a few weeks ago that he felt this group might be interested in knowing about our experiences in building up enrollments in radio junior-college work in Ohio. It would be presumptuous for me to pose here as an authority and attempt to tell this group how an emergency educational administration should promote and establish listening groups, so I prefer telling how we did it, mistakes and all, with a few suggestions thrown in at the end.

Our first work was rather impersonal. Our five field men were told about the plan for broadcasting various subjects from Station WOSU, and were asked to contact county emergency-school chairmen and to tell them about the work. It was expected that these chairmen, as leading educators in their counties, would enlist the interest of the other school men in their counties, and eventually, through publicity in the local newspapers and through announcements in schools, churches, and other places, people would be interested in enrolling.

Frankly, this system did not work as expected. The school superintendents co-operated well; announcements were made in the local newspapers, but still enrollments were few and far between. Some other device for enlisting interest was necessary if radio junior-college work was to succeed. This device consisted in an authorization from our office for the temporary employment of unemployed needy persons to serve as organizers of listening groups. In many cases, these persons were called "radio teachers." Where these organizers were well chosen and where they had some ability in educational promotion, they did excellent work. Through contacts with school superintendents, they obtained lists of names of promising recent graduates and contacted these persons much as an insurance salesman contacts a prospect. At times they met sales resistance. One organizer confided to me that a girl she knew wanted to "listen in," but her parents objected to further education. At the time we talked, the organizer said that she "just about had the parents sold."

Of course, not everyone whose name was secured as a poten-

tial enrollee could listen in on the lessons broadcast from Station WOSU, even when parents were willing, because many of these persons had no radios. Some of the organizers secured lists of radio owners before they began their contact work, and called only upon those who had the facilities for listening.

Although little success was made in bringing those who had no radios into one common center where a radio was available, one county reports that an enterprising radio dealer in the county seat supplied radios for various community centers free of charge. Here the persons enrolled in the radio courses were free to come and listen to the broadcasts.

After this first work of personal contacts had been completed, enrollments grew. Various people wrote in to our representative at Ohio State University and asked for information; others applied to the local organizers of radio-listening groups or to the county emergency-school chairmen for information about courses and enrolling. In cases where persons wrote to our representative at the station, their inquiries were referred to the person responsible for the organization of listening groups in the home counties. Where inquiries were made in the counties, naturally they were answered by the local emergency-school authorities.

I do not believe that I exaggerate when I say that perhaps half of those whose names are listed as enrollees in the radio-college courses have enrolled without personal solicitation from the radio organizers, but I do not believe that these people would have enrolled if the personal-solicitation work had not been carried on. My point is this. The personal-solicitation work enabled the radio organizers to explain what radio junior-college work was. The persons contacted talked to their friends, the word was passed around, and, finally, when newspaper announcements appeared, they were read with interest and more understanding.

If any of this group ever want to test the saying that we see what we want to see, try to enlist an interest in adult education in your home community by newspaper announcements alone.

I do not wish to deprecate the value of newspaper publicity—it has helped our work immeasurably—but only after some of the personal contact work that I have mentioned. After this work was done, newspaper publicity began to count.

I have discussed briefly our attempts, in part successful, to build up enrollments in this work, but I have left until last two of the most important features; namely, the descriptive outlines prepared and the excellent work before the microphone by the professors of Ohio State University, who, already loaded down with their regular courses, gave freely of their time in preparing syllabuses and in broadcasting the courses. The old saying about asking a busy man to do a task if you want it well done is well exemplified by the work of those who taught over the air.

Never have we received a word about these professors but praise, and I am absolutely positive, from the number of complaining letters we receive as a matter of routine, that if these radio instructors had ever split an infinitive, we would have received some sort of communication concerning the incident.

Our brief experience with radio junior-college work has indicated that there are four important steps in developing listening groups. First, secure the services of some person locally—I mean in each county—who is qualified to do organization and promotion work in education. See that this person is sponsored in his work by an interested and respected committee of local school men and other community leaders. Then, through personal contacts at first, and later through newspaper and other publicity, see that an ample opportunity is given for people to know about what is to be done. Those who have been contacted will have a “sense of belonging” after they have read the publicity or have heard an announcement. Second, be sure that syllabuses or interesting guides are available for distribution, and that they are distributed before the course begins. Also, have the course material arranged so that a person who misses one or two lessons, or a person who begins to listen after a few lessons, will not feel lost. Third, when possible, arrange for group-discussion periods at some central place, where social as well as academic values may be secured by those who partici-

pate. Fourth, select the instructors most carefully, for not all persons make the best impression before a microphone.

I feel that we have been weakest in developing a sound method of selling the idea of radio education through personal contacts and in the development of the discussion groups. The publicity about the work of the Emergency Radio Junior College has been ample and satisfactory in most cases. The syllabuses have been well written and have been distributed in most cases previous to the time the courses began. The instructors, as I have mentioned before, have in all cases won the interest and friendship of the listeners. However, when I look at a map of Ohio showing the distribution of enrollments for radio-college work in the various counties of the state, I find that the enrollments vary considerably and in no logical manner. In some cases, these enrollments are low because it is almost impossible to receive Station WOSU with any degree of success. In other cases, the only reason that I can give is that the local contacts and organization activities have failed. For example, in too many instances adjoining counties vary as much as ten to one in the number of enrollees they have in this work. One of the most distant counties in Ohio from Station WOSU has 136 listeners enrolled, while one county which adjoins Franklin County, where WOSU is located, has but one registered listener.

This condition presents in a way a challenge to us in the Emergency Schools Administration. If this work is to be continued, we must discover why it is that certain radio organizers seemingly have failed in their work. Granted that they all have tried hard, possibly the difficulty is that they did not know how to do the necessary contact work which was so successfully carried on in other counties. In the future, I hope that we will be able to bring these various radio teachers or organizers into some central place where they may be given a training course in the best methods of enrolling listening groups, where they may exchange ideas and learn of the more successful methods used by some of the radio teachers in the state.

Although the enrollments for radio-college courses have increased over 100 per cent since the work started, and although

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

I believe the work is well justified with only eleven hundred or twelve hundred enrollees, I still believe that we have just scratched the surface so far as reaching the many thousands of potential listeners who may be interested in securing a partial education over the air. In the future, we hope to select and train these radio organizers more carefully, and I hope that if I have the opportunity to tell about the work of the Emergency Radio Junior College next year at this time, I will be able to point with pride to ten thousand enrollees instead of two thousand.

MR. TYSON:

Is this work supported entirely out of Federal funds?

MR. BRYANT:

The instructors at the University are not paid. They have contributed their services with one or two exceptions. Organizers in the various counties quite often, as the quarter goes on, have been used as part-time instructors in various phases of adult education, but for at least a month most of them have worked full time for \$15 a week.

MR. TYSON:

Do you send them from Columbus?

MR. BRYANT:

They are appointed from the communities. They are principals and superintendents out of jobs who have had a little sales or promotion experience.

MR. ENGEL:

What devices do county organizers use in doing follow-up work with students who have enrolled? Is contact made from time to time, or are they left to their own initiative to carry on?

MR. BRYANT:

In some counties the organizer gets the listeners together, perhaps by inviting them all to his home or to the Court House on some Saturday afternoon to organize a little club. Perhaps they are studying French; he will talk to them and get them to select a leader out of their own group and possibly have progressive meetings—one Friday the group will meet at his home, and so on. The leader probably has been a teacher and will have questions prepared, and the members of the group will discuss the questions which occurred to them during the week. Perhaps they will decide to speak only in French during these meetings. Such meetings have academic as well as social values. Quite often these organizers take the initiative in getting groups together with

the hope that the group leader later will handle the group. Groups are lined up on subject interest.

MR. ENGEL:

Is there some compulsion for the county organizers to keep a certain number of students enrolled regularly?

MR. BRYANT:

There has not been enough compulsion. I sometimes wonder if we can justify paying some of these people although in most cases the situation solves itself. After a reasonable time, most men who are not successful at this work admit their weakness and ask to be released.

MR. McCARTY (Station WHA, Wisconsin State Station, Madison):

How many courses are broadcast?

MR. BRYANT:

Eight courses.

MR. HANSEN (Station WHA, Wisconsin State Station, Madison):

Do you ask any final reports from students so that you can tell whether or not they are playing "hooky"?

MR. BRYANT:

No. Of course, if listeners write in and ask for material, we know that they are interested and have been listening. We give these announcements two or three times, however. By that time they ought to be able to know what is going on, and out of the six hundred registered at the present time we have possibly three hundred in advanced French. It was the same as the course in advanced French given at the University, and from this advanced course at the present time one hundred fifty examination papers were received. I should mention, however, that the marks on the same examination as that given to students at the University ranged from 100 per cent down to 32 per cent. Outside of that we have no check on listening.

MR. HANSEN:

Do you supply material to people who have missed it? At Wisconsin, we have such requests. Do you do that?

MR. LEPHART (Junior Radio College, Station WOSU, Ohio State University):

No, full lectures are not written up. The outline, however, is furnished to anyone who has missed a lecture.

MR. McCARTY:

How much money is being used to finance this project, where does it come from, and how can we get some like it in Wisconsin?

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

MR. LEPHART:

During the first quarter of this academic year, we used \$1,610; in the second quarter the amount increased to \$2,140; and the cost will be the same this quarter. These figures include salaries and all mimeograph supplies, envelopes, printing, and so forth.

MR. RIES:

What would these figures be if you included that allocated to the station?

MR. HIGGY (Station WOSU, Ohio State University):

We do not make any definite budget for that type of thing. This program is just one phase of our complete operation.

MR. RIES:

When you are figuring costs you must figure the allocated cost of operating your station. May I ask an additional question? You have no postage cost because you used franked envelopes. What would be the comparative cost of reaching the same number of people by mail, and would it not be more economical to limit the audience you have?

MR. McCARTY:

I should like to answer Mr. Ries's question. He intimated that because of a limited audience this type of teaching might be carried on more economically by correspondence than by radio. You see, we are holding to a quality standard. If any single listener were deprived of radio service he might otherwise get, then I say that might be a proper question, but in consideration of the duplication of radio services available on the dial at any time of day, can we not abandon part of our service to do a little experimenting along the line?

MR. TYSON:

I do not think Mr. Ries was suggesting that it was not a proper way of doing this thing, but he was curious to know which was the more costly way of doing it.

MR. RIES:

I was asking for information. I would like to have the comparison made.

MR. ENGEL:

I do not think your stated enrollments include all the true listeners anyway. You are sending out examination questions only to people who ask for them. For example, the man in charge of that phase of our work at WHA told me that over 50 per cent of those who had written in for examinations had never enrolled for the courses. How many more there are listening we do not know.

MR. BRYANT:

I believe I can amplify that experience since I have been working in the field in Ohio. We have five regular field men, and they run into cases where

dozens of people are listening and have never even written to receive the syllabuses. They do not know, perhaps, that we have them available. The mail is heavy some weeks. I believe I can make a conservative estimate that there are three times as many people listening as we actually know about.

MR. TYSON:

Mr. Bush, since you are one of the directors of the Ohio Radio Education Association, will you tell us something of its activities?

MR. BUSH (Ohio Radio Education Association):

As Dr. Upham has said the Ohio Radio Education Association is in a formative stage. Others who have spoken have indicated clearly the importance of a needed and powerful effort to turn the attention of the people of the United States, by education, in the direction of thinking in avenues calculated to preserve our American form of government. Adult education, largely, seems to me to offer the best avenue for such activity. Social and economic problems are uppermost in the minds of the people, and while education in other directions might well be interspersed with social and economic matters, I do not think we will have much trouble in getting an audience. I believe that broadcasting stations will be glad to assist in this work.

TECHNIQUES CLINIC

● **MERRILL DENISON**

JOURNALIST AND DRAMATIST

● **C. L. MENSER**

CENTRAL DIVISION, NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY

MISS WALLER:

Mr. Merrill Denison, who was responsible for the dramatic programs which were sponsored successfully by the Canadian National Railways, and Mr. C. L. Menser, head of the Production Department of the National Broadcasting Company at Chicago, will play for you a number of transcriptions and records which have been sent in to us and will comment on the broadcasting techniques used in them.

MR. DENISON:

Mr. Menser and I are in an unhappy position. We two experts are committed to discuss techniques with you, but I am afraid that we have undertaken a rather delicate task. We have taken records at random and propose to speak frankly of them and in the main unfairly, I think, because neither of us knows the limitations under which these records were prepared—there are always

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

limitations which hamper radio production. When I was an architectural student, I remember going into a new building with one of my teachers and saying to him, "What do you think of this? Isn't it pretty good?" I have never forgotten his reply, "Never discuss or criticize an architect's work until you know his problems." The same holds true here, but since there would be no discussion if we held to that maxim, we must proceed.

Record No. 1—Our Canadian Neighbors
A geography lesson broadcast for the intermediate grades

MR. DENISON:

My own feeling about this program, knowing Canada as well as I do—the country, you know, of the quintuplets, the mounties, and other interesting national features—is that this record we have just heard is an almost perfect example of classroom dullness. That type of lesson may have worked well in the old days of the little red schoolhouse when they got the boys and girls in a room and locked the front door, and nothing save a fire or epidemic could get them out. You may or may not agree with me, but if I had listened to that lesson as a student in a school, I am much afraid it would have turned me against Canada for life. Here is a subject that can be made absorbing and interesting, but except for the little bit in the John Charles Thomas manner in the beginning, where the professor goes to visit his mother, no attempt seems to have been made to arouse the interest of the students. A professional record that has no educational intention at all but deals with travel in a different way will be played later, and I want you to contrast the two.

It is my own theory of radio and education that if education is to use this medium successfully, it must adapt itself to the medium. There evidently are two different problems in the educational broadcast. There is the educational program that is broadcast for use in the classroom; this is simply an extension of the teacher's method except that one teacher is able to speak to a great number of classrooms at one time. There is the educational program that tries to compete with other programs on the air; quite evidently, the educational program that is in competition with hour-by-hour commercial and sustaining programs has to be of a different kind than the program which is broadcast into the schoolroom. My comments apply more to the program that seeks a general audience than to the program that is written and broadcast for the school. I admit that it is unfair to judge these programs by standards they were never intended to meet, but the only basis upon which we can discuss them seems to me to be the professional basis.

Record No. 2—A Lesson on Hamlet
A literature lesson broadcast by a dramatic school

MR. DENISON:

This record starts with a synopsis of what has gone before, and then takes the story up where the preceding lesson ended. The question in my mind is,

Is there not a more interesting way to do this? Again I feel that the interest of only the most industrious students would have held through that introduction. Why be trite and obvious in a medium which lends itself so intensively to all kinds of devices? It seems that some effort might be made to vary monotony. In a later broadcast you will hear another presentation of Hamlet done in an entirely different manner, and you may contrast the two.

Record No. 3—Story Plays and Rhythmics

A broadcast for the pupils of the primary grades

MR. MENSER:

The "Smile Lady" is the name of this program. I think there are several things wrong with it, some rather deep-seated. Did you catch the fundamentally somber tone in this girl's voice? She has a half-tone slide which you hear in hospitals. So long as that exists, it will be hard to make this a smile program. Either change the voice, or change the girl, I should say. I do not know why she is in there; there may be perfectly good reasons. As Mr. Denison has said, we do not know the reason why these records were made.

I should like to call your attention to another characteristic of this record which is rather fundamental I think; if I am wrong, I should like to be told so. This young lady was attempting to get action on the part of her audience, yet I am sure all of you kept your seats. You did not show any of the spirit; you did not get up and dance; and I question whether the children felt inclined to. I have always held that the prime purpose of the minister was to instill fire into his congregation. I think the teacher needs to do much the same thing. I think the broadcaster needs to do it. This record lacks depth; the thing she is doing lacks the third dimension as a great deal of broadcasting does. Sometime we are going to wake up abruptly to the fact that there is no such thing as an audience of millions but audiences of one. The whole approach must be on a different psychological basis. The response must be different. I am afraid this record leaves out of account the fact that when you are talking to people as individuals, the audience is of one and two, settled all in the front row, and you have a different problem than when you are talking to a crowd as a crowd. Some of these days we are going to broadcast to individuals as individuals, and then we shall achieve personal interest.

Record No. 4—A St. Patrick's Day Program

MR. KALTENBORN:

Was that a different kind of record? It came over better than anything we have had.

MR. MENSER:

It is an aluminum record. Perhaps these others have been played too many times to give a clear tone. This kind of record can be used only a few times.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

Three types of recording will be displayed during this demonstration—two by direct process, one made on aluminum and the other on wax. Either of these can be played only a certain number of times. The third is made like a Victor record and of course has better quality. Without regard to quality, however, a record takes what the microphone gives it, and if a record is bad—and I am not speaking of tone quality, for after all, the record takes what it is given—probably the broadcast was not a great deal better.

MR. RIES:

I do not know how many times these records have been played. They left our hands after having been played once.

MR. MENSER:

They have been played three times then to our knowledge. I am not a technician; so I cannot tell you about the process.

MR. DARROW:

Did you use the soft steel needle on those first recordings?

MR. MENSER:

After carefully reading not to use steel needles on these, we used the soft needles.

MR. RIES:

The first was played with the thorn needle. That was why you got that worn effect.

MR. MENSER:

This last record does bring up an interesting point which has been proposed many times on many stations, the community-sing program. I personally am from Missouri, and I think it is going to be hard to get some one on the microphone who can get me, in front of my loud-speaker, to burst forth with song. However, if the *Star Spangled Banner* were played now, you would probably be polite enough to stand up, and some who knew the words would join in because you are here in a crowd. I question whether it is possible to get any great number of people as individuals to sing by the use of the radio.

MR. DENNISON:

What the last speaker brings up is interesting. You can never generalize. Mr. Menser is speaking about radio in general. Its audience is made up of millions of one or two listeners. It is quite evident that this is not true in school broadcasting. There you have groups of thirty and over.

All rules in radio are much like the rules for starting to write a short story—have a lot of clean white paper and sharp pencils—too simple and helpful. Most rules for writing for the radio are the same: use short sentences and simple words. Later on, we are going to play a record of Mr. Woollcott, and I

want you to listen, remembering all the rules on broadcasting you have heard. Mr. Woollcott is a charming speaker; he uses long involved sentences, big words, but in spite of it all, he invariably is interesting. Mr. Kaltenborn has a style of his own; Hill, another; Thomas, another; Hard, another. In short, it is dangerous to be dogmatic.

Record No. 5—An Art Appreciation Lesson
A broadcast for the pupils in Grades Six to Nine

MR. DENISON:

Now that program or lesson, whichever it is, tries to teach art appreciation. I do not know what age boys and girls are supposed to be listening to that, but the problem is not one of radio; it is simply a matter of teaching. You are concerned with three things here, the organization of material, writing it, and speaking it. Off-hand, I should say everything was wrong. I cannot imagine treating such a vital, exciting subject as the Renaissance in a worse possible way. And yet what are we criticizing? Is it the use of this medium, or is it the approach of the individual who was doing that job? I think the problem comes down to this: the radio is certainly a mass medium, and the writing techniques that hold in newspaper work and in the magazine world should hold for radio, too. The first obligation is to be interesting, to give high lights to the material so that it will interest and hold attention.

Record No. 6—A Science Lesson

MR. MENSER:

This is a science lesson with which there seems to me to be a number of things wrong. I believe you will all agree with that. From the point of view of a commercial broadcaster, of course, it is just impossible. The only reason he would have for putting a broadcast of that sort on the air would be that he did not have anything else to use in that fifteen minutes.

Mr. Denison and I were called upon to judge a record by its quality and performance, ignorant of any extenuating circumstances which might explain its quality. Our ignorance of these circumstances does not alter the fact that the record is bad, and I hope we shall be forgiven for calling attention to it. I think the voice was uninteresting and unpleasant. What is going to be done about that? I do not know, but I have an idea it will be taken care of in the same way that we get along with unpleasant people in the world. I think one of the prime things we must note about any of these records or programs, whether it be recorded or broadcast directly, is whether it is appreciably successful in doing the thing it sets out to do, and I question whether this, as a science course, successfully would teach science. Again I may be all wrong.

Record No. 7—Have You Any Special Talents?

This lesson is taken from a series of 23 vocational-guidance programs designed to acquaint young people with the most important problems concerned with choosing a voca-

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

tion. The aim in this particular lesson was to show that even though one has a special talent, it will avail little unless it is assiduously cultivated. This idea was developed through the medium of a dramatic sketch based on the experience of an actual boy, Joe Ehrhardt, who made a model airplane that won first prize in a national flying contest. In the international contest he also won first prize—the Wakefield Cup. The sketch showed Joe's struggles in making the plane, and also portrayed the exciting contest.

MR. MENSER:

That is a record of the American School of the Air, Columbia Broadcasting System. It is produced, I expect, with professional broadcasting help and under close supervision of educators. I should say that this is the best record that we have played so far. I do not see how you could bring any more competent professional elements in the picture than exist in this program. I do not know whether we have chosen a typical one or not, but it presents many methods that cannot be used unless you have a great deal of money. The reason for playing it is that it is professional. Most of the programs we have heard so far would be classified, I think, as amateur radio productions.

Record No. 8—The Household Finance New Year's Program

This is a record showing how an unusual idea may be worked out in a radio program to get immediate attention. The letters of the words "Happy New Year, E.A.G." (the initials of Edgar A. Guest) were given in Morse code, first by a telegraph instrument, then by the orchestra playing in the same rhythm, the whole blended together so that the orchestration of these code letters made a complete orchestral composition.

MR. MENSER:

We come now to a number of recordings that were arranged for audiences, for commercial clients and, in a couple of cases, trick records. The first is an aluminum recording taken off the air during the broadcast for the Household Finance New Year's Program. We have it here to show you that in spite of all criticism and comments to the contrary, we do go to great lengths in our attempt to present interesting things, to seize the attention immediately, and to change effects often enough to hold attention without any more effort than is necessary on the part of the listener. The New Year's greeting in code sent to the short-wave operators of the world is orchestrated. In other words, each letter in "Happy New Year" is spelled out in Morse code with the sounding instrument. It is an unusual idea, and I thought you might be interested in it for that reason. I think it is a novel opening, a good attention-getter.

Record No. 9—The Conoco Program

This music and drama program with a narrator who explained that each week there would be a dramatization of the "Travel Log" is declared winner in a contest. The program proceeds through narrative and dramatic flashes of separate themes to tell the story of a trip made by two families to the Ozark mountains.

MR. MENSER:

As another example of a good opening I should like to present a part of an audition that was built for Conoco. In my opinion the commercial aspect of some of our programs lies pretty close to the fundamental problems of educators. Because people travel in automobiles, they buy gasoline; and Conoco came to us for an idea to stimulate travel. We attempted by this device to get attention immediately. If you do not mind, I will jump the musical part as many of you have heard it a good many times. The speaker, of course, came into prominence in the early days of radio because of the particular quality in his voice. The scenes along the way in the mountains of Arkansas are dramatized. The record is about one third music and the rest conversation, dramatization, and so on.

Record No. 10—The Truth Serum

This dramatization combines entertainment in the form of a mystery story with educational elements intended to acquaint the general audience with the work of the crime-detection laboratory at Northwestern University. The recording opens with a quick flash showing a crime being committed. A detective is then brought in to pick up various clues and arrive at a conclusion about which the audience already knows. It is arranged in this order to get attention immediately.

MR. MENSER:

Here again, we attempted to bring to the public, primarily for entertainment and for sales purposes, the story of this laboratory which is conducted by Colonel Goddard. He is head of the Northwestern laboratory and is a broadcaster by profession. You may debate whether or not his introduction to this episode is sound radio. I think there are two things to consider definitely in that connection. When some one comes to me at Chicago with an idea for a radio program, I am concerned with two things: first of all, is the person who comes important enough so that no matter what he says or how it is treated it will be of general interest, or is the material he has important enough and can it be treated in such a way that it can be made interesting regardless of who he is. We thought it wise to put Colonel Goddard in this, because he is the authority.

On another record we have recordings of Eddie Rickenbacker in an aviation series. He talks much more poorly than he flies. It is always a question of whether or not the authority should be used. Incidentally, there is a question for the editor: whether the person who knows most about a subject is best able to disseminate it in a radio program.

Record No. 11—The Movie Theater

MR. MENSER:

This is a program we hope to sell. It is a pet program of mine built on a simple formula of pure entertainment. It attempts to present a complete routine of a de luxe movie in a half-hour program in your home and to follow

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

it right through from the opening overture to the news reel, stage show, the feature film with music score in the background, and a reminiscent program of old songs at the end. I do not know why somebody has not done it before. I should like you to bear in mind the criterion I mentioned awhile ago when you hear this. Does the program do what it is supposed to do? Does it have depth for you? If it propels you in your mind into the atmosphere of a large movie house, then it has done what we hoped.

I shall not play all this record. I think it is only fair to call attention to certain features. I am much interested in the smoothness with which this show proceeds from one phase to another. A presentation of this type has variety, and so far as the buyer is concerned, it has the laudable quality of allowing him to bring in his sales talk without making it too blatant. Mr. Denison and I now will welcome any brickbats any one wants to throw at our random comments on any of these records.

MR. McCARTY:

I should like to throw the first one and ask for a more detailed criticism of the vocational-guidance program. It is not sufficient to say one program is professional, another amateur; one is good, another bad. Could we not have more detailed criticism of that professional program?

MISS JOHNSON:

I chose the vocational-guidance program especially, because I wanted to get the comments of this group. That script as you noticed was slangy. I objected to it strenuously, but the committee insisted that was the type of presentation they wanted because they were dealing with a new problem, broadcasting for children and not adults. I am sorry it could not have been played through to the end because you would realize that the subject-matter was brought out grossly. Now vocational guidance is one subject you can treat that way. You cannot so treat literature, history, or any of the other subjects taught in school, but this one must appeal to the interest of the child; we put it on in this manner because we wanted to compete with such programs as Webb Davis and others of that type.

MR. DARROW:

We need to keep a few things in mind in criticizing broadcasts. Although educators often are too sure of themselves, it is not for the broadcasting fraternity to become too sure of itself and its standpoint. Education by radio is new, and the broadcasters may grow as thick-headed as the educators have grown. Those people whose lives are spent in peppering things up so that the appetites of people will accept the new things are apt to develop a formula; we spread mustard and spread it thicker than the meat. The only answer is more mustard. I hate to see the time come when an interesting story well told

ceases to be interesting, when it must be shot through with elements that do not belong there. I was glad to have you hear the first record because I think that six years and better of such broadcasts prove conclusively that the children do not agree with the criticisms made here. Since they are not so old as the critics and I, and have not had so many experiences, the children are quite happy to have something told as interestingly as the story on the first record was told. I will admit frankly to both Mr. Denison and Mr. Menser that my idea of geography in the first place was strictly one of dramatization or travelogue, but I soon found that the series to which this recording belongs was "clicking" with the school audience. The story-teller has organized the subject-matter so that it does carry, so I stand firmly in favor of the broadcast.

Now concerning the criticism of the Smile Lady, I am uncertain of the truth of it. We need to keep in mind that the children have a fresher ear; we older folks get too accustomed to things. I know, for instance, that the average newspaper drama critic cannot criticize for me. He sees right through the front into the machinery of the play. He often goes away in disgust, whereas I and millions like me enjoy the motion picture or stage play.

We were commenting on the vocational-guidance recording. Knowing the high class of most of the programs broadcast by the American School of the Air, I am tempted to think I would approve if I had heard it through. But in the first portion, I thought there was more strawberry shortcake than I had time for. We must remember that even though the broadcasters are not trying to carry a full load of teaching in any particular subject, teachers would be severely criticized if they covered only one-third of the subject-matter they were assigned in the school course.

MRS. GRUENBERG:

I think that particular vocational program, even if we did not hear it all through, is unsound from start to finish in the psychology and in the presentation of what it is trying to teach. I do not know who the educators or the professionals are who were responsible for it, but I happen to know something about boys. I think the program is poor.

MISS JOHNSON:

I am glad to have this comment, because we are no better judges of it than you are. In the first place, I want to tell you that this program was arranged and carried out by the vocational-guidance committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education. Sixteen prominent vocational-guidance teachers co-operated in its arrangement. It is purely experimental; that is why I chose it. I want to take your criticisms back to that committee and I think Mr. Tyson will be as interested in them as I am.

MR. BUCKLEY:

I was glad to hear that generalization on the part either of school people or of broadcasters is dangerous to the welfare of both. I have had college pro-

fessors who were interesting—I will just recall one who is not living, John Hopkins Greenwald. I am sure that the course he gave in *Macbeth* would not go on the radio, and yet I should not respect Mr. Greenwald or anything he ever did if he had attempted to modify his classroom method of presenting that play to a group of young people so it would fit anything illustrated here on the radio. He was a great teacher. I think we ought to quit calling all professors dull. We have been experimenting with the radio in the classrooms for seven years at Cleveland, and we know there are many teachers in the elementary schools and colleges who are not dull. On the other hand, I found some of them extremely brilliant. Certain phases of work in education cannot grow with bass drums and tawdry, cheap, slapstick methods. The generalization that all college professors are dull is dangerous for us to bandy about. Some of them are; some in the commercial programs are exceedingly dull, while others are good.

MRS. GRUENBERG:

What I object to is the bringing of no ingenuity or creative aspects to this medium. I would like to remind you of some things Mr. Crane said when he set up a scheme for radio. Superimposed boards of control have often been made up of such people as those in this highly respectable group of vocational advisers. Apparently we all agree that there was too much strawberry shortcake.

MR. MENSER:

I would like to say a word in defense of strawberry shortcake. I think some of you are missing a great point here in the attempt to be strictly academic. You show it by the assumption, passive perhaps, but none the less important, that because a thing is popular and light there must be something wrong with it. If in a thirty-minute program we talk twenty minutes about strawberry shortcake, and it helps us to come to the conclusion with a bang in the end, then I think it is right to talk about strawberry shortcake. You cannot build up a mood without details.

If we are effective we must strike the fundamentals and tell our story in swift strokes because we attempt to do in thirty minutes what other mediums attempt to take hours and hours to do. I agree with the opinion that it is better to cut out too much comedy but do keep carefully in mind that wholesome comedy properly spotted will do more to color the picture and get the proper emotional responses than an overstuffed weighty statement thrown into the same position.

MR. BARTLETT:

I think most of us agree substantially with Mr. Menser that there should be some interest element in every educational broadcast. I think we agree equally well that some of you commercial men are using it in excess. For example,

we had this year a program in which the object was to interest people in outdoor life in New York state, to get them out in the woods to camp, hunt, and fish. In order to catch attention, we wanted to use some kind of fanfare. We managed to get a live rattlesnake who was imprisoned in a glass case. We took him into the studio, and if anyone would walk toward the case this rattlesnake began to rattle; the sounds were unusually good for radio. We invited a number of people to come to the studio and listen to the broadcast. At the conclusion of the program the rattlesnake again was put near the microphone; someone walked toward him and he started to rattle. Seven out of ten of the listeners recognized the sound and wanted to see the snake. Yet that program was not satisfactory at all for there are few snakes in New York state. Educationally speaking, we were using the wrong fanfare, and the program did not reach the air. It seems to me in our discussion of children's programs and of dramas, we should make a definite point, that many of the commercial men in radio too frequently are putting too many high spots in what they are doing. Life is not that way. We are attempting to get in points of interest at the expense of good substantial content. Could not we educational broadcasters adopt in part the interest factors that these professional broadcasters have been speaking about, and can we not contribute something to them by insisting that there should be some basic content there in its proper proportion? That, I think, is a modest proposal, but it is something few of us have done.

MR. DARROW:

We have said for years we would rather the schools would not listen to programs unless they know what is coming, the purpose, who the teacher is, and the objective of the particular lesson; we also have said constantly that the greatest possible preparation of the class for broadcastings which may come to them by radio is that the teachers raise their interest in what is to come, their curiosity, their desire to know. If I were going to talk on the street corner or talk to some particular group who had been anticipating my comments for some time, it would be an entirely different talk even on the same subject. Your people are more like the street-corner audience, and you have to keep them from turning away. Let us keep in mind that the distinct advantage of the classroom audience is that it is organized, is young, is less sophisticated, and is listening to a program which is more dramatic than ordinary classroom teaching.

MR. MILLER:

It seems to me that quite a bit of this talk indicates that showmanship is, in itself, entirely an education. At the University of Chicago, we are getting new experiences in the need for showmanship. We have what is called the "New Plan," and one part of it makes it unnecessary for students to sit in the classroom if the instructor is not giving them something so vitally interesting,

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

so different, that they feel their time that they have spent in the classroom is giving them more than time spent with the textbook. In other words, in building programs, I make a special effort to find a teacher who has natural ability to hold the attention of his class whether they must remain in the classroom or not. We have built our programs on the hypothesis that we are interested not so much in planting into the program the greatest amount of factual material but rather in stimulating the interest of the listeners in the broad general field being discussed. We do not care whether we put across as many points if we can stimulate interest. I wonder if there is not a fundamental difference: Is the fundamental purpose of an educational program to stimulate interest or to present maximum content?

MR. TRACY TYLER:

I think most of us in the field of education understand the relationship between the specific techniques and the determination of the general policies. It seems to me in connection with the plan presented by Mr. Crane that the radio board is to determine the general policies just as in the case of a city public-school board of education.¹ It employs a superintendent and he, in turn, employs supervisors and teachers in the same manner as the committee which had in its hands the preparation of the program in vocational guidance, to which we listened, might have been selected. The plan proposed by the National Committee on Education by Radio has as its intention a system, the control of which should be in the hands of these national, regional, and state boards. Of course, as indicated by the broadcasting companies, the specific jobs will be done by technicians, but what shall be the general principles that will be decided by the boards? An answer might help those who are not closely in touch with the general method of handling education.

MR. DENISON:

A definite technique is required just as a technique is required in writing or in driving an automobile, and a great number of the points that have been brought up seem to me to be beside the point. The only thing that I actually have suggested is that radio is a technical medium that requires a certain amount of technical knowledge for its use. I have said that most professors are dull, most teaching is dull, and I stick to it. I have known great and magnificent teachers, and I think they were all master showmen. I am satisfied that that was one of the qualities that made them great teachers. Now we do not know a great deal more than any of you do, but in spite of our dogmatic statements, we have a humility of approach which I do not think an educator ever has toward anything. I think, perhaps, that our dogmatism has been unconsciously a defense mechanism. As to education by radio, I think that America might be better off if you would let non-academic interests take control and have seventy-five-per cent strawberry shortcake. The result could not be

¹ See pp. 123-24.

much worse than that by educators who have had control for one hundred and fifty years in this country. I think in the elementary- and high-school systems and the universities the American educational system turns out extraordinarily uneducated people. I believe that the newspaper man or the magazine writer is usually better equipped to use so tenuous a medium as the radio because he knows how to interest his audience, and I believe it is essential.

MR. RIES:

I want to present a resolution, and I am going to ask our chairman to step down and permit me to ask for a motion. I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the chairman and to the members of the committee that organized this three-day session. We know the time, the effort involved in preparing a program as comprehensive as this one has been. I would like to be able to mention by name each individual who has contributed to what has been for me, and I hope for all of us, a stimulating time of discussion. Let us express our appreciation by standing (The vote was unanimous.).

MR. CHARTERS (Ohio State University):

We appreciate the statement that Mr. Ries has given and which has been approved by you. As a matter of fact it is really not at all hard to get up a program like this. All the committee has to do is to pick out good speakers and then sit back and let them entertain the audience. That is the simple rule, is it not, Mr. Tyson?

MR. TYSON:

Correct.

MR. CHARTERS:

I have enjoyed this meeting very much. Frankly, I have not been under any strain. All the work has been done by Miss Richards and Miss Frost. Mr. Tyson and I are responsible for getting the speakers, but the rest has been done by the two young ladies and when you divide work, it becomes easy for every one. All a program committee has to do is to retain a sweet disposition, and everything goes along fine. Would you like to say a word, Mr. Tyson?

MR. TYSON:

I could not do it more gracefully than you have.

REPORTS OF THE

NATIONAL ADVISORY

COUNCIL ON RADIO

IN EDUCATION

ANNUAL REPORTS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

● LEVERING TYSON

To the Members of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education:

There is submitted herewith my report to the Board of Directors describing the activities of the Council office since the Assembly held at Chicago in October, 1934. In view of the relatively short period since this meeting and for the purpose of continuing the record, brief mention only will be made of the progress of former and established activities. As is customary I have again taken the liberty of adding a few personal observations on the current educational-broadcasting scene.

MEMBERSHIP

It is with deep regret that the deaths are recorded of two active members, Professor Michael I. Pupin and Mrs. C. Cary Rumsey. Professor Pupin, one of the prominent and most influential persons in the field of radio-telephony had been interested in the development of broadcasting as an instrumentality in education for nearly two decades; to this the Director can testify from personal knowledge. The place he occupied in the scientific world, his eminence as an educator, and his lovable and yet forthright character made him one of the most distinguished counselors in our membership. As one of the charter members of the Council his advice had been of continuous and continuing value, and his death has forced us to face a correspondingly heavy loss. Mrs. Rumsey, one of the outstanding women of her generation, was always connected with activities which influenced the public welfare. She showed no hesitation in supporting her firm beliefs whenever and wherever such support was requested and indicated as of potential helpfulness.

She quickly recognized the effect upon society in general which the radio might exert, and her concern over the possibilities inherent in it for advancing the public interest were always uppermost in her mind.

In addition to these two active members, the Director must record also the loss of Mr. F. Hillis Lumley, of the Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, whose tragic disappearance while on a vacation walking tour in the late summer of 1934 caused his friends and colleagues much sorrow. Mr. Lumley was a young man who had devoted his high intellectual capacity to a study of educational broadcasting, particularly its scientific research possibilities. He had won for himself the affection and respect of all with whom he came in contact. It is the general feeling that his was one of the best minds that had begun to consider the larger phases of the subject, and his analytical thinking will be missed sorely by broadcasters and by educators alike. It is fitting to note, among other studies which he had completed, his most significant book, *Measurement in Radio*, published by Ohio State University, April, 1934. This was a distinct contribution toward the solution of the fast-growing problem of measuring the effect of broadcast programs on the intangible yet very real American listening audience.

Resignations were received during the year from Dr. Max Farrand and Dr. Irwin Stewart, the latter of whom was appointed to the newly formed Federal Communications Commission. Miss Jessie Gray retired from the presidency of the National Education Association, to be succeeded by Mr. Henry Lester Smith. Miss Belle Sherwin is no longer president of the National League of Women Voters. Acceptances of active membership were received from Mother Antonia, president of the College of St. Catherine; Dr. Robert C. Clothier, president of Rutgers University; Dr. W. A. Jessup, president of the Carnegie Foundation; and Dr. Henry W. Wriston, president of Lawrence College.

Various changes in committee memberships have been made, but they need not be recorded here. The Director wishes to thank

the officers, active members, and those who constitute the committees of the Council for advice and assistance which, without exception, has been forthcoming immediately on request.

FINANCES

As a result of recommendations made by an informal committee appointed by the President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York after a conference called by him in the spring of 1934, all duly recorded in last year's report, appropriations were made to continue the work of the Council. In the fall of 1934, the Trustees of the Carnegie Corporation of New York made available two grants, one for maintenance over a period of three years, and one for experimentation and demonstration projects, whenever like sums were provided from other sources. As a result of this action the Board of Directors of the Council has budgeted the first-mentioned appropriation to extend over the three-year period indicated, and from time to time will consider proposals which, in co-operation with other organizations, will advance the solution of problems of educational broadcasting.

NEW HEADQUARTERS

A year or more ago it was evident that if the momentum gained by the Council continued to increase, more spacious offices would be required to house its records and provide additional room for continuing its various activities. The expiration of the lease of its original headquarters suggested a change. A somewhat similar situation faced the American Association for Adult Education so that a logical rearrangement of the space occupied by both, combining certain services which could be made communal, such as telephone, library, conference, shipping and mailing, and the like, was proposed. As a result both organizations are now housed in more commodious quarters adjacent to each other on one floor of the same building where each was formerly located. In addition to providing better accommodations for many inquiring students and visitors, it is now possible to organize and expand in workable shape the increasing volume of book and pamphlet literature on the subject

of broadcasting, and to facilitate other operations which were badly handicapped in the former offices. However, above all this, close proximity to sources of information concerning adult-education ventures of many kinds, all represented in the activities of the American Association for Adult Education, has a distinct and unusual usefulness, the value of which is already apparent.

General developments in educational broadcasting are recorded in pages of this report which follow. On reading these it will be evident that, in the year just passed, it would have been futile to make any radical changes in the operations of the Council. It is well to note the progress of various activities, without any particular comment thereon.

PUBLICATIONS

The literature concerning educational broadcasting and various problems connected with it continues to grow with considerable rapidity. There is appended to this report a complete list of publications of the Council or items the publication of which it stimulated.¹

In this connection there should be cited the appearance of a series of notable pamphlets on various phases of educational broadcasting issued by the Radio Institute of the Audible Arts. Members of the Council were responsible for most of these, and full co-operation has been given to the Institute in its attempt to spread information about the better programs.

The demand for authentic knowledge of many aspects of the so-called educational-broadcasting problem is a fairly reliable index of the growing interest in the whole subject. It has many fascinations which intrigue the casual inquirer as well as the serious student of large sociological questions. This condition is reflected in the office of the Council and makes more pressing the question of the publications program we should follow eventually.

The need for a select listing of the better broadcasts has not abated, but because of a growing selective habit on the part of

¹ See pp. 302-3.

the listening audience, this need has increased. Although the daily listings in the press indicate the popular entertainment programs, those of a more serious nature do not receive much attention chiefly because they are not spectacular enough to build up the large audiences which listen to popular radio favorites. Yet if the availability of programs of this type could be made known more generally audiences of considerable size would listen; the experience of the Council with its experimental ventures indicates this clearly. As has been pointed out in previous reports, a publication which could be relied upon to list and describe these programs would be one of the most constructive steps toward an improvement of educational broadcasting.

PROGRAMS

We can be somewhat encouraged over the development of educational programs. There is still plenty of room for improvement, but there are many bright spots.

There are evidences of improvement in techniques, but we are still way behind the popularity records of some commercial programs or of some of the sustaining programs broadcast by the industry. Apparently educators have begun to recognize the faulty techniques for which they have been criticized and because of which they have been so palpably vulnerable.

Advances have been made in the organization of adjuncts to programs which make them more effective. Evidence of this is the better condition, on the whole, of the institutionally owned and operated stations, only a few of which are in the straitened circumstances of a few years ago. The developments in Wisconsin, for example, are indicative of the kind of public-service job this type of station can perform. Other advances have been noted on the Pacific Coast, at the University of Michigan, the broadcasting to schools in Rochester (New York), short-wave station W1XAL at Boston, the ever growing popularity of the University of Chicago Round Table, and the government series of the Council, which received the non-musical sustaining award of the Women's National Radio Committee. These are encouraging signs and indicate a growing understanding of meth-

ods which must be employed in program production if the medium is to be used most competently.

It is still evident that the problem of finances is an enormously important one. The lack of money to do the job and to compete successfully for audiences with elaborate and attractive commercial programs seems almost hopeless. Unfortunately, there is not much chance to get money until there is some general understanding of, and agreement on, country-wide objectives to which local and regional objectives can be fitted, and until controversy over these objectives is eliminated so that a unified plan of procedure can be followed by all.

It is apparent now that no national plan will be workable that does not take account of local possibilities. It will take time to experiment with and develop these. That this is being thought of is evident from proposals for an educational broadcasting unit at Chicago, for the Ohio Radio Education Association, for a radio workshop in New York, for an organization for this purpose on the Pacific Coast, and for a New England Radio Council. These developments, still in embryo, are the result of regional thinking and study of broadcasting possibilities for education.

That the public in general is beginning to realize some of the serious educational uses to which broadcasting can be put is clear from the numerous attempts to organize listening groups. Without any doubt as regional organizations are built up, the listening group will flourish. So far there have been relatively few successful attempts to organize group listening in America.

During the year the Council has continued its program experimentation, and this experience has been the basis for the foregoing statements. The "You and Your Government" series, previously mentioned,¹ continued with the co-operation of the National Municipal League and concerned itself with the subjects "A New Deal in Local Government" during the summer of 1934, "Trends in Government" during the fall, and state legislative problems during a winter in which forty-four of the forty-eight state legislatures were then meeting. Professor Thomas H. Reed, chairman of the Committee on Civic Education by Radio,

¹ *Education and Radio, 1934*, pp. 217-18.

continued his rôle of guiding genius of this prize-winning series. The series in economics, which has continued regularly since the fall of 1931 except for the summer months, was broadcast from early in October until late in May with the co-operation of the League for Industrial Democracy and the Brookings Institution, the general subject being "Economics in a Changing Social Order." The Economics Committee of the Council continued to plan this series, which had a larger following than ever before. The Vocational Guidance Committee of the Council, with the co-operation of the National Occupational Conference, planned and produced a series, largely dramatizations, entitled "The World of Work" which was broadcast each week as an integral part of the American School of the Air. Under the auspices of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the American Federation of Arts, and with the co-operation of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Art Institute of Chicago, and the Museum of Modern Art in New York, as well as many individual museums and organizations throughout the country, the series "Art in America" was concluded several months ago, registering a distinguished success. The second half of this series was rebroadcast on the Pacific coast with the co-operation of many agencies interested in art. With the assistance of grants from the Pollak Foundation two most successful series were broadcast. One, entitled "Doctors, Dollars, and Disease" was concerned with medical economics. The other was called "More for Your Money" and discussed consumers' interests. Both were timely and aroused an enormous public following. In connection with the former two incidents should be noted. First, some officials of the American Medical Association accused the Council of conducting propaganda in favor of a system of socialized medicine, and certain state medical associations passed resolutions of censure, some of them before the series started! Second, a national network refused to allow incidental mention of the word "syphilis" in this series, to the great concern of the Committee in charge and to many public-health officials. The American Bar Association again co-operated with the Council in a continuation of its series "The Lawyer and the Public."

The Intercollegiate Council also continued its successful broadcasting of the year before by organizing three short series, designed particularly to interest young people, on the general subject "Critical Problems of American Foreign Policy." The World Peace Foundation undertook to broadcast a special series on "World Trade and American Prosperity" to elucidate the importance of the trade agreements proposed with other nations. Once more special mention should be made of the continuing popularity of the University of Chicago Round Table.

In all these activities the Council undertakes to build up audiences, to organize and conduct follow-up, to provide for correlated reading, and generally to emphasize the stimulative features of a program, as contrasted to its mere content. Yet authenticity of subject-matter is a prime requisite, and the greatest care has to be exercised so that the border-line between giving information and conducting propaganda is not crossed. In only a few instances has the Council been imposed upon in this way.

This danger is present in any attempt to discuss matters of immediate public interest and concern in which controversy is rampant. There are some broadcasters who claim that educators should keep out of this field entirely—that treating such subjects is not education. Yet educators in general have been criticized for broadcasting dry as dust programs on subjects which are not of public interest. It is evident that a balance will have to be found in this "public domain" territory, where the public interest can best be served, by combining the facilities of the big networks with the scientific information which scholars have assembled, so that the truth will be presented no matter where the chips will fall. This problem will be simpler of solution when the educators have adjusted themselves more readily to the demands in technique which the microphone makes upon its most successful artists.

TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Constant refinements of the broadcasting process, both in transmission and in reception, are being made. It is evident

that technical facilities are undergoing constant improvement. Better transmission will result inevitably in more satisfaction to the listener, and constant improvements in receivers add to this.

The Director is indebted to Mr. Henry K. Norton, of the Radio Corporation of America, for making available in outline form some information concerning the present status of television and facsimile broadcasting which he presented to an audience gathered in New York City recently to discuss radio. He says:

1. Technically, it is possible to accomplish television. Definition is good and flicker has been practically eliminated. The picture, however, even with an expensive receiving set, is only about 7 by 9 inches.

2. Television is an amazing scientific feat, and as such is of interest. I venture to question, however, whether this interest is sufficiently deep or sufficiently lasting to hold the attention of a "looker"—as the British say—to a small picture for any extended time.

3. We must still find the solution of the problem of enlarging the image and throwing it on a wall or screen, with dimensions sufficiently large to enable one to enjoy it *easily* and *comfortably* from any part of an ordinary-sized living room.

4. When we have done that we still have to face the fact that the enjoyment of television requires the entire attention of the "looker." It is not possible, as in the case of sound broadcasting, to occupy oneself with household tasks, such as cooking, washing dishes, ironing, sewing, or any other of the numerous occupations which can be carried on simultaneously with the enjoyment of a sound broadcast.

5. This means that the time during which an audience of appreciable size would be available would be limited to the late afternoon and evening hours. This of course cuts down the time during which revenue might be obtained from the operation of very expensive equipment.

6. A television station is far more expensive both to build and to operate than a broadcasting station. The range is limited to about 25 miles from the transmitter. Furthermore, again unlike broadcasting, the television receiver must be synchronized with the transmitter. This means that the receiver cannot be dialed from one transmitter to another unless all transmitters are so standardized as to synchronize with all receivers. This in turn means agreements by station owners and manufacturers toward adoption and maintenance of standards covering the whole field of television. The Government and the Communications Commission will find it necessary to regulate and police these matters.

7. The expense of programming sound broadcasting is, as you know, an

enormous item, but it would be multiplied many times in programming television. Anticipated events of importance might be filmed at the time and transmitted for television during the evening hours. All regular programs would require not only artists who could be heard, but artists who could act and be looked at without pain. There must be stage sets, costumes and training in action as well as voice. These requirements greatly restrict the field of talent and enormously increase the cost.

8. All these considerations apply to a single television station. When we come to consider a network the difficulties are again multiplied. With a 25-mile range, a network to various cities must either depend upon repeater stations or on specially constructed coaxial cable, either of which would cost several times as much as the telephone wires used for connecting the broadcasting network—an item sufficiently staggering in itself.

9. I have outlined some of the problems sufficiently to indicate that television is not “just around the corner.” There should also be an answer to any charge that the broadcasting interests are “holding back television.” The problems, however, are not insurmountable. They represent a challenge to the industry. As far as RCA [Radio Corporation of America] is concerned it is accepting that challenge. A large staff of engineers is working daily at Camden to develop ways and means of overcoming the difficulties, with the determination to give this country television service just as soon as it can be done in a manner which would not merely invite disappointment.

As to facsimile I can be more encouraging. Its present status may be summed up in two paragraphs:

a. Technically it is possible to deliver a satisfactory facsimile service.

b. The problem of making this service commercially available is being gradually worked out at the same time that the working designs are being improved with a view to improved service and reduced costs. It is possible that such a service may be in operation in the country within a couple of years.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The reports of various Council Committees are included in the later sections of this report.¹ Attention was called a year ago to the value of the significant document presented by the History Committee, and it is again included this year. The Director feels also that attention should be called to the report of the Engineering Committee which is separately published.² The

¹ See pp. 234-78.

² *Present and Impending Applications to Education of Radio and Allied Arts* (The University of Chicago Press).

group of specialists which comprise the membership of this Committee have regularly indicated the importance of the progress of invention in the broadcasting art, and too frequently the weight of their suggestion has gone unnoticed.

THE EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING SITUATION TODAY

Since the 1934 Assembly met in Chicago last October a number of important events have occurred in radio. Hearings called by the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934 were then in progress. It is unnecessary to recount all that led to those hearings, but to keep the record clear a brief summary is in order.

President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress in February, 1934, asking for legislation to consolidate American communications—telegraph, telephone, and wireless—including broadcasting. In the debates and hearings on the bills introduced to carry out his request, proposals were submitted which were designed to allocate a proportion of the frequencies available for broadcasting in America to specified types of interests, including education. When Congress passed the Communications Act of 1934, none of these proposals were included. However, the Act specified that the Commission, created by the Act, should hold public hearings to determine the validity of the various allocation proposals that had been made when the Act was under consideration. The new Commission was also directed to report its findings to Congress by February 1, 1935. If it had suggestions for new legislation in the subject, these were to be submitted, and the reasons upon which its recommendations, if any, were based were required.

In accordance with this mandate hearings were held at Washington beginning October, 1, 1934, and continued for nearly two months. The Commission sent its report to Congress under date of January 22, 1935. The document was eagerly awaited by educators, for it was believed that from it could be drawn some indication of the general attitude of the new regulatory authority.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

The Commission made only one recommendation, as follows:

That at this time no fixed percentages of radio broadcast facilities be allocated by statute to particular types or kinds of non-profit radio programs or to persons identified with particular types or kinds of non-profit activities.

On the surface this recommendation might be interpreted as evidence of an unfriendly attitude toward educational broadcasting. However, the recommendation must be considered with additional paragraphs in the report, as follows:

The Commission proposes to hold a national conference at an early date in Washington, at which time plans for mutual co-operation between broadcasters and non-profit organizations can be made, to the end of combining the educational experience of the educators with the program technique of the broadcasters, thereby better to serve the public interest. The conference should also consider such specific complaints as might be made by non-profit groups against the actions of commercial broadcasters in order that remedial measures may be taken if necessary.

The Commission intends also actively to encourage the best minds among broadcasters and educators alike in order to develop a satisfactory technique for presenting educational programs in an attractive manner to the radio listener. Co-operation with the United States Commissioner of Education and other governmental agencies already established to assist in building helpful radio programs will be sought to an even greater degree than it now exists. The results of the broadcast survey, which is now being conducted by the Commission to determine the amount and quality of secondary service of large metropolitan broadcasting stations in remote sections of the United States as well as by broadcast stations generally, will be studied with the thought in mind of providing the best possible service to every American radio listener and to provide him with a well-balanced selection of non-profit and public-interest programs. The results of a direct questionnaire survey now under way will be studied with the same thought definitely in mind.

The Commission feels, in particular, that broadcasting has a much more important part in the educational program of the country than has yet been found for it. We expect actively to assist in the determination of the rightful place of broadcasting in education and to see that it is used in that place.

There have been protests, particularly by persons interested in the preservation of the broadcasting facilities of educational institutions, against the procedure under which licensees are required to defend their assignments in hearings upon applications of other parties. The Commission now proposes that provisions be made to conduct informal, preliminary hearings on applications that appear from examination to be antagonistic to established stations, or likely adversely to affect the interests of any established station, to determine whether the application violates any provision of the Communications

Act or the rules and regulations of the Commission, or whether or not the applicant is legally, financially, and technically qualified to contest the use of a radio facility with an existing station. Under such a provision, applications found inconsistent with law or regulations and applications of those found not qualified to operate stations will be refused without requiring the presence of licensees of existing stations at hearings.

It is the earnest belief of the Commission that the action planned by it will accomplish results which will prove of lasting benefit to the broadcast structure as well as to the American radio public. The Commission seeks to accomplish the purposes for which the non-profit interests and the broadcasters are earnestly working without the necessity of any radical reallocation, which would precipitate dissatisfaction and chaos and which would tend only to complicate and impede true progress in the broadcast public service.

In making this report, the Commission is not unmindful of the sincerity with which the well-considered arguments were presented by the non-profit organizations supporting the proposal of a statutory allocation as well as by the broadcasters generally. The fine spirit and co-operation were most helpful. The Commission does not wish to seem to disregard the requests of the non-profit organizations. It is to effectuate these requests and to accomplish the greatest and the widest good that the Commission will undertake the action outlined in this report. It is our firm intention to assist the non-profit organizations to obtain the fullest opportunities for expression. Every sound, sensible, and practical plan for the betterment of the broadcast structure will be speedily effected.

The national conference proposed in this report has been called for May 15, at Washington. The value of an interpretation of the present situation is therefore questionable.

Critics of American radio do not give the industry due credit for what it has done under the circumstances. Whether criticisms of broadcasting as it has grown up are deserved or not, it is evident that a wide variety of public services have been included in the schedules of the broadcasting companies, and this in spite of and in the face of adverse criticism from many sources. With a reasonable amount of stabilizing guidance on the part of the regulatory authority, this might easily have been extended and expanded. Perhaps an attempt at an analysis of the probable attitude of the new Commission toward educational broadcasting will be worth while, particularly in relation to the attitude of the old Federal Radio Commission.

When the Federal Radio Commission died there were few,

if any, mourners. It had a glorious opportunity which it muffed entirely, and during its life American broadcasting endured a period of growth when practically all programs produced were the result of commercial or industrial interpretation of the tastes or desires of the public. So far there has been developed no effective machinery whereby interests other than commercial have perceptible influence upon American broadcasting. There could be no harm, little if any objection, and conceivably considerable general public benefit if a few non-commercial influences had been conceived and fostered by the Commission during those important formative years. But it did not have the courage to tackle that job.

Already there are indications that members of the new Commission do not have lady-finger backbones. They have waded into their job with a vim that is encouraging to those who ran into the constant passive resistance and unerring ineptitude of the old group.

The first public utterances of members of the new Commission were made last September at the annual meeting of the National Association of Broadcasters. These were not likely to inspire much confidence in the new Commission, coming just a few weeks before the hearings referred to earlier were to begin. For these first statements were a clear indication that the attitude of the old Commission toward broadcasting had been carried over into the new, but later events indicated that this was not the case. In the first place, it took some time for the new Commission to organize and get under way, so by September little study had been made of the demands of the new job. In the second place, subsequent to hearings leading to confirmation of its members, held after Congress reconvened, the new spirit in the Commission appeared definitely. There is no doubt now that a heavy majority of its members feel clearly that they were appointed to conserve the public interest, and that the President and the public expect them to do so. That something will at least be attempted is apparent from every public statement made by Chairman Prall. Those interested in educational broadcasting and in better radio both in and out of the industry

are fortunate in having a man of his attainments and courage at the head of the new Commission.

As the time for the Washington conference approaches, I am sorry that once more I am forced to report that the educators are not yet united to determine the best practical way to develop educational broadcasting in this country. This is particularly unfortunate when for the first time there is evidence of a sympathetic attitude on the part of the regulatory authority at Washington. During the hearings last fall a variety of criticisms of American broadcasting were advanced by many educators, but there was not the slightest evidence of agreement on practical constructive proposals for a considered development of what has been called educational broadcasting or for a concerted attempt to unite for determining the uses to which the radio can be put in American education.

If the Commission's report to Congress means anything it would seem to point out two things: first, that at this state of the development of broadcasting, it is not in favor either of generally overturning the system as it has been developed in this country, or of freezing that situation by legislative enactment so as to congeal an infant art; but rather, second, that it is determined to do everything in its power, under the limits of the present system, to effect co-operation between parties interested in the further development of broadcasting. Chairman Prall has stated publicly

the fullest possible use of radio as an educational medium has not yet been found. I have studied the records of the hearings before our Broadcast Division last fall, and both educators and broadcasters, as I interpret the record, freely admitted that they have not co-operated to the fullest extent. Whoever is to blame, the fact remains that they must get together for a unified plan of action. It is our plan to get them together.

And get them together he will, on May 15. The broadcasters will be united and ready. They will know what they can do and what they believe they should do. At this distance it looks as if the educators of the country have again failed to seize an opportunity for united constructive action. If Chairman Prall can bring about a unified result, he will be entitled to the plaudits

and commendation of a host of individuals in and out of the educational broadcasting field who have been disappointed in their attempts to bring it about. Looking at the whole situation practically, what can the educators hope to develop from the forthcoming conference?

Apparently proposals involving the allocation of facilities will not be entertained favorably. The Commission has indicated a friendly attitude toward the institutionally owned and operated stations, has recognized that they face a peculiar set of difficulties all their own, and has shown an interest in a solution of those difficulties. The Commission views as sheer folly the complete overturn of the American broadcasting structure as there is no public demand for it. It recognizes, on the other hand, expressions of opinion by important minorities that changes in regulation and practice are advisable in the public interest, and is willing to study these opinions and assist in bringing about any practical changes.

In general, a fair interpretation of its attitude thus far is: it believes in non-government-controlled broadcasting; it will protect the industry's rights in the present system, and defend the public's rights, regulating either whenever necessary, and promulgating regulations for this purpose.

There has always been a weakness in the claims we educators have put forward in that the field of interest has not been defined. We talk glibly of educational broadcasting or education by radio, but what do we mean? Some of us say all broadcasting is educational in the sense that it raises or lowers our national culture, and we have assumed therefore that we can occupy, or at least orate about, the whole arena of broadcasting. Frankly, some of these areas are none of our business. Some of us mean only broadcasting of the strictly academic variety; that is, series of programs, regularly organized and broadcast by academicians, and set up with various pedagogical adjuncts, just as is a college curriculum. Some of us mean broadcasting only by stations owned and operated by educational institutions. Some of us mean gradually adapting the medium, after experimentation, to projects for informing the public reliably

and regularly on matters of current popular interest and concern. Perhaps all of us are right, but we should make up our minds what we mean, what we are talking about, and not leave this to the suggestion of anybody but ourselves. And even though neither we nor anyone else can finally agree on a definition of educational broadcasting or education by radio, at least certain categories can be set up and agreed upon, within which our interests lie. From that point on it is a matter for negotiation and co-operative adjustment.

Furthermore, in shooting at the target our ammunition has been spread. We have used a fowling piece instead of a rifle. Although several have advanced the same idea of concentrating our efforts, Robert M. Hutchins has expressed it as concretely as anyone else. He said:

What is needed is a comprehensive study of the educational possibilities of radio by a group of competent educators (not university presidents) which should attempt to discover what can and cannot be done with the medium and what part is to be taken by the industry, by the government, by the educational institutions, and by philanthropy in its development.¹

He has hit the target on plumb center. There are actually few individuals in education studiously and objectively interested in the vast problems involved in broadcasting development. For more than five years we have been shouting and milling around, but we have not calmed down yet sufficiently to do this fundamental and obviously necessary job. Perhaps Chairman Prall will be the genius to make us do it.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

To prophesy about educational broadcasting in America is merely to give way to wishful thinking, no matter who attempts it. Certainly, no one can tell with any degree of exactitude what will happen. In the first place, this is practically impossible because the radio situation itself is unpredictable. The progress of invention was halted somewhat by the depression, but in spite of this fact the direction in which developments are likely to go is pretty well known. That is, it has been obvious that the

¹ "Radio and Public Policy," *Radio and Education*, 1935, p. 10.

largest possibilities lie in the field of short-wave, in television, in facsimile broadcasting, and in wired radio. Besides, the uses to which transcriptions can be put seem almost untouched. Scientific progress up to this point would indicate that it is probable that within a decade, or perhaps within a shorter time, none of the transmitting or receiving apparatus of today will be in use.

Unfortunately, the direction of program development—and the program is the real core of broadcasting—is not so clearly marked. Broadcasting organizations have been so much concerned with their purely economic problems that they could not devote sustained and progressive attention to what should be or could be accomplished in program organization and improvement. This fact is recorded in spite of clear recognition of the spectacular achievements of American broadcasters. They are as ready as anyone to admit their short-comings. They recognize them even ahead of their severest critics, and no doubt chafe over the handicaps they face more than they would care to admit.

If this situation exists in respect to the commercial broadcaster because of general conditions since 1929, the force that has caused it has worked with even more deplorable effect against the educational broadcaster. In that restricted group the biggest struggle of all has been one of mere existence. There remain, veteran survivors of approximately one hundred institutionally owned and operated stations, only several dozen. They have carried on a battle against seemingly overwhelming odds. It is no wonder there has been little chance to improve programs or to try out new ideas. In many cases, lack of support within the institution itself, chiefly a failure to realize what really was impending, to say nothing of the rigor of conditions imposed from outside, were responsible for abandonment of the idea. There is not a single instance on record, however, of an educational institution abandoning broadcasting because it believed it could not be made useful. And those institutions which have survived feel more strongly than ever that, given adequate financial support, which would enable them to do a good pro-

gram job, thoroughly sound and valuable educational results can be obtained.

This same conclusion has been reached by those educational agencies and institutions which broadcast programs over facilities which they do not own themselves. In their case the contacts made with the commercial broadcaster, who has made more rapid progress along many lines in developing programs, has been of great value, a contribution from the commercial broadcaster which is not always acknowledged.

It is fitting to record also a marked recognition by educators that special techniques are necessary to use the microphone effectively. Only a few years ago this was admitted reluctantly, if admitted at all, by the strongest proponents of the use of radio in education. Furthermore, the bitterness of the dispute between the educator and the broadcaster has abated. There was little hope of mutual co-operation to determine the larger uses of the medium when the commercial broadcaster never knew when he was likely to be subjected to vitriolic attack from an unknown quarter. It is true that strong divergent opinions about American radio are still held. However, the position has been reached where these opinions are expressed in the form of reasoned criticism rather than vented as disagreeable spleen. And that augurs well for future negotiations.

There is evidence, too, that the broadcaster, with the easing of the economic situation, is disposed to put his house in order. The government is not only aiding and abetting in this trend, but in some cases is providing the motivating force. In spite of some lapses in taste, there has been a marked tendency to eliminate many of the practices which a year or so ago were criticized widely by those who felt that the privilege of broadcasting was being grossly abused. The quiet insistence of the Federal Communications Commission that changes be made, the authority of the Federal Trade Commission where abuses were not corrected, and the constructive activities of such organizations as the Women's National Radio Committee, the Radio Institute of the Audible Arts, and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers all have had effect. The industry as a

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

whole has met the public's wishes in these matters willingly. There is every indication that whatever attempts will be made by Commissioner Prall to bring the educator and the broadcaster together, in the cause of better broadcasting, will be met with entire success.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Director would be ungrateful indeed if he did not acknowledge publicly, as he does herewith willingly, the industry and loyalty, not only of a faithful office staff, but of the officers and many friends of the Council in various parts of the country.

Respectfully submitted,

LEVERING TYSON, *Director*

MAY 1, 1935

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES

● COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

ART

On Saturday, January 26, 1935, the last program of the series Art in America was broadcast from the National Broadcasting Company studios in Radio City, New York. The entire project, made possible by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, was initiated by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and organized by the American Federation of Arts with the co-operation of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Art Institute of Chicago, the Museum of Modern Art, the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, and the National Broadcasting Company.

The program of Art in America attempted to present a picture of the development of the visual arts in the United States from the time of the early settlers to the present, and was divided into two series, the first covering the period up to the Civil War and the second dealing with the latter part of the nineteenth century and the contemporary world.

The first series was prepared with the co-operation of the Art Institute of Chicago and the Metropolitan Museum of Art,

and was broadcast in the spring of 1934. This series has been reported on at a previous date. The second series, *Art in America in Modern Times*, and the accompanying book were prepared by the Museum of Modern Art with the assistance of experts in the fields dealt with in the individual broadcasts. *Art in America in Modern Times* was broadcast weekly on Saturday evenings from 8:00 to 8:20, Eastern Standard Time, from October 6, 1934, to January 26, 1935, inclusive.

Unlike last spring, it was impossible to secure a coast-to-coast network for the second series. The original program, therefore, was heard only east of Denver. Through the courtesy of the National Broadcasting Company, however, a rebroadcast of the series on the West Coast was made possible. This rebroadcast of the programs started on February 15 of this year and continued until June 7. The results of this series conducted from San Francisco by the California Palace of the Legion of Honor cannot be included in this report. The programs were the same as those used in the original series but were cut down from twenty to fifteen minutes to fit the schedule of the western stations. The courtesy of the National Broadcasting Company in offering us their Pacific coast network has been greatly appreciated by the sponsoring organizations, especially as the demand for a second art program has been nowhere stronger than on the west coast.

The plan for *Art in America in Modern Times* was in many ways similar to that of the first series. Again a book was prepared to be used by the listeners as a guide and textbook, containing a great number of illustrations in black and white, and in color, articles on the different subjects discussed in the programs, lists of works of art, indicating their present location, and an extensive bibliography. This book, entitled *Art in America in Modern Times*, like the broadcasts, was edited by Alfred Barr, director of the Museum of Modern Art, and by Holger Cahill, art critic. It was published by Reynal and Hitchcock, New York, and sold in paper covers for one dollar a copy.

The articles in the book, as well as the material for the prepa-

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

ration of the corresponding broadcasts, were contributed by the following authors:

Topics Discussed	Authors
Painting and Sculpture	Holger Cahill
Architecture I, II, III.	Russell Hitchcock
Architecture IV, V.	Philip Johnson
Architecture VI.	Catherine Bauer
Stage Design.	John Mason Brown
Photography.	Lincoln Kirstelion
Motion Pictures.	Lois Barry

The last program was originally planned to be a summary and review of the entire series and had, therefore, no corresponding article in the book. Later, however, it was decided that there was a need to devote a large part of it to a discussion of the industrial arts. The text of this program was prepared by René d'Harnoncourt.

The scripts for the actual presentation were prepared by Sarah Newmeyer and edited by René d'Harnoncourt. The programs were presented by professional radio actors under the supervision of the editor of the scripts. To establish contacts with the listening public a weekly leaflet called the *Art in America News* was published and distributed free on request. Each number contained a short synopsis of the broadcast preceding its publication and an illustration of one of the works of art discussed in the program. Publicity releases went out weekly to over 160 newspapers announcing the subject of the next program and special care was taken to advise all museums well in advance whenever works of art by an artist represented in their collections were to be discussed. This enabled a number of institutions to feature many of the broadcasts in their communities as relating to their own activities. Special releases were also sent to newspapers in communities where the subject of the broadcast was expected to be of local interest. The publicity work, as well as the contact with public and endorsing organizations, was directed by Mr. Alan Blackburn, at that time Executive Secretary of the Museum of Modern Art, in cooperation with the Director of the program.

The response received to the full program compares most

favorably with that received during the first series. In spite of the fact that almost one-third of last spring's mail came from the Pacific coast and from areas not reached by this series, the total of letters increased by more than one hundred per cent. During the first four weeks alone four thousand letters were received, and it was necessary to omit in the following programs part of the announcement asking the public to write for the *Art in American News* because the demand threatened to become too great for our resources. In spite of this, the total of letters reached during the entire series was seven thousand. The sale of the guide also surpassed the sales of last spring by over one hundred per cent.

In judging the values of these returns one should keep in mind, however, the fact that the greater appeal of the second series was due, at least partly, to the fact that the contemporary arts are of greater interest to most listeners than the arts of the past, and that we had the advantage of starting the second series with an audience won during the first programs. It may also be possible that this year's *Art in America News* was a better means of stimulating requests than the *Family Tree of American Art* sent out last spring.

More important, however, than the increase in quantity of letters seemed the change in tenor that could be observed in the response to the second series. Complaints about the manner of delivery almost ceased, and criticisms of the dialogue became rare. On the other hand, there were a few more objections to subject-matter than last spring. Most of those letters protested against statements of artistic principles and against certain evaluations of specific works of art. These protests seemed to be unavoidable considering the fact that the series dealt with the work of living artists and therefore had to touch on problems that are still subject to controversy. In general, it may be said that the mail response to this year's program seemed to represent a more interested and intelligent public than that of last year.

A correct estimate of the effectiveness of a radio program is, of course, impossible. There are indications, however, that Art

in America was considered a popular program in many parts. The fact that it was discussed and used for parodies by local stations, that it was included by many newspapers and magazines among the radio features each week, and that it was used by several educational institutions in their curriculums gives at least a vague indication of the scope and size of its audience.

RENÉ D' HARNONCOURT, *Chairman*

●

HISTORY¹

"The Commission deems possible and desirable the attainment and spread of accurate knowledge and informed opinion among the masses of the American people both concerning the realities, tensions, and problems of the emerging era and concerning the ideals, traditions, and experiences of other ages and other people in order that all choices may be made with reason, with understanding, and with due regard to their moral and cultural, as well as their narrowly economic, implications" (Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies, published by the American Historical Association, 1934).

No one has ever tried broadcasting a project constructed by scholars, with a genuinely historical focus, aimed squarely and admittedly at the man in the street. And why should anyone try it? Whatever the man in the street has on his mind, it is not history. Indeed, few things seem so remote from his affairs as an unromanticized interest in the past. Yet, is it not possible that by starting with what *is* on his mind, with his immediate concerns, with the news item in his local paper, he may be made interested in large affairs of which he is now not even aware?

I. WHY BROADCAST TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC?

Most citizens are literate but badly educated.—For a progressive country, rather thoroughly committed to public education, the United States does not have a well educated population. Moreover, for a country rather thoroughly committed to the theory of popular government, the United States has generally irresponsible and individualistic citizens. Our states stop their

¹ Report of Joint Radio Committee of the American Historical Association—History Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education. Reprinted from *Education and Radio*, 1934, pp. 193–216.

work of education long before most people become mature individuals or responsible members of society, so that for the great majority of adults educational progress is arrested.

It is true that public education has handled its first basic problem: the mass of Americans are literate. That is, they can read. In the personal and civic lives of most people, however, being able to read is not of much more importance than being able to see or hear. The ideas and attitudes, emotions, tastes and actions of people are almost determined by the influence of popular journals, the cinema and the radio. For most people there are few other sources of information and opinion. They no longer attend classes or listen to educational talks; they do not buy or read non-fiction books; they have no contact with disinterested leaders. The information available is frequently so distorted by bias or sensationalism that most of it cannot be called educational, either from the standpoint of citizenship or individual edification. Worse, yet, when opportunities of sound educational values do appear, many people shun them as dull or remote from real interests.

Broadcasting undeveloped as a unique educational medium.—We are greatly impressed with ourselves as a “nation of listeners.” It is counted a mark of high standards that half the families in the United States have radio-receiving sets. That this situation offers immense and vague educational possibilities for these millions of listeners has become a widely accepted idea—an idea which has been talked about, written about, and organized. Yet, no statistics about audiences or type of program, and no arguments about results can dispel the common knowledge that broadcasting has not been a potent factor either in the cultural or in the civic education of the mass of Americans.

Certainly there have been excellent broadcasts to the general public, though most of them touched the conscious interests of comparatively select audiences; and there has been effective instruction within the educational system, chiefly for young people. However important these may be, it seems reasonable to believe that the social significance of the radio does not lie in further development in this direction, but lies rather in its po-

tentialities as an instrument of mass enlightenment. The educational use of a broadcasting technique adapted especially to this modern mechanical technique—the use of the radio in its own mass terms—may play the key part in a scheme of adult education for the general public on a more far-reaching scale than would otherwise be possible.

Education of individuals and of citizens.—Any plan of popular education in a country with traditions such as ours must serve the purpose of developing people in terms of their own potentialities, as well as in terms of their social responsibility; of enlarging their individual capacities for pleasure and cultural pursuits, as well as helping them to live intelligently as a part of a very complex modern society.

Creative use of leisure requires a cultural equipment which most people do not have. Broadcasting, instead of stereotyping leisure-time activities as it so obviously can, may well be a means of promoting new and varied interests, and of freeing individuals from an undue sense of local pressure for standardization of thought, activity, and avocations. The radio may be the stimulus for a larger process of self-education, in that it may make people more aware of the great variety of intellectual and cultural choices and of ways of pursuing their own interests.

Quite as important as the development of cultural quality in individuals is the task which popular education has of fitting people to live as intelligent members of a twentieth-century society. Experience has shaken our faith in economic individualism. This waning of confidence in our frontier philosophy has far-reaching implications, in terms not only of planning and control, but of the education of citizens to play a part in whatever is worked out from our experimentation. Being able to build realistically upon existing foundations and to adjust to fundamental changes entails an understanding of our past and a sense of our interrelations at present.

The radio, the press, and the government are the agencies which seem best equipped to initiate a plan of adult education of the dimensions suggested.

II. WILL THE PUBLIC LISTEN?

The habitual listener.—Certainly, we will start with an audience. Indeed, with a large one. It will be given us ready-made; our problem is to hold and educate it. This audience consists largely of habitual listeners, those who keep their receiving sets going five, six, seven or more hours a day. Usually, programs come automatically with no turn of the dial; that is, until matters become intolerable, or a more positive interest aroused in some other program causes a shift.

Unless we are very dull, most people who habitually listen to the stations carrying our programs will be exposed to what we say. This means that a considerable part of our audience will be composed of listeners too lazy or too busy to shut off a lecture on a historical subject, even though they do not expect to be particularly interested. But they will not really listen to it or profit by it unless we say something which seems alive and important to them. If they are arrested and interested, they will make a point of listening again. By thus making good with those who happen to hear, and by active promotion and follow-up, we can acquire a large and continuing audience.

Undoubtedly, there will be among our listeners some already well-informed on current and past affairs; school and college students; groups into whose activities our project may fit; and many individuals who tune in on single programs because of an interest in that particular subject. As much as we would encourage this, we will not address our remarks to any of them, except incidentally. We are aiming at the man in the street and at the rural cross-road, at the woman in the home and working outside it; that is, at as many as possible of the listeners in the seventeen million radio families.

The American who wants to know.—We will assume that most of these listeners have potential interests and average intelligence; that their mentality and experience are not those of adolescence, but of literate, rather badly educated adults. We will assume they have a considerable but untutored curiosity about large affairs. (It is easy to forget the diligence with which the public reads its local newspapers, as bad as some of

them may be.) It is with this uninformed and undisciplined curiosity that we will begin. In our mind's eye as we broadcast, we will visualize all sorts of Americans who do not know much of world affairs, but who either want to know or can be made to want to know.

Difficulties.—We may be suspected of whistling to keep up our courage, by first talking of our large and curious audience! Actually, we do not intend to evade the fact that one of the hardest tasks possible to undertake is that of constructing a sound educational project which will attract American listeners by the million. Achieving any appreciable results with such a varied and casual audience, is a problem bristling with even greater difficulties. To carry through this plan, we will probably need at least one genius in addition to a great deal of clear, hard-headed thinking and management. But this is no more than is needed for any large and important educational undertaking.

Among the chief difficulties which we will face is the traditional belief that one should get an education because it pays to be educated, it helps one get on. However important this function of education may be, it is unfortunate that the desire to improve the cultural quality of living and of civic activity has been subordinated to an interest in vocational advancement. In the public eye, the former, if ever attained, seems vague and of questionable value; the latter, attainable, concrete and almost unanimously desired.

Even if our broadcasts stir the imagination and arouse an eagerness among our listeners, most of them are busy and many are lazy. Adults are so occupied with necessary routine, and feel under so little pressure to learn, it seems almost too much to hope that education with no utilitarian value will be added to already full days or substituted for more usual pursuits.

Perhaps sheer indifference will be the greatest obstacle: indifference due to the fact that most of the background and experience of people will be pulling in the opposite direction from the objectives of our broadcasts; indifference due to an ingrained disinclination to the exertion necessary for thinking; or

due to standardization of interests and stereotyped use of leisure. "Amusement," without doubt, is the only form of recreation that most people know or believe in; but they will listen to whatever is made genuinely interesting to them, whether or not it falls into the category of "entertainment."

On being dull and being interesting.—Most speeches are dull because they are made by dull people. So far, no prescription has been found which will transform a thoroughly dull person into a lively, interesting speaker. But, unfortunately, all interesting and keen-minded people do not make effective speakers. Talk about "radio personality" has become trite; yet, undeniably, there is an elusive but real quality which attracts people to listen attentively, almost regardless of what is being said. It is a quality of voice, an arresting way of putting a thing.

We can now hear a few persons who have this gift to a marked degree. These men have voices which are neither monotonous nor "cultivated." Most of them are not "clever" speakers; on the contrary, one gets an impression of simplicity and straightforwardness. The arresting power of their broadcasting results, to a great extent, from the vigor with which they say important things simply and pointedly, so they can be understood by ordinary men and women.

These men have not had to rely upon the usual methods of mass excitation because in broadcasting that is unnecessary. Before the microphone, a speaker is not haranguing a milling crowd of listeners from a soapbox; he is talking to individuals, most of whom are sitting in relative quiet and isolation. Under this circumstances, undue emotionalism is apt to leave an ordinary human being a little skeptical; and that fast, almost panting tone, which is still supposed to convey a breathless suspense, often produces no more than a tension because words run over each other in confusion.

When men have had something vital and understandable to say, they have been listened to—even if not favorably. The fact that most of those who have had things to say to the general public have appealed to their prejudices and emotions does not prove that this is the only effective appeal which can be made;

it may quite as well mean that people who could and would make a different appeal have not troubled to do it *in understandable terms*.

Dullness of subject matter in a speech comes largely from its remoteness from what the listener has on his mind. The same speech which may prove highly entertaining to one person will be boring to another because it does not touch his past experience or existing interests. In this respect, the educated and uneducated are alike; the difference in what appeals to one and not to the other is a difference in what each is accustomed to think of as interesting and important.

A talk on a subject very vital to the public, however, can be made dull by overloading it with irrelevant and unassimilated facts, which leave the listener with a muddled idea and a futile sense of having heard nothing he can understand and remember. This kind of dullness may be due to a lack of imagination on the part of the speaker, or, quite as likely, to his not having a thorough enough comprehension of what he is trying to convey to his audience to enable him to put it into simple and understandable terms.

But no analysis of the dullness of educational addresses and no inference that they could be made more lively will answer the contention that it is not interesting enlightenment but entertainment that the public wants. There is much evidence for this, but none to show conclusively that anything is inherently entertaining. What has proved interesting enough to attract and hold public favor has varied so greatly with different localities and different periods of time that one is led to believe that public interest and public taste are not static things.

It is a commercially useful idea to hold that because people go to certain places, eat certain things, wear certain clothes, and listen to what they can get on the radio, that these, and not something else, are what the public really wants. But the American public has an astonishing capacity for being bored without realizing it; and, as for giving it what it wants, this is a metaphysical idea used to describe the practical process of teaching people to like what one has to offer.

The public does not present specific, fully developed likes and dislikes to be satisfied. Far more inarticulate than that, popular taste is largely a matter of habit, of liking or valuing the right and accepted thing. It is quite as much a matter of acquiescing in the mode, of being up-to-date, or "smart." It certainly is created to a great extent by a restless desire to change to something new and different when the novelty of a former fad has worn off. Consuming habits of all sorts have been built up by appeal to tradition, style, or novelty; and almost anything can conceivably be presented so as to appeal to these vague but strong popular "tastes."

Any people which accepts its styles in clothes as we do, without protest and eventually with enthusiasm for whatever comes, may be taking its education and its entertainment in the same way—who can be sure?

III. WHY BROADCAST HISTORY?

History as it is broadcast.—The listening public has learned through experience to expect its history in highly colored, sensational episodes, or in dull, remote lectures about events which once happened.

Exciting historical subject matter of spurious value has been used to a slight extent by commercial broadcasters to advertise the peculiar superiority of some such commonplace commodity, let us say, as dog biscuits. We have been presented with oddities and abnormalities of the past which belong in the same category with believe-it-or-not current events. Sponsored and unsponsored programs have reproduced trite romance, startling adventure, and dramatic scandal, disguised in sixteenth or eighteenth century costume. All of these may meet the requirements of amusement, but they are not history.

Broadcasting the personal intrigues of Catherine the Great is of no more historical significance than licentiousness in modern dress. Reproduction before the microphone of a mob scene at the Bastille, or one of the epileptic fits of Peter the Great, or melodramatic episodes in which his despised young son makes crude advances to his step-mother, so far from having any edu-

cational value, encourages the kind of sensationalism which sound education would combat. Nor have the dramatic sketches about early America made the public more intelligent or better informed about our country.

On the other hand, there have been series on local and sectional history, programs to commemorate national occasions, and lectures which provided incidental background for a problem, institution or industry under discussion. Most of these have been good enough as history, but not good for popular consumption. To the public, they have come as heavy, rather unpalatable items to make its diet seem better balanced.

Most of these lectures have been addressed to a limited audience already interested in public affairs; many of them have been so remote from the experience of ordinary people that they seemed dull. In attempting to avoid these shortcomings, other historical talks watered down their subject matter to a thin and superficial story. Without going into the good points which many of these broadcasts unquestionably had, it seems fair to conclude that, as a whole, they have not touched the educational problem with which we are concerned—that of attracting and of educating the general public.

How we want to do it.—We are determined to be interesting to the populace, to maintain our scholarly integrity, and not to talk down to our audience.

Though it is a difficult and rare achievement, it is within the realm of possibility to be genuinely interesting and at the same time intelligent. Perhaps educators have been as much at fault as entertainers in promoting a traditional belief to the contrary. Without distortion, history can be made interesting to the average person, and we intend to do it. We are aiming at the public and nothing in our program which does not reach its mark will be counted as good for the purposes of our broadcasts. For this reason, we will begin, not with the scholar or with history, but with the man in the street and with specific matters which he knows concern him. Relevancy is our cue and the news item our most promising point of departure.

We would like to leave with our listeners an addition to their

factual knowledge. In doing this, it is axiomatic that we will adhere rigidly to high standards of accuracy and impartiality in ascertaining and presenting these data. As important and necessary as this is, however, mere presentation of authentic subject matter is not our primary aim. A speech heavy with facts will be not only boring and unheard, but even if listened to would fall short of what the Committee wants of its broadcasts. Since only a few points can be made effectively in a brief period on the air, we will not attempt the impossible and really undesirable feat of covering a subject, of serving everything stuffed into a nut-shell. Rather, we will undertake to leave with the public some sound historical ideas and a new habit of thinking about their facts and experiences. We aspire to produce an "appetizing effect" by suggesting the possibilities of intellectual exploration; to stimulate in our audience an awareness of situations and a realization of their connection with these; to arouse a continuing and growing interest in understanding the background from which contemporary society has come. Our factual information will be selected and used in keeping with these objectives, and with a view to developing among the American public a sense of "historical-mindedness."

Historical-mindedness.—Historical-mindedness in the public is not a matter of gazing backward; it is the intellectual habit of thinking about present affairs in the light of the past from which they developed. It is an intellectual perspective which comes from seeing situations in their setting, an emotional equilibrium which comes from getting outside one's own limited experience. Without an understanding of how familiar ideas and institutions have grown up through adjustment to changing conditions, personal ideas and loyalties are apt to become dogmatic and emotional; and without an understanding of the foundations upon which modern society is built, personal action is apt to be made with unsound haste or with a sense of futility.

Historical-mindedness, far from making people conservative and irresponsive to change, might presumably make them less resistant to facing the facts of change and more aware of the soundness of adjusting to them. It might enable them to see

that society is not static, that a cross-section of any civilization, including our own, shows a part in a process of development. It might lead to a realization of the possible range of values, qualities and choices, and of the importance of choosing consciously and wisely.

Our broadcasts will handle controversial issues, both because we cannot possibly avoid them, and because we believe in the educational value of controversy. In the first place, it is obvious that no lively program based on front page news can ignore controversial issues. Furthermore, avoiding contested points would go counter to the objectives of our teaching. Among the things we want most are to interest the public, stimulate intelligent thinking, and to cultivate the habit of hearing conflicting evidence objectively. Cutting out controversy practically eliminates the possibility of all three of these objectives. One of the important ways of interesting people and stimulating them to think is to face them with a dilemma; and certainly it is difficult to conceive of a better way of teaching people to respond intelligently to emotional situations than for us to deal intelligently with just such situations. Unless we really believe in presenting conflicting evidence and views on contested subjects, our traditional emphasis on freedom of speech becomes scarcely more than a fetish. Therefore, in our broadcasts—which should be demonstrations of what historical-mindedness is—we expect to present and criticize evidence on controversial questions with absolute fairness; to examine different points of view; and to show the importance of being willing to revise opinions in the light of facts and experience.

One of the basic qualities in historical-mindedness is a disposition to face facts. Fortunately, the public already thinks it likes this. Actually, very few people enjoy having their traditional generalizations picked to pieces. This process would, however, be frequently involved in any historical analysis worth doing. We may call it “dispelling popular superstitions” or “challenging ancient myths”; we will not call it “debunking.” Certainly, we will not set out with malice to tear down the pillars of public complacency, but we wish to be realistic and to be

honest about history. We cannot let our desire for impartiality lead us to the mistaken and insipid extremes of being afraid to say what things mean—if we know.

We have no wish to tell our public what to think or do; rather we would suggest affairs worth thinking about, ways of thinking intelligently, standards of appraisal. We do not want to give them an unreal sense of simplicity, or of assurance that after fifteen minutes of listening they now have the authoritative answer. Indeed, we would avoid having them think that there is in existence anywhere the authoritative, ready-made solution to front page controversies.

On the other hand, we cannot leave all our questions entirely unanswered, our complicated situations in complete confusion. Fortunately, there is another alternative to producing closed minds or confused minds, though this has probably never been achieved on a large scale. Steering between these two undesirable situations will be one of our major problems.

We hope that thus broadcasting history with perspective and objectivity will arouse public interest and concern; will help develop a public too intelligent to be swept away by sensationalism and propaganda; and may help build up that balance between reason and emotion which is necessary for sound decisions and which results in constructive action.

Scholars as broadcasters.—Granted it may be possible to make history popular and true, controversial and objective, the next question to be answered is, “Shall scholars try to do this?” There may be sufficient reasons why scholars themselves should not be burdened to translate their own work into the vulgar tongue, but there are unanswerable reasons why a scholarly society should sponsor and direct the broadcasting of historical interpretation. Under its guidance programs will not be allowed to degenerate into the telling of quaint stories for no good purpose, or the cataloguing of unrelated events and persons, or the advancing of propaganda for any cause. It can furnish better than any other organization the raw materials for interesting and effective programs: authentic facts and intelligent deductions with the stamp of disinterested authority upon them.

Also, it can pass best judgment upon the final popularized form, seeing to it that a program concocted for popular consumption still contains the high-test ingredients of intellectual stimulation, accuracy, and objectivity.

IV. HOW CAN WE MANAGE THIS PROJECT?

Though alternative plans have been considered, the Committee is convinced that the soundest procedure for this project is to broadcast the background for the news; to draw upon the expert knowledge and advice of scholars for facts and interpretation; and to rely upon a broadcaster of exceptional ability to transform the historical material into popular form. It is obvious that well-oiled machinery will be necessary for getting decisions and subject matter through their various stages in the brief time which can elapse between the news event and the broadcast.

Background of the news.—Since being interesting is so largely a matter of talking of things which the listener is already concerned with, we have decided to center our broadcasts around current situations, beginning with the news and giving historical background for understanding it. We do not, of course, contemplate trying to discuss all events which are attracting attention; instead, we will select only those occurrences which lend themselves to adequate and effective *historical treatment*, and which are of especial importance and wide interest.

What the committee will do.—Most current events which get into headlines are part of already existing situations, and affairs which are of considerable immediate concern to people are usually connected with stronger and more continuing interests. We feel it is desirable that programs deal primarily with these matters of continuing importance and their background, doing it at the time when circumstances bring the situations vividly before the public. For this reason, the Committee envisages a plan of forecasting, of deciding in advance upon a number of significant situations and continuing interests which are calculated to break into the news within a short time.

The Committee will be responsible for gathering the historical

material from appropriate authorities, and for seeing that it is converted into popular form by a broadcaster whom they choose. The actual method of handling the material on any given subject will rest with the broadcaster, within the limits of the Committee's objectives and subject to its review.

Responsibility for making quick decisions and changes necessary to fit the news will be delegated to the broadcaster and a very small Committee, the latter being empowered to sanction these adjustments and to review the final form of the broadcast.

What the scholars will do.—At first, it seemed that the logical way to broadcast authentic history was to have historical authorities broadcast it. This would eliminate all the machinery through which material has to be sent before being put on the air. But we have concluded that the disadvantages of this method outweigh its convenience. We have been assured that scholars as scholars are not the best popular radio speakers, because they know too much about their subject and too little about the mental makeup of the public. Also it seems advisable, for the purposes of this project, to have one speaker continuing throughout the series, instead of presenting a new and strange authority each week. We have decided to call upon scholars for the basic contribution which no one else can make, the accurate factual material and the intelligent, unbiased interpretation, and to leave the translation of this into the language of the people to someone whose particular competence is to bridge the gap between the learned and the popular mind.

After surveying the contemporary scene and deciding upon the general fields in which the subjects of our broadcasts will presumably lie, the Committee will next choose, from among the historical experts on these subjects, a group of Associates. It is these Associates who will furnish the raw material for the programs. They will be asked to outline the most important aspects of their subject; to summarize points of special significance, giving illustrative material and interpretation to explain the facts; to make suggestions for interesting historical treatment of the current situation; to make specific references to material for the

broadcaster's own use; and to recommend for the use of our audience a list of appropriate readings. Copies of this material will be sent directly to the broadcaster, the Chairman of the Committee, and members of the Executive Committee. Whenever practicable, there will be typed and added to this material copies of printed articles and chapters which the Associates suggest for the broadcaster's use. Thus in most cases, all necessary data will be immediately available in a series of portfolios. Almost certainly the broadcaster would use material in any one portfolio for a number of programs, and, quite as likely, would draw upon several different portfolios in constructing a single broadcast.

After the broadcaster has worked over this material and matured his ideas about using it, he will consult with the Committee, and, whenever feasible, with the Associates. Before going on the air, he will secure the approval of the use he has made of the facts and interpretation from the authorities whose names will be linked with the broadcast.

Far in advance, the portfolios will be assembled, and the broadcaster will be prepared to present, on very short notice, a program in keeping with the news. This plan may entail waste of material and energy in that some of the anticipated questions may not arise. Should this happen, it will be a necessary sacrifice to immediacy, but the margin of error is likely to be small. It is conceivable that, due to unforeseen circumstances, a very important situation may unexpectedly emerge, finding us unprepared. To handle such an emergency for the next program, we would have to work overtime and under great pressure; but, if the occurrence were important enough to attract sudden and surprising attention, the chances are good that its news value would continue until the next week.

And the broadcasting company.—The broadcasting company, with the American Historical Association, will sponsor the project. The company will furnish the general publicity sent out for all broadcasts, and will encourage the carrying of these programs by the stations in its networks. Also, it will provide studios and other equipment necessary for broadcasting these historical pro-

grams once a week. It will undertake to handle, in its customary way, the routine fan mail which comes to it, but correspondence requiring any special attention or follow-up will be dealt with as a part of the office management of the project.

Alchemy.—From the standpoint of a scholar the process of popularizing history may be a matter of mixing alloy with fine gold; but, from the standpoint of our programs, it must be a process of alchemy, of transforming what the public considers dull metal into something greatly desired and valued by it. If it takes a wizard to do this, then we must locate a wizard—or a twentieth-century substitute. Making scholarly historical material ready for the ultimate consumer is the crucial point of this project, and all the objectives of our education depend upon this act of conversion. Authentic subject matter must be made immensely entertaining without being distorted, provocative without loss of impartiality or perspective, colorful and graphic without being cheap.

We hope that the person we find to do this creative writing will also have an attractive voice; that is, a voice which will attract people to listen. But it is not primarily a voice we want at the microphone, it is a personality; and this does not depend chiefly upon exact enunciation or any set mechanics of speech. If we find a person with the gift for popularizing history as we want it done and a real zest, not merely for talking, but for what he is saying to whom he is saying it, the chances are very good that, unless he has an impediment or an abnormally unpleasant voice, he will “get across” to the public.

If, however, we are not fortunate enough to locate the genius and the voice in the same person, then we will get the two separately. There is an undoubted advantage in having a person speak his own lines; but if a man cannot speak effectively he spoils his words, or if he can write only poor lines there is no advantage in reading them beautifully.

In our search for the person to carry through this project, we are not limiting ourselves to historians or professional broadcasters. Perhaps both are too well trained in their own profession to be suited for what we have in mind, though it would be

a great asset to have a broadcaster with historical and radio experience. We may find exactly whom we want among the historians or the broadcasters, but, if we do, it will be because he is the personality with the particular gift we need, rather than because he has academic or radio connections.

We do not contemplate forcing all our broadcasts into one mould. One reason is that the form of the programs must depend very largely upon the person preparing them; another is that different kinds of handling will be suitable for different subjects. While a fictitious radio character with any raciness at all would have too decided a viewpoint to be usable on some programs, this device might be the best possible means of dealing with other situations. Though dramatic sketches are not desirable as a rule, and are not as useful in attracting the public ear when we are explaining the present instead of reviving the past, yet, in some instances such dramatic reconstruction might be a very effective way of giving life to abstract and unfamiliar circumstances. If the idea appeals to him, the broadcaster might be "The American Who Wants to Know," or "The Man at the Crossroads." Or he might introduce into the conversation such persons as the editor of a small newspaper, a school teacher, a farmer, a factory worker, who could ask questions and converse from their particular experiences. In some cases it might be interesting to introduce the historian himself to give evidence during an argument. Plain talk, as well as narrative, dialogue, conversation, arguments, interviews—any and all can be used effectively, depending upon the problem to be handled and the aptitude or inspiration of the program-maker.

The Committee, therefore, does not wish to decide in advance on the exact technique of the broadcasts, but will confer with the person making the programs as to whether he shall create a radio character, set up a series of dialogues and debates, or use a combination of forms.

Summary of how the machinery should run.—If this project were scheduled to go on the air March 1, by the middle of the preceding October the Committee would decide upon the general fields for which portfolios were to be prepared. At once,

Associates would be called upon for their material, which should be submitted not later than January 1. They would be asked to mail their manuscripts directly to the broadcaster, and, in addition, one copy to the Chairman of the Committee and two for the use of the Executive Committee.

The broadcaster would start work as soon as material began coming in, and within a few weeks would meet with the Committee to consider tentative ideas on several programs. He would then consult in person with the Associates whose data he was using, if this were deemed advisable or if he wanted more or different materials. By February 15, say, the Committee would meet again, at which time most of the material should be well in hand and ready for use on short notice. Two more weeks would still be left for additional work and necessary revision. During this time the general approval of the Associates could be secured for the uses being made of their materials.

Since the actual adaptation of program to news event would have to be done as late as possible, the broadcaster and the Executive Committee would usually make decisions on the subject to be handled in the next broadcast. The Executive Committee would also approve the final form of the program.

V. WHAT SHALL WE DO BESIDES TALK?

During the months before the broadcasts begin, plans would be carried forward for publicity, promotion, co-operation with other interested agencies, and follow-up. This work would center in the office of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, and would be handled by a full time or a part time person, depending on the extensiveness of our activities along these lines. Such a secretary would also handle necessary correspondence, and be responsible for the typing of programs, tentative and final, for the use of broadcaster, the Committee, and the Associates.

Advertising what we have to offer.—Learning by rote has lost its ancient educational prestige, although modern advertisers are using this method with superb effectiveness. "I will believe anything if ye'll tell it to me often enough," said Mr. Dooley.

There will be a great many Mr. Dooleys in our audience. Indeed, our broadcasts will be heard by people whose consuming habits have been built up through the persistent and spectacular din of advertising—hundreds of millions of dollars worth each year. In choosing everything from a college to a cigarette, presumptions are apt to be against any article not widely heralded. To be sure, we have no ambition to see extravagant statements of our good intentions exposed in all the subways, or on bill boards at the crossroads, or in color photography in popular magazines—“World’s Most Colossal Broadcasting Programs, Enlightening 17,000,000 Families Daily.” But somewhere between this and utter silence, we would like to announce ourselves to the public in a clearly heard, if modest, voice.

The publicity essential for this project will not be so simple as advertisement is for most educational broadcasts. We will not have the benefit of a series of prominent speakers whose names have “news value” and whose words are quoted because of who said them. Maintaining sufficient flexibility to catch the front page is in itself a major advertising handicap, because it precludes the distribution of advance notices of the subject of programs, which ordinarily would appear in newspapers or be posted in appropriate places. General publicity about the broadcasts may easily seem too vague to be attractive, while individuals and groups may not know that they would be interested to listen when they are not informed of the title or speaker. In many cases, we cannot even announce at the end of one week’s broadcasts what will come next.

To a degree, we can compensate for these handicaps. We can adopt a “trade name” to cover a series of broadcasts which can be made so interesting that the public will listen for them, even if they do not know ahead exactly what they will hear. We should make this trademark familiar to radio listeners. Frequently, we can tell ahead what the next program will be, in which case, we will publicize the fact. On the other hand, if we are waiting for the news to determine the next move, we may turn this indefinite nature of the line-up of programs to good account, by announcing at the end of one broadcast that we do

not know just what we will talk about next because, in part, it has not happened. Or suppose an event of spectacular interest—such as the assassination of Dollfuss—occurs too late in the day of the broadcast to be used immediately; it could be decided and announced then that, since attention for the next week would undoubtedly be centered on the Austro-German situation, that would be the subject of the next broadcast. In this way we would stir anticipation at the moment when the news interest first began.

Furthermore, if we are willing to make our project adaptable enough to fit the news, the broadcasting company might be willing to give a few moments at the end of some program earlier in the day to announce the subject of our evening broadcast. This step might become an annoying precedent for them, but for the fact that our peculiar disadvantage in not having our programs cut and dried in advance could be reason for this special consideration. Also, perhaps the broadcasters of press reports would take a moment after their current events to call attention to our programs, because we start with news events and dwell upon the historical background of some of the very situations their broadcasts allude to. This seems a fitting plan of co-operation, as our programs would presumably be for the readers of newspapers and would encourage them to read their papers with more interest and intelligence. If this were done, interested and co-operating groups, such as libraries, could during the day post the title of the broadcast with appropriate reading lists prepared in advance.

We would expect to establish friendly relations with various newspapers, especially with any whose policy would make them particularly interested in the objectives of our broadcasts. We would hope to have them carry notices of programs whenever we have the information for them in advance. We would like to have them carry news reports after the broadcasts whenever the importance of the program seemed to warrant it. We would want radio editors to give the project a send-off when it begins and on any occasions of especial interest. We would prepare press releases to be sent to newspapers, containing statements

about the general undertaking, the subjects handled in the broadcast, and important excerpts from the programs. Magazines might carry articles, or at least effective notices, when their readers would be interested, or could be induced to become interested, in the subject matter or the technique of our broadcasts.

In addition to radio and press advertising, we could, through co-operation with other organizations interested in adult education, count on rather widespread notice and encouragement being given our project.

Other kinds of promotion and follow-up.—This project must be good enough to rest on the merit of the actual broadcasts, because for a majority of our listeners the broadcasts will be the beginning and the end of their exertion for enlightenment. Thus, what we say at the microphone will have to be interesting, stimulating and educationally worth while, regardless of any additional activity on our part. This is, however, no argument against a thorough plan of promotion and follow-up. We realize that no matter how excellent a brief program may be, its effectiveness will be increased by preparation and by building upon the interest stimulated by it. To as great a degree as possible, our broadcasts should gradually become a part in a process of self-education which would go far beyond a matter of passively listening for a few minutes now and then. Indeed, the real significance of our programs depends, not on how widely we are heard, but on how widely we are successful in inducing listeners to go further in their reading, to think more critically, and to act more reasonably. This is a large order to place upon a few aerial minutes once a week! Therefore, any reasonable plan of promotion and follow-up which will multiply the effectiveness of the broadcasts should be carried out with vigor.

Co-operation with other interested agencies is one of the important ways of extending the influence of a series of broadcasts. Details for any such scheme must be arrived at through negotiations with these agencies, and will have to be carried through as administrative problems. Yet there can be suggested in advance the possibility of working closely with the press, with libraries,

schools and colleges, and organizations interested in current questions. For instance, the American Library Association could assist in planning reading lists, in distributing them locally upon request, in making the suggested material easily available to readers at their affiliated libraries, and in checking on requests made for this material in connection with our broadcasts. Libraries could announce the subject and time of our programs, and even lend their receiving sets for the use of listening groups. Similarly, public schools could assist us by posting notices of broadcasts and reading lists, placing appropriate items of current news on their bulletin boards, calling the programs to the attention of current events groups, international relations clubs and history classes. Not that we are aiming at high-school children—but the educational value to adults of interests which their children bring home is a thing we cannot overlook. Furthermore, teachers in many of these schools may be interested in both the subject matter and teaching technique of this project. Schools equipped with receiving sets might make them available for groups of adult listeners, or might even help organize such groups.

Experience indicates that such agencies as women's organizations, labor groups, government educational enterprises, university extension divisions, may all be interested to co-operate in such a way as to further the reach of our broadcasts tremendously.

If not enthusiastically, then in spite of ourselves, we will be promoting these broadcasts by personal correspondence. A broadcasting company is not willing to have fan mail discouraged or unanswered, when sensible answers can be readily given. We would certainly not favor a lengthy exchange of letters with habitual writers; nor could we undertake to maintain correspondence on questions raised in the broadcasts; or enter into argumentative intercourse with contentious listeners. There are always apt to be problem letters of this kind in the morning mail! Experience shows, however, that most people who write about reasonable programs write reasonable letters. They may want a reading list, a copy of the speech or many copies of it, or

they may need suggestions for material because they have no local library. We are not under obligation to add to the facilities for giving information to the public through any plan of correspondence; but, in addition to stimulating a desire for such, we ought to be ready at least to direct our listeners to available sources of information, especially when they ask us to.

Along this same line of promotion, we find a device which has proved useful in maintaining and checking upon public interest is the "mailing list." We would send out a brief statement of the project to a large number of organizations and key people who would presumably be interested in our undertaking. If they care to follow the progress of the venture, to receive program announcements and reading lists, either for their own use or for public announcement, they would reply requesting to be placed upon our mailing list. We would expect such requests to run well into the thousands, and the names on this list would include many of our most faithful listeners, enthusiastic promoters and intelligent critics. Where this plan has been tried, it has proved well worth doing.

An important part of our promotion would be the encouragement of regular listening groups, in homes, schools, recreational centers and libraries. Such group reception is an incentive to continuing and attentive listening. It stimulates discussion as individual listening-in is not apt to do, and usually increases reading in connection with the subject broadcast. Furthermore, these groups will give us an exceptionally good opportunity to check on the effectiveness and shortcomings of programs, by providing us with criticisms from various sections of the country and from various sorts of people. If practicable, it would be a very interesting experiment to have a special person assigned to working out and carrying through this particular aspect of our project. If not, even a small number of groups would be worth fostering. In any case, the effectiveness of such group listening will depend on the alertness and perseverance of a few energetic, imaginative persons. We need to locate them in their several communities.

Any explicit plan for the distribution of supplementary mate-

rial had better await our experience. We do believe in developing such a plan to strengthen the objectives of our broadcasts and in carrying it out realistically to meet actual needs. Our activities would develop with the project and out of demands as they arise. In the meantime, we know there will be requests for reading lists and speeches, and these should be distributed as widely as we can manage. If we have a broadcaster working full time on this enterprise, he could prepare whatever supplementary material that he, the Committee, and the public agreed would be useful. This might include, not only reprints of broadcasts, with readings and perhaps outlines and introductory explanations, but he might also prepare summaries and outlines for study groups, questions and suggestions for discussions, and special material for forums which were using the broadcasts as a part of their historical approach to current issues.

The foregoing suggestions for promotion and follow-up are bare indications of what will be possible when several persons with keen interest in this educational venture and with lively imaginations concentrate their attention upon this problem of extending the effectiveness of the broadcasts. The Committee will carry out as thoroughgoing a program as is consistent with its objectives and its funds, and will endeavor to secure the best possible assistance for this purpose.

ELIZABETH YATES WEBB

●
LABOR

During the seven months that have elapsed since the convening of the last Assembly of the Council, the Labor Committee has been able to do little else than formulate plans for future broadcasting. Under a special conditional grant from the Carnegie Corporation the National Council has made available a sum of \$1,000 to match a similar amount appropriated by the Executive Committee of the Workers Education Bureau for the development of a series of radio programs on labor problems to begin in the fall of 1935. Plans for this series are as yet too

indefinite to admit of any extended description, but we shall attempt a faithful representation to the American public of the rôle of labor in our contemporary civilization.

Two other events, however, deserve special reference in this report. During the months of February and March the Columbia Broadcasting System made available three nation-wide broadcasts on Saturday evenings for a discussion of current labor problems. Two of these addresses were delivered by Mr. Matthew Woll on the question of wages and recovery, and the third was delivered by Senator McCarran of Nevada on the subject of the prevailing rate of wage. These addresses were widely reported in the papers and brought a considerable measure of public response. Two of them were published in the *Congressional Record*.

The second event of importance to the Assembly was the arrangement with the Columbia Broadcasting System for the presentation of the two international broadcasts from Geneva, Switzerland, by the Secretary of the Labor Committee on two Sundays, June 9 and 23. While these two broadcasts were not strictly under the direction of the Labor Committee, they were made possible through the long and co-operative relationship brought about by the Council. It is a matter of gratification to your Committee that the grant from the Carnegie Corporation just referred to will make it possible to continue this fall the useful series begun under the auspices of the Council during 1932.

MATTHEW WOLL, *Chairman*
SPENCER MILLER, JR., *Secretary*



LAND-GRANT COLLEGE RADIO

In the last report rendered by this committee considerable discussion was given to a survey conducted jointly with the Radio Committee of the Land-Grant Colleges, the Radio Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the United States Department of Agriculture, the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, the National Committee on Educa-

tion by Radio, and the United States Office of Education. Certain recommendations were made in that report to the Council, and, in addition, copies of the complete printed report were turned over to each organization co-operating in the survey and to those institutions in which the survey of radio was made.

The Land-Grant College Committee on Radio, which serves as a functional committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, found this survey of inestimable value in the preparation of factual data for presentation of the interests of educational institutions in radio in the hearing before the Federal Communications Commission in October, 1934. Briefly summarized, the Committee on Radio of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities recommended, and the member associations endorsed, the following general statement of principles which were presented to the Federal Communications Commission at the hearing just referred to:

1. The assurance to American listeners of the opportunity to hear a reasonable number of programs of information, instruction, and wholesome entertainment without advertising and free from domination by the advertisers; and
2. The protection of the broadcasting privileges of educational stations whose primary purpose is the broadcasting of programs designed to promote public welfare.
3. That existing educational public-welfare stations be protected in their present privileges; and
4. That provision be made for the improvement of the existing facilities of these educational public-welfare stations and for the establishment of additional stations of like character, as need for such stations appears, by allocating for non-commercial broadcasting a reasonable and adequate percentage of desirable channels and privileges; and
5. That in determining "public interest, convenience, and necessity" public welfare as a primary purpose of educational stations should be given due and favorable weight.

The Committee further wishes to call to your attention a statement on fundamental principles which should underlie American radio policy drawn by a committee of the conference on the use of radio as a cultural agency in a democracy and adopted by that conference on May 8, 1934. The statement follows.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

Listener's choice—The wholesome needs and desires of listeners should govern the character, the content, and the relative extent and frequency of programs broadcasted. Variety sufficient to satisfy the tastes of all groups of effective size should be provided. Matter detrimental to the welfare of listener groups should be eliminated regardless of commercial profit. The present operation of commercial stations secures neither a genuine expression of listener's choice nor an effective fulfillment of that choice.

Minority voice—Responsible groups, even the minorities, should not be debarred from broadcasting privileges because of their relative size, for radio is but the amplification and extension of the individual's free speech and discussion.

Youth protected—Positive, wholesome broadcasts for youth at home and in schools should be provided. The impressionable, defenseless minds of children and youth must be protected against insidious and harmful, degenerative influences.

America's best—The control and support of broadcasting should be such that the best obtainable of culture, of entertainment, of information, of statescraft shall have place on the air available to all the people.

Controversial issues—Discussion of live, controversial issues of general public concern should be encouraged for the safe and efficient functioning of a democracy and should not be denied a hearing because it is offensive to powerful advertisers.

Your Committee respectfully submits that the Association may well consider the adoption of these principles as basic in its policy toward the radio problem.

The Committee wishes to again reassert its stand that land-grant colleges and universities are institutions representing "public interest, convenience, and necessity," and as such they are entitled to a proportionate and adequate assignment of daytime broadcasting facilities with the assurance, by government regulations, that such facilities, when assigned to such institutions, will be protected from encroachment by other radio interests. Your Committee

Recommends, That land-grant colleges and universities continue to co-operate whenever possible with the radio service, office of information, and the United States Department of Agriculture in the maintenance and in the further development of the land-grant college and home-demonstration radio hours, and the National 4-H Club radio broadcasts.

Recommends further, That through the extension services of the respective institutions consideration be given to a more con-

certed effort in developing the broadcasting of educational programs over commercial radio stations.

The Committee does not wish to imply that land-grant colleges and universities should depend wholly upon commercial radio stations for broadcasting their educational services, for the Committee is convinced that to serve the best interests of the institutions land-grant colleges and universities should own their transmitters and have assigned to them wave-channels that cannot be encroached upon by other radio interests. But the Committee does recommend that the land-grant colleges give consideration to the possibilities that may be developed through commercial stations.

H. UMBERGER, *Chairman*

●

LIBRARY CO-OPERATION

The greater part of the Committee's work for the year ending has been devoted to the shaping of plans for effective library sponsored broadcasts. As the work will not mature for some months or even a year, at this time we must confine ourselves to reporting progress. Simultaneously one member of the committee, Miss Mary Gould Davis, has been actively engaged in furthering a plan, sponsored by the American Library Association in co-operation with other organizations, for establishing a central agency to promote radio programs for young people. The project as now shaped was unanimously endorsed by this committee which has recommended that the Executive Board express its interest in the undertaking. A third phase of the year's work centers around the endorsing and publicizing of continuing educational broadcasts. The interest aroused by these broadcasts may be advantageously sustained and further developed through follow-up work carried on by libraries.

RALPH A. ULVELING, *Chairman*

●

PARENT EDUCATION

The current year marks the tenth anniversary of parent-education broadcasting, the first programs for parents having been initiated by the Child Study Association as early as 1924. As a

result of the slow but steady growth of a decade, radio is now used by many parent-education organizations in every part of the country, broadcasting over both local and national networks. Although its use has spread, and its potential value in parent education has been increasingly recognized, there is as yet no means of pooling experience and no central source of information regarding the radio activities carried on by individual agencies. It is therefore difficult, if not impossible, to gather complete information on the present status of parent education by radio. In making this report no attempt has been made to cover the field exhaustively. The programs described here, however, are representative, and are particularly significant in that they suggest the increasing grasp of the possibilities and limitations of radio with which most programs for parents are being organized.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, of which Mrs. B. F. Langworthy is President, and Ada Hart Arlitt is Chairman of Parent Education, has conducted a weekly parent-education program in co-operation with the University of Chicago and the National Broadcasting Company. This series, extending from October to July, included addresses by about forty outstanding educators and leaders of public thought. Its purpose was to furnish a basis and guide for intelligent discussion of practical problems in listening groups organized under parent-teacher association auspices throughout the country: "Nationally known experts in the various fields represented bring to listening groups a new viewpoint and a broad knowledge of topics related to a question of vital interest to every parent today—changing family patterns." The age range covered was from infancy to late adolescence; some of the topics discussed will suggest the scope of the series as a whole: Do Parents Want Good Schools? Vocational Adjustments in a Changing Social Order, Individual Differences in Ability and Personality, The Movies in and out of School, The Radio as an Educational Agency, Changing the Child's Behavior-Habits, Nature and Place of Discipline in the Training of Children, The Lengthening Dependence of Young People, and The Father's Place in Modern Education.

Groups average about ten members, each of whom pays a registration fee of one dollar and receives in advance a pamphlet containing abstracts of the addresses, questions for discussion, and occasionally suggestions for reference reading. Group members are urged to send in suggestions as to questions they wish to have discussed.

The Iowa Radio Child Study Club was initiated in 1932 at the University of Iowa by the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station in co-operation with Iowa State College, at Ames, and Iowa State Teachers College, at Cedar Falls. Its fundamental purpose is to make available to the entire state up-to-date materials direct from child-development centers and to aid communities in organizing study groups. Each successive year has seen an expansion of the original program, which presented one course for parents of elementary-school children. Three courses were offered this year, each on a particular age-level—preschool, elementary school, and adolescence. Each course consisted of 22 weekly talks of thirty minutes each divided into two series on the semester plan. In order to make the groups as widely available to parents as possible, different days were assigned to each course, and an afternoon and evening broadcast given in each.

The total enrollment was 2,304, representing 144 groups in 62 Iowa cities, 13 out-of-state groups, and 44 individual members. In one city in another state, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, the elementary-school course was broadcast over the local radio station to a group of over one hundred. This course also had the largest total registration. The growth of the club from its inception is seen by comparing this report with that of 1932-33, which shows 31 groups with 425 members.

A wide range of topics is discussed in each group, covering physical, emotional, and intellectual development, discipline, sex education, play, leisure, responsibility and self-reliance, the use of money, and other problems related to each age-level.

The program for 1935-36 is similar in plan and purpose, but indicates further developments: a fourth course on the newborn infant has been added; and each course in the future will be planned as a two-year, rather than a single season, unit.

Parents may enroll for these Iowa child-study courses under

either a group or an individual plan. Each study group, made up of ten or more members and a leader, elects which course it wishes to follow. There is no charge for group enrollment. Leaders are supplied in advance of each broadcast with a copy of the lecture, suggested reading references, and a problem for discussion. The group works out a suggested solution to the problem and sends in its answer on a report form provided for this purpose. These reports are assembled and discussed over the radio two weeks later. Libraries have co-operated to make reference books available. Parent-teacher-association study groups enrolled in the Radio Child Study Club receive credit toward standard or superior rating. Individual members may enroll upon payment of a registration fee of fifty cents for each series. Each individual member receives a copy of the lecture and the assignment for each lesson and reports a solution to the problem.

The University of Minnesota conducts two radio programs for parents. The study program consists of three series of talks for listening-in groups given by Miss Esther McGinnis under the joint auspices of the University of Minnesota and the State Congress of Parents and Teachers. The latter organization undertakes the organization of the groups, of which there were 37 this year with a total registration of 334. In addition, there is evidence of much listening by individuals. It is significant that this program was continued as a direct result of the expressions of interest on the part of parents which were received by the broadcasting company. The topics of the three series, each of about eight weekly broadcasts, were: Youth in a Changing World; Adolescents and Their Parents; and Adolescents Themselves. Before each series the groups were provided with mimeographed outlines giving the titles of the talks, questions for discussion, reference reading, suggestions for conducting the group, and blanks for its reports. The second program sponsored by the University of Minnesota was an informal series in story form, *The Betterson's Neighbors*. Although this has been continued for many years and seems to have aroused wide interest (it is rebroadcast by stations in both St. Paul and Duluth),

no statistics as to numbers of listeners are available. The continuities, written by Marion Faegre and Pearl Cummings, cover such familiar situations as *The Gang under the Street Light*, *What Shall We Do about Hallowe'en?* *What Makes John So Irritable?* and *That Guilty Feeling!*

The Department of Education of the state of Vermont has tried an interesting experiment in presenting parent-education content over the radio in dramatized form. Under the title, *The Allen Family*, this program presents sketches depicting familiar situations in a family of mother, father, and three children of varied ages. It is under the general supervision of Martha P. Buttrick, state supervisor of parent education for the Vermont Emergency Relief Administration.

The Child Study Association has continued to maintain its active interest in, and use of, the radio as a means of reaching a wide public. During the current season it has presented about fifty programs over local and national networks. It has experimented with several types of presentation in addition to the usual lecture or talk by a single speaker. There have been several group presentations or symposia. An informal question-and-answer dialogue between the speaker and the announcer has also been tried out and found particularly live and effective. A number of broadcasting companies have shown an increasing interest in parent-education programs and have called upon the Association for various special series. During the months of March and April, 1935, the Association carried on three such series simultaneously, one series of three weekly broadcasts and two of one weekly. With these, and occasional hours over other stations, the Association's staff was on the air on an average of four times a week for eight weeks. The Association will continue this type of co-operation over various networks next year; for the spring and summer it has, however, reduced its broadcasting since some of its staff members are on leave. These series were given by the staff and officers of the Association. Other radio speakers under Association auspices have included: Harold F. Clark, Louis I. Dublin, Harrison Elliott, Paul Hanly Furfey, Benjamin C. Gruenberg, Joseph Jastrow, Eduard C.

Lindeman, Eric Matsner, M.D., Bruce B. Robinson, M.D., Arthur L. Swift, Jr., and Ira S. Wile, M.D. Some of the titles will suggest the range of problems covered: *The Family and Its Functions Today*, *Health and Personality*, *The Professional Woman at Home*, *Growing Up with Our Children*, *Good Homes in Times of Stress*, *Parents as Teachers*, *Spending and Earning*, *The Child Who Is "Different,"* *The Gifted Child*, *Why Is Daily Conduct So Important?* and *Obedience and Rewards*.

The Alabama College Radio Club, which has recently been organized by the State College for Women at Montevallo, Alabama, offers a program for parents either in groups or individually. The general organization is similar to that described under the Iowa Radio Child Study Club. In its first year, this Radio Club served 51 groups and had a total enrollment of 517 members, who followed a twelve-weeks course on general problems of child management. Next year two additional courses will be added and the subject-matter will be subdivided according to age-level.

The Ohio State University has presented two series of broadcasts for parents under the supervision of Miss Virginia Sander-son. The winter series was entitled *What Is Progressive Education?* and the spring series, *The Child and the School*. The programs are a half-hour in length and are given one evening each week. Though the Ohio School of the Air, of which Mr. B. H. Darrow is Director, is primarily concerned with broadcasts to schools, it has assisted the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers with occasional broadcasts, and with the organization of a series to be given during the coming year.

Many other national and local organizations, and educational institutions serving parents or interested in child welfare, have been making the radio an integral part of their general parent-education programs. But as has already been pointed out, there is at present no means of making a survey of all that is going on in the field. Moreover, in addition to all of these programs under recognized educational auspices, a great deal of miscellaneous "advice to parents" is on the air. Most of this is broadcast by individuals, as a rule on commercially sponsored

programs. The extent, and the effect on parents, of this type of program is impossible to estimate.

The situation as a whole has pointed clearly to the urgent need for some means of co-ordinating effort and pooling experience in the use of radio for parent education. As a step in this direction, the Radio Committee of the National Council of Parent Education, of which the writer is chairman, took the initiative in calling a meeting of representatives of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education and of the National Council of Parent Education on April 12, 1935. Those present were Ralph P. Bridgman, Sidonie M. Gruenberg, Levering Tyson, Lita Bane, William E. Blatz, and George D. Stoddard. The group felt, according to Mr. Bridgman, that all the evidence now available points to a continuing interest on the part of parent listeners, an increasing co-operation on the part of broadcasting stations, and a growing concern among adult- and parent-education workers. In order to make the most of this favorable situation, ways and means should be considered: for securing a fuller knowledge of the extent and content of parent-education broadcasting today; for gaining a fuller understanding of the difficulties and problems involved, and a clearer vision of what studies and experiments might aid in their solution; and for offering counsel and guidance on parent-education broadcasting.

It was agreed that a joint committee of the two Councils should take responsibility for the general direction of whatever program might develop, and that those present should form the nucleus of this committee, with the addition of representatives of other interested national organizations.

Some possibilities and problems which such a committee might well consider were outlined as follows; the first two were felt to be the most needed and immediately practicable:

The preparation and distribution of a statement, regarding parent-education broadcasting, to be worked out by a representative discussion group.—This statement should outline the parent-education broadcaster's responsibilities to the public, the scope of available topics and material, and suggestions as to suitable procedures for presenting different types of programs; it should also

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

indicate the areas in which further experiment is needed, and suggest what lines of development seem most promising.

A study of parent-education broadcasting.—In addition to information about the number of stations, programs, broadcasters, listening groups, and the like, this should include an organized plan for the further development and improvement of parent education over the air.

An information service.—A means of spreading information to the general public and for educators, regarding local and national programs, stations, available materials, and similar data.

Encouragement and counsel for local broadcasters of parent education.—Since parent-education broadcasts tend to be more effective when they take into account such matters as local needs and the special interests of the listening groups with which the broadcaster is in close touch, it was agreed that local programs should be encouraged. At the same time it was recognized that many local programs could be improved, if local parent-education broadcasters had access to some central counseling service which could furnish information about the failures and successes of other local programs.

Experiment through selected stations with different types of presentation.—These might include the presentation by a single skilled radio speaker of scripts written by different specialists; the uses of various kinds of programs, such as lectures, discussions, dialogues, and dramatic continuities; the effectiveness of programs of various lengths; and the special needs of organized listening groups. Other problems for experiment would undoubtedly arise as the work progressed.

Another useful service might be the preparation and distribution of information for listeners' groups—in a form similar to news releases, and also to the bulletins of Consumers' Research. This would enable listeners to check the accuracy of broadcasting, especially on such scientific questions as nutrition, physical growth, and the like.

Preparation and distribution to parent-education groups of study materials on the problems related to children's radio listening.—These should include discussions of such questions as parental responsibility for the guidance of children in radio listening; the implications of advertising programs addressed to children; the development of taste and capacity for choice in children; the possibilities of radio as a means of drawing the family together through shared interests, and so on.

The final suggestion made at this meeting links parent education by radio with the whole complex question of radio as it affects children. Parent educators are awake to the potentialities of broadcasting to parents; they cannot fail to take equal cognizance of their obligation to co-operate in developing the possibilities of radio for the enrichment of child life. The whole field of broadcasting for children is one which is arousing the keenest interest, not only among broadcasters and advertisers, individual parents and parents'

organizations, but also among educators, psychologists, and all professional groups who work with children.

The Child Study Association has been actively concerned with this field for a number of years and recently organized a Committee on Radio for Children similar to its long established Children's Book Committee. In evaluating current programs and in discussing parental attitudes toward broadcasting for children, the Committee has been of real service in clarifying some of the issues involved. As a result of its first season's work an annotated list of radio programs for children was prepared and has been published by the Radio Institute of the Audible Arts. This list will be brought up to date in the fall of 1935. The Committee reports not only that there has already been marked improvement in broadcasting for children, but also that there are indications of an increasingly constructive approach.

*Radio and Children*¹ is a study not only of the effect of radio upon children themselves, but also of the implications of the "radio problem" as related to parental management of children and to family relationships. Some of the points brought out in this brochure are here summarized briefly. While not minimizing the problem, or the concern with which many parents view the possible effect on their children of certain types of radio programs, it suggests that these situations are often of an individual nature, varying with the type of child. Though the radio still addresses itself to the "average child," who is notoriously non-existent (and from its nature perhaps can never do otherwise), the child in the home is a unique personality and must be so treated by his parents. It is, therefore, out of the question to establish general rules for guidance in the use of the radio. Parents can be most helpful when they consider the child's behavior with respect to radio as a symptom, rather than a cause, and guide him in the selection of programs best suited to his individual personality.

Instead of looking upon children's radio interests as mani-

¹ *Radio and Children*. By Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg. Published by the Radio Institute of the Audible Arts, 1935.

festations of wickedness or perversity, we might profitably consider them as indications of drives and desires that somehow must be met and that are present whether we have any radio or not. The radio programs preferred by children of different age-levels bear a striking resemblance to their preferences in other fields; and these preferences, however manifested, represent real needs. The radio is only one of the instruments through which the growing individual can share the experience of others and so grow in stature and understanding. The child is not aware that he is seeking through radio vicarious expansion of his own personality; it is sufficient that he likes it. It is for parents and educators to recognize that there are values here, notwithstanding frequent crudities or extravagances.

There is probably no program that is good for all children or bad for all children. Moreover the conditions of the times and the child's background may influence both the appeal and effect of a program. The speed which characterizes exciting radio features is part of the age in which our children live; and they do not need to make the adjustments which their parents apprehend. Because children differ so tremendously in the temperaments and prior experiences they bring to any situation, it is never possible to predict what a specific exposure to books, to movies, to radio, will have upon them. Probably the good effects are as unpremeditated as the bad. We have not yet found any sure way through our didactic teaching to make our children good. We may at least suspect that some of the objectionable lessons are equally ineffective in making them bad.

But this does not imply that parents must accept for their children what they know to be unworthy. Through analyzing parental criticisms of radio, it is possible to discover and formulate certain criteria, the validity of which the intelligent and fair-minded among parents and broadcasters will recognize:

1. *Emotional emphasis.*—While excitement and adventure are both valid and desirable in children's entertainment, dramatized violence, brutality, and crime are hardly suitable for their daily consumption. An adventure story must be exciting—else who would care to follow it? But, on the other hand, a too sus-

tained excitement defeats itself; there must be light and shade to make the dramatic effect. The attempt to exert disciplinary pressure by way of broadcasting also has emotional implications. These may involve problems so much more deep-seated than the behavior difficulty the program tries to correct that the whole procedure lays itself open to serious question.

2. *Good taste.*—On this question we may find it more difficult to fix specific standards, yet certainly we recognize and may reject “low” comedy, coarse voices, offensively loud noises, and unworthy behavior.

3. *Truthfulness.*—We may legitimately demand truthfulness and sincerity in programs where either the background or the story itself purports to convey information. Sketches based on historical, geographical, or scientific material must be authentic and accurate. But we cannot apply this criterion in the same way to programs that are frankly imaginative. The borderline between realism and phantasy is a radio problem.

4. *Attitudes and sentiment.*—Closely related to reliability is the question of the sentiment which a program manifests or cultivates. Here, too, it is impossible to set up hard and fast standards, but we can certainly demand genuineness and integrity. If partisan opinions are on the air, children should at least have an opportunity to hear both sides. In programs designed for amusement, the subtle arts of propaganda have no place. There is serious question whether some of the methods used to teach children ideas are effective, and whether many things which seem “bad for them” actually have the undesirable effects some parents fear. At least this is still such an open question, that we must be wary of condemning programs on the grounds that they will, for instance, make children militaristic or lawless.

5. *Language and quality.*—Criticisms of slang, bad grammar, vulgarisms, and poor diction may properly be directed against announcers or speakers; but they are pointless when directed against a performer speaking “in character.” More important than the minutiae of diction is the question of quality in the whole program. We do have a right to expect certain stand-

ards in writing, dramatic presentation, acting, and incidental music.

6. *Advertising.*—The advertising policy is a factor to be considered in evaluating any program. Competitive pressure often seems to tempt radio advertisers to unsound devices in which the best interests of children are forgotten.

The rôle which parent-education leaders must play in this whole movement toward the improvement of children's broadcasts is clearly visualized by those, like the members of this group, who are in close touch with both fields. The closing paragraph of *Radio and Children* emphasizes this obligation to act as interpreters and leaders in a co-operative effort:

Parents will therefore be most effective, and their own purposes will in the long run be best served, when they combine with their point of view that of educators and psychologists and of others who are in a position to take a wider and less personal view of all the issues involved. Parents do have to guard against having imposed upon their children programs determined by a single group. It is obvious that no single group, not even an association of parents, can be allowed to impose upon the rest of the community its notions of what is suitable and proper for children. The problem of suitable and proper programs can be solved only through pooling a wide range of experience and judgment, and discussions in this spirit are essential if the radio is to fulfill its promise as a medium which can meet an almost infinite variety of common needs. . . . There is danger that otherwise it will be dominated too much by fears and pressures and panics. . . . The greatest need in the development of the radio is to have the creative efforts of talented men and women turned toward this field as worthy of serious application.

This need is not confined to children's programs. Broadcasting for the general public makes an equal demand for creative effort on the part of everyone interested in radio's future.

SIDONIE M. GRUENBERG, *Chairman*



SPANISH

Three years ago the Spanish Committee formulated a plan for an elaborate series of broadcasts on Spanish topics. The first few numbers in the series were to deal with the life and customs of the people of Spain. With this as a background, the remainder of the series was designed to show how these customs,

and Spanish culture in general, spread over into the new world and into a large portion of our own country and how they have had considerable influence in our own national development. Most of the details of the program were decided upon and the foremost authorities, speakers, and artists were tentatively selected. Unfortunately, the necessary funds were not available to put the program on the air.

Since that date the Committee has been standing by awaiting the time when the money will become available. In the meantime, conditions have changed in the field of broadcasting as well as in the taste and interests of the public so that now it will be necessary to modify and rearrange the original plans considerably when an opportunity is presented to put the program on the air. Your Committee also has suffered casualties, but it is still ready for work.

FRANK CALLCOTT, *Chairman*



VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

The general objectives of the Committee may be summarized as follows: to broadcast the idea that every person should plan his vocational life with care; that drifting is likely to lead to failure and unhappiness; to describe and explain the steps one should take in making vocational plans; to deal with certain persistent problems and conditions encountered in occupational life; to keep before the public consciousness the need for vocational guidance, to give an understanding of the existing agencies now concerned with it, and to suggest possibilities for extending its scope. A considerable amount of broadcasting on this theme has been carried on by city and state boards of education, and by interested agencies such as Y.M.C.A., Kiwanis, and the like.

The chief activity of the Committee during the past year has been centered on the program entitled *The World's Work*, sponsored by the American School of the Air. This consisted of twenty-three so-called vocational-guidance periods, scheduled on Fridays at 2:45 o'clock. Instead of using the lecture

method or the interview technique which has been used almost exclusively heretofore, the Committee planned a series of dramatic sketches to be as interesting, if possible, as the popular commercial dramatizations. Technical materials were assembled by the Committee and were placed in the hands of experienced scenarists, whose services were paid for through a grant from the National Occupational Conference; professional actors were provided by the School of the Air; and a sheet containing suggestions for utilizing each broadcast was prepared to accompany each lesson.

While an accurate count could not be made of the schools and individuals using the broadcasts, the number of schools regularly receiving the suggestion sheets numbered several hundreds. Correspondence revealed an immense audience of parents who were regular listeners. The dramatic nature of the presentations elicited praise from all sources. In response to a lively demand, preparations are being made for the publishing of the scripts for use in various localities and especially for school-assembly programs. In the effort to determine the practicality of electrical transcriptions one broadcast has just been transcribed. If the market seems to warrant, the entire series planned for the academic year 1935-36 will be transcribed, and the records will be sold for sums ranging from \$1 to \$2 each, depending on the quantity produced.

The Committee hopes during the coming year to sponsor an investigation looking toward the measurement of the learning and the changes in attitude toward occupations produced by the broadcasts.

HARRY D. KITSON, *Chairman*

RESEARCH

AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

RESEARCH AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

STUDIES OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

● TRACY F. TYLER

SECRETARY AND RESEARCH DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
BY RADIO

TWENTY-FIVE state departments of education, about the same number as reported last year, have been using radio since September 1, 1934, according to reports received from a recent inquiry.¹ This annual inquiry, which has been carried on during the past three years, reveals that six states, California, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, and Oregon, have carried on regular radio broadcasting programs during the entire three years. Although the same number of states (12) are carrying on regular broadcasts as were doing so a year ago, the number of states using radio has increased from 14 to 25. State departments of education, with a single exception, have not been required to pay for radio time used. The three states, Wisconsin, Ohio, and North Carolina, which were carrying on schools of the air during 1933-34 were still carrying on these schools during the current year.

Eighteen of the state education associations of the United States have been making use of the radio since September 1, 1934. Only five associations however, have been carrying on regular programs. The other thirteen presented programs occasionally. These programs were given generally either during American Education Week or to present information concerning legislative matters during an election campaign. California, Iowa, and South Dakota, states which broadcast regularly last

¹ This report describes briefly three service studies carried on by the National Committee on Education by Radio during the past year. More complete reports of each study, in mimeographed form, may be obtained by addressing the Committee at 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

year, are still maintaining a regular program. North Dakota and Tennessee are new additions to the ranks of regular broadcasters. The programs presented by the associations are planned for a general audience rather than for specific groups. None of the states presenting regular broadcasts is required to pay for the time it uses. Co-operative arrangements in the presentation of radio programs are reported by but two states, Maine and Oregon, as compared with the four reporting such arrangements last year. It would appear that some sort of working arrangement between the state department of education, the state education association, the state congress of parents and teachers, and the state educational institutions in each state might make it possible to present some particularly effective radio programs.

Twenty-seven state congresses of parents and teachers reported the presentation of regular radio programs since September 1, 1934, as compared with the 23 reported last year. Seven states reported the presentation of occasional programs. The data collected indicate a decided increase in the radio activities of the state branches. Listening groups have been of particular interest and were reported in 26 states. Thirteen of these had made sufficient check-ups to report that the listening-group method was successful. Fifty stations were being used regularly by the 27 state congresses. The usual program is of 15-minute duration. It is presented at an afternoon hour about the middle of the week, and the time is provided free by the station manager. New Jersey reported an interesting experiment. Broadcasts in the Italian language were being given from Jersey City and Camden. The programs originated with the Italian people themselves. The talks were on the subjects of health and child care. It was found upon translation that these talks were on a par with the regular congress broadcasts given in English.

A TECHNIQUE FOR MEASURING ATTITUDES AT THE ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL LEVEL

● FREDERICK B. DAVIS

PEBBLE HILL SCHOOL, DE WITT, NEW YORK

● CALVIN J. NICHOLS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FOR several years the Columbia Broadcasting System has been experimenting with educational programs intended for reception in school classrooms and has tried through its American School of the Air to make the programs as effective as possible. With this end in view, the Columbia System recently sponsored an experiment designed to measure the educational effectiveness of a summary incorporated into one of its regular programs, a geography lesson presented in the form of a drama concerning Manchuria.¹

Tests were constructed to measure the effect of the summary in producing learning of an informational sort and in changing certain attitudes of the pupils. The three attitudes which we attempted to measure were: the attitude toward the Japanese people, the attitude toward the Chinese people, and the attitude toward international aggressions. It is primarily with the techniques employed to measure these three attitudes that this report is concerned.

Our subjects consisted of several hundred children in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. Few studies in the measurement of attitudes have been reported which utilize subjects as young as these. Most of the important work in this field has been done with college students or adults.

In constructing the attitude scales for use in this experiment, we kept in mind the findings of Kelley, Likert, and Kulp.²

¹ The authors are greatly indebted to Miss Helen Johnson, broadcasting director of the American School of the Air, for her co-operation and helpfulness.

² Since reported in: Kelley, T. L., and Krey, A. C. *Tests and Measurements in the Social Studies*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1934, pp. 84-85

Likert, Rensis. *A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes*. New York: Columbia University, 1932. (Archives of Psychology, No. 140.)

Kulp, D. H. "Statements in Attitude Tests," *Sociology and Social Research*, XVIII (September-October, 1933), pp. 18-29.

Items for the Japanese and International Aggression scales were culled from various sources and modified to suit our needs. The items for the Chinese scale were taken directly from the Peterson-Thurstone Chinese scale on the basis of suitability for use as a multiple-choice item, and the vocabulary difficulty of the items.

Two forms of the attitude scales were prepared, each form containing 36 items. Every third item tested a given attitude variable; thus 12 items in each form pertained to each variable. The items were rotated in this fashion in the hope that the pupils might not be able to tell exactly what they were being tested on. Each item offered five alternatives (I Agree Strongly, I Agree, Undecided, I Disagree, I Disagree Strongly) to which arbitrary weights (0, 1, 2, 3, 4) were assigned. It was intended in each case to represent the liberal point of view by the larger weights. The "direction" of the weights for each item was checked by the method of internal consistency, using the results of preliminary forms administered to sixth-grade pupils in Belmont, Massachusetts. A few completely non-diagnostic or "reversed" items, most of them ambiguous statements, were eliminated by this means. The two forms of the test were then built up in such a way as to equate them as far as possible.

Our experimental set-up made it possible to isolate the effect of the summary on the attitudes of the children. One group of children was given one form of the attitude scales shortly before the broadcast and another form of the scales immediately after the entire broadcast. Another group of pupils took one form just before the broadcast and another form after listening to the broadcast without the summary. In both groups, half of the children took Form A of the scales first and Form B second; the other half reversed that order. Since the two groups and the two halves of each group were selected at random, there is no reason to suppose that they were not roughly comparable.

Because we did not utilize a central group, we cannot state exactly the possible effect of agencies other than the broadcast on the pupils' attitudes. A control group would have taken the tests before and after the broadcast simultaneously with their

fellow students, but they would not have heard any part of the broadcast. However, our testing schedule and instructions to the teachers participating made it unlikely that any agency other than the broadcast operated between tests to affect systematically the variables being measured.

We could not obtain a measure of the reliability of the attitude scales used in this experiment by correlating Forms A and B because of the intervening broadcast. Instead, we have used the well-known split-half Spearman-Brown method. In Table I are shown the estimated reliability coefficients for four groups

TABLE I
ESTIMATED RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS ON THE TWO FORMS
OF THE ATTITUDES TESTS

	Japanese Scale	Chinese Scale	Aggression Scale
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Grade VI (Tacoma, 62 pupils)—			
Form A.....	.87 ± .02	.82 ± .03	.67 ± .05
Form B.....	.77 ± .03	.84 ± .03	.64 ± .05
Grade V (Bremerton, 17 pupils)—			
Form A.....	.92 ± .03	.56 ± .11	.61 ± .10
Form B.....	.74 ± .07	.79 ± .06	.58 ± .11

of pupils at Tacoma and Bremerton, Washington. These reliability coefficients are surprisingly high when the small number of items per scale is considered. The lower reliability of the International Aggression scale is not unexpected since the concepts underlying this variable are more abstract. That 12-item scales should yield such high reliabilities, considering the nature of the variables measured, the grade-levels of the pupils measured, the homogeneity of the groups, and the scoring system employed is interesting. It leads us to the tentative conclusion that the children's reactions to many specific items are based on some common factors, some generalities in mental life, which point to the existence of definite attitudes in children as young as ten or eleven years of age.

The effect of the scoring system on the reliability of the

scales has not as yet been determined. Likert investigated the relationship between scores obtained by means of arbitrary weights, the "direction" of which had been checked by the method of internal consistency, and standard scores calculated from the distribution of responses to each item. Since he obtained high correlations between the two sets of scores, he concluded that the arbitrary weights were equally effective and far more economical of time and effort. This conclusion, however, did not take into consideration the probable higher reliability of the standard scores.

Included among the sixth-grade pupils whom we tested at Tacoma, Washington, were a number of Japanese pupils. The scores of ten of them who happened to take Form B of our attitude scale before the Manchurian broadcast have been averaged separately and compared with the mean scores of 57 of their non-Japanese classmates who also took Form B before the broadcast. On the Japanese scale, the Japanese pupils obtained a mean score considerably higher than the non-Japanese pupils, the difference being 7.8 times its standard error. On the other two scales, the Japanese children obtained mean scores significantly lower than those of their non-Japanese classmates.

Since the validity of our scales is dependent on the extent to which they are able to differentiate between people favorably disposed toward the Japanese and Chinese peoples and international aggression and those not so disposed, we may regard the mean scores just mentioned as evidence tending to indicate the validity of the scales.

In order to show the relationships between the three variables tested by our scales, we have estimated the intercorrelations of scores on the three scales. After correcting these coefficients for attenuation, we obtained the values given in Table II.

A considerable amount of overlapping between the Chinese and Japanese scores is indicated; this probably represents a generalized attitude toward Orientals. It is clear, however, that the overlapping is small enough to warrant the construction of two separate scales. The negative correlation between liking for the Japanese people and international non-aggression is interesting in view of Japanese foreign policy in recent years.

A complete report of the conclusions drawn from this study is available elsewhere, but a brief résumé seems appropriate here.¹ The entire broadcast produced no statistically significant differences in the attitudes of the groups tested, but this does not mean that there were no changes in the scores of individual pupils or that their distribution about the mean remained the same. For example, in one group of 46 pupils, the correlation between scores on Form A (given before the broadcast) and Form B (given after the broadcast) of the Japanese scale was found to be only $.27 \pm .09$. This low correlation indicates that

TABLE II
 INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE THREE VARIABLES ON FORM A
 BY THE SIXTH-GRADE PUPILS AT TACOMA—THE RELIABILITY
 COEFFICIENTS ARE SHOWN IN PARENTHESES
 (63 Pupils)

	Japanese Scale	Chinese Scale	Aggression Scale*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Japanese scale.....	(.87)	.52	-.32
Chinese scale.....		(.82)	.31
Aggression scale.....			(.67)

* High scores indicate favorableness to non-aggression.

the individual scores in the distribution changed more than would have been expected by chance. But these changes within the group were not systematic and cancelled themselves out; the mean remaining practically constant while the standard deviation increased. The increase in the variability of the groups as a result of the broadcast is, perhaps, attributable to the fact that the broadcast intensified the attitudes of the pupils with respect to the three factors which we attempted to measure.

Sectional and grade differences between the various groups tested were small and statistically insignificant. If school work in the elementary grades is intended to engender feelings of friendship for the Chinese and Japanese peoples, it apparently fails to attain that objective.

¹ "Research Studies in Education by Radio," Co-operative Group. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1935.

In conclusion, the authors wish to stress the importance of measuring attitudes in practical school work. Curriculums usually state their objectives in terms of knowledge to be acquired, skills to be developed, and attitudes to be cultivated. Although the terminology may differ somewhat, the classification of objectives is fundamentally the same. Certainly, the importance of the development of proper attitudes has been recognized. But, as yet, the schools have not checked up on their acquisition as they have in the case of knowledge and skills. This has been true partly because suitable measuring instruments have not been available. The three simple scales employed in this experiment are easily administered and scored by the classroom teacher, and at the same time they appear to have satisfactory reliabilities for group measurement. If both forms of the Japanese or Chinese scales are administered, the accuracy of measurement becomes almost great enough to allow individual diagnosis. Additional proof of their validity is needed.

Although the type of scale that we have used is not immune to the effects of deliberate "faking" on the pupil's part, it may prove to be of some practical utility. The development of free-association or controlled-association tests may provide a new and perfected sort of attitude scale. Meanwhile, the construction of a battery of adequate scales of the type used in this experiment might be of considerable value. In any case, further experimentation in this field is badly needed.

RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL RADIO

●

THE practice of listing the titles of research studies in educational radio, completed each year, was begun in *Education on the Air, 1933*. This bibliography is the third annual list and includes materials which have been completed since June, 1934. Many of the titles mentioned are reports compiled by the members of the so-called Co-operative Group who have been reporting their findings to each other for several years. The procedure has been for all such studies carried on by individuals to be re-

ported to the Radio Division of the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University. The Radio Division, in turn, distributes copies of the projects to each member of the Co-operative Group.

1. Barr, A. S., and Willing, M. H. "Foundations of Teaching." Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Extension Division, 1935. 272 pp. Mimeographed. (Series I. Round-table discussions of the problems of classroom instruction)
2. British Broadcasting Corporation. *Yearbooks* 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934 and 1935. London, England: British Broadcasting Corporation. (8 vols.)
3. Brockway, Don C. "Sound in Education." 1934. A Master's thesis on file at the University of Southern California Library.
4. Brockway, Don C., and Brockway, William W. "Survey of the School Use of Centralized Sound Equipment," *1934 Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1934. pp. 418-25.
5. Brockway, William W. "Sound System Engineering for Schools." 1934. A Master's thesis on file at the University of Southern California Library.
6. Bryant, George R. "Organizing Radio Junior-College Groups," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 191-96.
7. Callcott, Frank. "Spanish" Committee Report, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 276-77.
8. Cantril, H., and Allport, G. W. *The Psychology of Radio*. New York: Harpers, 1935. To be published in the early fall of 1935.
9. Columbia Broadcasting System. *The Truth about the Harvard Findings*. New York: Columbia Broadcasting System, December, 1934. (Summary of Harvard experiments on subject of visual and auditory presentation.)
10. Cortright, Rupert L. "A Technique for Measuring Perceptual Differences for Radio and Direct Audience Speaking and Some Results Concerning Intersensory Induction as Measured from Auditory Acuity Deprived of Vision." 1935. A Doctor's thesis on file in the library of the University of Michigan.
11. Darrow, B. H. "Can the School Teach Discrimination in Radio Listening?" *Educational Method*, XIV (March, 1935), pp. 311-15.
12. Davis, Frederick B., and Nichols, Calvin J. "A Technique for Measuring Attitudes at the Elementary-School Level," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 283-88.
13. Denison, Merrill, and Menser, C. L. "Techniques Clinic," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 199-206.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

14. Der Schulfunk. *Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft*. Berlin-Charlottenburg 9.
15. DeWick, Henry N. "The Relative Recall Effectiveness of Visual and Auditory Presentation of Advertising Material." To be published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
16. Dunn, Fannie W., and Koon, C. M. "Radio in the Classroom." New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934. 34 pp. Mimeographed. (A bibliography used in connection with a course in radio education.)
17. Eklo, Elmer B. "Teaching Poetry Appreciation by Radio." 1935. A Master's thesis on file in the library of the University of Wisconsin.
18. Ewbank, H. L. "Conservation of Radio Resources." Madison, Wisconsin: Station WHA, 1935.
19. d'Harnoncourt, Rene. "Art," Committee Report, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 234-38.
20. Hettinger, Herman S. ed. *Radio: The Fifth Estate*. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1935. vii+301 pp. (The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 177)
21. Jackson, E. W. "School-wide Radio at Low Cost," *Journal of Education*, CXVII (June 4, 1934), p. 308.
22. Jansky, C. M., Jr.; Higgy, R. C.; and Salisbury, Morse. *The Problem of the Institutionally Owned Station*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1934. v+32 pp. (Information Bulletin No. 10, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education.)
23. Kitson, Harry D. "Vocational Guidance," Committee Report, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 277-78.
24. Koon, Cline M., and McCabe, Martha R. *Good References on Education by Radio*. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education. 1935. In press. (A revision of Bibliography No. 6, 1932.)
25. Koon, C. M. "Broadcasting to Schools." To be published by the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education.
26. Koon, C. M. "Educational-Cultural Influence of Broadcasting in the United States," *The Intellectual and Educational Rôle of Broadcasting*. Paris, France: International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation (2, Rue de Montpensier, Palais-Royal), 1935. 312 pp.
27. Koon, C. M. "Electrifying Education," *School Life*. Continuous. (Short reports on the activities and publications in radio education.)
28. Koon, C. M. *Some Public Service Broadcasting*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1934. iii+36 pp. (Information Bulletin No. 12, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education.)
29. Long, T. S. "An Analysis of Children's Radio Programs." 1935. A Master's thesis on file in the library of the Catholic University of America.

30. MacLatchy, Josephine H. ed. *Education on the Air*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, and 1934. (Proceedings of the meetings of the Institute for Education by Radio for the years mentioned.)
31. MacLatchy, Josephine H. ed. *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Institute for Education by Radio combined with the Fifth Annual Assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, Columbus, Ohio, May 6-8, 1935.)
32. Merrill, Vivian. "Radio Teaching versus Classroom Instruction in Literature Lessons for the Fifth Grade." 1935. A Master's thesis on file in the library of the University of Wisconsin.
33. Miller, Allen. "Developments in Radio Education," *National University Extension Association Proceedings*, 1934. pp. 85-90.
34. Miller, Allen. "Techniques of Presenting Dialogue," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 149-57.
35. National Committee on Education by Radio. *Education by Radio*. Washington, D.C.: National Committee on Education by Radio. 1931-35. Vols. I, II, III, IV, and V.
36. "Parents, Children and Radio: a Summary of the Symposium," *Child Study*, XII (January, 1935), pp. 124-26.
37. Read, Conyers. "The Problem of Program Organization," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 158-62.
38. Redefer, F. L. "Radio Programs for Children," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 129-37.
39. Society for Improvement of Children's Programs. "One Thousand Listening Parents Discover Fine Radio Programs for Their Children." Chicago: Society for Improvement of Children's Programs, 1935. 5 pp. Mimeographed.
40. Stanton, Frank N. "A Critique of Present Methods and a New Plan for Studying Radio Listening Behavior." 1935. A Doctor's thesis on file in the library of the Ohio State University.
41. Stuebaker, J. W. "Radio Hearings," *School Life*, XX (December, 1934), pp. 78-79.
42. Tyler, I. Keith. "Interests of Secondary School Pupils in Commercial Radio Programs." Oakland, California: Oakland Public Schools, 1934. 8 pp. Mimeographed.
43. Tyler, Tracy F. "Broadcasts by Senior High Schools," *Secondary Education*, IV (March, 1935), pp. 102-104.
44. Tyler, Tracy F. "Organizing Listening Groups," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 168-80.
45. Tyler, Tracy F. "Radio and Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XVII (February, 1935), pp. 115-17.
46. Tyler, Tracy F. *Radio as a Cultural Agency*. Washington, D.C.: National Committee on Education by Radio, 1934. 150 pp.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

47. Tyler, Tracy F. "Radio Broadcasting Activities of State Congresses of Parents and Teachers." Washington, D.C.: National Committee on Education by Radio, February, 1935. 8 pp. Mimeographed.
48. Tyler, Tracy F. "Radio Broadcasting Activities of State Departments of Education." Washington, D.C.: National Committee on Education by Radio. February, 1935. 8 pp. Mimeographed.
49. Tyler, Tracy F. "Radio Broadcasting Activities of State Teachers Associations." Washington, D.C.: National Committee on Education by Radio, February, 1935. 7 pp. Mimeographed.
50. Tyler, Tracy F. "Radio Education." College Park, Maryland: The University of Maryland, 1934. 24 pp. Mimeographed. (A bibliography used in connection with a course in radio education.)
51. Tyler, Tracy F. "Studies of the National Committee," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 281-82.
52. Tyler, Tracy F. "What English Teachers Should Know about the Broadcasting Situation in the United States," *English Journal*, XXIV (April, 1935), pp. 316-18.
53. Tyson, Levering, ed. *Radio and Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931, 1932, 1933 and 1934. (Proceedings of the Assemblies of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education for the years mentioned.)
54. Tyson, Levering. "Report of the Director of the Council," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 215-34.
55. Ulveling, Ralph A. "Library Co-operation," Committee Report, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. p. 265.
56. Umberger, H. "Land-Grant College Radio," Committee Report, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education," *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 262-65.
57. Willis, F. A. *Widening Horizons*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1934. iv+14 pp. (Information Bulletin No. 11, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education.)
58. Winch, Leland S. "A Vocabulary Analysis of the 1932 Campaign Speeches of Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt." 1934. A Master's thesis on file in the library of the University of Wisconsin.
59. Winkler, P. K. "Psychology of Listening," 1934. A Master's thesis on file in the library of New York College for Teachers.
60. Woll, Matthew. "Labor," Committee Report, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935. pp. 261-62.
61. Woolpert, Elton D. "Wisconsin's Broadcasting System," *National Municipal Review*, XXIII (September, 1934), 5 pp.
62. Ziebarth, Elmer. "Presenting Radio Broadcasts for Elementary Schools." 1934. A Master's thesis on file in the library of the University of Wisconsin.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION

●

OFFICERS

President:	R. A. Millikan
Vice-Presidents:	Livingston Farrand Meta Glass Robert M. Hutchins Robert G. Sproul Walter Dill Scott
Chairman of the Board:	Harry W. Chase
Vice-Chairman of the Board:	James E. Russell
Treasurer:	William J. Donovan
Secretary and Director:	Levering Tyson

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

To hold office until annual meeting in 1936:

W. W. Charters
Ralph Hayes
James G. McDonald
Carl H. Milam
Spencer Miller, Jr.

To hold office until annual meeting in 1937:

Morse A. Cartwright
Everett Case
William J. Donovan
James E. Russell
George F. Zook

To hold office until annual meeting in 1938:

Harry W. Chase
John Erskine
Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher
Frank B. Jewett
George E. Vincent

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Mother Antonia, President
College of St. Catherine
St. Paul, Minn.

William C. Bagley
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

Newton D. Baker
Union Trust Building
Cleveland, Ohio

Bruce Bliven
The New Republic
40 East Forty-ninth Street
New York, N. Y.

Mrs. C. C. Bolton
2301 Wyoming Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Nicholas Murray Butler, President
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

Louis G. Caldwell
National Press Building
Washington, D. C.

Morse A. Cartwright
American Association for Adult Edu-
cation
60 East Forty-second Street
New York, N. Y.

Everett Case
6 Mercer Circle
Cambridge, Mass.

W. W. Charters
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Harry W. Chase, Chancellor
New York University
100 Washington Square
New York, N. Y.

Robert C. Clothier, President
Rutgers College
New Brunswick, N. J.

Karl T. Compton, President
Massachusetts Institute of Tech-
nology
Cambridge, Mass.

Walter Damrosch
133 East Eightieth Street
New York, N. Y.

Norman H. Davis
48 Wall Street
New York, N. Y.

Edmund E. Day
Rockefeller Foundation
49 West Forty-ninth Street
New York, N. Y.

John Dewey
320 East Seventy-second Street
New York, N. Y.

Harold W. Dodds, President
Princeton University
Princeton, N. J.

William J. Donovan
2 Wall Street
New York, N. Y.

Luther P. Eisenhart
Princeton University
Princeton, N. J.

John Erskine
Juilliard Musical Foundation
130 Claremont Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Livingston Farrand, President
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

Francis D. Farrell, President
Kansas State Agricultural College
Manhattan, Kansas

John H. Finley
New York Times
229 West Forty-third Street
New York, N. Y.

Dorothy Canfield Fisher
Arlington, Vermont

Raymond B. Fosdick
61 Broadway
New York, N. Y.

Meta Glass, President
Sweetbriar College
Sweetbriar, Va.

Frank P. Graham, President
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Ralph Hayes
111 Broadway
New York, N. Y.

Ernest M. Hopkins, President
Dartmouth College
Hanover, N. H.

Charles E. Hughes, Jr.
100 Broadway
New York, N. Y.

R. M. Hughes, President
Iowa State College of Agriculture and
Mechanical Arts
Ames, Iowa

Frederick M. Hunter, Chancellor
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Robert M. Hutchins, President
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Harold L. Ickes
Secretary of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

W. A. Jessup, President
Carnegie Foundation
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Frank Baldwin Jewett
Bell Telephone Laboratories
195 Broadway
New York, N. Y.

Alvin Johnson
New School for Social Research
66 West Twelfth Street
New York, N. Y.

Father George Johnson
1312 Massachusetts Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C.

R. G. Jones
Director of High Schools
Cleveland, Ohio

Hans V. Kaltenborn
9 Garden Place
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Franklin J. Keller
National Occupational Conference
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

F. P. Keppel, President
Carnegie Corporation of New York
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

John A. Lapp
Petroleum Labor Policy Board
Lemon Building
Washington, D. C.

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

Walter Lippmann
245 East Sixty-first Street
New York, N. Y.

Frank O. Lowden
Sinnissippi Farm
Oregon, Illinois

Helen Taft Manning
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

William McAndrew
Orienta Point Apartments
Mamaroneck, N. Y.

James G. McDonald
Foreign Policy Association
8 West Fortieth Street
New York, N. Y.

Frank L. McVey, President
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Ky.

Carl H. Milam
American Library Association
520 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Spencer Miller, Jr.
Workers Education Bureau
1440 Broadway
New York, N. Y.

R. A. Millikan
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California

Ralph S. Rounds
165 Broadway
New York, N. Y.

James E. Russell
R. F. D. Number 4
Trenton, N. J.

Alexander G. Ruthven, President
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Walter Dill Scott, President
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

James T. Shotwell
405 West One Hundred Seventeenth
Street
New York, N. Y.

Henry Lester Smith, President
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Robert G. Sproul, President
University of California
Berkeley, Calif.

John W. Studebaker
U. S. Commissioner of Education
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

Levering Tyson
25 Claremont Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Willis L. Uhl
University of Washington
Seattle, Wash.

George E. Vincent
Juniper Hill
Greenwich, Conn.

Henry A. Wallace
Secretary of Agriculture
Washington, D. C.

Felix M. Warburg
1109 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

RADIO AND EDUCATION

Ray Lyman Wilbur, President
Leland Stanford University
Stanford University, California

Matthew Woll
American Federation of Labor
1440 Broadway
New York, N. Y.

Henry M. Wriston, President
Lawrence College
Appleton, Wisconsin

Owen D. Young
General Electric Company
570 Lexington Ave., New York

George F. Zook
American Council on Education
744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

ORGANIZATIONS CO-OPERATING WITH THE
NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
RADIO IN EDUCATION



AMERICAN

- | | |
|--|--|
| Air Law Institute | General Federation of Women's Clubs |
| American Association for Adult Education | Institute of International Education |
| American Association of Museums | Institute of Pacific Relations |
| American Association of University Women | Institute of Radio Engineers |
| American Association for the Advancement of Science | Intercollegiate Council |
| American Bar Association | League for Industrial Democracy |
| American Chemical Society | League of Nations Association |
| American Civil Liberties Union | Metropolitan Museum of Art |
| American Council on Education | Modern Language Association of America |
| American Economics Association | Museum of Modern Art |
| American Federation of Arts | National Association of Broadcasters |
| American Federation of Labor | National Association of Educational Broadcasters |
| American Historical Association | National Association of Teachers of Speech |
| American Home Economics Association | National Bureau of Economic Research |
| American Institute of Decorators | National Catholic Welfare Conference |
| American Library Association | National Congress of Parents and Teachers |
| American National Committee of the International Institute for Intellectual Co-operation | National Council of Parent Education |
| American Philosophical Association | National Council of Teachers of English |
| American Political Science Association | National Education Association |
| American Psychological Association | National Home Library Foundation |
| American Public Health Association | National League of Women Voters |
| American Sociological Association | National Municipal League |
| American Vocational Association | National Occupational Conference |
| Art Institute of Chicago | National Research Council |
| Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Separate State Universities | National Student Federation |
| Brookings Institution | National University Extension Association |
| Bureau of University Travel | New York Adult Education Council |
| Child Study Association of America | Pollak Foundation for Economic Research |
| Foreign Affairs Forum | Progressive Education Association |
| Foreign Policy Association | U. S. Office of Education |

Vocational Guidance Association	World Peace Foundation
Women's National Radio Committee	Young Men's Christian Association
Workers Education Bureau of America	Young Women's Christian Association



FOREIGN

British Broadcasting Corporation	Radio Free University of Budapest, Hungary
British East Africa Broadcasting Company	Magyar Telefon Hirmonds es Radio R T, Hungary
Postmaster General's Department, Commonwealth of Australia	India State Broadcasting Co., India
Oesterreichische Radio Verkehrs, Vienna	Broadcasting Service, Department of Post and Telegraph, Ireland
Amalgamated Wireless, Ltd., Australia	Ente Italiano per le Audizione Radiofonische, Italy
Australian Broadcasting Service, Australia	Vatican Radio Station, Italy
Institut Belge de Radiodiffusion, Belgium	Broadcasting Corporation of Japan
Ministère des Sciences et des Arts, Belgium	Broadcasting Corporation of Norway
N V Radio—Louvain, Belgium	Polskie Radjo S A., Poland
Union Professionnelle de la Radio, Belgium	Administration Portugaise des P & T, Portugal
Canadian Radio League	Société de Diffusion Radio Téléphonique de Roumania, Roumania
Institute of Educational Research, China	Union Radio, S A, Spain
Radio Journal, S.A., Czecho-Slovakia	Aktiebolaget Radiotjänst, Sweden
Radioraadet, Denmark	Société Romane de Radiophonie, Switzerland
Osakeyhtio Suomen Yleisradio, Finland	S A. Turque de Téléphonie Sans Fil, Turkey
Administration des Postes et Télégraphes, France	U.S.S.R. Chamber of Commerce, Russia
Compagnie Françaises de Radiophonie, France	Radio A D, Jugoslavia
Compagnie Générale de Télégraphie, France	All-Union Radio Committee, U.S.S.R.
Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft, Germany	China Broadcast Association, Shanghai
Algemeine Vereininging Radio Omroep, Holland	World Association for Adult Education, London, England
Vereininging Arbeiders Radio Amateur, Holland	Union Internationale de Radiodiffusion, Geneva
	League of Nations, Geneva
	International Commission for Intellectual Cooperation, Geneva

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

PUBLICATIONS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION

●

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS:

Radio and Education, edited by Levering Tyson, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934,
Education on the Air and Radio and Education, edited by Josephine
H. MacLatchy, 1935

Educational Broadcasting, a Bibliography, by Robert Lingel

Men of America Series:

Radio's Past and Future, by Robert A. Millikan

American Education Past and Future, by John Dewey

America and the World Situation, Albert Einstein, Henry M. Robinson,
William B. Munro, and Robert A. Millikan (symposium)

A Decade of Radio Advertising, by Herman S. Hettinger

The Control of Radio, by Jerome G. Kerwin

Psychology Today, edited by Walter V. Bingham

Aspects of the Depression, edited by Felix Morley

American Labor and the Nation, edited by Spencer Miller, Jr.

The Lawyer and the Public, edited by the American Bar Association

The Economic World Today, edited by Felix Morley

Government in a Depression, edited by Thomas H. Reed

Legislatures and Legislative Problems, edited by Thomas H. Reed

Doctors, Dollars, and Disease—a series on Medical Economics

Debate of the National University Extension Association—1933

Resolved: That the United States should adopt the essential features of
the British system of radio control and operation.

More for Your Money—a series on consumers' interests

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE:

Constructive Economy in Government, edited by Thomas H. Reed

The Crisis in Municipal Finance, edited by Thomas H. Reed

Reviving Local Government, edited by Thomas H. Reed

A New Deal in Local Government

Trends in Government

The Forty-four State Legislatures of 1935

Taxation for Prosperity

Planning

UNDER COUNCIL AUSPICES SOLELY:

Information Series:

1. *National Advisory Council on Radio in Education*, 3d. edition rev. 1934.
36 pp.

2. *What to Read about Radio*—An annotated bibliography, by Levering Tyson, 1933. 30 pp.
3. *The Broadcaster and the Librarian*, by Francis K. W. Drury. 1931. 28 pp.
4. *Research Problems in Radio Education* by W. W. Charters. rev. ed. 1934. 34 pp.
5. *Present and Impending Applications to Education of Radio and Allied Arts*. Committee on Engineering Developments. 3d. ed. rev. 1934. 83 pp.
6. "The Broadcaster and the Museum" (In preparation)
7. *Broadcasting Abroad*. rev. ed. 1934. 104 pp.
8. *Group Listening*. British Institute of Adult Education. 1933. 28 pp.
9. "Broadcasting to Schools" (In preparation)
10. *The Problem of the Institutionally Owned and Operated Station*. 1934. 32 pp.
11. *Widening Horizons—The Commercial Broadcaster's View of Educational Broadcasting*. 1934. 14 pp.
12. *Some Public Service Broadcasting*. 1934. 36 pp.
13. "Broadcasting for a State" (In preparation)
14. *The Future of Radio and Educational Broadcasting*. 1934. 32 pp.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

●

- Education on the Air*, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, edited by Josephine H. MacLatchy, *Education on the Air and Radio and Education*, 1935, edited by Josephine H. MacLatchy
- Measurement in Radio*, by F. H. Lumley, 1934. 309 pp.
- Broadcasting Foreign-Language Lessons*, by F. H. Lumley, 1934. 90 pp.
(Bureau of Educational Research Monographs, No. 19)

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

STATISTICAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE NUMBER OF RADIO LICENSES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD*

TABLE I

COUNTRY (1)	POPULATION (2)	LICENSES		LICENSES PER THOUSAND	
		1933 (3)	1934 (4)	1933 (5)	1934 (6)
Europe					
Denmark.....	3,550,651	532,992	568,175	150.1	160
Great Britain.....	46,047,046	5,973,759	6,780,569	133.4	147.25
Sweden.....	6,211,566	666,368	733,190	108.1	118.03
Holland.....	8,351,117	648,275	909,127	79.8	108.86
Germany.....	65,188,626	5,052,607	6,142,921	77.4	94.22
Iceland.....	115,000	8,030	10,350	72	90
Switzerland.....	4,066,400	300,051	356,866	73.5	87.75
Austria.....	6,760,000	307,479	527,295	75.5	78
Belgium.....	8,213,449	465,791	603,860	57.1	73.52
Danzig.....	414,114	20,909	26,462	51.3	63.90
Norway.....	2,870,000	137,968	157,434	48.5	54.85
Czechoslovakia.....	14,726,158	573,109	693,694	38.8	47.10
Luxembourg.....	299,993	13,750	45.83
France.....	41,834,923	1,367,715	1,755,946	33.1	41.97
Hungary.....	8,688,319	328,179	340,117	37.6	39.14
Finland.....	3,697,505	121,014	129,123	32.8	34.92
Latvia.....	1,900,045	50,808	64,567	26.2	33.97
Ireland.....	3,000,000	45,008	60,000	15.1	20
Estonia.....	1,113,647	14,758	16,827	13.3	15.10
Union of Socialistic So- viet Republics.....	168,000,000	2,323,000	13.82
Poland.....	32,133,000	311,287	374,000	9.75	11.63
Italy.....	42,621,000	365,000	430,000	8.6	10.08
Spain.....	23,677,794	154,662	213,004	7.7	8.99
Lithuania.....	2,476,154	17,305	20,240	7.1	8.17
Roumania.....	18,052,896	100,000	100,981	5.55	5.59
Yugoslavia.....	13,934,038	58,896	66,530	4.1	4.77
Portugal.....	6,825,883	16,093	27,895	2.5	4.08
Bulgaria.....	6,081,049	7,736	9,000	1.3	1.48
Greece.....	6,204,820	3,318	5,000	0.53	0.80
Other Continents					
United States.....	127,900,000	18,925,000	20,750,000	147.9	162.23
Australia.....	6,689,719	518,628	681,634	78.1	101.89
New Zealand.....	1,551,785	112,581	148,284	70.3	95.55
Canada.....	10,353,778	813,000	78.52
Union of South Africa..	1,828,175	67,160	98,562	36.7	53.91

* Reprinted by special permission of the British Broadcasting Corporation from *World-Radio*, XX (May 31, 1935), p. 3.

RADIO AND EDUCATION

TABLE I—*Continued*

COUNTRY (1)	POPULATION (2)	LICENSES		LICENSES PER THOUSAND	
		1933 (3)	1934 (4)	1933 (5)	1934 (6)
<i>Other Continents—Continued</i>					
Chile.....	4,287,445		200,000		46.64
Argentina.....	12,025,000	450,000	500,000	37.5	41.58
Cuba.....	4,000,000		150,000		37.50
Mexico.....	16,552,722	800,000	500,000	48.3	30.20
Japan.....	90,395,041	1,681,162	1,951,858	18	21.59
Bolivia.....	3,500,000		50,000		14.28
Newfoundland.....	264,000	3,500	2,632	13.3	9.96
Salvador.....	1,550,000		10,000		6.45
Palestine.....	1,035,000	2,500	5,900	2.4	5.70
Hong Kong.....	849,751	3,278	4,201	3.9	4.94
Algeria.....	6,553,451	9,249	30,904	1.5	4.71
Morocco.....	4,681,194	11,218	18,267	2.2	3.90
Tunisia.....	2,410,692	4,192	8,106	1.74	3.36
Siam.....	12,000,000	19,894	24,202	1.6	2.01
Honduras.....	854,184		1,500		1.75
Egypt.....	14,500,000		25,170		1.73
Philippines.....	14,158,000	15,693	20,929	1.1	1.47
Guatemala.....	2,195,242	1,488	1,958	0.7	0.89
Malaya.....	2,827,111	826	2,526	0.3	0.89
Syria and Levant.....	2,768,000	785	2,070	0.3	0.74
Turkey.....	13,660,275	5,404	6,930	0.4	0.50
Ceylon.....	5,312,548	1,665	2,342	0.3	0.50
Manchukuo.....	32,377,317		12,384		0.38
Kenya.....	3,106,945	591	1,152	0.19	0.37
Dutch East Indies.....	60,731,025	8,580	17,950	0.14	0.29
Madagascar.....	3,772,569	201	269	0.06	0.07
India.....	271,201,146	10,914	16,250	0.004	0.05
French Indo-China.....	22,107,000	836	966	0.04	0.04

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

ROSTER OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION BY RADIO

combined with

THE FIFTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIO IN EDUCATION

Abbot, Waldo, University of Michigan
Anderson, Earl W., Ohio State University
Anderson, Mrs. Earl W., Columbus
Antonia, Sister, College of St. Catherine
Appleman, H. M., Columbus
Arps, George F., Ohio State University
Auble, Robert N., Arsenal Technical Schools, Indianapolis
Aumann, F. R., Ohio State University

Banning, George C., Station WAIU, Columbus
Barker, Frank, Station WAIU, Columbus
Bartlett, Kenneth, Station WSYU, Syracuse University
Bell, Alice G., Columbus
Bell, Hobart H., Ohio Education Association
Bell, Viola M., Student, Ohio State University
Bennett, Mrs. Raymond, Columbus
Bibber, H. W., Ohio State University
Bibber, Mrs. H. W., Columbus
Bidlack, C. S., Station WOSU, Ohio State University
Blackburn, Wm. J., Jr., Ohio State University
Blackwell, R. E., University of Louisville
Blakey, W. C., Columbus
Bolander, Karl S., Columbus
Boone, Elizabeth, Philadelphia Shut-in Society
Brackett, B. B., University of South Dakota
Bradbury, Mary Dodd, Columbus
Brown, William H., Station WSUI, Iowa City
Bruney, H. A., Jefferson County, Ohio
Bryan, Ernest R., World Peace Foundation, New York
Bryant, George R., Ohio Emergency Schools Administration
Buckley, H. M., Board of Education, Cleveland
Burchuk, David, University of Michigan
Bush, S. P., Ohio Radio Education Association
Byrns, E. L., Buckeye Teachers Agency, Columbus

Caldwell, F. C., Ohio State University
Caldwell, Mrs. H. O., Ohio Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations

- Caldwell, Otis W., American Association for Advancement of Science, New York
- Carpenter, H. K., Station WHK, Cleveland
- Case, Mrs. C. H., Board of Education, Akron, Ohio
- Chadderdon, Hester, Student, Ohio State University
- Chancellor, John, American Library Association, Chicago
- Charles, Mrs. Ann, Station WOSU, Ohio State University
- Charters, W. W., Ohio State University
- Charters, Mrs. W. W., Columbus
- Church, Arthur B., Station KMBC, Kansas City, Missouri
- Cochran, Elizabeth K., Arsenal Technical Schools, Indianapolis
- Coleman, Robert J., Station WKAR, Michigan State College
- Collum, Harold M., Station WNAD, University of Oklahoma
- Cook, Mary Elizabeth, Columbus
- Cowley, W. H., Ohio State University
- Cowley, Mrs. W. H., Columbus
- Crane, A. G., University of Wyoming
- Croneis, Carey, University of Chicago
- Crosgrave, Lloyd M., Muncie, Indiana
- Darrow, B. H., Ohio School of the Air, Columbus
- Davis, E. R., Station WAIU, Columbus
- Davis, Mrs. H. H., Columbus
- Denison, Merrill, Palisades, New York
- Devlin, Irene L., Athens, Ohio
- Dickerson, L. L., Indianapolis Public Library
- Dreese, Mrs. E. E., Columbus
- Dunham, F. G., Educational Director, National Broadcasting Company
- Dustheimer, O. L., Baldwin Wallace College
- Engel, Harold A., WHA, Wisconsin State Station, Madison
- Erskine, Mrs. T. C., Columbus
- Evenson, Pattee E., University of Michigan
- Farley, Belmont, National Education Association, Washington
- Felber, Marguerite B., Akron, Ohio
- Fihe, Pauline, Cincinnati Public Schools
- Finney, Marie, RCA Manufacturing Company, Camden, New Jersey
- Flautt, Mrs. L. J., Radio Chairman, American Legion Auxiliary, Columbus
- Florence, Mrs. George, Columbus
- Ford, Gertrude C., Ohio State University
- Frame, Nat T., C.C.C. Camp, Fort Hayes, Columbus
- French, R. S., Station WAIU, Columbus
- Frost, Rosemary, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, New York

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

Frutchey, F. P., Ohio State University

Frutchey, Mrs. F. P., Columbus

Fulk, Mrs. Lucille W., Ohio Radio Education Association

Gaw, Mrs. Esther Allen, Ohio State University

Gibson, Pauline, Scholastic Radio Guild, Pittsburgh

Goldsmith, Kathleen, Radio Institute of the Audible Arts, New York

Gorrell, Mrs. Faith L., Ohio State University

Gorrell, H. R., Massillon (Ohio) Public Schools

Graham, Mrs. Wm. C., Columbus

Graves, Mortimer, American Council of Learned Societies, Washington

Gray, Frances, Ohio School of the Air, Columbus

Griffith, W. I., Station WOI, Iowa State College

Gruenberg, Benjamin C., New York

Gruenberg, Mrs. S., Child Study Association, New York

Hamilton, Howard L., Ohio State University

Hansen, Vern, WHA, Wisconsin State Station, Madison

Harrington, Evaline, Columbus

Harris, Robert C., Fort Wayne (Indiana) Public Schools

Harshbarger, H. C., University of Iowa

Heck, H. R., Station WNAD, University of Oklahoma

Heimlich, Friel, Station WOSU, Ohio State University

Helle, Mrs. R. H., Columbus

Hemens, R. D., University of Chicago Press

Henney, J. L. W., Columbus

Higgy, R. C., Station WOSU, Columbus

Higgy, Mrs. R. C., Columbus

High, Stanley, National Broadcasting Company, New York

Holy, T. C., Ohio State University

Hunter, Katherine E., League of Nations Association, Chicago

Hupp, James L., F.E.R.A. in Ohio, Columbus

James, Herman G., University of South Dakota

Jeanne d'Arc, Sister, College of St. Catherine

Johnson, Helen, American School of the Air, Columbia Broadcasting System,
New York

Johnston, W. C., National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, New
York

Jones, S. W., South Dakota State College

Kaltenborn, H. V., Columbia Broadcasting System, New York

Keating, Anne C., Ohio University Library

Keller, Edith M., State Department of Education, Columbus

Kelley, Mrs. C. E., Akron (Ohio) Council Home and School League

- Kent, Eugene E., Columbus
Ketcham, V. A., Ohio State University
Kiefer, Mrs. A. S., Columbus
Kimball, Mrs. Milo, Columbus
King, Corinne Johnson, Ohio State University
Klein, Arthur J., Ohio State University
Koon, Cline M., United States Office of Education, Washington
- Langworthy, Mrs. B. F., National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Chicago
Learned, Margaret, Ohio School of the Air, Columbus
Lephart, Dale, Junior Radio College, Station WOSU, Ohio State University
Link, Mrs. A. J., Columbus
Lippincott, Mrs. J. H., Columbus
Lohnes, H. L., Washington
Lord, Mrs. H. C., Columbus
Loucks, Philip G., National Association of Broadcasters, Washington
Lumley, F. E., Ohio State University
- McCarthy, H. B., WHA, Wisconsin State Station, Madison
McClelland, A. C., Station WAIU, Columbus
McConnell, Mrs. Kenner, Columbus
MacLatchy, Josephine H., Ohio State University
Maddy, Joseph E., University of Michigan
Mahan, Bruce E., State University of Iowa
Maish, J. C., Cincinnati
Marshall, John, Rockefeller Foundation, New York
Mead, A. A., Columbus
Melvin, John H., Columbus
Menser, C. L., National Broadcasting Company, Chicago
Menzer, Carl, State University of Iowa
Miller, Allen, University of Chicago
Moffat, Mrs. G. N., Columbus
Morrill, J. L., Ohio State University
Morrill, Mrs. J. L., Columbus
Morris, Mrs. W. R., Shaker Heights (Ohio) Council of Parent-Teachers
Association
- Neal, Mrs. Clara E., "Travel Club of the Air," Station WGAR, Cleveland
Nelson, Albert H., Michigan State College
Nisonger, H. W., Ohio State University
Noon, Paul A. T., Ohio State Library
Norfolk, Genevieve, Columbus
Norris, Mrs. Orville, Columbus
Novik, Morris S., Station WEVD, New York

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

- Orton, William A., Smith College
Osborne, Florence M., Columbus
- Page, Arthur C., Station WLS, Chicago
Papier, William, Ohio School of the Air, Columbus
Patterson, Mae, Columbus
Pearl, G. Carleton, The Microphone, Inc., Boston
Perry, Armstrong, National Committee on Education by Radio, Washington
Peters, Clarence A., Kalamazoo (Michigan) Public Schools
Pettegrew, C. W., Station WOSU, Ohio State University
Pierson, Ray H., Columbus
Prall, Anning S., Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington
- Price, Richard R., University of Minnesota
Purtee, E. O., Franklin County Emergency Schools, Columbus
- Randall, Harris K., Chicago Civic Broadcast Bureau
Read, Conyers, American Historical Association, Philadelphia
Reavis, G. H., State Department of Education, Columbus
Redefer, Frederick L., Progressive Education Association, Washington
Reeder, Fred N., Arsenal Technical Schools, Indianapolis
Reese, L. W., State Department of Education, Columbus
Reichelderfer, Roy, Ohio School of the Air, Columbus
Rennie, Mrs. W. H., Akron, Ohio
Richards, Alice L., Ohio State University
Ries, Joseph, Station WLW, Cincinnati
Rightmire, George W., Ohio State University
Rose, Ella J., Student, Ohio State University
Roundy, Mrs. Floyd, Akron (Ohio) Council Home and School League
Ryan, Mrs. Norman A., Cleveland
- Schneider, Gertrude, Columbus
Scudder, Frances, Syracuse Home Bureau
Senn, Helen Miller, University of Oregon
Shannon, Jack, Station WFBC, Syracuse
Sharman, Olive, Station WJR, Detroit
Shaw, Ernest J., Yu Ying School Broadcasting Station, Teng Shih K'ou, Peiping, China
Sheahen, Mrs. J. J., Columbus
Shepherd, Mrs. Arthur, Western Reserve University
Shepherd, Richard J., Western Reserve Academy
Shough, Agnes H., National Broadcasting Company, New York
Shurrager, P. Sheridan, Ohio University
Siegel, Norman, The Cleveland Press
Silbernagel Mrs. F. A., Worthington, Ohio

- Skinner, B. O., Ohio Director of Education, State Department of Education, Columbus
- Smith, Mrs. Alva W., Columbus
- Snook, Mrs. Ward, Columbus
- Snyder, Victor P., C.C.C. Educational Adviser, Gallipolis, Ohio
- Stahl, Myrtle E., Station WGN, Chicago
- Stewart, C. S., Arsenal Technical Schools, Indianapolis
- Stewart W. E., Station WOI, Iowa State College
- Stout, Mrs. B. E., Akron, Ohio
- Stradley, B. L., Ohio State University
- Sulzer, Elmer G., University of Kentucky
- Swing, Raymond Gram, Washington
- Taylor, Mrs. Ralph, Columbus
- Tefft, Mrs. C. Forrest, Columbus
- Tharp, James B., Ohio State University
- Tyler, I. K., Ohio State University
- Tyler, Tracy F., National Committee on Education by Radio, Washington
- Tyson, Levering, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, New York
- Tyson, Mrs. Levering, New York
- Uleman, Turrell, University of Michigan
- Upham, John H. J., Ohio State University
- Valentine, Mrs. Elma P., Columbus
- Vogt, Paul L., Workers Education Bureau of America, Detroit
- Voorhees, Douglas R., C.C.C. Camp, Fort Hayes, Columbus
- Walker, Miriam, Adult Education Council of Cincinnati
- Waller Judith C., National Broadcasting Company, Chicago
- Weedon, Vivian, Ohio State University
- Wharff, Mrs. C. C., Columbus
- Wheeler, Carleton A., WIXAL and Tufts College
- Whittinghill, W. W., Department of Visual-Radio Education, Detroit Public Schools
- Wiley, J. B., Station WNAD, University of Oklahoma
- Williamson, W. P., WKBN Broadcasting Company, Youngstown, Ohio
- Winemiller, Wm. G., Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus
- Wing, Mrs. George, Worthington, Ohio
- Woodruff, Julia R., University Branch of Adult Education, Columbus
- Wright, Jos. F., University of Illinois
- Young, Blanche C., Indianapolis Public Schools
- Zirbes, Laura, Ohio State University
- Zook, George F., American Council on Education, Washington
- Zoppel, Mrs. F. J., Columbus
- Zorbaugh, Grace S. M., Ohio State University

INDEX

INDEX

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The numbers set in italics indicate references to discussion, not to the text of the papers read before the Institute-Assembly.]

- American Association for the Advancement of Science, broadcasting by, *164*
- American Historical Association, radio committee of the, *158-62, 164, 238-61*
- Art education, *89-90*
- Bartlett, Kenneth, *54-55, 208-9*
- Bibliography, research in educational radio, *288-92*
- Bolander, Karl S., *89-90*
- Brackett, B. B., *55*
- Broadcasters' Interests in Educational Radio, Philip G. Loucks, *25-29*
- Broadcasting: American Association for the Advancement of Science, *164*; American Historical Association, *158-62, 164, 238-61*; art-appreciation courses, *89-90*; by state departments of education, *281*; by state education associations, *281-82*; censorship of educational, *137-38*; difficulties in arranging children's programs, *138-39*; educational, *225-31*; freedom of speech in, *24-25, 53-55*; modern languages, *165*
- Broadcasting in the American Home, Mrs. B. F. Langworthy, *144-47*
- Bryant, George R., Organizing Radio Junior-College Groups, *191-96; 196-97, 198-99*
- Buckley, H. M., *39, 89, 98, 142-43, 207-8*
- Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, publications of, *303*
- Bush, S. P., *199*
- Caldwell, Otis W., *126, 127, 164-65*
- Callcott, Frank, report of the Spanish Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, *276-77*
- Censorship, *see* freedom of speech
- Central agency on radio programs for children, *133-37*
- Charters, W. W., *35, 211*
- Child Study Association, Radio Committee: survey of children's programs, *137-38; 265-76*
- Children: arranging programs for, *138-42*; censorship of programs for, *130-32, 140, 142*; influence of radio on, *147-48*; sex differences in choice of radio programs, *143*
- Crane, A. G., Safeguarding Educational Radio, *117-25; 35-36, 37, 38, 99, 127-28*
- Darrow, B. H., *80, 138-39, 143, 149, 206-7, 209-10*
- Davis, Frederick B., and Nichols, Calvin J., A Technique for Measuring Attitudes at the Elementary-School Level, *283-88*
- D'Harnoncourt, René, report of the Art Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, *234-38*
- Democracy and the Radio, Herman G. James, *45-53*
- Denison, Merrill, *199-201, 202-3, 210-11*
- Denison, Merrill, and Menser, C. L., Techniques Clinic, *199-211*
- Dialogue, radio uses of, *150-52*; difficulties of, *153-55*
- Dickerson, L. L., *140-41*
- Education by Radio, William A. Orton, *63-70*
- Education by Radio in Ohio, B. O. Skinner, *102-4*
- Educational Station, if I Ran an, Judith C. Waller, *71-78*
- Electrical transcriptions: for use of small stations, *80-81*; recordings of news reels, *163*; types of records used, *201-2*
- Emergency Radio Junior College in Ohio, *100-101, 176-77, 191-95, 196-97*
- Engel, Harold A., Wisconsin Teachers' Round Table, *165-68; 198*

EDUCATION ON THE AIR

- Facilities of Educational Radio in Ohio, George W. Rightmire, 99-102
- Freedom of speech, 24-25, 53-55
- Goldsmith, Kathleen, 137-38
- Griffith, W. I., 80, 81, 90
- Groups listening *see* listening groups
- Gruenberg, Sidonie M., report of the Parent Education Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, 265-76; 148, 190-91, 207, 208
- Hard, William, The Microphone in Politics, 16-23
- Harris, Robert C., 90, 148
- Higgy, R. C., 198
- High, Stanley, The Radio of the Future, 56-63
- James, Herman G., Democracy and the Radio, 45-53
- Johnson, Helen, 39, 90, 181, 206, 207
- Kaltenborn, H. V., 23, 25, 38, 39, 80-81, 93, 125-26, 128, 143-44, 147-48, 149, 162-63
- Kitson, Harry D., report of the Vocational Guidance Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, 277-78
- KOAC (Oregon), co-operation with listening groups, 175-76
- Koon, Cline M., 149
- Langworthy, Mrs. B. F., Broadcasting in the American Home, 144-47; 148, 149
- Legislative Aid for State Radio, H. B. McCarty, 91-98
- Lephart, Dale J., 197, 198
- Listening groups: Buffalo Museum of Science, 174, 180; desirable number of persons for, 181; Emergency Radio Junior College in Ohio, 176-77; England, 170-71, 182; Indianapolis, 174; Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, 171-72; Kansas State Congress of Parents and Teachers, 177; Minneapolis, 174; New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers, 173-74; Oregon, 175-76; University of Kentucky, 175; women's organizations, 183-90
- Loucks, Philip G., Broadcasters' Interests in Educational Radio, 25-29
- McCarty, H. B., Legislative Aid for State Radio, 91-98; 35, 112, 198, 206
- Menser, C. L., 141-42, 201-2, 203-6, 208
- Menser, C. L., and Denison, Merrill, Techniques Clinic, 199-211
- Microphone in Politics, The, William Hard, 16-23
- Miller, Allen, Techniques of Presenting Dialogue, 149-57; 53-54, 157
- Miller, Spencer, Jr., and Woll, Matthew, report of the Labor Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, 261-62
- Milligan, Mrs. Harold Vincent, Women Organize to Listen, 183-90
- Millikan, Robert A., Radio's Part in the Creation of an Intelligent Electorate, 10-16
- National Advisory Council on Radio in Education: annual report of director, 215-34; committee reports: history, 238-61; labor, 261-62; land-grant college radio, 262-65; library, 265; parent education, 265-76; programs of, 219-22; Spanish, 276-77; vocational guidance, 277-78; co-operating organizations, 300-301; members of, 296-99; officers of, 295; publications of, 218, 302-3
- National Committee on Education by Radio, plan for American system of radio broadcasting, 119-25, 125-28
- National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 181, 143
- Neal, Mrs. Clara E., 31
- Nichols, Calvin J., and Davis, Frederick B., A Technique for Measuring Attitudes at the Elementary-School Level, 283-88
- Novik, Morris S., The University of the Air, 112-16; 182
- Ohio Emergency School Administration, *see* Emergency Radio Junior College
- Ohio Radio Education Association, activities of the, 103, 106-11, 112
- Organizing Listening Groups, Tracy F. Tyler, 168-80
- Organizing Radio Junior-College Groups, George R. Bryant, 191-96
- Orton, William A., Education by Radio, 63-70
- Page, Arthur C., 38-39
- Perry, Armstrong, 163
- Pettegrew, C. W., 78-79, 89
- Please, Mr. Ringmaster, 40-44
- Prall, Anning S., Radio in Relation to Education, 29-34; 35, 36-37
- Price, Richard R., 79-80
- Problems of Program Organization, Conyers Read, 158-62

RADIO AND EDUCATION

- Radio and the Future, Raymond Gram Swing, 3-10
- Radio in Relation to Education, Anning S. Prall, 29-34
- Radio Interpreting Education, Agnes Samuelson, 82-89
- Radio licenses, statistical information regarding the number of, throughout the world, 304-5
- Radio of the Future, The, Stanley High, 56-63
- Radio Programs for Children, Frederick L. Redefer, 129-37
- Radio's Part in the Creation of an Intelligent Electorate, Robert A. Millikan, 10-16
- Randall, Harris K., 24, 28, 39, 54, 125-26, 140
- Read, Conyers, Problems of Program Organization, 158-62; 163
- Redefer, Frederick L., Radio Programs for Children, 129-37; 133
- Research in educational radio, bibliography, 288-92
- Ries, Joseph, 37, 38, 39, 198, 202, 211
- Rightmire, George W., The Facilities of Educational Radio in Ohio, 99-102
- Round table, University of Chicago, 54, 155-56, 157
- Safeguarding Educational Radio, A. G. Crane, 117-25
- Samuelson, Agnes, Radio Interpreting Education, 82-89
- Skinner, B. O., Education by Radio in Ohio, 102-4
- State Unit of Radio Education, A. J. H. J. Upham, 104-12
- Studies of the National Committee, Tracy F. Tyler, 281-82
- Swing, Raymond Gram, Radio and the Future, 3-10
- Technique for Measuring Attitudes at the Elementary-School Level, Frederick B. Davis and Calvin J. Nichols, 283-88
- Techniques Clinic, Merrill Denison and C. L. Menser, 199-211
- Techniques of Presenting Dialogue, Allen Miller, 149-57
- Tyler, Tracy F., Organizing Listening Groups, 168-80; Studies of the National Committee, 281-82; 23, 181, 182, 210
- Tyson, Levering, report of the director of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, 215-34; 24-25, 112, 127, 163-64, 181, 198
- Ulveling, Ralph, report of the Library Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, 265
- Umberger, H., report of the Land-Grant Radio Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, 262-65
- University of the Air, The, Morris S. Novik, 112-16
- Upham, J. H. J., A State Unit of Radio Education, 104-12
- Vogt, Paul L., 53
- Waller, Judith C., If I Ran an Educational Station, 71-78, 54, 138, 181, 199
- Webb, Elizabeth Yates, A Broadcasting Venture in Mass Education, 238-61
- WEVD (New York), broadcasting the university of the air by, 112-16
- WHA (University of Wisconsin): co-operation with listening groups, 174-75; operation of educational stations, 91-98; round-table discussions for teachers, 166-68, 174-75
- Wheeler, Carleton A., 81, 90, 165
- Wisconsin Teachers' Round Table, Harold A. Engel, 165-68
- WLB (University of Minnesota), co-operation of, with listening groups, 174
- WLBL *see* WHA
- WOI (Iowa State College), art-appreciation courses by, 96
- Woll, Matthew, and Miller, Spencer, Jr., report of the Labor Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, 261-62
- Women Organize To Listen, Mrs. Harold Vincent Milligan, 183-90
- WIXAL (Tufts College): art-appreciation course, 90; modern languages broadcasting, 165
- WOR (Newark, N.J.): co-operation with listening groups, 173-74; electrical transcriptions of programs, 163
- WOSU (Ohio State University): broadcasts of Emergency Radio Junior College, 100, 192-95; co-operation with listening groups, 176-77
- WSUI *see* WOI
- Zook, George F., 142, 165

[PRINTED
IN U.S.A.]

