

President Nixon's Chief advisor on communications policy will dedicate the all new broadcasting facilities at Jefferson High School in Lafayette, Indiana on Friday January 7, 1972, according to William S. Fraser, Director of the radio and color television facilities at the high school.

Clay T. Whitehead, Director of The Office of Telecommunications Policy in the executive office of the President will throw the switch which will begin official operations of what is believed to be the most modern and complete High School communications training facility in the country.

Friday, January 7th Jefferson High School will begin operations of a 250 watt educational F.M. radio station (WJJE-FM 91.9MHZ) and a complete closed circuit color television facility. The television equipment includes 3 color cameras, 6 video tape recorders, complete multiplex capabilities and 60 color television sets located throughout the building.

Fraser stated "We are very pleased that Mr. Whitehead has agreed to come to Lafayette to dedicate our wonderful new communications facilities. We feel that they are the best kind anywhere and what's more it is all being financed with local money."

For Bill Fraser the opening of the new radio and T.V. studios is an 18 year dream and endeavor. He credits Lafayette School Officials and Board of Trustees with having the foresight to start a project now that give high school students excellent training in all phases of the radio and television industry and could be a model for high schools all over the country.



## Television Premieres at Jeff

Even though boxes still are being uncrated and equipment installed, the television program at Jefferson High School is already in production. Pupil Dave Alenduff (right), gets briefed on being a weatherman from his teacher, a former TV weatherman and now radio-television director at Jeff, William Fraser. Manning the camera is the chief

engineer, Steve Speheger, also a former commercial radio-television man. Closed circuit color television productions are now a reality at Jeff, and soon to air is the student-run FM radio station, WJJE—about Dec. 1. (Staff Photo by Dick Vellinger)

# Jeff TV Unit Opens New Vistas to Pupils

By ANGELYN RIZZO

New horizons in teaching and learning are opening up at Jefferson High School this year, thanks to the initiation of black-and-white and color television studios and facilities.

According to William Fraser, radio-TV director at Jeff, "the possibilities are limited only by the imagination."

The television scope won't be communitywide, as the new WJJE-FM radio station will be, but will serve the community through the Jeff pupils and their projects.

Workshops have been conducted in use of the television facilities, as well as in possibilities for teaching opened up by television, and the teachers are enthusiastic, Fraser said.

There are 60 TV sets at various locations throughout the school, including 45 color sets. Each outlet, one in each room at the school, has three closed-circuit channels — 2, 4 and 6. Channels 7 through 13 will pick up signals from the local television cable so pupils can watch space shots, see important news breaking or watch United Nations or Congressional sessions.

From the fully equipped studios at Jeff, three shows can be broadcast through the school at the same time — such as a science lecture, a film and a discussion group. Television productions can be handled right in the professional-type studios — even color productions.

Fraser said the portable units can be taken to 14 areas including the gymnasium, pool, stage, choral and multi-purpose rooms — to record right on the spot.

The television set-up already is in use at the school.

One class recently learned the various cuts of meat by seeing a butcher cut up a side of beef, pointing out the various cuts as he went along.

A fall convocation talk by the admissions officer from Purdue University was taped

so pupils who weren't free to attend could see the lecture later, Fraser said.

Also on tape is a tour of the Instructional Materials Center at Jeff, to show sophomores during orientation rather than taking all 600 of them on personal tours. "This way they won't be totally lost in the IMC when they walk through the door," Fraser said.

In the science area color video tape capabilities will be particularly helpful. Some experiments are expensive and time-consuming to set up. For all the pupils to see such experiments is difficult. But, with the TV tape facilities, the experiment can be done once, then viewed time after time via television.

Also, a TV camera can be mounted on a microscope so all pupils can see the same thing at the same time under the scope in color.

"We're pioneers in color work in high school," Fraser said. There are four color cameras available, three in the studio and one that can be taken to classrooms.

Fraser said the two local mayoral candidates have cut a tape to be presented in social studies classes.

George Haley, in charge of the Jeff Theater, is preparing backdrops for the television productions; Richard Jaeger's choral pupils are cutting tapes of jingles for radio and television breaks.

Jaeger's chorus also is preparing the opening themes for radio station WJJE-FM — "The Star Spangled Banner" followed by "Sons of Jefferson." That's 91.9 on the FM dial, starting about Dec. 1.

The public is invited to visit the TV and radio facilities next week, during American Education Week.



# Norman Mark on Television

## A Carrot for the Brute

**PROPOSAL:** The United States government should use all federal tax dollars derived from radio, television and cable broadcasting companies to promote quality TV programming in America.

To put it bluntly, most of the time most viewers are watching crud television. Usually, it's the only programming that is available.

There is almost no reason to create good radio and television shows in America today. In fact, under the present system, it is surprising that anyone even tries to do anything meaningful in the mass media.

If a TV network tells us that a huge corporation is treating its migrant workers badly, that network may lose advertising revenue. If another network reveals that the Pentagon is spending bagfuls promoting the Pentagon's own budgets and aims, that network is investigated, its films and paperwork subpoenaed and the vice president of the US malevolently maligns the maladjusted malefactors.

If television broadcasts an ambitious, honest, hard-hitting program, the critics judge that effort more harshly than run-of-the-mill junk, elected representatives get huffy, advertisers get frightened and the audience defects to other networks.

Public television may be under even more restraints than commercial TV. If PTV broadcasts a documentary revealing that certain congressmen sit as directors of several banks, those same congressmen may vote PTV less money the following year. When it comes to better TV, we operate with a huge stick to beat such shows out of existence and no carrot to encourage them.

American broadcasters pay about \$300 million a year in federal taxes, according to Federal Communications Commission officials. For the purposes of argument, let us propose that all this money is to be spent for better communications, so that the world's most

powerful nation can understand itself more perfectly.

Half to two-thirds of the sum should go to public television, providing the permanent funding it so desperately needs. Of the rest, some should go to aid schools teaching television and related arts (drama, film, speech, dance, music, etc.), but a major segment of the money should go to monetary awards for the best, most creative radio and television shows of the year on public and commercial television. The awards should be substantial, enough to make creating fine radio and television profitable, and the money should be split between the artists, the producers (the people who finance the programs) and the stations. A local broadcaster might thus benefit if he carried a prize-winning program. If he censored such shows because they might offend the good citizens in the station's area, the broadcaster would lose a fat year-end bonus.

This is not some wild, visionary scheme designed to put broadcasters on the public dole. It is an adaptation (with special American modifications) of a legal agreement now in effect for the Swedish film industry.

Around 1963, television began cutting into movie-theater attendance and Swedish film production went into a decline. The government, the theater-owners, the unions, film distributors and producers sought to increase home-grown film products and to find a way to assure that Swedish film would be recognized for excellence the world over. The result was an agreement creating the Swedish Film Institute, which now gets 10 percent of the income from ticket sales in all Swedish cinemas. (The government agreed that it would not collect taxes on ticket sales and that the money would go to the Institute.)

Thirty percent of the Institute's income goes to direct support of feature-length films. Another 30 percent funds schools, archives, films for children, etc; 18 percent is for quality awards (more about that later); 15 percent for quality-award winners who need additional stipends; two percent for short film awards; and five percent for public relations.

The Institute has built Filmhuset, an imposing, modern structure near Stockholm, where studios, libraries, schools and administration are found under one roof.

The "quality awards" are determined by six experts, who must be completely independent of the film trade, plus the chairman of the Institute. The prizes

can mean the difference between financial success and failure for the films that win them. The "experts" are usually newspaper critics and novelists, chosen by agreement between the government and the industry.

This panel is warned by the agreement that created the Institute to avoid "conformity of taste," to define "quality" in its broadest sense and to search for "innovation." Quality is further defined as "the intensity or freshness of its (the film's) interpretation of reality or its criticism of society, the level of psychological insight and spiritual experience, playful imaginativeness or visionary power, epic, dramatic or lyric values, the technical skill displayed in the manuscript, direction and acting."

Obviously, the Swedish agreement cannot be taken into the American system without substantial changes. Our commercial television industry does not need direct government support to guarantee its existence. But prizes can be cost effective because they do alter behavior (I was told that the system is working well in Sweden) and public television does need permanent financing if it is to avoid becoming a propaganda arm of whatever administration holds the White House.

Furthermore, this plan doesn't increase taxes on broadcasters, TV-set manufacturers or satellite-owners, the powerful lobbies adversely affected by previous suggestions for permanently financing PTV. It also uses a good old capitalistic inducement — pay the blighters to get them to do better shows.

The most serious objection to the idea is that congress may never consider it because public TV and the White House are so far apart these days they may never agree on anything again. Without the support of both, any plan to help the current sad state of the broadcasting art is doomed.

PTV officials expected to gain permanent financing this fall. One such plan actually floated through the back corridors of the White House this summer, only to be shelved because both sides couldn't agree on how the money was to be administered. The White House wanted it to go directly to the local PTV stations and PTV officials wanted the network to handle the funds.

Today there is growing warfare between the two groups. In October, a high White House official told an educational broadcasters' convention that PTV should stay out of politics or risk the loss of funding. The PTV bureaucracy

(continued on page 34)

racy said that was political interference. Amid charge and countercharge, public television is certain to be stymied until 1973 and possibly crippled forever. (Actually the politics of TV, as distinguished from the politics on TV, has become so complicated that to describe it as warfare between two groups is a bit melodramatic. There will be later columns on this.)

To solve the current deadlock, I'd like to see a compromise. Of the federal taxes going to support PTV under this plan, a fourth or more should directly aid the network. The rest should be sent to the local stations with this provision: a fourth or more of the money that the stations receive should be earmarked by law to be returned to the PTV network to fund series of the local station's choice. In this way, the network would have enough money to create the shows it feels the nation needs, and the local stations would have enough leverage to demand the programs they wish.

The White House obviously believes the local public TV stations will be conservative enough to represent the President's interests. Many observers of PTV would like to see a nationwide PTV network with the muscle needed to investigate what it wants when it wants and to tell us what it has learned. A compromise might satisfy both goals.

I can already hear the other hoots that will greet this proposal. How do you guarantee that the Eastern Establishment, conservatives, Jews, blacks, commies, Archie Bunkers or anyone my side doesn't like won't take over the awards and encourage the kind of shows they want to see? (In Sweden, the government and the industry submit lists of experts independent of both. The lists have been in remarkable agreement.) How do you apply what works in a country of eight million people to 200 million argumentative souls? Who cares what's on television anyhow? We've got the FCC, what more do we need? Will President Nixon buy that proposal? Will Congress earmark funds? And on and on and on.

Nevertheless, I think the idea deserves investigation as one way to fight mental pollution. It would be better than allowing radio and TV to remain the way they are now. Anything would.



Lafayette-West Lafayette, Ind., Saturday, October 16, 1971



## Student DJ Learns Board

Preparing for the 'on the air' signal from federal authorities, Marcia Anthony learns how to operate a radio board from a seasoned radio man and teacher, William Fraser. The student-run station of Jefferson High School hopes for a

Dec. 1 go-ahead for broadcasting on station WJJE-F.M. 91.9 on the dial. The station will be for the entire community. Fraser said, including area high schools, elementary schools and the public. (Staff Photo)



# Jeff Radio Station Expects To Go on Air Before 1972

By ANGELYN RIZZO

"After 18 years, its almost like a dream!"

William Fraser, director of the radio-television unit at Jefferson High School, looked around the new modern radio-television facilities and smiled as he reported:

"Jeff will be the leading school in the area of communications — both radio and television."

Fraser's happiness also comes from the realization that in late November or early December, radio station WJJE-FM at 91.9 on the FM dial, will begin broadcasting from the studios. The student-run station will cover about five-eighths of Tippecanoe County, "possibly more." It is a 250 watt educational FM station whose signal will reach about 15 miles.

Fraser has been working with radio-television, and teaching it, too, for the past 18 years at Jeff. That's why all this is such a thrill to him.

"With these facilities, we can supplement and enhance the teachers and the teaching in all areas," he said.

Fraser said the call letters WJEF-FM had been applied for, but a Michigan station already had those letters. He settled for next best, WJJE-FM, and expects approval any day now from the Federal Communications Commission.

Broadcast hours, initially, will be 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. daily.

"I hope as we progress and develop a program format, to be on the air the entire school day and for all basketball games." In 1972-73, sports cov-

erage will be "full blown" to include all Jeff athletic events.

The radio programs will be available within the school and hopefully, all schools in the area will get involved.

"We plan to give each elementary and junior high the opportunity to have a program on the station," Fraser said. "They can highlight their own school events and activities over the area."

To create good will among the area schools, Fraser currently is contacting the principals of other high schools in Tippecanoe County to let them give their school news and promote their public events over the air.

"This will be a community station, for the entire community, and we hope for involvement from all schools."

The operation will eventually be 50 per cent educational and 50 per cent music, news and sports as related to the Lafayette community, he said.

As the format develops, the station will join the National Association of Education Broadcasters so they can take advantage of the educational tape service the association provides and select programs suited to the community's needs. Such programs range from elementary geography to an audio "Sesame Street" program, Fraser said.

Once in operation, the program schedule will be sent on a regular basis to all teachers in all schools to enable them to tune in to the programs they want. The educational

programs will run in a 13-week series.

Each department at Jeff will have time available to go on the air to program the activities of their classes — like a drug-abuse program for pupils in the drug class. The purpose of such programs will be to give people in the community a more thorough understanding of what is being taught in the city schools. There will be social studies discussions, items of world news and world problems and many student discussions.

The programs need not be aired as they are happening, but can be broadcast at various times via use of tape.

The speech department will get time on the air also.

Fraser said he hoped, as the format developed, to include announcements of area club activities, like a Community Bulletin Board, for non-profit and charitable organizations. Also, he plans that tapes be made to publicize events of community interest — like the hospital fairs, Harvest Moon Festival.

"Thanksgiving, or the last week in November has been our target date," Fraser said, but actual broadcasting may not begin until Dec. 1. Most of the equipment has been delivered, but not all of it has been installed yet. And, the station is awaiting the official assignment of its call letters also.

"Then we'll test it out and when the FCC is happy, they'll give us the go-ahead and we'll be on the air," Fraser said.

A 100-foot radio tower is

being installed at Jeff in preparation for the on-the-air sign, and pupils in the radio and television classes are being trained in radio techniques and background.

The pupils are writing news, sports, filling out program logs, learning microphone techniques and how to handle the control board.

Helping the pupils with writing copy is former Jeff English-Journalism teacher C. J. "Jack" Hopkins, who is assisting Fraser in the radio-TV area.

Also on the radio-TV staff is Steve Speheger, chief engineer for the station who will be in charge of maintenance, repair and upkeep of the electronic equipment. Speheger is new to the Jeff staff this year and has a B.S. degree in electrical engineering from Purdue University and three years experience as chief engineer for the local television station, WLFI, Channel 18. He also worked television for the biology department at Purdue and at Bluffton.

Fraser worked with Speheger at Channel 18 and also has radio-television experience, in addition to 19 years of teaching, dating back to 1948 when he had his first radio job at WTOM in Bloomington as a student at Indiana University.

Both Fraser and Speheger have commercial and teaching experience in both radio and television, which, they believe, will make for better learning opportunities for their pupils.

NEXT: Television at Jefferson

# Nixon Adviser To Dedicate Jeff Radio Station Jan. 7

By ANGELYN RIZZO

Jefferson High School's radio station, WJJE-FM, will be dedicated in special ceremonies at 2 p.m. Friday, Jan. 7, by the director of the office of telecommunications from Washington, D.C.

William Frazier, radio-TV unit director at Jeff, announced that Clay T. Whitehead, who also is the presidential adviser on communication policy for the United States, will be in Lafayette to dedicate the new 250-watt station.

Accompanying Whitehead for the dedication will be his assistant, Brian Lamb, formerly of Lafayette and a former student of Frazier's at Jeff. Lamb is the son of Mr. and Mrs. William Lamb, 3600 Cedar Lane.

In preparation for the "on the air" signal, 40 of Frazier's radio-TV students took the third class radio operator's license test at Chicago's Federal Building Thursday.

Frazier announced that the official switch for broadcasting will be thrown by White-

head and himself during the dedication.

Special guests for the dedication will include the school board, administrators and the Jeff administration. A reception for the official family will follow the ceremonies.

Initial programming calls for broadcast during school hours, Frazier said, but these later will be expanded.

"We hope to be able to broadcast some of the basketball games yet this season," Frazier said.

The station is basically to serve as a training and instructional facility for Frazier's radio-television students and also to serve the community of Lafayette and Tippecanoe County.

WJJE-FM will be located at 91.9 on the FM dial and has a range of about 15 miles.

Also in operation at the school is a closed circuit television unit, the first in the nation on the high school level, Frazier said. The television facilities are being used to supplement learning situations, by teachers to tape for later showing of experiments and lectures and also for students to learn the operations of television broadcasting.

At the radio station dedication, Whitehead will give an address which will be the first broadcast over the airway from the school.

The third class radio operator's license, for which the pupils tested Thursday, will allow them to operate the radio station, take meter readings of the station and operate all the equipment. Results of the tests will be announced to the students following Christmas vacation.

Frazier said he pre-tested the pupils prior to the examination and preparation has been in progress all semester.

Essentially, Frazier said with the third-class license the pupils will be eligible to work at any radio or television station in the country as licensed operators, following completion of the Jeff course. The test was administered by Federal Communications Commission official.

Accompanying Frazier at the 40 pupils on the bus trip to Chicago were Rick Miles, student teacher from Purdue and WASK radio station employee and Roger Priest, announcer of WBAA radio, Purdue University. Priest is a former student of Frazier's at Jeff.

Following the test, the pupils toured the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry, concentrating on the communications displays.



REMARKS OF

Clay T. Whitehead, Director

Office of Telecommunications Policy  
Executive Office of the President

at the

Dedication of the Jefferson High School  
Radio and Television Facility

Lafayette, Indiana  
January 7, 1972

It is an unexpected pleasure for me to be here today and participate in dedicating this magnificent communications facility. Before arriving here I read several background articles about this new Jefferson High School radio and television unit and, of course, heard much from an old student of Mr. Fraser's, who wouldn't stop talking about the fantastic television and radio studio being installed in his old high school.

I must say, after seeing these facilities in person, that I am not only amazed at how complete they are, but I am finding it hard to believe that they belong to a high school. I am sure there are any number of colleges throughout the United States that would be overwhelmed to have this kind of communications facility. There is no quick way to survey every single high school in this country, but from the information available to me, this has to be one of the finest, if not the finest, high school radio and television facility in the entire United States. This facility is what most communities have not yet envisioned and probably won't have for at least another ten years.

As we all know, we are at a cross-roads, or better, at a turning point in the future of communications. There are two exciting technologies ready to burst at the seams as soon as decisions are reached that will permit their growth. In probably less than 10 years we may see a complete change in the way people communicate with one another with the advent of domestic satellite system and cable television. Until now, people have not been able to watch certain kinds of programming in their homes because of a scarcity



of space in the frequency spectrum, but more importantly, production costs were prohibitive because equipment was tremendously expensive. For example, if the people of Lafayette had decided to equip this television facility about 5 years ago with color equipment, the price tag would have been at least 10 times as much at that time. So combined with these new technologies and the lower costs for equipment, I'm sure your entire community will benefit from this project. After others see what you have done, I am sure it will only be a matter of time before many other high schools will realize how important and effective a communications facility like this can be in training and educating their students.

In addition, the people of Lafayette, through their school board and school city, are to be further complimented for building all of this entirely with local money. We are so used to everyone coming to Washington and asking for federal funds for this or that project. It is exciting to see this kind of local initiative.

Before we throw the magic switch which I understand will begin the official operation of WJJE-FM radio station, I would just like to say a complimentary word about the director of this radio and television facility, Bill Fraser. I am aware that he has worked for 18 years toward the creation of this unique facility and deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the final result. I only hope that the present and future students of this high school will realize what a tremendous opportunity they have to both learn the art of communications through radio and television and through its use

to provide an important teaching tool that can also be beneficial to listeners and viewers on the receiving end of this equipment.

I thank you, again, for allowing me to participate in this exciting event.



The following is a transcript of a television and radio program produced and directed by Jefferson High School students in Lafayette, Indiana. The program was taped at the dedication of the new High School Communications Facility on Friday, January 7, 1972.

Announcer: Live and in color the Jefferson Television Center presents an interview with Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, telecommunications adviser to President Richard Nixon. Interviewing Dr. Whitehead are Susan Clark, feature editor of the Jeff Booster (school newspaper), radio and television students, Dave Allenduff (senior), Craig Bone and Dennis Kruszewski..

Question: Can you tell us what the OTP is and does because we didn't have one before the Nixon Administration.

Whitehead: It was just set up last year by the Congress. The President asked that it be set up. It is interesting, though; there was a lot of talk as far back as the Truman Administration that something like this was needed. Our job is broken into two broad parts. One is to oversee the use of electronic communications by the Federal Government. I am not now thinking about public relation activities. I am talking of defense communications, communications to control airplanes, space communications -- all of that kind of thing.

The Federal Government spends over 5 billion dollars a year on all electronic communications and this is scattered among all the departments. Our job is to oversee all of that and try to bring some coherence to it and to assign radio frequencies for those uses. This is a big expense for the Federal Government.

The other side of our responsibility deals with commercial communications. Trying to figure out what is the future, how it is regulated now, and what kinds of new laws and new regulatory policies will be needed for the future. For a long time we did not need an office like ours because there really wasn't that much change going on.

Television came in the early 50's, but since it was really the same as radio with pictures regulations could pretty much be applied in the same way. But during the 50's and 60's, the electronics field began to mushroom. All kinds of new technology advances, prices kept going way down and the capabilities kept going way up. Now, all of a sudden, we are all finding all kinds of new things we can do with communications. You can't really do much in the communications field commercially unless the Government lets you because this is almost a completely regulatory field. The Government now has trouble dealing with all this rapid change. All these new people who want to do new things -- cable television, public television, the international communications scene. International phone calls are doubling every two years. All of this is creating new strain and problems. The Government quite frankly is having problems dealing with it. It is our job to look out ahead and see how we should be dealing with them.

Question: You said something to the effect that when the FCC does something it is kind of looking to the past and making laws and changes according to that instead of looking into the future and planning ahead? What do you think the ideal solution for the FCC would be? The ideal way for the Government to control these things and to what degree should they control these things?

Whitehead: Well, of course, that is one of the central questions we face today. How much communications should be regulated in a great amount of detail, what the FCC is set up for and what parts of it can be regulated just by passing a few laws or setting up a few antitrust criteria and leaving the rest of it to the market place.

We think the FCC, by and large, has done a very good job. The problem is that they have had so little guidance from the Congress. The courts, in many cases, force them into a lot of things they should not be in and force them to deal with things in ways they don't like to and by their very nature they are sort of a crises-oriented agency. They have to deal with problems of today. What are the



problems between a licensee in a particular town where there is a group of dissidents that think the license should be taken away. What decision are we going to make and how are we going to make it. When you have that kind of a heavy workload, with these very real day-to-day possibilities, it is very hard to think where we will be 10 years from now. You've got to take care of today before 10 years from now.

The reason OTP was set up was to try to work with the FCC, not to replace it in any sense, but to work with them to see what are the problems you are having. What are some of the problems you anticipate and how can we work together to try to sort this out. I still think you'll see the FCC continuing to do a lot of detailed regulation, but it will be a little more clear in what areas they are doing it.

Question: When I studied radio and television, I learned about the Fairness Doctrine, but I thought that was one of the basic points to regulating this industry and you said we should do away with this. I don't understand. We talk about broadcasters rights but what about the public's rights. Does the public have rights when it comes to broadcasting?

Whitehead: The public's rights are, of course, the most important. That is where you have to start from. The Fairness Doctrine started off as a very simple kind of thing. Saying that if a broadcaster presents one side of a controversial issue, he has to be fair and provide reasonable opportunity for people on the other side to get on and have their say. Well, I think all of us in this country would agree with that kind of principle.

The trouble is the Fairness Doctrine--capital F, capital D--has over the last 20 years come to mean something entirely different. It has become a mechanism used in part by the FCC, driven very heavily by the courts to put the FCC and courts in the middle of all kinds of day-to-day controversies about who gets on the television screen



to say what to whom. We think that invites too much government meddling. The public to be sure has to have this right of general Fairness. We don't think that right is best served by having the government decide in that much detail what ought to go on television.

Question: Your Office has proposed several suggestions for changes. What is the FCC's attitude toward the changes?

Whitehead: The FCC recognizes very clearly that there are problems. They regulate the communications industry based on the 1934 Communications Act. They recognize that they do not have enough guidance from the Congress. They recognize the precedents they have built up over the years in many cases don't apply in some of these new fields. They just as much as we are looking for ways of handling this. Their job, as I said before, is to try to deal with these problems as they arise. They can't say "Well, I am sorry Congress hasn't given us enough guidance to solve those problems." That would be irresponsible. They have to deal with that as best they can. So they are looking to work with us, and we are looking to work with them to find new ways of dealing with these changes.

It is not easy because the problems are complicated. It is not easy because we have all these precedents built up - court decisions and FCC decisions. You can't lightly throw all those over and say, "Gee, We changed our minds, and we are going to regulate differently."

Question: You are the youngest Presidentially appointed head of an agency. How did you get to such a high place in the Government so quickly? Senators, I think, have to be 35 or 36, you are only 33. I think you have achieved a pretty high office in a relatively short period of time.

Whitehead: You are saying why or how?



Question: I definitely think how?

Whitehead: Well, the how is really quite simply answered. I was invited to join the White House staff when the new Administration came into office, and I was involved in a number of matters. I was Special Assistant to the President and that involved whatever problems arose while I was in the White House. One of my responsibilities was communications, and the President recognized the need to look way ahead and plan where we are going in communications policy. He was concerned about the situation we have in other regulatory industries - like the problems we have with railroads. He didn't want to see that happen in communications. So I was involved in working with all manner of people to see how the Government can deal with these problems. It was decided that OTP should be set up, and I was involved in looking for some one to run it.

The questions came up why don't I since I had been handling these things. At first I didn't think I was the best person to do it - there must be other people around who knew more and could do a better job. Essentially, I was prevailed on and decided to do it. I think a deeper answer that you may be looking for is that with the rapid amount of change going on, 30 or 40 years of experience in broadcasting or television business or something like that really is not that much help in dealing with these new problems. It is possible for a younger person like myself to deal with these problems because I don't deal with them through my long experience. I deal with them by going out and finding the people who understand the problems - the people who have the right expertise and bringing them together and figuring out how we deal with them. So I think younger people can deal in some of these areas where change is the important thing.

Question: What really brought you to the attention of the Nixon Administration?

Whitehead: Well, I sort of brought myself to their attention. I felt if you feel strongly about what is happening in the country and you think it is important



to do the right thing, then you have to get out there and make it happen - instead of sitting back and criticizing, which doesn't work too well. During the 1968 campaign, I felt that Richard Nixon was the best hope for the country and that he would be a good President and would create the opportunities to bring about some of the needed changes, so I sought out some people I knew who were associated with him and asked if I could be of help and here I am.

Question: On the topic of CATV. I was reading about it. I would like to know how growth of CATV can be of harm to the broadcasting industry.

Whitehead: Well, it depends a lot on how CATV grows. If we exclude the broadcaster so he can't have any part of this new cable medium - if we then say - cable you can use as many broadcast signals as you want, bring them in from wherever you would like to bring them, bring in as many as you want and show them on a cable and you don't have to pay as much or work as hard to put on a program, you run a very real risk of driving the local broadcaster out of business. It is just that simple. So, of course, we are not going to do anything as stark as that. It would not be good government policy to do that. It becomes a question of how you strike balances. How you let the broadcaster get into this.

Question: You said you wanted-possibly in the future-to have channels on the television that will possibly have as many as 40 or 50 programs on at the same time.

Whitehead: That's right.

Question: And with that you thought that instead of one half hour or hour, or 90 minute programs we have today, programs could be 45 minutes or however long they needed to be. Say what you want to say and that would improve programming. Is that one of the other benefits of CATV?

Whitehead: Yes. I think it would. You know when you start talking about 50 channels, television isn't the same old thing that it used to be.



Really those channels will be used for things which they are not used for now. The evening news for instance will probably run every half hour on the half hour on various channels so you could get it when you want it -- television when you want it and probably a lot more choice because when you have that many channels, you can afford to take one or two of them and program them with programs that many people would not like to watch.

Question: Would there still be commercial television?

Whitehead: Oh, yes.

Question: What about networks? Don't you think that CATV could become a fourth network?

Whitehead: Well, I would suspect that CATV looking a long way down the road 10 years maybe 20 years, that you will see a 4th, 6th, 10th, 20th - that many networks. At that point, networks will be something different. There probably won't ever be more than 3 or 4 very popular ones like you have now. But there would be very specialized networks. Sports network, news network -- it's kind of hard to imagine because we don't have that possibility now. It might be more like the magazine field is now. You have a very few popular magazines that have large circulations and a whole host of more specialized things.

Question: With that then the present networks will probably have to break down a little bit at least they will become smaller and somewhat less significant.

Whitehead: Well, I think that depends a lot on how they do business. They certainly have the institutions, the money, the expertise. I would expect they would change a little bit the way they do business. The history of this kind of thing is that when some business is threatened, you allow them to go into the new business, and they know what they are doing and are interested in adapting to the change. They very often come out better than before the change happened. I wouldn't worry too much about this.



Question: This Domestic Satellite Policy. I am not sure I really understand what it is. Could you explain what you hope to do with it?

Whitehead: Right now it is not possible for anyone to put up a communications satellite to use within the country. It is only allowed for international communications. The reason that it is only allowed there is because Congress specified how it would be handled for international communications, and the Government has not been able to make up its mind how to handle it in domestic communications. What we propose is really quite simple. If somebody has the resources and wants to put up a system and sell the services to someone else, why not let them. That may sound like common sense, but in the bureaucracy of Washington, that could be a rather radical dogma. It is not quite that simple, of course, because you have to specify a lot of conditions, under what circumstances people will be allowed to do it. Basically, somebody wants to buy that kind of service, and somebody wants to sell it to them. There is plenty of space up there. We are far from using all the space and all the spectrum.

Question: But if you turn them loose like that one satellite and CATV, you want to get less government control and run it more like a business. TV has a great influence on the minds of the American people. Don't you think it will lead to a little bit of irresponsibility on part of the stations? Couldn't that be harmful to the country?

Whitehead: Well, I would rather have a little bit of irresponsibility dispersed very widely than have it highly centralized in the Government. It is just that simple. I am afraid there is no perfect solution, but you are quite right. The power is great. The Government does have to worry about seeing that power is not misused. In this country there is a long tradition of feeling that particularly with the media and press, the Government ought to keep hands out as much as possible. What we are trying to do is find a way to do that.



Question: Has there been much response from industry people toward this Domestic Satellite Policy?

Whitehead: Quite a bit of response from industry. The average home owner is not about to buy a communications satellite for \$100 or \$200 million. It is only going to be used by other businesses. The large users, the television networks, the telephone companies might use it. Some of the computer companies might use it.

Question: How would you decide who would send up that satellite because that would mean money to whoever sends it up.

Whitehead: What we are saying is that we should not decide. The Government should not decide who puts it up. When you put the question that way, you see, you prejudged two things. You say the Government ought to make the decision and that there ought to be one system. Why not let the people decide who uses it, how they want to get it, and what they want it to be. There is no reason for the Government to make that decision.

Question: President Nixon appointed you to this Office. Does he really take an avid interest and has he always kept up on it real well? Does he agree with your decisions? Do you have disagreements? (laughter)

Whitehead: Well, it is not considered good form to talk about your confidential relationships with the President in regard to advice and decisions, but I think I can say in general that he does take a great interest. He feels that communications is very important in a number of ways not just economically but socially and politically. It is a very important shaper of what a country and society is like. He does take an interest and agrees with some of my decisions. I suspect he would disagree with some if he knew about them. Obviously, by and large, we are in agreement. On all big decisions, he gets to call the shots.



Question: When Spiro Agnew gave his speech about broadcasting and the news on the different networks, how did you feel about what he said and do you agree completely or partially? In general, how do you feel about what he had to say?

Whitehead: Well, I try not to talk too much about that because I think with the job I am in, I should not express my personal views about the broadcast press and about their journalistic qualities, but I do feel very strongly that the Vice President is not only entitled but is obligated to think about those things and make his views known; and if he feels that way about the press, and certainly a lot of people would agree with him, he has a great responsibility to say that kind of thing. I just don't have any sympathy with people who feel that is intimidation of the press. The press is a free press in this country. That implies a certain responsibility. The Vice President can tell them they should live up to that responsibility. If they are free to criticize the Government, elected officials ought to be able to reply back and forth. After all, it is not a one way street. What we are looking for is a healthy give-and-take between government, the people and press. I would like to emphasize the Vice President is not calling for me or the FCC to use our governmental power over the broadcasters to enforce his point of view. He has never suggested that. What he is saying - broadcasters you ought to be doing certain kinds of things. It is not at all incompatible with what I am saying. The Government should not regulate in such a great amount of detail.



The following is a transcript of a television and radio program produced and directed by Jefferson High School students in Lafayette, Indiana. The program was taped at the dedication of the new High School Communications Facility on Friday, January 7, 1972. The program will be aired on Friday, January 14, 1972.

Announcer: Live and in color the Jefferson Television Center presents an interview with Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, telecommunications adviser to President Richard Nixon. Interviewing Dr. Whitehead are Susan Clark, feature editor of the Jeff Booster (school newspaper), radio and television students, Dave Allenduff (senior), Craig Bone and Dennis Kruszewski.

Question: Can you tell us what the OTP is and does because we didn't have one before the Nixon Administration.

Whitehead: It was just set up last year by the Congress. The President asked that it be set up. It is interesting, though; there was a lot of talk as far back as the Truman Administration that something like this was needed. Our job is broken into two broad parts. One is to oversee the use of electronic communications by the Federal Government. I am not now thinking about public relation activities. I am talking of defense communications, communications to control airplanes, space communications -- all of that kind of thing.

The Federal Government spends over 5 billion dollars a year on all electronic communications and this is scattered among all the departments. Our job is to oversee all of that and try to bring some coherence to it and to assign radio frequencies for those uses. This is a big expense for the Federal Government.

The other side of our responsibility deals with commercial communications. Trying to figure out what is the future, how is it regulated now, and what kinds of new laws and new regulatory policies will be needed for the future. For a long time we did not need an office like ours because there really wasn't that much change going on. ~~Since~~



*Since*  
television came in the early 50's, but it was really the same as radio with pictures, regulations could pretty much be applied in the same way. But during the 50's and 60's, the electronics field began to mushroom. All kinds of new technology advances; prices kept going way down and the capabilities kept going way up. Now, all of a sudden, we are all finding all kinds of new things we can do with communications. You can't really do much in the communications field commercially unless the government lets you because this is almost a completely regulatory field. The government now has trouble dealing with all this rapid change. All these new people who want to do new things -- cable television, public television, international communications scene. International phone calls are doubling every two years, all of this is creating new strain and problems. The government quite frankly is having problems dealing with it. It is our job to look out ahead and see how we should be dealing with them.

Question: You said something to the effect that when the FCC does something it is kind of looking to the past and making laws and changes according to that instead of looking into the future and planning ahead? What do you think the ideal solution for the FCC would be? The ideal way for the government to control these things and to what degree should they control these things?

Whitehead: Well, of course, that is one of the central questions we face today. How much communications should be regulated in a great amount of detail, what the FCC is set up for and what parts of it can be regulated just by passing a few laws or setting up a few antitrust criteria and leaving the rest of it to the market place.

We think the FCC, by and large, has done a very good job. The problem is that they have had so little guidance from the Congress. The courts, in many cases, force them into a lot of things they should not be in and force them to deal with things in ways they don't like to and by their very nature they are sort of a crises-oriented agency. They have to deal with problems of today. What are the

problems between a licensee in a particular town where there is a group of dissidents that think the license should be taken away. What decision are we going to make and how are we going to make it. When you have that kind of a heavy workload, with these very real day-to-day possibilities, it is very hard to think where we will be 10 years from now. You've got to take care of today before 10 years from now.

The reason OTP was set up was to try to work with the FCC, not to replace it in any sense, but to work with them to see what are the problems you are having. What are some of the problems you anticipate and how can we work together to try to sort this out. I still think you'll see the FCC continuing to do a lot of detailed regulation, but it will be a little more clear in what areas they are doing it.

Question: When I studied radio and television, I learned about the Fairness Doctrine, but I thought that was one of the basic points to regulating this industry and you said we should do away with this. I don't understand. We talk about broadcasters rights but what about the public's rights. Does the public have rights when it comes to broadcasting?

Whitehead: The public's rights are, of course, the most important. That is where you have to start from. The Fairness Doctrine started off as a very simple kind of thing. Saying that if a broadcaster presents one side of a controversial issue, he has to be fair and provide reasonable opportunity for people on the other side to get on and have their say. Well, I think all of us in this country would agree with that kind of principle.

The trouble is the Fairness Doctrine, capital F, capital D, has over the last 20 years come to mean something entirely different. It has become a mechanism used in part by the FCC, driven very heavily by the courts to put the FCC and courts in the middle of all kinds of day-to-day controversies about who gets on the television screen



to say what to whom. We think that invites too much government meddling. The public to be sure has to have this right of general Fairness. We don't think that right is best served by having the government decide in that much detail what ought to go on television.

Question: Your office has proposed several suggestions for changes. What is the FCC's attitude toward the changes?

Whitehead: The FCC recognizes very clearly that there are problems. They regulate the communications industry based on the 1934 Communications Act. They recognize that they do not have enough guidance from the Congress. They recognize the precedences<sup>to</sup> they have built up over the years in many cases don't apply in some of these new fields. They just as much as we are looking for ways of handling this. Their job, as I said before, is to try to deal with these problems as they arise. They can't say, "well, I am sorry Congress hasn't given us enough guidance to solve those problems." That would be irresponsible. They have to deal with that as best they can. So they are looking to work with us, and we are looking to work with them to find new ways of dealing with these changes.

It is not easy because the problems are complicated. It is not easy because we have all these precedences<sup>to</sup> built up - court decisions and FCC decisions. You can't lightly throw all those over and say, "gee, we changed our mind, and we are going to regulate differently."

Question: You are the youngest Presidentially appointed head of an agency. How did you get to such a high place in the government so quickly? Senators, I think, have to be 35 or 36, you are only 33. I think you have achieved a pretty high office in a relatively short period of time.

Whitehead: You are saying why or how?

Question: I definitely think how?

Whitehead: Well, the how is really quite simply answered. I was invited to join the White House staff when the new administration came into office, and I was involved in a number of matters. I was Special Assistant to the President and that involved whatever problems arose while I was in the White House. One of my responsibilities was communications, and the President recognized the need to look way ahead and plan where we are going in communications policy. He was concerned about the situation we have in other regulatory industries - like the problems we have with railroads. He didn't want to see that happen in communications. So I was involved in working with all manner of people to see how the government can deal with these problems. It was decided that OTP should be set up, and I was involved in looking for some one to run it.

The questions came up why don't I since I had been handling these things. At first I didn't think I was the best person to do it - there must be other people around ~~that~~ <sup>who</sup> knew more and could do a better job. Essentially, I was prevailed on and decided to do it. I think a deeper answer that you may be looking for is that with the rapid amount of change going on, 30 or 40 years of experience in broadcasting or television business or something like that really is not that much help in dealing with these new problems. It is possible for a younger person like myself to deal with these problems because I don't deal with them through my long experience. I deal with them by going out and finding the people who understand the problems - the people who have the right expertise and bringing them together and figuring out how we deal with them. So I think younger people can deal in some of these areas where change is the important thing.

Question: What really brought you to the attention of the Nixon Administration?

Whitehead: Well, I sort of brought myself to their attention. I felt if you feel strongly about what is happening in the country and you think it is important



to do the right thing, then you have to get out there and make it happen - instead of sitting back and criticizing, which doesn't work too well. During the 1968 campaign, I felt that Richard Nixon was the best hope for the country and that he would be a good President and would create the opportunities to bring about some of the needed changes, so I sought out some people I knew who were associated with him and asked if I could be of help and here I am.

Question: On the topic of CATV. I was reading about it. I would like to know how growth of CATV can be of harm to the broadcasting industry.

Whitehead: Well, it depends a lot on how CATV grows. If we exclude the broadcaster so he can't have any part of this new cable medium - if we then say - cable you can use as many broadcast signals as you want, bring them in from wherever you would like to bring them, bring in as many as you want and show them on a cable and you don't have to pay as much or work as hard to put on a program, you run a very real risk of driving the local broadcaster out of business. It is just that simple. So, of course, we are not going to do anything as stark as that. It would not be good government policy to do that. It becomes a question of how you strike balances. How you let the broadcaster get into this.

Question: You said you wanted <sup>1</sup>possibly in the future <sup>1</sup>to have channels on the television that will possibly have as many as 40 or 50 programs on at the same time.

Whitehead: That's right.

Question: And with that you thought that instead of one half hour or hour, or 90 minute programs we have today, programs could be 45 minutes or however long they needed to be. Say what you want to say and that would improve programming. Is that one of the other benefits of CATV?

Whitehead: Yes. I think it would. You know when you start talking about 50 channels, television isn't the same old thing that it used <sup>1</sup>to be. ~~Really what it will~~

~~become is~~ Really those channels will be used for things which they are not used for now. The evening news for instance will probably run every half hour on the half hour on various channels so you could get it when you want it -- television when you want it and probably a lot more choice because when you have that many channels, you can afford to take one or two of them and program them with programs that many people would not like to watch.

Question: Would there still be commercial television?

Whitehead: Oh, yes.

Question: What about networks? Don't you think that CATV could become a fourth network?

Whitehead: Well, I would suspect that CATV looking a long way down the road 10 years maybe 20-years, that you will see 4th, 6th, 10th, 20th - that many networks. At that point, networks will be something different. There probably won't ever be more than 3 or 4 very popular ones like you have now. But there would be very specialized networks. Sports network, news network -- it's kind of hard to imagine because we don't have that possibility now. It might be more like the magazine field is now. You have a very few popular magazines ~~and~~ <sup>that</sup> have large circulations and a whole host of more specialized things.

Question: With that then the present networks will probably have to break down a little bit at least they will become smaller and somewhat less significant.

Whitehead: Well, I think that depends a lot on how they do business. They certainly have the institutions, the money, the expertise. I would expect they would change a little bit the way they do business. The history of this kind of thing is that when some business is threatened, you allow them to go into the new business, and they know what they are doing and are interested in adapting to the change. They very often come out better than before the change happened. I wouldn't worry too much about this.



Question: This Domestic Satellite Policy. I am not sure I really understand what it is. Could you explain what you hope to do with it?

Whitehead: Right now it is not possible for anyone to put up a communications satellite to use within the country. It is only allowed for international communications. The reason that it is only allowed there is because Congress specified how it would be handled for international communications, and the government has not been able to make up its mind how to handle it in domestic communications. What we propose is really quite simple. If somebody has the resources and wants to put up a system and sell the services to someone else, why not let them. That may sound like common sense, but in the bureaucracy of Washington, that could be a rather radical dogma. It is not quite that simple, of course, because you have to specify a lot of conditions, under what circumstances people will be allowed to do it. Basically, somebody wants to buy that kind of service, and somebody wants to sell it to them. There is plenty of space up there. We are far from using all the space and all the spectrum.

Question: But if you turn them <sup>8</sup>lose like that on satellite and CATV, you want to get less government control and run it more like a business. TV has a great influence on the minds of the American people. Don't you think it will lead to a little bit of irresponsibility on part of the stations? Couldn't that be harmful to the country?

Whitehead: Well, I would rather have a little bit of irresponsibility dispersed very widely than have it highly centralized in the government. It is just that simple. I am afraid there is no perfect solution, but you are quite right. The power is great. The government does have to worry about seeing that power is not misused. In this country there is a long tradition of feeling that particularly with the media and press, the government ought to keep hands out as much as possible. What we are trying to do is find a way to do that.

Question: Has there been much response from industry people toward this Domestic Satellite Policy?

Whitehead: Quite a bit of response from industry. The average home owner is not about to buy a communications satellite for \$100 or \$200 million. It is only going to be used by other businesses. The large users, the television networks, the telephone companies might use it. Some of the computer companies might use it.

Question: How would you decide who would send up that satellite because that would mean money to whoever sends it up.

Whitehead: What we are saying is that we should not decide. The government should not decide who puts it up. When you put the question that way, you-see, you prejudged two things. You say the government ought to make the decision and that there ought to be one system. Why not let the people decide who uses it, how they want to get it, and what they want it to be. There is no reason for the government to make that decision.

Question: President Nixon appointed you to this office. Does he really take an avid interest and has he always kept up on it real well? Does he agree with your decisions? Do you have disagreements? (laughter)

Whitehead: Well, it is not considered good form to talk about your confidential relationships with the President in regard to advice and decisions, but I think I can say in general that he does take a great interest. He feels that communications is very important in a number of ways not just economically but socially and politically. It is a very important shaper of what a country and society is like. He does take an interest and agrees with some of my decisions. I suspect he would disagree with some if he knew about them. Obviously, by and large, we are in agreement. On all big decisions, he gets to call the shots.



Question: When Spiro Agnew gave his speech about broadcasting and the news on the different networks, how did you feel about what he said and do you agree completely or partially? In general, how do you feel about what he had to say?

Whitehead: Well, I try not to talk too much about that because I think with the job I am in, I should not express my personal views about the broadcast press and about their journalistic qualities, but I do feel very strongly that the Vice President is not only entitled but is obligated to think about those things and make his views known; and if he feels that way about the press, and certainly a lot of people would agree with him, he has a great responsibility to say that kind of thing. I just don't have any sympathy with people who feel that is intimidation of the press. The press is a free press in this country, that implies a certain responsibility. The Vice President can tell them they should live up to that responsibility. If they are free to criticize the government, elected officials ought to be able to reply back and forth. After all, it is not a one way street. What we are looking for is a healthy ~~give-and-take~~ between government, the people and press. I would like to emphasize the Vice President is not calling for me or the FCC to use our governmental power over the broadcasters to enforce his point of view. He has never suggested that. What he is saying - broadcasters you ought to be doing certain kinds of things. It is not at all incompatible with what I am saying. The government should not regulate in such a great amount of detail.

The following is a transcript of a television and radio program produced and directed by Jefferson High School students in Lafayette, Indiana. The program was taped at the dedication of the new High School Communications Facility on Friday, January 7, 1972. The program will be aired on Friday, January 14, 1972.

Announcer: Live and in color the Jefferson Television Center presents an interview with Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, telecommunications adviser to President Richard Nixon. Interviewing Dr. Whitehead are Susan Clark, feature editor of the Jeff Booster (school newspaper), radio and television students, Dave Allenduff (senior), Craig Bone and Dennis Kruszewski.

Question: Can you tell us what the OTP is and does because we didn't have one before the Nixon Administration.

Whitehead: It was just set up last year by the Congress. The President asked though; there was a lot of talk as far back as the Truman Administration that something like this was needed. Our job is broken into two broad parts. One is to oversee the use of electronic communications by the Federal Government. I am not now thinking about public relation activities. I am talking of defense communications, communications to control airplanes, space communications -- all of that kind of thing.

The Federal Government spends over 5 billion dollars a year on all electronic communications and this is scattered among all the departments. Our job is to oversee all of that and try to bring some coherence to it and to assign radio frequencies for those uses. This is a big expense for the Federal Government.

The other side of our responsibility deals with commercial communications. Trying to figure out what is the future, how regulated now, and what kinds of new laws and new regulatory policies will be needed for the future. For a long time we did not need an office like ours because there really wasn't that much change going on.



PREPARED REMARKS FOR CTW AT THE DEDICATION OF THE  
JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL RADIO AND TELEVISION FACILITY IN  
LAFAYETTE, INDIANA:

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, Mr. Hiatt, Mr. Leveren, and Mr. Fraser:

It is an unexpected pleasure for me to <sup>be here</sup> ~~join with all of you here~~ today *and*  
*participate* in dedicating this magnificent communications facility. Before arriving  
here ~~today~~, I read several background articles about this new Jefferson  
High School radio and television unit and, of course, heard much from  
an old student of Mr. Fraser's, who wouldn't stop talking about the  
fantastic television and radio studio being installed in his old high school.

I must say, after seeing these facilities in person, that I am not only  
amazed on how complete they are, ~~but~~ I am finding it hard to believe  
that they belong to a high school. I am sure there are any number of  
colleges throughout the United States that would be overwhelmed to have  
this kind of communications facility. There is no quick way to survey  
every single high school in this country, but from the information avail-  
able to me, this has to be one of the finest, if not the finest, high school  
radio and television facility in the entire United States. I would suggest  
that Jefferson high school has today what must be called a communications  
model for the future, for high schools in towns throughout this nation.

As we all know, we are at a cross-roads, or better, at a turning point  
in the future of communications. There are two exciting technologies  
ready to burst at the seams as soon as ~~the Government can decide which~~  
*decision are reached*  
*that will permit their growth.*



way they want them to go. In probably less than 10 years we may see a complete change in the way people communicate with one another.

through the use of a domestic satellite system and cable television.

*Until* ~~Up~~ *not been able to* ~~til~~ now, many people have ~~been~~ deprived from watching certain kinds of programming in their homes because of a scarcity of space in the

frequency spectrum, but more importantly, production costs were prohibitive because equipment was tremendously expensive. *For example,* If the people

of Lafayette, <sup>had</sup> decided to equip this television facility about 5 years ago

with color equipment, the price tag would have been at least 10 times

as much, *at that time. So combined with these new technologies and the lower costs for equipment*

*I'm sure your entire community will benefit from this project*

After others see what you have done, I am sure it will only be a matter

of time before many other high schools will realize how important and

effective a communications facility like this can be in training and

educating their students.

In addition, the people <sup>of</sup> Lafayette, through <sup>their</sup> ~~its~~ school board and ~~school~~ city, are to be further complimented for building all of this entirely with

local money. We are so used to everyone coming to Washington and

asking for federal funds for this or that project. It is exciting to see

this kind of local initiative.

Before we throw the magic switch which I understand will begin the

official operation of WJJE<sup>FM</sup> radio station, I would just like to say a



complimentary word about the director of this radio and television

facility, Bill Fraser. *I am aware that he has* *Toward*  
*the creation of this unique facility, a very hard*  
~~Any man who has worked for 18 years to improve~~  
~~communications between people~~ deserves a tremendous amount of credit.

for the final ~~product~~ *result*. I only hope that the present and future students

of this high school will realize what a tremendous opportunity they have

to both learn the art of communications through ~~radio~~ and television and

through its use to provide an important teaching tool that can also be

beneficial to listeners and viewers on the ~~other~~ *receiving* end of this equipment.

I thank you, again, for allowing me to participate in this exciting event.