



60 MINUTES

Volume V, Number 16  
as broadcast over the  
CBS TELEVISION NETWORK  
Sunday, March 25, 1973  
6:00 - 7:00 PM, EST

With CBS News Correspondents Morley Safer and Mike Wallace

PRODUCED BY CBS NEWS

EXECUTIVE PRODUCER: Don Hewitt

MIKE WALLACE: Public television is in the middle of a big battle. Not over programs like Julia Child and "Sesame Street". The fight is over some of the public-affairs broadcasts that originate in Washington and New York and over some of the newsmen that participate in them.

PETER LISAGOR: Well, I think public television lost its virginity, Mike, when government money was put into it. Every two-bit politician then felt compelled or obliged or somehow able to say, "I am not going to vote money for the kind of garbage that that fellow is speaking on public television."

. . . . .

MORLEY SAFER: . . . image of Dayan is of the lean desert commander striding past tough, determined Israeli troops: a kind of Jewish Patton. Tonight we'll meet a different kind of Dayan.

MOSHE DAYAN: With my bald head I can't go without the hat.

SAFER: And Anwar el-Sadat. Our image of Sadat is of the statesmanlike conspirator, trying on the one hand to keep some of his more volatile Arab neighbors under control, while at the same time making warlike noises at Israel. Tonight we meet a different kind of Sadat.

. . . . .

[Race track bugle call]

DOUG THOMAS: This is a rough sport. It's a dog-eat-dog game. You're trying to get on horses. You're cutting one another's throat to get on horses. This is the name of the game, to get on the right horse at that right time, to win races. You've got to have guts.

. . . . .

SAFER: I'm Morley Safer.

WALLACE: I'm Mike Wallace. Those stories and more, tonight on 60 MINUTES. First these headlines:

Hanoi turned over a list of the last 107 American POW's it holds and proposed to release them on Tuesday and Wednesday, but the U.S. held out for assurances that nine Americans captured in Laos would be freed at the same time. President Nixon ordered the 6,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam to remain there until such assurances have been given.

The retail cost of a market basket of food rose by two and a half percent between January and February, the Agriculture Department says. And chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee says he's going to introduce legislation to freeze all prices and interest rates at March 16 levels.

60 MINUTES continues in a moment.

[Announcements]

["WHAT ABOUT PUBLIC TELEVISION?"]

WALLACE: The television you're watching is called network television. It's commercial. What goes into the program is strictly our responsibility at CBS News, but outside companies can buy time to sell their products with commercials. Now, there is another kind of television called public TV. It's the fourth network, though it likes to call itself an interconnection of local stations, not a network. Remember that word: interconnection.

Public TV has no commercials, no profits. It has to scrounge for money from foundations like the Ford Foundation or from the Federal government or from private individuals. And it always has its hand out. Public television has made its reputation, to a large extent, with some first-rate shows like these:

MAN: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I-- Hey, you know what letter comes after I?

CHILDREN [singing]: Can you tell me how to get, how to get to "Sesame Street"?

MAN: . . . all the myths, promises, joys and sorrows that shape "An American Family".

MAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to "The Advocates".

JULIA CHILD: This is chicken in red wine! This is chicken in white wine! We're doing the classics!

WOMAN: How can you bed with a woman who does not please you?

CHILDREN: J!

WALLACE: Well, public television is in the middle of a big battle. Not over programs like Julia Child and "Sesame Street". The fight is over some of the public-affairs broadcasts that originate in Washington and New York and over some of the newsmen that participate in them.

What programs are we talking about? And what newsmen? Well, Sander Vanocur was at the center of it. He used to be a newsman for NBC. He used to be a newsman for public television. But he got into trouble because too many people in the White House and the Congress thought he was too liberal and that his \$85,000 salary was too high. So if Vanocur hadn't resigned from public TV, he'd have been pushed out.

Then there's Bill Moyers. He has a weekly show on public television.



And though it's hardly controversial, still, a lot of folks in Washington felt it was unwise to have the former press secretary to a Democratic President, Lyndon Johnson, as anchorman for a public television series.

Bill Buckley is a different matter. The waspish conservative was called by someone in the White House "nothing but a fig leaf" for all the liberals in public television. And besides, there have been complaints that his weekly fee of \$1900 for doing an hour's interview is welfare for the rich.

But a good deal of the fire in Washington has been directed at a weekly half-hour called "Washington Week in Review". Vanocur's old NBC sidekick, Robert MacNeil, moderates it and a cast of fault-finders regularly takes the President to task in the course of illuminating the week's issues.

Well, a couple of weeks ago, the ax fell. All those shows - Moyers, Buckley, "Washington Week" - had their money taken away by an outfit called CPB - the Corporation for Public Broadcasting - that gets its money from the Congress. When this season's over, says CPB, the well has run dry for those shows. There have been cries of censorship and dictation from the White House, but Peter Lisagor, one of the regulars on "Washington Week in Review," says the trouble really began back in 1967, when public television first accepted a Federal handout.

LISAGOR: Well, I think public television lost its virginity, Mike, when government money was put into it. Every two-bit politician then felt compelled or obliged or somehow able to say, "I am not going to vote money for the kind of garbage that that fellow is speaking on public television." More than that, we in our program have gotten letters from taxpayers, people who say: "I am a taxpayer. You are speaking things that I don't agree with and I just don't-- I'm not going to--" you know, "I'm not going to tolerate this situation." So it seems to me that public television got itself into trouble once the government began to vote it that first nickel.

WALLACE: Pete Lisagor may not agree often with Clay Whitehead, who is President Nixon's television adviser. Whitehead has attacked television news as laced with something he calls "ideological plugola" and "elitist gossip". But Whitehead and Lisagor do agree about public television and the tax dollar.

WHITEHEAD: The sensitivity about public television being involved in public affairs, I think, comes when you start using the tax dollar. And I don't care whether it's used in a pro-Nixon way or an anti-Nixon way or whatever. When you start using tax dollars to fund television programming about controversial issues of public importance - the current issues of the day - you're skirting awfully close to having a propaganda network.

WALLACE: But the man who got public television its money to begin with, Senator John Pastore of Rhode Island, says everybody knows

public television could never have gotten off the ground without Federal money. The money argument, says Pastore, is just a cover-up for the Nixon Administration's hypersensitivity.

PASTORE: This is all ridiculous on the part of this Administration. I think it's become a little thin-skinned about a little criticism and they've reached the point now that, just because Vanocur or Bill Moyers was with Johnson or they don't like maybe what Buckley said on one or two occasions, they've just got to cut those programs out because, they said, this was not what was envisioned. They're absolutely wrong!

WALLACE: Fred Friendly is television adviser to the Ford Foundation, which has put even more money into public television than the government. And he sees a double threat: not just to public television, but to the commercial networks too.

FRIENDLY: I would think that this attack is insufferable, that there is an appetite right now to change the American people's view of journalism - and particularly broadcast journalism. It's an attack aimed at commercial broadcasting, at the nightly news, at documentaries, at programs such as you do and at the programs on public television.

WALLACE: There's one more actor in our cast: Henry Loomis. He runs something called CPB - the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I asked him just what it is that CPB does.

Are you editors? Are you publishers? Are you censors? Are you moneybags? What is it that you are?

LOOMIS: I think it's the latter. I--

WALLACE: You're moneybags?

LOOMIS: Yeah, we're moneybags.

WALLACE: You have taken your support, your financial support, away from Buckley, Moyers, "Washington Week in Review" and Liz Drew, right?

LOOMIS: Right.

WALLACE: Because-- because why?

LOOMIS: Because we ran out of dough, primarily.

WALLACE: Well, you had to choose the--

LOOMIS: Yes, between those programs and others.

WALLACE: So why did you get rid of them?

LOOMIS: First of all, Moyers and Buckley are high-ticket items. They're expensive.



WALLACE: You did not get rid of Buckley, Moyers, "Washington Week," Liz Drew because of controversiality?

LOOMIS: No, we think they should-- we--

WALLACE: You'd like to see them on the air if you had the money?

LOOMIS: Yes. Yes.

WALLACE: But the skeptics don't believe Loomis. They say he's just following instructions from Clay Whitehead and the White House.

A little bit more than a year ago, Mr. Whitehead, you said, in effect, in a speech: "Why doesn't public television stay out of news and public affairs? That kind of thing is done pretty effectively right now by the commercial networks."

WHITEHEAD: I was simply expressing my view of the relative priorities. There are so many things that commercial television cannot do - when you get to education and culture and all kinds of other programming - that on the priority totem pole, I would think that public television should be focusing its priorities on other things.

WALLACE: Everybody who was in on the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, Mr. Whitehead, said there was no doubt that public television was going to include news and public affairs and controversy. Everybody who was in on the passage of that act, right?

WHITEHEAD: I think that that's correct.

WALLACE: With long-range financing?

WHITEHEAD: That's correct.

WALLACE: Shielded, insulated from government interference?

WHITEHEAD: That's correct.

WALLACE: Is there anything wrong with that?

WHITEHEAD: If it can be worked out, there's nothing wrong with it.

WALLACE: Well, what happened, then? All of a sudden, here is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting cutting the throat of Bill Buckley, Bill Moyers, "Washington Week in Review," Elizabeth Drew, on the basis that they are what?

WHITEHEAD: I don't know. I presume they're making them-- their decisions on the basis of the programming priorities that they have and what the-- the programming they feel they ought to be doing.

WALLACE: Mr. Friendly, you don't think that the White House in general and people like Clay Whitehead in particular have any merit in their argument that public television should stick principally to

culture and steer clear of controversy - in other words, keep out of news and public affairs? There's no merit to that at all?

FRIENDLY: There is no merit in it, Mr. Wallace. I should have thought you might have asked that question a little differently in the light of the last few months. A year and a half ago, when Mr. Whitehead first said: "Why doesn't public television stay out of news and public affairs? The commercial networks do it so well" - that was one thing. Now he is saying commercial television ought to watch what it does in news and public affairs; it doesn't do it so well; the local stations ought to do it. Don't you see any pattern in his earlier attacks on public television and now his attacks on commercial television news, asking that local television play a bigger role? Don't you see a pattern there, Mr. Wallace?

WALLACE: What pattern do you see?

FRIENDLY: I see a pattern of trying to lessen the amount of news and public affairs done in commercial television and in public television.

WALLACE: To the end that there will be less criticism of this Administration, solely that end?

FRIENDLY: To the end that television journalism generally be much more vapid, much more innocuous about all administrations.

WALLACE: And you feel, on the contrary, that there should be as much or more news and public affairs, funded partially by Ford Foundation, funded partially by CPB, and so forth?

FRIENDLY: Not only do I think so, I think that's what the Public Broadcast Act of 1967 said, approved by the Senate and the House and signed by the President of the United States. I believe that public television without public affairs is neither television nor public and wouldn't deserve to live.

WALLACE: Some people say that the government, the Federal government, has two money screws on broadcasting news and public affairs. The money screw on public television is the funds given to it by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and on the other hand, the licenses of the commercial network licensees, which is, in the final analysis, money. And what you're really trying to do is lay down some big brother rules about the way that television, public and commercial, should run their news operations.

WHITEHEAD: Precisely to the contrary. We are trying to reduce the degree of government involvement in the regulation of broadcasting today, including the news. We are trying to get a wider range of point of view on television: more sources, more diversity, more choice for the viewer as to what he sees. We're trying to get public television to be a strong and independent medium. But we're saying that if you want that to happen, you've got to be very careful about the use of tax dollars in these controversial public affairs shows.



WALLACE: You know that a good many people in network television news distrusts the attitude of the White House about them and they believe that Clay Whitehead is the White House's hatchet man - or, to use a nicer word, philosopher - in this area?

WHITEHEAD: Clay Whitehead is responsible for recommending to the public, to the President, to the Congress, policies for the regulation of broadcasting and other communications forms in this country. It's the Congress and the FCC - not the White House - that has the ultimate responsibility for these things.

WALLACE: Do you see any connection between government interference, if you will, with public broadcasting news and public affairs and White House interference or White House pressure on commercial network news programs?

PASTORE: They deny this. Mr. Whitehead has been before my committee. But throughout the country, the editorials, the reaction of the industry, the reaction of the man on the street, feels that this is, more or less, a system and procedure of intimidation. And it's wrong, it's wrong. I think we have to do nothing to interfere with the free flow of news. I think we ought to have more public affairs programs. And the one thing that will educate the American public the most is to know exactly what is in the background of the negotiations that went on in Paris. What is it that Kissinger is trying to do in Indochina? What is it that the President has on his mind with reference to asking for money to rehabilitate all of Indochina? What are we going to do about our troop concentration in Europe? What are we going to do about the devaluation of the American dollar? What are we going to do about the price of food? All of these questions ought to be gone to and in depth and that's what public television is for.

WALLACE: Well, then, what in the world is the White House so afraid of?

PASTORE: I have no idea! I can't understand that. It's mystified me from the first day that they hired Whitehead.

WALLACE: But the big issue now is whether Buckley, Moyers and the rest can get back on the air if the money can be found someplace else. For instance, if the Ford Foundation foots the bill. The public TV stations say they want them, but the outfit that controls the money to put that fourth network together - the interconnection - is CPB, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, run by Henry Loomis.

If the Ford Foundation decides to go ahead and pick up the tab for these programs which you have lopped off, will you pull the plug on interconnection or will you permit those broadcasts to be seen on your network?

LOOMIS: We would not pull the plug on interconnection.

WALLACE: That's a firm promise?



LOOMIS: Yes, provided, as I said before-- provided that this mechanism that we are in the process of setting up with the licensees-- agrees that they are balanced and objective.

WALLACE: Well, the licensees want them.

LOOMIS: There's two different things: that when you use the Federal interconnection, a determination has to be made that the program is balanced and objective.

WALLACE: But you say that they are balanced and objective up to now.

LOOMIS: That is correct.

WALLACE: Well, there's no reason to believe-- I mean--

LOOMIS: There's no reason to believe that they would not be passed, not at all.

WALLACE: But Clay Whitehead worries about the baleful influence of the Ford Foundation.

WHITEHEAD: Well, I think it would have to be a cause of some concern, because of what I mentioned earlier: that-- the dangers of having any one organization, particularly a foundation that's not directly answerable to the public in any way, and using tax-free dollars. I just think you have to be very concerned about that kind of an organization having an undue influence over this potentially very powerful medium.

WALLACE: It is no secret that the Ford Foundation and you, Fred Friendly, in particular, as the man who advises the foundation where to put its television money, it's no secret that you're a prime target of the White House attack on public television. They think that you run a fourth network, that you're the major sponsor of a fourth network that reflects, by and large, your views.

FRIENDLY: What's your question?

WALLACE: Is it true? What's your reaction?

FRIENDLY: [Cross talk] not true. The first-- the use of the word sponsor is untrue. Secondly, we fund, Mr. Wallace, those programs that the public television stations want. We fund no programs that they don't ask us to fund. And until the current crisis, where we don't know what the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is going to do, we do it all on a 50-50 basis.

WALLACE: And so the battle rages. If the money can be found to back Buckley, Moyers, "Washington Week" and such, can the CPB deny the public TV stations the network - the interconnection - that will carry those programs coast-to-coast? We put that question to Senator Pastore.

PASTORE: I think they would be hard put to deny it. As a matter of fact, their responsibility to the Congress would be rather severe. The next time they come up here, they'd have to account for it. It's like everything else, you know: you can take a horse to water, but you can't make him drink. And there's a lot of things going on in government that a lot of us are unhappy about. But the big question is: What do you do about it? You don't go down there with a club and say: You either do it my way or you don't do it at all, or you've got to do this and you've got to do that. But the laws are being impinged upon every day. We have the problem on freezing of funds, impounding of funds, and that's a controversy that's going on now.

WALLACE: And now you have an impounding of ideas, perhaps?

PASTORE: And now you might have an impounding of ideas. And that's the sorrowful situation that confronts us today. And I would hope that somehow President Nixon would get into this thing and assure the American public that insofar as he is concerned, there will be no strong arm of the government that will supervise the news nor supervise programming in this country, whether or not the Congress puts up ten cents or not.

WALLACE: This week in Washington, Senator Pastore opens hearings into the funding of public television. He wants \$140-million for the next two years. But if the government were to give no money to public television, where would its lifeblood come from? Though it's called public television, the public has shown no disposition to contribute the kind of money it needs to do a proper job. In Britain, the BBC is supported by a yearly tax on every television set. In this country, the suggestion is heard that the commercial networks make a large, enforced yearly contribution. Almost everyone agrees the government should keep its hands off public television. But as long as the government pays the piper, chances are it will try to call the tune.

[Announcements]

["DAYAN - SADAT"]

SAFER: With the war in Southeast Asia diminishing, America's - indeed, the world's - attention returns to the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli struggle continues quietly, diplomatically - occasionally openly. Well, tonight we look not at the struggle itself but at two men who live at the very center of it. We've seen and heard these men before, but never quite so close up, never quite so candidly.

Moshe Dayan, age 58, a native Israeli - Sabras, they call them, named after the tough little Israeli cactus that's supposed to be prickly on the outside, sweet on the inside. A national hero at home and an international reputation as a brilliant military strategist. Our image of Dayan is of the lean desert commander striding past tough, determined Israeli troops: a kind of Jewish Patton. Tonight we'll meet a different kind of Dayan.



DAYAN: With my bald head I can't go without the hat.

SAFER: And Anwar el-Sadat, age 55, born in the Nile Delta, part of that small clique of educated, multilingual Egyptians who rose to power in the army and politics when the British left the Middle East. Our image of Sadat is of the statesmanlike conspirator, trying on the one hand to keep some of his more volatile Arab neighbors under control, while at the same time making warlike noises at Israel. Tonight we meet a different kind of Sadat.

Dayan, recently divorced, lives alone - alone except for the Israeli soldiers who guard his house. Across the canal, Sadat has his bodyguards. He cannot even take a morning swim without them. They are not only marksmen, but karate and judo experts and frogmen as well.

DAYAN: It's an old habit with me to wake up at half past four. This is, I believe, because I used to wake up early in the village to milk the cows and I can't get rid of it. But it's not bad, anyway, because I wake up at half past four, I've got the paper already coming here, make my cup of coffee and then I have between half past four and seven o'clock, when I have to go to office, a few hours for myself here. I'm alone, living alone in the house, and I can attend to my hobby, to antiquities, archeology.

And I think this one is one of the best in the world. And I wish somebody would come and tell me where there is a mosaic of the Roman time, a better one, well-preserved, colorful, than this decorated lady. I think it's an exceptional good piece, an exceptional good piece. But my heart is not with her, it's too late for me. For she's too young: it's fourth century. What I really appreciate is the old Canaanite, old Israeli before Christ. I think it's a very famous collection and I hope that I do have some of the best pieces in the world - not only in the country; in the world - which I wouldn't depart while I am a proud collector.

SADAT: I myself am a writer, but up till now, even the novels I read are those who are relating about history. I prefer always the historical novel. I must say-- I must confess that very little time I give to my children and my family, and this is very unfortunate for me.

SAFER: Sadat's wife, Gehan. Their marriage was an arranged one. She was only 15. The Sadats have three girls and a boy. And Madame Sadat, whose mother was English, says she does not want her daughters' lives arranged the way hers was.

Dayan has three children. One son lives on this farm with his wife and baby. Another is an actor. Dayan's daughter, Yael, is a novelist. Dayan is a loner. He was divorced this year after 36 years of marriage. Yael wrote of him: "The most painful thing he ever said was, 'If I had my life to live over again, I would do it without a family.'"

DAYAN: I came here at the age of five. I was born in a kibbutz near the Lake of Tiberias. But then my parents wanted to have a family farm and they came here with the first eight families that established, started this village. So this is what we call a moshav: a Socialist farm with the idea of equality. And I think that living on the land is one of the most essential things for the individual and for the nation. Jews should turn into farmers. It taught me the individual responsibility which came again also during my military life.

I think that by nature, by character - even now - I'm more of a farmer than of a military man.

SADAT: I was born here in this village. And all my childhood I lived here in this village. And I started my school here. All my dreams up till this moment and everything that has been shaped since my childhood was shaped here in this village and on this land.

These are my cousins here in the village. And I would have been here with them, but education is the difference between me and them. But they are villagers and they are living-- they have-- they were born here and they live here and they will die here. I hope I shall do the same. And then I must tell you this: the village and the land here makes one very solid and feel superior to those in the cities, really: a kind of aristocracy.

DAYAN: Farming is the nicest thing in the world - not only better than war and killing, but I don't know anything else which you feel so much the creative feeling like farming, where you put the seed in the land and watch it grow up and you put the eggs in the incubator and you grow, you raise the chicken. You-- excuse me saying so, you are a partner of God.

[Chanting]

SADAT: Here we consider always, everything is done by God. We just put the seed and then it bring-- makes a tree or makes a crop or so. We consider this is the make of God. So everything here is related to God.

DAYAN: I myself am not all-- I'm not religious - not at all, I never pray. So I think, though, religious - strict religious, like going to synagogue every Saturday or anything like that - didn't really take any major part in this religion, but the deep belief, the belief-- the deep faith in Judaism, in ideals, in the right way of treatment between human beings, the faith in the Jews coming back to their land - not because this is God's order but because this is our duty and our desire, our dream.

SADAT: I can remember now when my father used to tell me-- first, my father really was fascinated by Napoleon. All his tales about history was about Napoleon. And then after that, he was fascinated by Kemal Ataturk of Turkey.



I have always dreamt to be an officer, even while I was here in the village. And my grandmother told me about her father, who was an officer in Arabi's army. And she used to tell me he was a cavalry officer. I was fascinated by Napoleon, like I told you when my father used to tell me, and after that, my father used to tell me about Ataturk. Both of them were officers.

DAYAN: When I became the commander of the Israeli Army, I thought that the army was not daring enough. So I pressed hard on the soldiers that they should fight and take more risks and try harder - things like that. But then, the first real battle that I had to take care of was the Suez Campaign. And for us it was a problem. The world doesn't like war and they don't want war, so we had to do it quickly. Ben Gurion, the Prime Minister, told me right away: "You have to take the entire Sinai Peninsula within seven days. If you can't do it, don't start." And I told him, "We shall do it."

[Children singing]

SAFER: Twenty years before that Sinai Campaign, Sadat had left his village to become the army officer he had dreamed of becoming. In the army he became friendly with a fellow officer, Gamal Abdel Nasser. Both were eventually to join the revolutionary council that overthrew the monarchy, and then met to decide Egypt's political future.

SADAT: Seven of us out of eight voted for dictatorship and I was one of them. One only voted for democracy-- for democracy and this is-- this was Nasser. I was young and at that time I thought that through dictatorship one can build the country. Our main aim is to build a new country and a very powerful country. So this was my idea. But I remember this night, when Nasser refused and even resigned. On the 27th of July, '52, Nasser resigned and went to his home. He said, "I can't work in a dictatorship regime at all." And he said, "For the simple reason I myself, I can't agree to be a dictator and even I can't agree to any one of you to be a dictator." I'm convinced of collective leadership, but there must always be the power of decision. Collective leadership doesn't mean that there is no leader. There must be a leader: there always must be that who can take the decision and take the responsibility.

DAYAN: Things are happening now not the way-- not the way that the beginner of the Zionist movement thought that they would. They had a very pastoralic picture, a very idealist picture. They thought that we would come to a country where nobody is here - they didn't realize that many Arabs were here - and that everybody will be happy because we will bring money and prosperity and development and all the Jews will be nice people here and they will become farmers and all the pictures were very, very idealistic - an ideal picture. Well, it didn't work this way. It didn't work this way.

SAFER: And so history has pushed a farm boy - a kibbutznik - into the business of national survival. And less than 300 miles away, it took an Egyptian peasant boy - a fellah - out of the Nile Delta and made him ruler of 40 million people.

## [Announcements]

## ["BUG BOY"]

SAFER: It is spring and the voice of the horseplayer can be heard in the land. Racing, for most people who follow it, is a get-rich-quick or go-broke-even-faster pastime. The behind-the-scenes of it, even the names of the horses, are of small interest to many horseplayers. In this age of off-track betting, it's only the winning numbers that count.

Well, 60 MINUTES was curious about one of the human aspects of the racing game: the apprentice jockeys, young hopefuls who want to make it big on horses. They call themselves bug boys. So we spent some time at the track with jockey Doug Thomas, who was once himself a bug boy.

[Race track bugle call]

TRACK ANNOUNCER: It's post time.

MAN: Somebody get the five horse. All right, sit still, keep him straight, Henry. Don't move on him, Henry, just keep him straight.

TRACK ANNOUNCER: And they're off!

DOUG THOMAS: It's a great thing to come across that wire first and just feeling the surge of the power of the horse, stride by stride, and going with him and just giving all you can, every ounce of energy coming out of you and coming out of the horse at the same time. This harmony between you and the horse, it's a great feeling.

You notice in your program you've got a jockey's name and one, two or three little asterisks beside his name. This signifies that he is a bug boy, an apprentice jockey. Maybe some guy who might have seen one or two or three of these things walking across a program and thought it was a little bug and that's the way the term came about: bug boy.

When a boy comes onto a race track and he figures he wants to be a rider, naturally, the first step to being a rider is an apprentice rider, a bug boy. He doesn't get on a horse's back right away. He doesn't understand horses. He'll start from the bottom of the ladder.

When I was a student back home in Toronto, Canada, all I wanted to do was ride in Canada at that particular time. Well, finally somebody said: "Why don't you go to New York? You might as well go to the big time and see what happens."

[Voices, noise]

Listening to what a trainer has to say to you is very important, because he can tell you things. I've ridden a lot of horses that I'd never been on or I'd never even seen before. These people work



around these horses every day. They've got to know something about that horse that you don't know, which The Telegraph, the form and past performances of a horse, isn't going to tell you. And if they can tell you something, it's going to help you and brother, you better listen.

I try to follow instructions as much as I can. What he tells you in the paddock and how he tells you he thinks the race is going to run, that race might not even happen. That might not even occur. And then it's up to you and you've got to make your own decision.

[Bugle]

Being small and going through life as a small kid and trying to reach out for goals that are just impossible to get - but you want them, you know - it's a hard thing to get. And getting into racing, I thought, man, this is a field where I'm on equal terms with the rest of these guys and man, I'm going to prove myself.

This is a rough sport. It's a dog-eat-dog game. You're trying to get on horses. You're cutting one another's throat to get on horses. This is the name of the game, to get on the right horse at that right time, to win races. You've got to have guts.

Before a rider is ready to ride races, he has to prove to the starter that he's well-schooled for the gate, that he isn't going to bother anybody, that he can break horses straight, that he can keep horses out of trouble away from the gate. Before he is granted a license, the starter has to approve and go to the stewards and say this boy is fit to ride races as far as breaking from the gate is concerned. And then when he finally gets to ride in the afternoon, the stewards are watching him very carefully.

Naturally, you've got to get a good start. I'm concentrating on what's happening right there. I want to know what my horse is like - if he's straight in the gate, how he's acting, how he's warmed up and so on.

TRACK ANNOUNCER: It is now post time.

THOMAS: I'm in the gate and the race is ready to happen. I'm looking at the other horses to see how they're acting. I'm looking back to see how many more horses there are to come in the gate. I'm looking at the starter. And then when I know where everybody's set, I hope to God I'm going to be out of there on time. There's an old saying that races are won from the gate and this is true.

[Voices; starting gate bell]

The big thing is to get away from that gate as fast as you can, getting him out of there straight and not bothering anybody.

[Horses racing]

Some horses are more coordinated than other horses. Sometimes horses are chicken, they're just faint-hearted. Sometimes they just don't want to be around other horses; it gives them confidence to be on the outside and looking at horses and, you know, it gives them confidence. Now the turn is coming up. Where are you in position to the turn? Are the other horses outrunning you going into the turn? You don't want to get outrun too much or you'll have to take back. You've got to make sure you're head and head with them, whether you're on the lead or not. And if you're on the outside of horses going into the turn you have an advantage over the other riders, especially if you have speed and you can use it.

At the quarter pole you're looking to see, okay, how much has he got? Do I have to use my horse now? Because you don't want to use too much of your horse too soon; you want to preserve and conserve your horse's strength for the last part of the race. The horse will tell you if he's got it.

Every horse is different. Every horse has his own personality, he has his own way of expressing himself and it's a matter of being able to interpret a horse. Horses are moody and they'll be able to tell you whether they want to-- whether they want you to fight them or-- some horses are masochists, some are sadists. Really. Some want to be hit, some don't. Sometimes they'll try to bite you. Sometimes a horse will nuzzle up to you and just want to be loved and petted and you just talk to him. A horse likes to hear your voice. And if he doesn't want to hear your voice, he'll let you know if he doesn't want to hear it. And you can tell by a horse's eyes, sometimes, whether he wants to run or if he's mad at you or-- so you just leave him alone.

Even while you're riding him, he know-- he knows he's there. He's bred to do a job. And after he's educated and he's run quite a few times, he knows what he's out there for. You can only do as much as a-- as much as the horse can. They say it's the old saying: it's 90 percent horse and 10 percent jock. Let me tell you, it's all horse to me.

If I'm not riding in a race I don't want to even be on the scene. Maybe when I get older I'll be able to watch races and sit back, but all I want to do is ride. I just love to ride, that's all.

[Cheering]

. . . . .  
[ POINT/COUNTERPOINT ]

WALLACE: Crime in the streets - and other places too. The President has been vowing since his campaign in 1968 that he'd do something about it. And this week he sent some new proposals to the Congress. Messrs. Von Hoffman and Kilpatrick add up the score as they see it on the Nixon crime program. Here is "Point/Counterpoint".



NICHOLAS VON HOFFMAN: Well, the verbal war on crime has begun again. Jack, your friend Mr. Nixon wants to reinstitute the death penalty. And his grisly Christian associate, Billy Graham, is braying for the castration of rapists. Wonderful stuff. I'd suggest cutting off the hands of burglars, but I'd hate to see any members of the White House staff wandering around with no place to wear their gloves.

Medieval melodrama aside, none of this posturing is going to make the streets safer. You can pile up the punishments, but it doesn't mean much if you don't catch the crooks. The best-known deterrent to crime is made up of three elements: certainty of being caught, swift trial and sure punishment. Nixon's grandstanding proposals do none of them. They don't put any more cops on the street, they don't hasten our absurdly slow judicial procedures and they actually make punishment less likely. Our American juries are loathe to convict if it means horrendous mandatory sentences.

The President's stand on marijuana is no help, either. In case he doesn't know it, lots of Republicans now smoke weed too, so while he wastes the police's time catching them, the rest of us get mugged.

Well, Jack, that's Nixon: If food costs too much, eat less. If the muggers are stealing too much, don't carry money.

JAMES J. KILPATRICK: Well, Nick, I share your doubts as to marijuana and mandatory sentences. But otherwise, our disagreement is just about total. I thought Nixon's message was a great message. And if you think he's waging no more than a verbal war on crime, you ought to get in touch with the facts.

The picture, bad as it still is, is dramatically improving and that's the important thing. The rate of increase in major crime has indeed dropped. In most of our major cities, the actual number of crimes is down. Here in Washington, crime is running at the rate of about half of what it was four years ago.

Look at the facts, Nick, it's good for you. In the past four years, more than 2500 convictions have been obtained in the field of organized crime. Upwards of one and a half billion dollars have been channeled to local law-enforcement agencies. Criminal trials have been speeded up: in Washington, the period between arrest and trial in felony cases has been cut from ten months to two. The narcotics traffic has been cut all over the world.

And Nixon, in his message, is urging some of the very deterrents you have in mind. Sure, the death penalty may be no deterrent in crimes of passion. But hijacking is no crime of passion. Neither is sabotage, assassination or kidnapping. In fact, the possibility of a death sentence may be the one thing that would deter a kidnapper from not killing his victim. Sure, Nixon's proposals are rough, tough and ruthless. But so is crime, Nick, so is crime.

. . . . .

WALLACE: We were still getting mail last week about our story of two weeks ago that told of some of the troubles besetting Amtrak. From a vice president of the advertising agency that represents Amtrak came this anguished howl: "In my opinion it was the shoddiest piece of TV journalism I have viewed in years . . . I was personally shocked and angered by the total misrepresentation."

But another vice president at that same advertising agency found our story "professional and truthful, [while leaving] doubts . . . as to the present quality of Amtrak service."

Most of the mail, however, was about our story on the black mayor of Tuskegee, Alabama, who is married to a white woman. One letter said: "Apparently our leader in Tuskegee feels that blacks can do any job as well as anyone . . . except be a wife."

There was also a letter that said: "After [seeing] the black mayor of Tuskegee . . . shake hands with the same George Wallace who stood at Alabama University and barred black students from entering, all I can guess is that hell finally froze over."

And another viewer wrote: "The only thing I regretted about your Johnny Ford segment was that you didn't show how well he shined George Wallace's shoes."

But another viewer said: "I'm one black . . . who congratulates the mayor [for] getting a job done. As for his admiration of Nixon and Wallace and his marriage to a white woman, I say being free means holding hands with anybody you want to."

And finally, there was this: "After viewing . . . the mayor of Tuskegee, I can only say that Booker T. (Tom) Washington is alive and disgustingly well. . . . Why put this Oreo cookie (black on the outside, white on the inside) on television?"

I'm Mike Wallace.

SAFER: I'm Morley Safer. We'll be back next week with another edition of 60 MINUTES.



CBS REPORTS

"Inside Public Television"

as broadcast over the

CBS TELEVISION NETWORK

Tuesday, April 20, 1976

10:00 - 11:00 PM, EST

With CBS News Correspondent Charles Kuralt

PRODUCED BY CBS NEWS

PRODUCER: Paul W. Greenberg  
EXECUTIVE PRODUCER: Perry Wolff

©MCMLXXVI CBS Inc.  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Song: "Our Station Needs Money"]

CHARLES KURALT: Public television people even write songs about it. They need money. Forbidden to sell advertising time, the 264 non-commercial, non-profit educational stations go after money in as many ways as their imaginations and licenses allow.

[Cousin Bruce conducting an auction on TV]

Aside from raising money, auctions raise basic questions about public television. It is non-profit. That's why it's tax-exempt. But is it entirely non-commercial?

[Cousin Bruce conducting an auction on TV]

Public television is supposed to serve all the public, but much of its programming and many of its sales pitches aim at a monied elite, what the commercial people call an "up-scale skew".

[Woman auctioneer on TV]

Public television supposedly scorns the ratings game, which is basic to the pricing system of commercial television. But the New York station president hoped that his auction would have "serendipity value", that the audience would discover his station because of it, and get hooked on a new game show where everyone plays and pays.

[Auction volunteers on phone on TV. . .callers]

Public television is supposed to serve the needs of the public, but programs on Public television often serve the stations' need for money.

[Cousin Bruce conducting auction on TV]

[Song]

But besides raising questions, the auction demonstrates a great strength of public television - the devotion of staff and unpaid volunteers who work long hours for the love of something. A system that almost works.

[Song]

ANNOUNCER: CBS REPORTS: "Inside Public Television" - with CBS News Correspondent Charles Kuralt.

KURALT: We admit right off that it's a little brassy for us commercial TV folks with all our special interests to go looking into public television, but television has become a national issue. We've reported on a variety of aspects of commercial television, so when a kind of television labels itself "public" and spends tax dollars it's earned the right to be reported on.



Public television began in 1952 with the Federal Communications Commission setting aside channels for non-commercial, educational use. It grew haphazardly. Then the Johnson Administration backed a Carnegie Commission attempt to straighten it out. The Commission reported a high-sounding plan demanding excellence, emphasizing local control, talking about an alternative to commercial television. But the call for enough politically free money to pay for all that lost out in Congress. Since 1962, public television has received modest annual sums, subject to the usual Congressional pressures. The non-commercial system has been forced into a series of compromises in an attempt to survive and to fulfill at least part of its mandate. How well those compromises have been made and how much they have cost is our subject tonight.

[ANNOUNCEMENTS]

KURALT: To understand public television, you must understand the local stations and the pressures on them. They - the stations and the pressures - run the system.

[Babble of party conversation. . .recorded music]

This is the annual members' meeting and beer bust at KERA, Dallas. They're heavy on the handshakes here. The station relies on members' dues to meet the payroll, and the party is a way of thanking people devoted enough to pay for what they could watch for free. KERA is a community station, licensed to a citizen's group. Other stations in the public system are licensed to states and schools, but it's the community stations like KERA which are the go-getters of public television.

Dallas is a booming city, liberal and conservative, cosmopolitan and a little country. KERA's mission is to serve this unique constituency in a different way than the local commercial stations do. So, it searches out foreign films. It became the first American outlet for the outrageous British comedy series "Monty Python's Flying Circus". To General Manager Bob Wilson, the fact that his station was supposed to provide an alternative service didn't mean that it would overlook sophisticated programming techniques aimed at building audience ratings.

BOB WILSON: We're not in the ratings game to the degree that the commercial networks are, but we are in the ratings game to the point where we have to have significant audiences, and we should be able to show that our audiences are growing. That's effete to say that-- and-- or that is elitist to say that you're not in the ratings game, that we are going to program for ourselves, we're not going to program for the-- for the audience. If the audience is there, tremendous. If they're not, that's okay, too.

KURALT: As with all public stations, most of KERA's schedule, from Jennie to the Cookie Monster, comes down the line from Washington. To understand the national set-up, you need a bit of Rube Goldberg and a love of initials. Number one in Washington is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting - CPB - the top policy body created by Congress in 1967 to disburse Federal funds to the system and protect it from Government meddling. Its board is appointed by the President. CPB created PBS, the Public Broadcasting Service, to operate the public network: a network, unlike the commercial ones, with no production capability. The programs broadcast nationally are provided by stations individually or purchased by the stations cooperatively. What you end up with is a network controlled by the stations - unwieldy, inefficient, but democratic.

[Excerpt of folk singer on Public TV]

The first priority of a public station is supposed to be serving the needs of its local audience. Actually, the priority is the survival of the station itself. Many program choices are dictated by the station's need for money.

[Public TV excerpt]

With limited dollars for local filmmaking, KERA chose to showcase jailbird country singer David Allan Coe.

[Public TV excerpt]

The decision was reached by what might be termed commercial criteria. Program Director Ron Devillier spoke with CBS News producer Paul Greenberg.

RON DEVILLIER: Commercial, yes, in the sense that we're very concerned about who's watching us, how many people are watching us. Because on that depends how many people are going to support us, become members, and that's a commercial concern. I mean, we need money, and we need it from the people who watch, who enjoy, who appreciate, and we had better find what they appreciate and put it on the air.

[Public TV excerpt]

Aside from an occasional documentary and a weekly medical show, KERA discharges its local programming responsibility with a nightly half-hour of news. "Newsroom" at KERA is tough and controversial - some say the best news show in Texas.

[Public TV excerpt of KERA's "Newsroom"]

KERA thought its probing reports on the schools led to the reluctance of the Dallas Independent School District to renew an in-school television contract worth \$200,000 to the station. Eventually, most



of the school money came through; but even with a tenth of the station's total operating budget in doubt, "Newsroom" stayed tough, and producer Lee Clark continued to invite controversy. This night, anti-busing Dallas Councilwoman Rose Renfro.

[Public TV excerpt of KERA's "Newsroom"]

Public television is supposed to involve its public, and in many communities invented the technique of talking back to the tube. At KERA, it's called "Feedback".

[Public TV excerpt of KERA's "Feedback"]

If you didn't get your satisfaction on the air, you can argue and drink beer with the station's staff.

[KERA's beer party: "Yeah, Dean Birch is a partner in the firm and, you know, so, I mean, those guys-- they've got some big wheels in there, yeah". . ."They know their way around. They know their way around, yeah". . .Hello". . ."Hello, I'm glad to see you". . ."Hello, Lee Clark. Dot Gruber". . ."How are you? Lee Clark, glad to see you"]

"Newsroom's" Lee Clark uses the occasion to apply some heavy Texas charm to the members.

[KERA's beer party: "Thank you. You're nice. . ."]

The participation, the conviviality, pay off with an involved membership which pays needed dollars to the station. But KERA's active presence in Dallas is fairly recent, the result of the involvement of white-haired Ralph Rogers. This evening, they're dedicating the Ralph Rogers adobe classic office building, small enough tribute to the man who raised the money for the building, who as chairman of the board breathed life into the station, and who, on the national scene, led the fight against an attempt by the Nixon White House to cripple the public system. Tonight, the Ford Foundation's television advisor, Fred Friendly, comes to pay tribute.

FRED FRIENDLY: I can't tell you what a pleasure it is to be here at Ralph Rogers' bar mitzvah. [Laughter]

KURALT: The Ford Foundation adopted public television in its infancy, ladling \$300-million into its maw from the Foundation's silver spoon. And Friendly remembers Rogers' role.

FRIENDLY: Ralph, and others of you in this tent tonight, not only rejuvenated and saved public broadcasting in Dallas, Texas, but in fact saved broadcasting for the entire nation. In the summer of 1972, there was an internal eruption within the system, stimulated by devastating pressures by the Nixon Administration, which wanted to politicize, if not destroy, public broadcasting. At that. . .

KURALT: The Nixon Administration did not like news and public affairs programs, commercial or non-commercial, but it had special leverage on public television, and it tried to get its people at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to stop funding public affairs and to take control of the non-commercial network away from what the White House regarded as the liberal-dominated Public Broadcasting Service.

CHARLES COLSON [former White House Counsel]: The general feeling in the White House - and I don't know whether I would necessarily ascribe it to the President himself - is that there was a-- a clear liberal bias in terms of the programs and programming of-- of the Public Broadcasting network.

KURALT: Charles Colson was the media hatchet man at the White House. He has served a jail term for obstruction of justice. He knew what President Nixon wanted to do to public broadcasting.

COLSON: Well, the-- the major thing that the President wanted to do was to cut the funding.

RALPH ROGERS: This culminated by a veto by President Nixon of the authorization bill for funding for public television. I don't see how you can put any greater pressure on than by vetoing the bills for Federal funds.

KURALT: Ralph Rogers responded by rallying his fellow station chairmen, and he was elected to head the PBS counteroffensive against the White House.

PAUL GREENBERG [CBS producer]: Well, you've been a lifelong Republican. Did you try to see the President?

ROGERS: I certainly did, and I did just about everything I could because I was confident that if the President understood the facts he never would put up with that kind of nonsense.

GREENBERG: What happened?

ROGERS: I never did get to see the President.

CLAY T. WHITEHEAD [former Director, Office of Telecommunications Policy]: I know that Mr. Rogers did make a strong attempt to see the President.

KURALT: Clay T. Whitehead applied his own pressures to public television as Director of the Office for Telecommunications Policy under President Nixon. Now he is writing a book on television. In 1972, Dr. Whitehead warned the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that its future funding depended on taking control of the public network away from PBS.



WHITEHEAD: Well, it was impossible for us to recommend to the Congress that they have more money, large amounts of more money, until this basic structural question was worked out.

TOM CURTIS: I think we can take. . .

KURALT: Tom Curtis was picked as CPB Chairman by the White House to "work out" the structure of Public Broadcasting. But instead of insisting on a takeover of PBS, he compromised with Ralph Rogers and ended up under fire.

CURTIS: Mr. Whitehead was the one that relayed to me that, if I persisted in going ahead with the compromise as it was, that there were people in the White House that would cause trouble, messing around with our budget.

KURALT: Curtis could not get his compromise past his CPB board either. He says the White House interfered there, too.

CURTIS: I'll-- I'll make that very emphatic, as far as-- I don't know who was putting on pressure, or whether there was or not. I do know that two of the members said that, and I had reason to believe that the White House was - pretty strong reasons to believe it.

COLSON: I seem to recall that calls were made to try to get the board to support the policy that the President wanted, yes.

PRODUCER GREENBERG: Do you remember who made the calls?

COLSON: I think that would have been Pete Flanigan.

KURALT: Peter Flanigan confirmed that, as Assistant to the President, he spoke to members of the board to emphasize Mr. Nixon's philosophy of public broadcasting. Curtis, furious at what he felt was a betrayal, resigned with such a public bang that the CPB board quickly approved a new Chairman and the compromise. PBS was saved.

ROGERS: I learned a very important lesson. One was personal - that I was starry-eyed and naive and couldn't believe that such things could happen. I learned that lesson. But the much more important lesson I learned was that public television cannot exist in the United States unless the public is in it. The public has got to be public television.

KURALT: But the potential for political meddling is very much a part of the public television system.

COLSON: I think any time you have any organization and the management is appointed by the Federal Government, you're going to find political pressures. That's inevitable in politics.

KURALT: With all of the political pressures and the constant need for money, Public Television is still alive and growing at the local station level. Some stations - like KERA - are more alive than others, but even here bucking the system, striving for excellence while living hand-to-mouth, takes a toll. Bob Wilson, tired of playing tennis without a net, as he describes life in public television, and left to open an advertising agency. KERA will survive, but in the world of public television the loss of even one vital talented person is hard to overcome.

[ANNOUNCEMENTS]

KURALT: How is non-commercial television shaped by the fact that it was an afterthought on the American media scene? Commercial networks had staked claim to the audience. The audience has become used to the 30-second commercial. Public Television was expected to be an alternative, to figure out a way to raise money, and not to compromise its ideals in the process. With those ground rules, the big brothers welcomed the stepchild.

MIKE DANN [Consultant, Children's Television Workshop]: Commercial networks have really always adored, for the most selfish reasons possible, public television. Because if public television was doing something, they didn't have to do it, we didn't have to do it then.

KURALT: Mike Dann is a consultant to the Children's Television Workshop these days, but for 22 years - first for NBC, then at CBS - he was a network programmer.

DANN: Since public television never took an advertiser away from the networks in-- since the inception of commercial television, their first barometer was a basis for affection - they didn't touch the till. After that, the question was they were always supplying for the most part programming that commercial television didn't want any part of - children's programming, cooking classes, intelligent, provocative seminars about the mating habits of moths - all those programs that were very good and very good to have on the air. We'd just think it was just great in my years at commercial networks, and we used to give them all the old equipment - even gave them cash from time to time.

PRODUCER GREENBERG: They were never a threat to pub-- to commercial television?

DANN: Did-- Public television ever a threat?

GREENBERG: Yes.

DANN: By going out of business, you mean? No, no, you-- you have it turned around. The only threat public television has to commercial programming or commercial networks is that it will cease to exist. At that point, the commercial broadcaster will be in serious trouble.



KURALT: Paul Klein is a television troubleshooter. He's now an NBC vice president for the second time. In between, he was a consultant to public television. Once, as NBC research chief, he supported keeping public television local.

PAUL KLEIN: It certainly is a-- is a terrific idea to keep public television local while the other three networks are national. That-- That would guarantee a weak public television system, because nobody could-- no one station could produce programs that could compete on the air with a national system like commercial television. So that they would automatically remain weak, not be a factor commercially, and never-- never amount to anything and never hurt the commercial television system in the United States. But as soon as public television gets together, that is, pools all their local money and buys programs nationally, they'll-- they could be competitive.

PRODUCER GREENBERG: Well, what percentage would the public television network have to take away from commercials?

KLEIN: Well, I-- I figure right now they get a two-share, approximately, nationally. . .

KURALT: A "two-share" means only two percent of the viewing audience.

KLEIN: . . . preface this by saying public television operates on weak facilities. They are on UHF stations which-- you need, somebody said, the fingers of a safecracker to tune into a public television station. The-- So that, they-- they can really only reach effectively 70% of the population. So immediately, they're-- they're inhibited. But if they got a ten-share amongst that 70% of the population - which is a seven-share overall - they would be a factor that would hurt commercial television. And they would get that amongst the most vulnerable audience - the upper-income, upper-educated people who are not satisfied with commercial television and are looking for another source.

[Public TV excerpt]

KURALT: Professional tennis in Los Angeles. Public television - the other source - is here to reach the vulnerable audience.

[Public TV excerpt]

People know television by the programs they see on it. The programs seen on public television nationally get on the air by satisfying two criteria: one, the need for money; two, the goals imposed on the system.

[Public TV excerpt]

Public television is supposed to provide alternative programming, but you see quite a bit of Roscoe Tanner and Harold Solomon on the commercial networks. So, why tennis? Because public television needs



money, and it's easy to get money to put tennis on television. Why? Because of the audience tennis attracts. Theoretically, public television is supposed to be free to serve small audiences, minority audiences, audiences not served by commercial television. But the corporations which provide an important part of public television's funding want their images as benefactors displayed before an elite, the opinion makers - and the larger the audience, the better. The public stations like this audience, too, since it has money and might reward the stations with a donation. At court-side and at tube-side, the special audience is drawn to tennis, the in sport of the seventies. And public television isn't about to relinquish the territory. Dr. James Loper of Los Angeles station KCET.

DR. JAMES LOPER: The networks didn't really start to cover tennis until public television did. I think that the public television coverage essentially helped make tennis into the interesting sport that it is, and our feeling is that why should we back off just because someone else has decided to cover something.

PRODUCER GREENBERG: One of the charges you hear levelled against public television is elitism. Are you elite?

DR. LOPER: Sure, and I think anyone that goes after specific audiences beyond the mass audience is elite.

PUBLIC TV STAGE MANAGER: Take one-ten, scene 18, episode 12, "Adams Chronicles".

KURALT: To program for a specific audience, big money is needed, and big money often means compromise. Five-point-two million corporation, foundation and Government dollars backed "The Adams Chronicles", produced by New York's WNET. Directing this sequence is Fred Coe, veteran of the glory days of drama on the commercial networks. Now he's involved in the most ambitious series in the history of American public television. The critically acclaimed productions are lavish. The attention to detail down to the last buttonhole (perish the zipper) is fanatical. And "The Chronicles" are cited as proof of all kinds of things: public television can do it, can produce historical drama, can surpass the BBC, can show commercial television where it's lacking. But there are complications. Public television can also run one-and-a-half million dollars over budget, as "The Adams Chronicles" did. And with its commitments to the Atlantic Richfield Company and the Mellon Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, WNET has to complete the series on time. A compromise: make up the overrun by slashing the stations' public affairs schedule. "The Adams Chronicles" are saved.

[Public TV excerpt from "The Adams Chronicles"]

The man in the red Channel 13 suspenders, WNET President Jay Iselin.



PRODUCER GREENBERG: When you see this before you, do-- are you reminded of the troubles you've had with the series, or what do you think of?

JAY ISELIN: I'm reminded of the fact that we really went out of our way to make this authentic history, and at the same time we strove mightily to make it good drama. And I think the judgment is in the hands of the viewer as to whether we succeeded or not.

GREENBERG: One of the things-- things that seemed to annoy some observers was the fact that when-- when "The Chronicles" ran over, what was sacrificed were public affairs shows on WNET, and-- and the trade-off annoyed a lot of people who like public affairs broadcasts.

ISELIN: The-- The immediate problem we had was that we had to keep the budget for this station on-- in balance. We have no reserves. We have none of the contingencies that commercial television has to cover any variation in budget. And therefore, we have an acute obligation at all times to make sure that we are in-- in balance with our budget, overall budget, at the station. As soon as it looked as though our budget figure was going to be surpassed, we took certain steps to correct it. What we did was postpone some shows which were in pre-production. They were not on the air. They were in the planning stage, against the hope that they would be able to go on the air. That was a prudent step, and a very important one in public broadcasting, that one has to take.

KURALT: The prudent programming decisions of public television often hinge on where the money is. The big backers who support important productions like "Chronicles" are kept happy. Public affairs are compromised, but that's the way the game is played.

[Public TV announcement excerpts]

You see a lot of these blurbs on the non-commercial network. The prevalence of oil companies has led wits to dub PBS the "Petroleum Broadcasting Service".

[Public TV announcement excerpts]

After a few unhappy incidents, obvious tie-ins between underwriters and program content are avoided, but backers still have tremendous influence on the system. The President of the Children's Television Workshop, Joan Ganz Cooney.

JOAN GANZ COONEY: You get an idea for a program, and-- and you maybe put some ideas on paper, and you begin talking to potential funding sources, be they corporations, Government, Government agencies, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, PBS - and-- and at that point you get in-- and foundations, you get input from those backers on-- or potential backers on what they would be willing to fund and not fund. Now, at that point you may decide to tailor your proposal or to drop it.



KURALT: The idea of tailoring proposals to meet the specifications of funders is chilling, enunciated as it is by the producer of the most successful programs in the history of American public television. But all the awards that "Sesame Street" and "Electric Company" have won, all the toys and records and books and programs in German and Spanish and French, don't pay the bills. Mrs. Cooney was asked how money pressures affect the public television schedule.

COONEY: I think that what-- what you have are-- are more of the kinds of shows (and the public seems to like them) that-- that corporations are apt to be interested in, which is the performing arts, drama, and less news and public affairs. I don't think that's a secret to anyone that most corporations do not jump at the idea of-- of underwriting controversial investigative reporting, and I-- that money just has to come in public broadcasting from other sources.

KURALT: Corporations do support non-controversial documentaries like the National Geographic specials. Gulf Oil put \$3.7-million into a dozen hours, and then promoted the first special, "The Incredible Machine", with a \$900,000 media blitz. "Machine" got the highest public television rating in history, and the decision to spend nearly three times the cost of the program on publicity was made on hard business criteria. Gilbert Goetz of Gulf.

GILBERT GOETZ: We promoted the specials because we had a sizeable investment in the production funding. We felt we were bringing high-quality programming to public television. However, there was a factor of a small audience that we could have expected without promotion. So, in a very real sense, what you might say we did was to make the first investment good by providing an audience for quality programming.

PRODUCER GREENBERG: Does the involvement of Gulf have anything to do with what you might call the image of the petroleum industry in general, or Gulf in particular?

GOETZ: Well, in this respect it may have. We do think it's a community service that we should provide. If in the process, however, the people who view the specials decide to applaud our involvement, we're grateful for that.

GREENBERG: We've talked to other representatives of oil companies, and they say what they're trying to reach are opinion makers, leaders and the kind of people who are reached by high-quality programming. Is this what Gulf is trying to do?

GOETZ: Well, we are interested in that same audience, but I think we're, first of all, motivated by providing the high-quality programming and then trying to get the audience with it.



KURALT: A major portion of the high-quality programming seen on public television is produced in Britain.

[Public TV excerpts from "Upstairs, Downstairs"]

"Upstairs, Downstairs", the public television program that inspired the ill-fated CBS series, "Beacon Hill".

[Public TV excerpt, "Upstairs, Downstairs"]

It's easy to get commercial underwriting for the brilliant British productions. They attract a quality audience.

[Music]

The British programs provide an alternative, shows you can't get on the commercial networks - like the meticulously produced science series, "The Ascent of Man".

[Public TV excerpt from "The Ascent of Man"]

There's another reason you see such shows as "Jennie", the story of Lady Randolph Churchill, on public television: they're inexpensive.

[Public TV excerpt from "Jennie"]

It's a great deal cheaper to buy British programs, as lavish as they are, than it is to produce new programs domestically. Most of the programs seen on public television aren't British imports or glossy underwritten productions. Many are purchased through the Station Program Cooperative - SPC - the marketplace. The printing machines at PBS spew out proposals submitted by the stations and such producing agencies as the Children's Television Workshop. The stations pool their money in SPC to support productions that individual stations can't afford, and end up filling 40% of their air time with shows from the cooperative.

Proposals are submitted in book form to the stations. As in this simulation, managers estimate programming hours, subtract programs provided free to the system by underwriters, like "Jennie" and "The Adams Chronicles", compute locally produced shows, and decide what ingredients are needed to complete their programming mix. They have to buy the popular and very expensive "Sesame Street" and "Electric Company", but what else? Tennis or Tennyson? Drama or documentaries? Instinctively, they stick with winners, the familiar. They avoid controversy and experimentation. And if it's cheap, it's better.

Choices made, they sit down to the station teletype machine and call up the computer at PBS, Washington. SPC goes through a number of rounds until the computer belches out a final selection. The consensus serves democracy, but the price is limited money for public affairs and documentaries; no nationally supported experimentation. PBS Vice Chairman Hartford Gunn acknowledges the system he invented is far from perfect.

HARTFORD GUNN: The stations are very unwilling to use their own financial resources to speculate on new programming which they cannot see, and that's a fault of our system. We haven't developed, as commercial broadcasting has so successfully done, a seri-- a-- an arrangement by which one can pilot programs and thereby make, hopefully, a more informed judgment as to whether or not that program is-- is one that is wanted and-- and will be appreciated.

KURALT: A beach on Catalina Island off the coast of California. The stations won't experiment, so CPB is backing a dramatic laboratory. The woman blocking the shot is producer Barbara Schultz.

BARBARA SCHULTZ [to cast, crew]: . . .very casual. I mean, sort of just. . .

KURALT: Ms. Schultz has a list of commercial credits as long as the beach. She is now producing "Visions", a series of original plays by authors new to television. "Visions" is supported by the Ford Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting - a partial fulfillment of CPB's mandate for program development. Experimental programs find it hard to get corporate or station dollars, but they are vital to the future of the medium.

SCHULTZ: I think it's terribly important that television does-- allows writers to write original work and produce them and to learn and to try to develop drama, and this is the only opportunity there is in television at the moment.

PRODUCER GREENBERG: And could it only be done in public television?

SCHULTZ: I think it could, yeah. I think it only could, yes, because I don't think the-- the way commercial programs are set up, I don't think they can take the risks.

KURALT: The Carnegie Commission envisioned a number of production centers, a cafeteria full of quality programming for public television. Dr. James Loper of KCET says public television lost three years of momentum fighting off the Nixon Administration and healing the internal ruptures that resulted. Now, with CPB moving from politics to piloting, public television is slowly getting to its feet. But corporations have a lot of influence about what gets on the air. The Station Program Cooperative doesn't cooperate in the area of new or controversial programming, and the system still hasn't figured out its role in public affairs programming. Public affairs is still paralyzed from its run-in with the Nixon White House.

[ANNOUNCEMENTS]



KURALT: Is taxpayer money freer for public television than members' dues or corporate underwriting? Hardly. Last December, Congress passed, and President Ford signed, the first long-range funding bill for public broadcasting. It authorizes \$88-million in 1976; \$160-million by 1980 - but only if Congress views the system favorably enough to appropriate those sums each year, and only if the stations match each Federal dollar with two-and-a-half of their own, not easy conditions.

[Music]

The people of public television are used to hard going, and the pressures they face from their local funding sources are more intense than those that filter down from Washington. Shared problems draw the stations together at events like the annual convention of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. Here even the music is a problem, and a product of the system. On trumpet, Dr. Frederick Breitenfeld of the Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting. On piano, Harold Holst of WKNO, Memphis. On trombone, Al Curtis of WSJK, Knoxville. The NAEB dates back to the early days of educational broadcasting, and reflects a stricter view of the system's mission - education. Members are cynical about the new faces that have appeared recently to lead them out of the wilderness.

DR. FREDERICK BREITENFELD: Now, I was thinking. How-- How do these influential and powerful people learn so much about our business so quickly? I figure there must be a school. [Laughter] The Public Broadcasting School for Saviors! [Laughter] Limited! [Laughter] And I figure maybe one of the classrooms in that School might look like this: [Music] All right, you guys, settle down, will you? All right, now each one of you is going to be tapped for a very important job in public broadcasting, so today we're going to give you your all-purpose public broadcasting inaugural address: "I share with you some of those wonderful goals you've set for yourselves. Yes, public broadcasting should be a conscience for America, a showcase in constant search of excellence, a catalyst for social change." Okay, now this is your basic public broadcasting filler. [Laughter] You ought to have about eleven or twelve of these on hand at all times. They don't mean anything, but the press picks them up. [Laughter] Wind it up, Harry. "Of course, I'll need input from all of you. [Laughter] And I plan to visit one or two stations every several years. [Laughter] Remember, if we all pull together, we can make PB first in the nation." All right, now, during the applause, what you want to do is wave once, kind of like a regular guy, get off the podium. Don't take questions. [Laughter. . . applause. . . music]

KURALT: This is the Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting, home base of a four-station network where you can see the interplay of State money and station output. This, not comedy or trumpeting, is the showpiece of Rick Breitenfeld's world.

The state university and school stations make up the grassroots of public television; big city community stations provide the flash. But here, you see the inner fiber, a surprising amount of production strength and impressive technical plant.

PUBLIC TELEVISION DIRECTOR: Three, turn around to Iris at this camera - Natalie, I mean. Very good. . .

KURALT: And you get those good old public television surprises. Where, after all, should you produce a network show called "Wall Street Week"--

[Public TV excerpt seen from their control room]

--a program about the financial world reaching twice as many people as *The Wall Street Journal*? Where but in Owings Mills, Maryland, of course, 195 miles from Wall Street.

[Public TV excerpt. . .then studio scene from "Consumer Survival Kit"]

Another Maryland production, "Consumer Survival Kit" - like "Wall Street Week", purchased by the stations through the Program Cooperative. Using comedy and film, song and dance, and plain facts, "Survival Kit" aims at helping the viewer through the consumer maze. It offers advice on everything from buying tires and insurance to doing your income tax.

[Public TV excerpts]

The Maryland Center produces a quarter of the programs it airs - double the system average. Almost half of non-commercial program hours are aimed at children, and Maryland's entry is the nature program "Hodge Podge Lodge".

[Public TV excerpt]

In addition to producing national and local shows, the Center is responsible to the State for in-school programming. From eight in the morning until three-thirty in the afternoon, the Maryland schedule, like that of most other state and school stations, is almost exclusively instructional. The lessons produced at Owings Mills start at kindergarten and run through college.

[Public TV excerpt]

In everything it does, the Maryland Center emphasizes localism - believing the strength of the system to be in the stations, not the central agencies. Dr. Breitenfeld.



DR. BREITENFELD: We deal in educational services via television programs. "Consumer Survival Kit" and "Wall Street Week" are two services that began in Maryland, and to this day the panelists are basically Marylanders. A lot of people think that public broadcasting is an "it" and it takes place in Congressional halls or in Washington, New York or California. Actually, public broadcasting is an "us". Public broadcasting is happening back home.

KURALT: Part of what's happening back home, of course, is what goes on in the State capital, where the Maryland Center gets 80% of its five-and-a-half-million-dollar budget. The Center covers legislative sessions and Gubernatorial press conferences. There's been a special quality to Governor Marvin Mandel's conferences since his indictment for fraud and racketeering.

[Public TV excerpt of Mandel news conference]

The Governor has gone on to deny the charges against him, but Maryland's public television system has carefully avoided investigating the controversy.

DR. BREITENFELD: We cover the Gubernatorial press conference. Sometimes we cover "hot" hearings in the General Assembly. In every case, we cover it. We hold a mirror up to what's happening, and we say to Marylanders, "Here's what's going on, and we figure it's part of our duty to bring it to you." When people say, "Are you covering a scandal?" - the connotation is that we've got a-- a guy saying-- saying, "You've just seen the Governor sweat a lot, and notice how he stuttered on that last question, and this-- and the brow was kind of wiggling." That is not our function in covering the political activity of Maryland.

PRODUCER GREENBERG: Are you afraid that you'd lose in your pocketbook by-- if you did comment about this, about the Governor?

DR. BREITENFELD: I'm not afraid we'd lose in our pocketbook if we were to get involved in a political hassle in Maryland. I'm-- I'm sure of it.

KURALT: Many of the greatest strengths and most serious problems of public television are reflected in the Maryland system. This five million-watt transmitter at Annapolis is one of the most powerful in the United States, but it has problems reaching an audience because it transmits a UHF signal that is weaker and harder to tune than the standard VHF signal. The well-equipped Maryland network produces quality programs in impressive volume, but it operates nervously under self-imposed censorship, worrying about its purse strings. The facts of life in public television.

DR. BREITENFELD: The question of political pressures is in-- is apt to come up - obviously, it will - when-- as soon as you're publicly owned. The school guy has no political pressures. I, as a state operator, have no political pressures. The university guy has no political pressures. Now that we've got that out of the way, we have to understand that the school station is less apt, less likely, to produce a program saying that the superintendent of schools is a drunk. It's just less likely. Now, they might be very courageous. The university station is less likely than another station to put on a program that-- that would indicate that the board of regents is a bunch of dunderheads. Similarly, when the Speaker of the House in a state general assembly happens to own the factory upstream that's dumping pollutants into the water, you-- you are not likely (underscore that)-- you're not likely to find a "hard-hitting" documentary on pollution. This is not to say that there's political pressure. It's to say the way this monkey has been set up in this country, we are forced into certain ways of being supported. And whether you're commercial or non-commercial or selling socks or whatever, you are going to find yourself with a certain amount of bread and a certain amount of butter; and after you've buttered your bread, you have to sleep in it.

KURALT [laughing]: Rick Breitenfeld's metaphor is masterfully mixed. Public television has been expected to do a great deal, but hasn't been supplied with the means for doing much of anything. People like Dr. Breitenfeld and Joan Cooney and Jay Iselin work in and with and around the system to produce the programs that make public television an alternative. But without adequate funding, the system has to rely on British imports, and favor domestic productions which appeal to the big money sources which will pay for them.

Things are changing, though. There's a new PBS president talking network programming. CPB is trying to get more VHF outlets, and is working on a domestic satellite system to serve the stations. Groups of stations are discussing pooling documentary money. And there's talk about a surcharge on corporate underwriting to feed a public affairs kitty. This is no master plan, but the bits and pieces and trials and errors of a democracy. Public broadcasting is growing and will continue to grow. It may never prosper, but it has come to be so many things to so many people that its audience will not let it perish.

This is Charles Kuralt for CBS REPORTS.