



UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

College Park, Maryland 20742

NATIONAL PUBLIC BROADCASTING ARCHIVES

June 18, 2008

Susan Burgess
1828 Corcoran St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20009

Dear Ms. Burgess,

Here, at last, is the photocopied materials from the Ralph Rogers Papers as well as the copy of Laurence Jarvik's interview with Mr. Whitehead. I hope this material is useful to you and Mr. Whitehead.

Sincerely,

Karen E. King
Acting Curator

October 24, 1969

FOR Director Mayo
FROM Peter M. Flanigan
RE Corporation for Public Broadcasting

Frank Pace, Chairman, and Al Cole, Director, of the CPB met with the President this morning to make a case for additional funds in the 1970 budget. While Pace made a strong pitch that the Budget Bureau should give them the full \$20 million, it was clear that he would be pleased with something less.

After the meeting the President asked me to inform you that he would like them to have an additional \$5 million. The President feels very strongly that public broadcasting should not be dependent for content on Foundation supported programs.

If you would like to discuss this further, I would be most happy to sit down with you. When the decision is made, it is important that I have an opportunity to talk first to Pace and Cole in order to inform them of other desires of the President which will be a condition of his support.

Rogers
Box 1
Folder 3

October 27, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT'S FILE

At 11:30 A.M. on Friday, October 24, the President met with Frank Pace, Chairman, and Al Cole, Director, of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The meeting was an outgrowth of a dinner conversation between Cole and the President at a party for the latter given by Hobe Lewis, at his home.

Cole said that the current programming by National Educational Television was being carried out by Ford Foundation financing. He felt that this was inappropriate in that "He who pays the piper calls the tune". The President entirely agreed and said that he was very anxious this not be the case. However, he said that an increase in the CPB's budget was difficult in this year. He did say that he would make an effort to arrange such an increase.

A great deal of discussion was had about the importance of television. The President particularly stated his conviction that the newspapers were very much behind the "box" in influencing the American people, particularly the young.

After the meeting the President suggested that I discussed this matter with Director Mayo but agreed that any additional funds should be subject to the establishment of an independent program producing unit.

Rogers
Box 1
folder 3

Peter M. Flanigan

Rogers

Box 2

folder 14

STATEMENT BY

CLAY T. WHITEHEAD, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ON

S. 3825

PUBLIC BROADCASTING FINANCING ACT OF 1974

before the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS
HONORABLE JOHN O. PASTORE, CHAIRMAN
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE
UNITED STATES SENATE

August 6, 1974

Mr. Chairman, members of the Sub-Committee, I welcome this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss S. 3825, the Administration's proposed long-term funding plan for public broadcasting.

It was four years ago that I appeared before you at the hearing regarding my confirmation as Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy (OTP). At that time, you reminded me of this Administration's pledge to submit a long-range funding plan for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) and the local educational stations it is intended to serve. I promised that we would do so. I never realized then what an arduous journey it would be before we could keep that promise.

Working closely and constructively with public broadcasters, we have now devised a financing mechanism that satisfies as fully as possible the many objectives and concerns surrounding such an important and sensitive subject.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is analyzed in detail in the material we submitted with the legislation, and I offer it for the record. Therefore, I would like, in my time here today, to

review briefly how we arrived at this financing approach and how this approach serves and enhances the fundamental principles first set out in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

Those principles are, first, that there must be local station autonomy from centralized control within the public broadcast system and, second, that there must be insulation of programming from Government control arising out of the use of Federal funds.

We all agree that program choices must be left to the judgment of broadcasters, independent of the wishes of Government officials. But a medium of expression funded through the Federal appropriations process can never be totally independent of Government. It matters little that governmental control is not actually exerted over programming; the mere potential for such control and influence can chill--or charm--the exercise of independent judgments by educational broadcasters. For these reasons, the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television strongly recommended permanent, insulated financing for the Corporation--that is, financing completely free of the budgetary process of the Executive Branch and the appropriations process of the Congress.

OTP rejected this recommendation, just as the Johnson Administration and this Sub-Committee did in 1967, when legislation created the framework, but not the financing, for public broadcasting. The reason for the rejection is that the Congress has an inescapable responsibility for holding the recipients of tax dollars accountable for their use of public funds. This is a valid and necessary governmental responsibility even when the recipients of such funds operate a communications medium.

Annual appropriations are just as unacceptable as permanent appropriations, because there is insufficient insulation between the budgetary and appropriations processes and sensitive programming judgments. A multi-year appropriation represents a reasonable balance between the conflicting objectives of insulated financing and Government fiscal responsibility.

We did not, however, urge multi-year appropriations prior to this time, since we felt an obligation to see that public broadcasting was developing in line with the goals of the 1967 Act--to do otherwise would be to set in concrete a system which worked at cross purposes to the intention of that legislation. The Administration's recognition of this responsibility was interpreted by some as an attempt to dismantle public broadcasting. But we were not quarrelling

with public broadcasting as envisioned in the 1967 Act. We did object to a fixed schedule, real-time public network controlled and programmed in Washington in a manner that made a sham of meaningful local participation.

Despite those problems, this Administration continued its support for the public broadcasting system, recognizing its contributions as well as its shortcomings. Our funding requests for CPB have increased from \$5 million in 1969 to \$60 million for 1975. But we rightly withheld support of a long-range, insulated funding plan, until the public broadcast system operated with checks and balances adequate to merit long-term funding without intervening Congressional review.

Over the years public broadcasting changed. The structure of the system and the policies of CPB and the Public Broadcasting Service now reflect the importance of a direct and real local station participation in programming decisions at the national level. We have reached the point where insulated funding of the system is not only appropriate, it is essential if public broadcasting is to continue its present course to excellence and diversity.

I would now like to turn to the provisions of the Administration's proposed bill. S. 3825 is more than an appropriation for public broadcasting. It completes the basic structure established in

the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act by providing for insulated funding, with Congressional oversight every five years, and fosters the goal of local autonomy by the "pass-through" of funds to local stations.

Under this financing plan, funds would be simultaneously authorized and appropriated on the basis of a matching formula. The Federal Government would match 40 percent of the entire public broadcasting system's non-Federal income for each fiscal year. This amounts to one Federal dollar for every \$2.50 contributed to public broadcasting by non-Federal sources.

This matching fund formula insures strong Federal support for public broadcasting and, at the same time, creates an incentive to generate non-Federal contributions. As the Federal share will represent at most 28 percent of public broadcasting's total income, the matching principle also assures that Federal funds will not dominate the financing of the system.

It is clearly necessary for the Administration to propose and for Congress to set a maximum amount--or ceiling--for the Federal funds available in a given year. The annual ceilings

proposed in S. 3825 reflect the Administration's estimate of the needs of the system. The ceilings also take into account the other demands upon the Federal budget, as well as the overriding need to economize in the face of current fiscal problems. I believe that the ceilings in our bill are adequate. Naturally those in public broadcasting believe that higher ceilings are needed. However, this is the first venture into multi-year appropriations for public broadcasting and it is prudent to establish conservative limits at the outset.

The proposed legislation also serves the essential principle of localism by building into the system checks and balances against centralization of power over programs and operations. The Administration's support of localism often has been misconstrued to mean that we are against nationally produced and distributed programs and want only those that are produced and originated at local stations. Of course, there must be a balanced mix of nationally and locally originated programming, but this is not the main thrust of the localism principle. It is that local educational stations should have a substantial role to play and a voice in national programming decisions and a meaningful choice in deciding whether to broadcast those progra

to their local audiences. This concept goes back to the Congress' own intent in the 1967 Act. The system created by that legislation was based on the concept of localism not merely because local autonomy in and of itself was seen as a desirable social goal. It is also the best way to promote the more basic concept of diversity. Only when there is assurance of substantial diversity of ideas and information will a Government-funded medium of expression be compatible with our country's values; and it is only then that exercise of governmental budgetary responsibilities can be limited to five-year intervals.

To foster the principle of localism, S. 3825 requires that a substantial percent of the annual appropriation of the Corporation be passed on to the local stations for use at their discretion. In addition to insuring significant financial support for local stations, the bill requires the Corporation to consult with the stations in making decisions regarding the distribution of the Federal funds.

I recognize that, controversial as it has been in the past, the notion of pass-through funds to enhance local station autonomy in a structure of checks and balances is not particularly controversial now. As is apparent from the enactment of the

Budget Reform Act of 1974, however a multi-year appropriation is an extraordinary request to make of both the Executive and Legislative branches. But public broadcasting, and the viewers and listeners it serves, should ask for or accept no less from those of us in Government.

The financing of public broadcasting presents rare and unique circumstances in which the Executive and Legislative branches should give up some of the control they wield over federally funded programs by virtue of the annual authorization and appropriation process. This unusual funding mechanism is essential, if the public broadcasting system as conceived by the 1967 Act is to succeed. It is that simple. For that reason the Administration has put aside its own reservations and has proposed this bill. For the same reason Congress should loosen its control of public broadcasting's pursestrings and pass this legislation.

The past seven years have brought us all to a point at which we simply must trust the people who run the stations and the national public broadcast organizations and trust the American people who would be the true beneficiaries of this funding approach. I am not asking the Congress to have blind faith in public broad-

casting; just as I did not ask that of the President in urging him to send this legislation to the Congress. But we have created the system; it is a reality. We must now give it a chance to succeed according to the original vision for a truly independent and financially insulated system of public broadcasting. To do so, I have discovered, you must be willing to respect both reality and idealism. This bill is our best effort to combine the two. I commend it to you and your colleagues.

Hooper
 Box 2
 folder 13

OTP FORM 6
 December 1971

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Handwritten initials

DATE OF DOC		SEC. CL	ORIGIN		CONTROL NO.	
DATE REC'D	DATE OUT		SUSPENSE DATE	CROSS REFERENCE OR POINT OF FILING		
TO FROM SUBJ.				ROUTING DATE SENT _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____		
<i>Handwritten: To: Hooper, Box 2, Folder 13</i>						
<i>Handwritten: From: [unclear]</i>						
<i>Handwritten: Subj: [unclear]</i>						
<i>Handwritten: [unclear]</i>						
<i>Handwritten: [unclear]</i>						
<i>Handwritten: [unclear]</i>						
<i>Handwritten: [unclear]</i>						
<i>Handwritten: [unclear]</i>						
<i>Handwritten: [unclear]</i>						
COURIER NO.		ANSWERED	NO REPLY		2	

Rogers

Box 2

folders 10

112

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20504

April 20, 1973

To: Mr. Whitehead
From: Mr. Goldberg *AG.*
Subject: Public Broadcasting

Almost two years ago we focused upon a policy for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the public broadcasting system in general. Generally, that policy was one that was tied closely to the principles of localism underlying the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 -- a policy opposed to the development of a "Fourth Network."

The hope was to strengthen the local stations so that they could act collectively as an effective counter force to the centralized, national public broadcasting entities, including the Fred Friendly wing of the Ford Foundation. Structurally, the two approaches that the policy relied upon to achieve this result were (1) converting the interconnection facilities into a distribution network, with the stations taping programs and delaying for later broadcast, and (2) directing operating funds to the local stations in a manner intended to provide them financial independence from CPB. The memorandum outlining this policy approach is attached.

Since September 1971, however, we have not attempted to implement this policy and seek structural changes in public broadcasting. Rather, we have "talked" the policy but relied upon the Directors and staff of CPB to make the needed changes in the operation of the public broadcasting system. This approach involves an inherent inconsistency, in that it seeks centralization as the first step in achieving decentralization. Since the inherent inconsistency is apparent, our motives become suspect and the continued restatement of the localism goal is discounted as simply not being credible.

Another difficulty with this approach is that it requires a high degree of competence and leadership in the individuals chosen for CPB. Past events have demonstrated that these characteristics are quite rare among

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

-2-

the people who make up the talent pool we have available to us. Ineffective or ineffectual people simply cannot achieve the requisite goals. In such a vacuum, it devolves upon us to exercise the necessary leadership, thereby exacerbating the centralization problem and bringing our motives into further question.

At this point we are at or near the bottom of the "slippery slope" we first set upon a year and a half ago. However, the chaos within public broadcasting that has resulted from our approach also has its advantages. The present disarray of our opponents, and the fact that we have gone just about as far as we can with this approach, makes this an ideal time -- perhaps our last clear chance -- to restructure public broadcasting and to extricate ourselves and future Administrations from continuous tinkering with public broadcasting.

As I see it, we have two general alternative approaches at hand. One approach is to find competent, fair-minded and independent leadership for the Corporation, both at the board and staff levels; outline the decentralized/localized structure we seek (which might involve their developing new legislation that we could support); and leave this leadership free to rectify the deficiencies in the public broadcasting system. Our other alternative is to take it upon ourselves to call together the CPB, PBS and other station interests, and work out a legislative restructuring of public broadcasting that we all can support.

Both of these alternatives are based upon certain assumptions. One is, that despite our strongly held wishes to the contrary, that it will be impossible for us to "kill" the Corporation either through direct legislative action or through suffocation by stringent cutbacks in appropriated funds.

Another assumption is that, eventually, the full development of cable television, with pay cable as a viable service, will obviate the need in 10-15 years for the Federal Government to subsidize an entire supplemental broadcasting system as an alternative to the present commercial television system. Therefore, both options are mid-range options, i.e., options to see us through the next ten years.

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

-3-

I am disposed toward the second alternative. The first is too much like our present course of action, which has been unsuccessful. In taking this approach you and your successors will inevitably be drawn deeper and deeper into public broadcasting to make short-term adjustments for deficiencies in CPB's leadership.

While I am not optimistic that the legislative restructuring alternative is a viable one, I suspect that some key leaders in public broadcasting are getting tired of having defeat continually snatched from the jaws of victory. They know that, at least for the next three years, they face veto after veto of any funding bill that exceeds a subsistence diet for public broadcasting. Moreover, the realists among them cannot pin all of their hopes on a change to a liberal Democratic Administration in 1976. In short, they may be willing to negotiate now.

I think that our own enlightened self-interest dictates that we use this opportunity to create something constructive and lasting by way of a public broadcasting policy. If not, the great expenditure in time and effort and personal sacrifice of your "image" over the past two years will all be for naught. I would not like our record in public broadcasting to be one solely of creating, enhancing and feeding upon chaos in this element of the broadcasting system.

Attachment

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

July 15, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO MESSRS. WHITEHALL AND SCALLA

From: Henry Goldberg

Subject: Corporation for Public Broadcasting

The following is intended to offer a policy rationale for accomplishing the objectives explicit and implicit in the July 9 "Action Memorandum" and July 10 memorandum concerning the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) and to suggest approaches for amending the draft bill ("Public Telecommunications Act of 1971") to implement these objectives.

I. Background of CPB and Public Broadcasting System

Without belaboring many of the background details, the Carnegie Commission proposal for a strengthened "public" broadcasting system in the U.S. stressed, to a degree that is largely forgotten today, the critical importance of having autonomous local broadcast stations responsive to and representative of their local communities. While CPB was the glamorous aspect of the Carnegie proposal, a strong, financially independent group of local stations was considered the prerequisite -- the "bedrock" of a public broadcast system that would be capable of becoming the clearest expression of American diversity and excellence. The relationship between the central, "leadership" organization -- CPB -- and the local stations was viewed as very sensitive. Although it was felt that the Corporation must support the local stations and represent them to some degree, the Carnegie Commission felt CPB must be restrained from control or even the appearance of control over the local stations. This desire to "check and balance" the inevitable influence of CPB was reflected in the interconnection and station operating fund aspects of the Carnegie proposal.

A. Interconnection

The Carnegie Commission took a strong stand against use of interconnection facilities for "fixed schedule" networking. Local public broadcast stations were not to be "affiliated," as in the commercial system where local stations are often dominated by the network. Still, the choice of whether to carry the "network" offering is left to the local station, in the "fixed schedule" network it is a Hobson's choice, since the local public TV station does not have any other alternatives as the network program to broadcast at the time when the network program is coming down the line. To avoid interfering the local station's operation if necessary, the Carnegie Commission proposed that the interconnection facilities be used substantially as a distribution system (i.e., simply a convenient means of distributing programs to stations). Programs would be sent to stations at various hours and times of day, including times when carrier rates are low, and transfer interconnection by the stations. The stations would thus have complete control over their program schedules and the choice of broadcasting CPB programs would be a real one. "Real time" networking would be used infrequently when the immediacy of the subject matter called for simultaneous national presentation.

At the time this aspect of the Carnegie proposal was incorporated in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, the Friendly/Ford/NET interests strongly opposed it, but held their peace knowing that their leverage would control once CPB was established.

B. Underwriting Station Operating Expenses

To assure the financial independence of local stations, the Carnegie Commission proposed that HEW help underwrite their nonprogramming operating expenses. The level of this support was estimated to be roughly \$30 million a year through 1972 and \$53 million by 1980. With a steady supply of funds made available directly to the local stations, it was anticipated that they would be a viable and effective counterforce to CPB. The Corporation would provide financial assistance to local stations only for local programming.

At the Senate hearings Dr. Killian justified this split in funding (i.e., programs funded by CPB and station operations funded by HEW) for the following reasons:

1. the level of funding (i.e., \$30 to 50 million annually) was considered too great to be met with an excise tax;
2. the Corporation should not be involved in classroom programming, "and it would be most difficult to confine operating funds to public television purposes since all educational stations are engaged in instructional television;"
3. the Corporation should focus on its important programming function and support of operating expenses would diminish overall effectiveness; and, as Mr. Hillier stated,
4. "One of the things that certainly led us to this separation of funding was the concern that this corporation not grow too big or not become too central, and that we have a . . . distribution of responsibility in this total system of public television."

"We felt that the corporation should not become too dominant in the organization. We sought to construct the kind of entity here that would be a leader in educational broadcasting, particularly in supporting television programming. But that again, every local station must not look to the corporation for its daily requirement. If it had to look to the Corporation for its daily requirement, I fear that this would lead naturally, inevitably, to unwise, unwarranted and unnecessary centralization of educational broadcasting."

Despite the urgings of the Carnegie Commission members and others, the Public Broadcasting Act lodged responsibility for station operating support with CPB and the legislative history of the Act shows that CPB was supposed to devote a significant portion of its funds to general station support. However, through a combination of lack of funding and lack of interest, CPB has not made station operating support one of its substantial undertakings.

II. Critique of CPB's Present Approach to Public Broadcasting

The principal criticism that could be made of CPB, without involving an ideological dispute over its programs, is that it has not made enough of the opportunity for public broadcasting that was envisioned by the

Carnegie Commission and reflected in the Public Broadcasting Act. The influence of plans on "localism" has been lost and the financing of the local broadcast stations has never taken place. While the situation has improved for public broadcasting on the national level, the local stations are not much better off than they were in the pre-CPB days.

CPB and PBS have used interconnection facilities in much the same way, albeit on a smaller scale, as did the NBC, because they want to be a fourth national network. The control of the local stations over their own schedules has been largely illusory in the face of this centralized program network operation. Moreover, local stations have not had the financial independence that would have resulted from a steady supply of federal funds to underwrite operating expenses. The stations are at the mercy of CPB for program, production and operating expenses.

The task before the Administration is to introduce legislation that will direct Federal financial support for public broadcasting in such a way as to emphasize the role of the local stations. This would not be done to punish CPB for past excesses but simply to make adjustments in the existing legislation in order to stress the basic principles that underlie that legislation.

The legislative goals have always been: (1) to keep public broadcasting from falling under government control, (2) to preserve the autonomy of the local stations, and (3) to achieve these objectives without sacrificing the prestige of the national organization or the quality of the programming it underwrites and distributes. The new legislation must be presented to CPB, and others in public broadcasting, as furthering these goals by giving the local stations direct, substantial financial support in a manner consistent with the original principles of the Carnegie Commission and the Congress.

The following legislation proposals would accomplish this and would also expand the application of these principles to nonbroadcast "public" communications entities.

III. Proposals for Changes in Draft "Public Telecommunications Act of 1971"

The legislative objectives discussed below are intended to make adjustments in the "balance of power" presently prevailing in the public broadcast system. Generally, this would be accomplished by direct funding of local stations and by making the national "network" more responsive to the control of local stations by having them pay a fee to

... broadcast service. ... the Federal Reserve, ...
... the public interest of the ...
... the public interest of the ...

Proposed Legislative Amendments

1. ... facilities construction ...
... facilities ...
... facilities ...
2. ... facilities ...
... facilities ...
... facilities ...

... broadcast facilities ...
... broadcast facilities ...
... broadcast facilities ...

This more gradual approach to nonbroadcast funding would also win the support of the public broadcasters, who fear that the appropriations pie would be sliced too thinly if they had to compete for funds with a multitude of IRTS, close circuit and CATV entities.

3. Authorization of IRTW to make operating fund grants to licensees of public broadcast stations at a maximum level of 1/3 of the nonfederal (and non-CFB) contributions received by such licensees, with a maximum grant limitation of \$150,000 - \$200,000 per station. The legislation would make clear that such grants would be received as a matter of right, with no restrictions placed on the use of the grant. Approximately \$35 million would be the first year's approximation for this program.

4. NBS would be given no responsibility for classroom and instructional programming beyond what it is already under existing legislation. However, NBS could be authorized in this bill to cooperate or contribute to its existing Office of Education and other programs for support of classroom programs, demonstration projects, etc. A small amount (1.2, \$5 million) could be provided for furthering these activities and carrying out demonstration projects, pilotage, and developing "community services" programming.

B. Objectives for CFB Under Title II

1. Fund programming activities of national production centers and local stations, as in the past.
2. Excluded from support of programming primarily intended for classroom use.
3. Arrange for interconnection services to be paid for, at least in part, by fees charged local stations.
4. "Permanent" financing from a fund in the Treasury with annual disbursements from the fund in the amount of \$20-\$25 million, plus an amount equal to nonfederal and nonpublic broadcasting contributions to CFB directly.

cc: Subject File
Chron File

HGoldberg/ec/15Jul71

STATEMENT BY
CLAY T. WHITEHEAD, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
ON
PUBLIC BROADCASTING AUTHORIZATIONS

Rogers
Box 2
folder 10

before the

Subcommittee on Communications
Honorable John O. Pastore, Chairman
Committee on Commerce
United States Senate

March 28, 1973

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee, I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the two pending public broadcast authorization bills, S. 1090 and S. 1228.

Federal funding of public broadcasting presents a dilemma. On the one hand there is a need for the government to support public broadcasting. On the other hand it should be insulated from government interference. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 attempted to deal with this dilemma by creating a system based upon the "bedrock of localism" and, by creating an institution--the Corporation for Public Broadcasting--to serve the needs of local stations.

Unquestionably, the Corporation in the few years of its existence has made important contributions to our nation's educational and cultural life. In view of these achievements and the promise of educational broadcasting in general, this Administration has demonstrated its support. We have sought increased appropriations for the Corporation, from \$5 million in Fiscal Year 1969 to the present \$45 million requested in Fiscal Year 1974. Moreover, the Administration has supported steady increases

in funding for the Educational Broadcast Facilities Program.

Nonetheless, despite public broadcasting's positive achievements, there remained serious deficiencies. The purpose of the 1967 Act was to prevent local stations from ever becoming mere conduits for the programming of centralized production sources. But there was a tendency toward centralized program decision-making by CPB and PBS, its wholly-funded interconnection service.

Interconnection was viewed by the Congress primarily as a means of program distribution and not as a means of establishing a fixed-schedule network. But the distribution of programming over the interconnection system by PBS amounted to precisely the kind of federally-funded "fourth network" which the Congress sought to avoid. Such a monolithic approach to public broadcasting is inimical to the letter and spirit of the Public Broadcasting Act.

Another problem area is the funding of public affairs programs. Public affairs and current events programs are important components of public broadcasting's contribution to the flow of information. Indeed, this type of programming is recognized as part of every broadcaster's responsibilities under the Communications Act of 1934. But there

is great concern regarding the use of federal appropriations to produce and disseminate such programming at the national level. This is especially true in view of the tendency to centralize its production in New York or Washington. In short, reliance on federal monies to support public affairs programming is inappropriate and potentially dangerous. Robust electronic journalism cannot flourish when federal funds are used to support such programming.

All of these problems affecting the structure and operations of public broadcasting vitally affect the issue of long-range funding. It is, of course, possible to amend the Public Broadcasting Act to convert the system into one built upon the concept of a centralized network. The Congress could then consider long-range funding for such a system. But unless and until Congress abandons public broadcasting as a community centered enterprise, multi-year funding must await the resolution of the present uncertainties and deficiencies. The problems facing public broadcasting in 1973 are quite similar to those that confronted the Congress in 1967. There is no greater rationale for large-scale, multi-year funding now than there was then.

In 1967, the question of public broadcasting's role was vigorously debated. The debate was thorough and resulted in legislation which placed the stress on localism--a system in which control would flow upward from strong local stations to the national entities. The future funding of such a system, which was the result of much thoughtful and constructive debate, should be right rather than rapid.

We must support public broadcasting, both for what it has accomplished and for its future promise. This is the reason the President is requesting measured increases in funding for CPB.

With this as background, let me turn to the specifics of S. 1090. First, the level of funding, is in my judgment, too high. When all of the demands of the Federal budget are considered, it is impossible to devote \$140 million to public broadcasting in Fiscal Years 1974 and 1975. Second, until the basic problems that I have discussed are resolved, the Congress should review the funding authorizations annually and observe the Corporation's progress in dealing with these problems.

The Administration's bill--S. 1228--provides for the sound development of public broadcasting by extending for

one-year CPB's current authorization. This one-year extension would allow for the growth of public broadcasting to proceed soundly while all elements of the system make progress in resolving the issues under debate.

Continuing the Administration's record of requesting increased funds for public broadcasting, the authorization would add \$10 million to CPB's current level of funding, for a total of \$45 million. Unfortunately, CPB did not receive its full authorization for Fiscal Year 1973.

Recognizing that CPB appropriations were caught up in the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations, we now ask for the same increase requested in Fiscal Year 1973 and regret that it is now one year later. In addition, the HEW request for Fiscal Year 1974 funding of the Educational Broadcast Facilities Program will be at a \$13 million level, despite severe budgetary pressures affecting other HEW programs.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to close on a hopeful note by alluding to the efforts now underway to rationalize and improve the relationship between CPB and the local stations. The Corporation must take into account and respond to the needs of all classes and categories of public broadcasting stations around the country. In undertaking these efforts,

a fundamental principle must be maintained. It is that decentralization of programming activities is the cornerstone of the public broadcasting structure. Local stations should play a major role in decision-making in matters of programming and ultimately must have a realistic choice available in deciding whether to broadcast any CPB-supported or distributed programs. But this cannot be accomplished if the role of the local station is limited to some form of representation in national entities that make program decisions.

The best way to proceed is to implement the plan of the Public Broadcasting Act and its rejection of use of interconnection facilities for fixed-schedule networking. This would give local stations the autonomy and authority for complete control over their program schedules. In particular, it would be unfortunate if we were to have a centralized bureaucracy through which the Corporation would have to deal with the stations. The goal should be to create an environment in which the Corporation works directly with all the stations and seeks at all times to preserve their independence and autonomy.

Research

1. Impress on Curtis and Loomis the necessity of dumping NPACT and withdrawing CPB support for news and public affairs programs, particularly preventing all of the current efforts to make public broadcasting a "network of record" a la New York Times.
2. Past efforts to do this through "friendly" Board members have been unsatisfactory, apparently because these Board members do not appreciate the depth of the President's personal concern. There should be no confusion on this point at present.
3. The Administration will keep CPB's FY 1974 budget at a \$45-50 million level, so Curtis and Loomis will have adequate incentives to enforce strict priorities in use of CPB program and networking funds. Thereafter, if progress is being made, funding will increase.
4. In addition to news and public affairs, one of the most important Curtis/Loomis tasks is to clean house at CPB and staff it with reliable people. They should be open to suggestions from OTP on staffing.

5. PBS power

Rogers
Box 2
folder 8

Rogers

Box 2 folder 6

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20504

June 26, 1972

DIRECTOR

To: Peter Flanigan

From: Tom Whitehead

Attached is a memorandum for the President reviewing our efforts in the public broadcasting field and the recently passed legislation for funding the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We conclude that the President should veto the legislation. The option of a Pocket Veto is not an attractive option since a veto on grounds of principle will have more impact and provide us with more initiative.

John Mitchell sees no problem with this course of action, and Cap Weinberger poses no objection. I have sent copies to Colson, Ehrlichman, and MacGregor. I urge that this be handled urgently to permit the President's statement to go forward before I leave Friday morning.

Whichever course of action the President chooses, it is very important that the substance of our draft signing and veto statements be retained. Any major changes should be checked with us.

Attachment

P.S. Pat Buchanan and Max Friedersdorf also concur in this decision.

cc: DO Records
DO Chron

Mr. Flanigan (Orig. and 1)
Mr. Ehrlichman

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20504

June 26, 1972

DIRECTOR

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

CLAY T. WHITEHEAD 

SUBJECT:

Public Broadcasting

Background

The Congress has just passed legislation authorizing funding of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) for \$65 million and \$90 million in FY73 and FY74 respectively. The current authorization expires June 30 this year. Funding for FY72 was \$35 million, and your budget recommended a one-year authorization for FY73 of \$45 million. The legislation also contains other provisions, the most important of which are the establishment of a permanent Public Broadcasting Fund, and the requirement that five of the fifteen CPB board members be managers of public TV stations.

The Senate has appropriated the full \$65 million for the coming year; but the House has made no appropriation. The conference this week is likely to approve something over \$45 million.

The legislation is essentially that proposed by Torbet Macdonald, Chairman of the House Communications Subcommittee. It was actively and effectively supported by CPB and most of the public TV stations around the country. I opposed the Macdonald bill in the House hearings, and OTP introduced an Administration bill in support of our position. The vote on our funding position lost 183-166 in the House and 58-26 in the Senate. We succeeded in generating active debate and dissension in both the House and the Senate over the direction of CPB and public broadcasting generally.

Our five recent appointments to the CPB Board have been confirmed

replaced with Henry Loomis or Neal Freeman and that our appointment to the Whitney vacancy will be elected to replace Pace.

You will recall that your decision to support an increase of CPB funds from \$35 million to \$45 million was based on the expectation that a substantial reduction in politically controversial news and public affairs programming would ensue. That has not occurred, and there is no sign that the professional public broadcasting community intends any such action. It will require active control by the new CPB Board and management under real funding constraints to make progress in this area.

Options

You must decide whether to sign or veto the CPB authorization. (Draft signing and veto statements are attached at Tab A.) The major objectives are (1) containing the growth of Federal funding, (2) showing CPB and Congress the seriousness of your concern, (3) achieving answerability on the part of CPB and the local stations in their use of tax dollars, and (4) reducing the use of Federal dollars for support of politically controversial programming.

Whichever course you choose, I believe we should retract our commitment to the early development of a plan for long-term, insulated financing for CPB. While the goal of insulating CPB from governmental pressures is sound, the public broadcasting community has not yet demonstrated the responsibility or maturity to justify such funding.

Option 1: Sign CPB bill

Pro:

1. Avoids making an issue of the subject this year and giving the appearance of hostility toward public broadcasting.

2. Easily relieves us of our commitment to develop long-range financing for CPB by acknowledging that the two-year authorization and annual appropriation pattern set by Congress is the most appropriate approach for the present.

Con:

1. Risks large increases in funding for CPB both this year and next, and makes \$90 million the floor for FY 75 authorizations.
2. Casts doubt on our desire and ability to restrain public broadcasting, since CPB has pushed this legislation through against our strong opposition and despite our criticism of their performance and responsibility.
3. Places very heavy reliance on our CPB Board appointments to support positions that they may not be able to maintain. It will be hard for them not to support appropriations up to the full authorization, and extension of the authorization to three or five years.
4. Because of the high funding levels and the doubt cast on the seriousness of our concern, it will be more difficult for the CPB Board to cut back funding of news and controversial public affairs programming.

Option 2: Veto CPB bill

Pro:

1. Keeps both authorization and appropriation at lower levels.
2. Calls attention to the direction and performance of public broadcasting.
3. Will help avoid the growth of CPB into a highly centralized full-scale TV network instead of the experimental and educational program production entity originally envisioned.
4. Limiting funds this year will assist CPB Board in shifting priorities away from news and public affairs toward educational programming.

Con:

1. Will produce some criticism that your Administration is trying to intimidate the media and is unsympathetic to the cultural and educational benefits of public TV.
2. Will cause short-run, and perhaps long-run, animosity against us by professional public broadcasters.

3. May antagonize Senators Magnuson and Pastore.

Recommendation:

There is not a large viewing audience for public TV, nor does the public seem very aware of it. The professional public broadcaster at CPB and in the local noncommercial stations, however, are becoming an effective lobbying constituency in the Congress. In the name of "public" broadcasting, they are seeking funds and independence to create a TV network reflecting their narrow conception of what the public ought to see and hear. This should not be allowed to happen.

I strongly recommend that you veto the CPB financing legislation.

Attachment

Signing Statement

In forwarding for my signature the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972 (H.R. 13918), the Congress has presented me with a poor approach to public broadcasting financing and a difficult personal decision. I have decided to sign this legislation, but I do so with serious reservation.

Congressional consideration of this legislation has brought to the surface many fundamental disagreements, not only in the Congress, but within the public broadcasting community itself, concerning the directions which the enterprise has taken in the past and should pursue in the future. Serious questions were raised concerning lack of adequate support for the educational programming that was the principal purpose of the Public Broadcasting Act; concerning the establishment of a system of fixed schedule, coast-to-coast networking, that as a practical matter gives inadequate freedom to local stations in the selection of programming; and concerning the fair distribution of programming funds among local stations in various regions of the country. Most important of all; there was expressed serious and widespread concern that an organization originally intended only to serve the local stations was becoming instead the center of power and the focal point of control for the public broadcasting system.

The present legislation does little or nothing to resolve these problems, while at the same time purporting to establish a framework for long-range, insulated funding. The one cannot responsibly be done without the other. Nor is it responsible, in the face of such fundamental and unresolved disagreement over past and future directions, to increase the Corporation's authorization by some 200 per cent over the next two years-- at a time when the public treasury is under heavy pressure to provide even essential services to our citizens.

The public and legislative record generated by the present bill and the Congress' inability to resolve the basic issues which it presented, have convinced me that the original reasons for withholding high-level, long-range, insulated funding still obtain. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has not reached sufficient maturity, and has not sufficiently fixed the course of its future development, to enable the Congress to make the necessary judgments concerning the conditions under which it can be entrusted with large amounts of public money free of the public control exercised through the budgetary process. The Congress evidently felt the force of these considerations,

because although this legislation prematurely establishes a structure for long-term, insulated funding (namely, a separate Public Broadcasting Fund in the Treasury), it makes no real use of that structure and provides instead for annual appropriations.

Rather than jeopardize the future of public broadcasting, especially the further contributions it can make in the area of educational programs, I have chosen to sign this bill. In so doing, I do not mean to approve either the level of funding that it provides for the next two years or the structure that it establishes for long-range, insulated funding in the future. To the contrary, I would hope that the appropriations approved under this legislation will be no more than \$45 million for Fiscal 1973 and that consideration of genuine long-range, insulated funding will be deferred until the structure of public broadcasting is more firmly established and its performance can be more intelligently evaluated. I urge the Corporation's Board of Directors to exercise restraint in the use of Federal funds, to restore the Corporation to the path of compliance with the statutory requirements for public broadcasting, and to exceed substantially the minimum 30 per cent of the Federal appropriation that H.R. 13918 requires the Corporation to distribute to local educational radio and television stations.

Veto Message

I find it necessary to veto H.R. 13918, which is intended to provide improved financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and to modify the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 by making various changes in the structure of the noncommercial, educational broadcasting system. Educational and public broadcasting can offer many benefits to the public, especially high-quality, educational and cultural programs reflecting diversity and excellence. Educational children's programs such as "Sesame Street" and "The Electric Company" have begun to repay the investment America made in the 1950's when channels were reserved for educational purposes. Because of public broadcasting's potential, as well as its accomplishments, I feel that a thorough explanation of my action today is in order.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 made localism the motivating force for the educational broadcasting system. Consistent with the philosophy reflected in the very structure of our Federal Government, localism places the principal public interest responsibility on the individual educational radio and television stations licensed to serve the needs and interests of their own communities. It was widely recognized when the Corporation was established that it would be undesirable for the Government to influence or control a broadcast network. Such influence or control should be avoided, whether it springs from intimidation by the Government or the desire of the broadcast entity to assist an Administration with which it agrees. In 1967, the Congress had no clear idea of how the various parts of the system it created would work, and it therefore deferred consideration of a plan to insulate the system by providing Federal financial assistance on a long-range basis without regular Congressional review. The Congress realized that until the system matured sufficiently it would be unwise to entrust the Corporation with such financing.

Prior to the Congressional deliberations on H.R. 13918, I was concerned about the priorities and directions of the Corporation, especially its apparent desire to become a centralized, fixed-schedule network operation controlled in Washington. This simply undermines the statutory imperatives of localism and structural checks and balances. I was, however, confident that these issues could be resolved if the Congress explored them fully and in the interim funded the Corporation for an additional year at a reasonable increase in appropriations.

Instead, the Congress rushed through legislation that glosses over fundamental problems. This bill was passed in the Senate without comprehensive hearings. The floor debate on amendments designed to correct deficiencies in the House bill was cut short on a number of occasions. The Congress must be sensitive to the implications of proceeding in this manner, without careful consideration of the problem of excessive centralization of the public broadcast system and the risk inherent in government establishment of a broadcast network.

The legislative record of the bill shows that there are many in the Congress who share my concerns about present trends in public broadcasting. In my opinion, their views did not receive sufficient consideration. The Congress has adopted a plan which changes the statutory framework for public broadcasting without solving the genuine problems, prematurely establishes a structure for long-range insulated funding, and fixes a level of appropriations that is excessive in view of the uncertainties regarding the Corporation's future direction.

I cannot approve such action and therefore cannot sign this bill. The public and legislative debate regarding passage of H.R. 13918 has convinced me that the problems posed by government financing of a domestic broadcast system are much greater than originally thought. They cannot be resolved until the structure of public broadcasting has been firmly established, and we have a more extensive record of experience on which to evaluate it. I therefore urge the continuation of carefully measured funding for the Corporation, under the present statutory framework, subject to regular budgetary oversight and review.

I request that the Congress take immediate action to enact a one-year extension of the Corporation's authorization at the \$45 million level specified in my budget. This represents a 30 per cent increase for the Corporation, and in light of past increases and the need to hold down expenditures in the coming year is exceedingly generous.

The Board of Directors of the Corporation is made up of men and women of intellectual stature and independence of mind. I urge them to restore the Corporation to the path of compliance with the original philosophies and statutory objectives for public broadcasting. As they work to correct the short-comings in the present system, we shall continue the long, difficult process of reviewing the roles of the Corporation, the local stations, and other entities involved in public broadcasting, and determining what part Federal funding can appropriately play.

Monday 6/26/72

MONTE INC
6/27/72
10:00

12:30 Mr. Whitehead will meet tomorrow morning (Tues. 6/27) at 10:00 with Irving Kristol. Mr. Kristol is a Henry Lucas Professor of Urban Values at New York University. He wrote the Book "On The Democratic Idea in America."

(212) 895-0267 (home phone)

REMARKS OF

Clay T. Whitehead, Director

Office of Telecommunications Policy
Executive Office of the President

Rogers

Box 1 folder 12

at the

47th Annual Convention
National Association of Educational Broadcasters

Miami, Florida
October 20, 1971

It would be refreshing for you, I'm sure, to hear a convention speaker dwell on all the good things that public broadcasting has accomplished--after all the accomplishments are real. But government policy making doesn't usually concern itself with good news, it deals with problems and policy is my topic today.

Public broadcasting occupies a very special role in my Office and in the Executive Branch generally. It is one of the few elements in our communications system that has had a policy blueprint. The policy for public broadcasting--even its very name--was the result of deliberate study, public discussion, and legislation in the form of the 1962 ETV Facilities Act and the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act. Much of the policy has been developed and administered by the Executive Branch.

The process of developing policy is a continuing one. After four years of experience with the system created by the Act, you and OTP are asking whether the policies that guide public broadcasting work--where they have taken us and where they are taking us. The process has taken much longer than we all wanted it to take. But now I'd like to talk to you about the factors that have shaped our thinking about public broadcasting and how we view the policy questions.

I honestly don't know what group I'm addressing. I don't know if it's really the 47th Annual Convention of NAEB or the first annual meeting of PBS affiliates. What's your status? To us there is evidence that you are becoming affiliates of a centralized, national network.

For example, CPB calls PBS our fourth national TV network--and the largest one at that, with over 210 affiliates. Don Quayle's National Public Radio may be the only real national radio network we have--I half expect Arthur Godfrey--or maybe David Susskind--to be hired to do a "morning magazine" show for NPR. I see NAEB's ETS Program Service transferred to PBS and NPR. Because of CPB's method of funding program production, it's less than candid to say the production system is a decentralized group of seven or eight regional centers. Who has real control over your program schedules?

On a national basis, PBS says that some 40% of its programming is devoted to public affairs. You're centralizing your public affairs programs in the National Public Affairs Center in Washington, because someone thinks autonomy in regional centers leads to wasteful overlap and duplication. Instead of aiming for "overprogramming" so local stations can select among the programs produced and presented in an atmosphere of diversity, the system chooses central control for "efficient" long-range planning and so-called "coordination" of news and public affairs--coordinated by people with essentially similar outlooks. How different will your networked news programs be from the programs that Fred Friendly and Sander Vanocur wanted to do at CBS and NBC? Even the commercial networks don't rely on one sponsor for their news

and public affairs, but the Ford Foundation is able to buy over \$8 million worth of this kind of programming on your stations.

In other kinds of programming, is it you or PBS who has been taking the networks' approach and measuring your success in rating points and audience? You check the Harris poll and ARB survey and point to increases in viewership. Once you're in the rating game, you want to win. You become a supplement to the commercial networks and do their things a bit better in order to attract the audience that wants more quality in program content.

The temptation to make your mark this way has proven irresistible. The press is good. You've deserved the limelight much sooner, but it's coming now with truly outstanding efforts in the up-coming "Electric Company" and "Sesame Street" and "Forsyte Saga" and the BBC's other fine dramatic and cultural shows. You do this job brilliantly. You can pick up where the commercial networks leave off. You can do their children's shows, their drama, their serious music, their in-depth informational programs--you can even be their "farm system" and bring up young, minority-group talent to work in the "majors" in New York and Los Angeles.

You can program for the Cambridge audience that WGBH used to go after--for the upper-middle class whites who

contribute to your stations when you offer Julia Child's cookbook and Kenneth Clark's "Civilisation." It also has the advantage of keeping you out of the renewal and access conflicts now faced by commercial broadcasters. With a few notable exceptions, maybe the community activists don't think you're meaningful enough in your own communities to warrant involving you in these disputes.

As the fourth national network, things are looking pretty rosy for you. Between 1968 and 1970, national broadcast hours went up 43%. This year alone PBS is sending an average of two hours a night down the interconnection lines. But local production of instructional and "public" programs continue a decreasing trend--down 13% from 1968 to 1970. The financial picture at the local stations looks bleak, even though CPB can now raise the range of its general support grants to between \$20,000 and \$52,000 per TV station. But it's still not enough. The average TV station's yearly operating costs are over \$650,000 and the stations are suffering--Delaware may be without a state-wide system, local programs are out on WHYI in Philadelphia, things look bad elsewhere--even at the production centers.

Money alone--great bales of it--would solve a lot of the problems. CPB would be able to fund programs on America's civilization and programs on the Adams family instead of the Churchill and Forsythe families. The production centers could be more independent and the other local

stations could devote more energy to programming, ascertainment and community service instead of auctions, fund-raising gimmicks and underwriting grants. More money could even lessen the internal squabbling that seems to occupy so much of your attention.

But money alone won't solve the basic problems that relate to the structure of public broadcasting--a structure that was to be built on a bedrock of localism. I've read Arthur Singer's speech last June at Boyne Highlands and I've read the Carnegie Commission Report and the legislative history of the '67 Act. Singer wins--the reality of 1971 doesn't match the dream of 1967.

Do you remember that the Carnegie group put its principal stress on a strong, financially independent group of stations as the foundation of a system that was to be the clearest expression of American diversity and excellence; that the emphasis was on pluralism and local format control instead of a fixed-schedule, real-time network, and that this view was reflected in the House, Senate and Conference reports on the '67 Act; that CPB was supposed to increase options and program choices for the stations; and that the Carnegie Commission wanted general operating funds to come from HEW because of the concern that the corporation not grow too big or become too central. As Dr. Killian put it, if stations had to look to the corporation for all their requirements, it would lead "naturally, inevitably,

to unwise, unwarranted and unnecessary centralization of educational broadcasting." The concept of dispersing responsibility was essential to the policy chosen in 1967 for public broadcasting. Senator Pastore said on the floor of the Senate that, "since the fundamental purpose of the bill is to strengthen local noncommercial stations, the powers of the Corporation itself must not impinge on the autonomy of local stations."

The centralization that was planned for the system-- in the form of CPB--was intended to serve the stations--to help them extend the range of their services to their communities. The idea was to break the NET monopoly of program production combined with networking and to build an effective counterforce to give appropriate weight to local and regional views.

In 1967, the public broadcasting professionals let the Carnegie dreamers have their say--let them run on about localism and "bedrocks" and the rest of it--let them sell the Congress on pluralism and local diversity--and when they've gone back to the boardrooms and classrooms and union halls and rehearsal halls, the professionals will stay in the control room and call the shots. The professionals viewed the Carnegie concept of localism as being as naive and unattainable as the Carnegie excise tax financing plan. They said that no broadcasting system can succeed unless it appeals to a mass audience in one way or another;

that networking in the mold of the commercial networks is the only way to get that audience; that a mass audience brings a massive reputation and massive impact; that it's cheaper, more effective, more easily promoted, simpler to manage, and less demanding on local leadership than the system adopted by the Congress; and they are right. But is that kind of public broadcast system worth it? Is it what you want? What your community needs? What's best for the country?

You've been asking yourself these questions. For you, the past few months have been a time for self-analysis and hard questions--from Singer's Boyne speech, to the Aspen meetings; the Jack Gould-Fred Friendly debate on the pages of the Sunday New York Times; the discussion that's been going on between my Office and CPB; and the emotional debate within public television over the FBI sequence on "Dream Machine." Your public debate has focussed on the fundamental issues and you're to be admired and respected for it.

You are grappling with the policy imposed on a going enterprise in 1967. That policy was not only intended to change the structure of ETV, it was also supposed to avoid the structure of commercial TV and to steer clear of a government-run broadcast system. There are trade-offs in this policy. For example, if you imitate the commercial structure, we have is a network paid for by the government and it just

invites political scrutiny of the content of that network's programs. We're asking a lot of you when we expect that you implement the policy chosen for public broadcasting. But some of you haven't succumbed to despair yet. Some of you don't want to be a fourth network. Some of you are trying to make the policy work.

For example, PBS will be trying to use its interconnection for program distribution as well as networking; it's trying to broaden the base of small station representation on its Board; CPB is trying to devote more funds to general operating grants; as long as there is a centralized network, Hartford Gunn is trying to make it work in a responsible manner despite the brickbats and knives that come his way; some local stations are really trying to do the job that must be done at the community level. I recognize this. I appreciate the problems you face.

CPB seems to have decided to make permanent financing the principal goal and to aim for programming with a national impact on the public and the Congress to achieve it. But look at the box that puts you in. The local station is asked--and sometimes willingly accedes--to sacrifice its autonomy to facilitate funding for the national system.

When this happens, it also jeopardizes your ability to serve the educational and instructional needs of your communities. All the glamor is packed into your nighttime schedules and the tendency is to get more public attention

by focusing on the news, public affairs and cultural programs that are aimed for the general audience. But there must be more balance in your service to your communities. In quantitative terms, your schedules are already split equally between instructional and general programming. But in qualitative terms, are you devoting enough of your resources to the learning needs of your in-school and in-home audiences?

Do any of you honestly know whether public broadcasting--structured as it is today and moving in the direction it seems to be headed--can ever fulfill the promise envisioned for it or conform to the policy set for it? If it can't, then permanent financing will always be somewhere off in the distant future.

The legislative goals for public broadcasting--which I hope are our common goals--are:

- (1) to keep it from becoming a government-run system;
- (2) to preserve the autonomy of the local stations; and
- (3) to achieve these objectives while assuring a diversity of program sources for the stations to draw on in addition to their own programs.

When you centralize actual responsibility at a single point, it makes you visible politically and those who are

prone to see ghosts can raise the spectre of government pressure. When you, as local stations, are compelled by the system's formal structure, its method of program distribution, the mere lack of a programming alternative or simple inertia to delegate formulation of your program schedules to a central authority, how can you realistically achieve the objective of local autonomy. All we are left with is the central organization and its national programs and that was never intended to be an end in itself. When the struggle is simply between the Washington center and the New York center, it doesn't much matter who wins. It probably isn't even worth the effort.

You've been told at this convention all that you should do--that you should be--as cablecasters, minority group employers, public telecommunications centers and the lot. But is enough expected of you when you are branch offices of a national, public telecommunications system? It would be a shame for you to go into the new world of electronic education centers offering a dazzling array of services without engaging in the most exciting experiment of all--to see if you as broadcasters can meet your wide responsibilities to your communities in instructional and public programming. It's never been tried and yet, as a policy, it's America's unique contribution to broadcasting--it's our concept of mass communications federalism.

Your task then is one of striking the most appropriate balance in determining the local station's role in the public broadcast system--a balance between advancing the quality of electronic instruction and the quality of programs for the general public and, ultimately, the balance between the system's center and its parts. You have to care about these balances and you have to work for them. We in government want to help, but the initiative must come from you.

DRAFT
CTWhitehead:jm
9/23/71

Handwritten notes:
H. J. ...
...

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Corporation for Public Broadcasting

Several weeks ago you expressed dissatisfaction with the performance of public television and indicated that you wanted funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), "cut back." The purpose of this memorandum is to describe and explain the alternatives available.

A. STRUCTURE OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The term "public broadcasting" was coined by the Carnegie Commission in 1967. It is now understood to refer to those noncommercial stations (with the supporting industry) which carry educational, cultural, and public affairs programming. It is primarily the character of the public affairs programming which we find objectionable; but "public broadcasting" as a whole extends much beyond this field and is indeed primarily directed to educational and cultural purposes.

The foundation of the public broadcasting network is the local stations. Most of these were created and are supported by State funds, and almost all carry classroom programming during school hours. These stations generally reflect the philosophical outlook of the areas which they

Handwritten on yellow sticky note:
Rogers
Box 1 folder 11

serve, and, as a group, are not dominated by the liberal establishment of the Northeast. The local stations are members of a national organization known as the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB).

In 1967, Congress authorized the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), a private corporation which is almost entirely funded by the Federal Government. It is statutorily prohibited from doing any programming itself, and from owning or operating any network or interconnection system. As will appear below, however, the intent of these prohibitions has not been fully achieved.

CPB has funded and fostered the development of certain production centers for national programming. Some of these, such as Children's Television Work ("Sesame Street") are exclusively production entities; most centers are ~~also largely~~ ^{owned by} local public TV stations, such as National Educational Television (NET) at Station WNET in New York. Some production centers (notably NET) receive considerable financial support from the Ford Foundation.

The networking service for public broadcasting is the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). This entity receives (generally without charge) the programs whose production has been subsidized by CPB and others, ^{choices which will be piped} and ~~pipes them~~ out to the local stations. PBS is the creature of CPB and is funded entirely by that organization. Although CPB claims that the local stations ^{control to PBS to through a board they elect,} ~~control what PBS chooses to carry,~~ in fact this is not always the

case. PBS makes no charge to the stations for its services and is thus not dependent on them for funding. An individual station may decide not to carry a program which PBS sends out, but when it does so its only realistic alternatives are to go dark or present less attractive programming. The combination of CPB's funding of programming, plus its economic control of PBS, gives it a position barely distinguishable from that of a "fourth network," although the affirmative obligations and prohibitions of the 1967 Act were intended to avoid this.

staff & boards & control (CPB & PBS)
B. CURRENT FEDERAL SUPPORT

Federal funds are available from HEW for the construction of facilities for educational broadcast stations. Since these stations do classroom programming as well as "public broadcasting," these funds may be considered directed towards school education. They are in fact administered by HEW's Office of Education. During the current year the HEW facilities program is funded at \$15 million.

Virtually all Federal funding for public broadcasting which is directed outside the classroom is distributed through CPB. During the current year this is \$35 million, ~~\$25 million last year~~ *\$25 million last year &* an increase from \$15 million two years ago. Although some of this money is in fact given to the local stations for their own use, the level of such funding has been relatively low, and all of it comes only at the discretion of CPB. All Federal support of programming, networking, and local station operations is, therefore, funneled through CPB. This arrangement has several undesirable effects: (1) It gives CPB a position

of complete dominance in the field; (2) It makes it impossible to reduce Federal support for national public affairs programming without at the same time reducing support for the more desirable educational and cultural aspects of public broadcasting.

C. APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEM

As the foregoing description suggests, we are confronted with a long-range problem of significant social consequence -- that is, the potential development of a government-funded broadcast system not unlike the BBC. There are three kinds of actions that would halt that development or significantly reduce its adverse effects.

1. Drastically reduce Federal support for CPB;
2. Induce CPB to change its orientation and emphasis on public affairs programming;
3. Alter the basic structure of funding for public broadcasting.

~~D. DISCUSSION~~

Action 1:

There is widespread public and Congressional support for the educational and cultural programming on public television -- such as Sesame Street, The Forsythe Saga, high school equivalency programs, etc.

{ Much of this is funded by CPB, at least in part. } Further, there are _____ Congressmen with one or more educational TV stations in their district. It is unlikely that we could press a significant budget reduction for CPB through the Congress without a major -- and unpopular -- effort. Win or lose, we would lose what leverage we now have with the

CPB Board, ^{and} the Ford Foundation and NET would regain some of their dominance, ^{Also,} ~~and~~ a future Administration could readily increase funding with the "fourth network" structure intact.

Action 2:

Our friends on the CPB Board of Directors, notably Jack Wrather, Al Cole, and Tom Moore, favor this approach and are working with limited success toward this end. At a minimum, replacement of Frank Pace as Chairman, ^{and} ~~John Macy as President~~, would be necessary, and more detailed White House intervention would probably be required to keep a rein on the full-time CPB ^{PBS} ~~staffs~~. This action alone would arouse political controversy and invite charges on media control. It is of questionable effectiveness in the short-run and almost no effectiveness in the long-run. We are committed to an "improved" financing bill for CPB. This ^{action} ~~option~~, therefore, must be combined with the first or third ^{action} ~~option~~ to be viable.

Action 3:

This ^{action} ~~option~~ establishes statutory arrangements to strongly limit the future dominance of public broadcasting by CPB. This would be done by tying Federal funding to a matching of private funds and by requiring a significant portion of Federal funds to go directly to the local stations,

programming centers, or cable TV systems. CPB would be excluded from programming designed principally for classroom education. This would diminish CPB's control and ultimate scope, both in the short-run and in the long-run. The concerns of the local stations are primarily educational and cultural rather than public affairs; local and regional rather than national; and are less dominantly "Eastern Liberal" than Washington/New York oriented CPB. The local stations (NAEB) will support this ~~option~~^{action}, but only if funds are significantly increased. CPB may or may not, depending on how far we go in reducing their discretion in allocating funds.

signed on NAEB

E. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that we adopt a combination of ^{actions} ~~approaches~~ 2 and 3 above. Legislation would be submitted to establish the funding arrangements and limitation of CPB in classroom programming. Significant increases in funding over the current \$35 million will be required to obtain the support of the local stations for this approach, but that will provide two advantages: (1) public and Congressional approval, and (2) support of our friends on the Board to agree with our stipulation that Macy be removed. Pace should be asked to resign shortly after passage of the legislation. Federal funds would increase to about \$85 million (\$60 million for CPB) in the first year of the program (probably FY 74 if we delay a bit) and would be limited to about \$135 million (\$85 million for CPB). These are the minimum amounts necessary to obtain NAEB and CPB support, and probably to obtain the support of our friends on the Board for proposals.

These legislative proposals would be combined with legislation generally favored to increase funding under HEW grants for local educational stations to improve their technical facilities from \$ _____ million to \$ _____ million and to permit HEW to make grants to State for demonstration and experimental educational TV projects.

DECISION OPTIONS

- A. As recommended (actions 2 and 3) _____
- B. Reduce funding (action 1 above). _____
- C. Attempt redirection of CPB and reduce funding (actions 1 and 2) _____
- D. Introduce legislation without serious effort at redirection of CPB
(action 3 only) _____
- E. Discuss further _____

*Mandatory spending?
Can we cut it in the Congress?*

Date: September 23, 1971

Time: 6:30 pm

FOR ACTION: Peter Flanigan

cc (for information):

FROM THE STAFF SECRETARY

DUE: Date: September 29, 1971

Time: 2:00 PM

SUBJECT:
HIGH PRIORITY

Public Broadcasting
"

ACTION REQUESTED:

For Necessary Action

For Your Recommendations

Prepare Agenda and Brief

Draft Reply

For Your Comments

Draft Remarks

REMARKS:

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately.

JON M. HUNTSMAN
For the President

C.P.B

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20504

July 15, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO MESSRS. WHITEHEAD AND SCALLA

From: Henry Goldberg

H.G.

Subject: Corporation for Public Broadcasting

The following is intended to offer a policy rationale for accomplishing the objectives explicit and implicit in the July 9 "Action Memorandum" and July 10 memorandum concerning the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) and to suggest approaches for amending the draft bill ("Public Telecommunications Act of 1971") to implement these objectives.

I. Background of CPB and Public Broadcasting System

Without belaboring many of the background details, the Carnegie Commission proposal for a strengthened "public" broadcasting system in the U.S. stressed, to a degree that is largely forgotten today, the critical importance of having autonomous local broadcast stations responsive to and representative of their local communities. While CPB was the glamorous aspect of the Carnegie proposal, a strong, financially independent group of local stations was considered the prerequisite -- the "bedrock" of a public broadcast system that would be capable of becoming the clearest expression of American diversity and excellence. The relationship between the central, "leadership" organization -- CPB -- and the local stations was viewed as very sensitive. Although it was felt that the Corporation must support the local stations and represent them to some degree, the Carnegie Commission felt CPB must be restrained from control or even the appearance of control over the local stations. This desire to "check and balance" the inevitable influence of CPB was reflected in the interconnection and station operating fund aspects of the Carnegie proposal.

Rogers

Box 1 Folder 10

A. Interconnection

The Carnegie Commission took a strong stand against use of interconnection facilities for "fixed schedule" networking. Local public broadcast stations were not to be "affiliates," as in the commercial system where local stations are often dominated by the network. While the choice of whether to carry the "network" offering is left to the local station, in the "fixed schedule" network it is a Hobson's choice, since the local public TV station doesn't have anything as attractive as the network program to broadcast at the time when the network program is coming down the line. To avoid undercutting the local station's operational autonomy, the Carnegie Commission proposed that the interconnection facilities be used substantially as a distribution system (i. e., simply a convenient means of distributing programs to stations). Programs would be sent to stations at various hours throughout the day, including times when carrier rates are low, and taped for later presentation by the stations. The stations would thus have complete control over their program schedules and the choice of broadcasting CPB programs would be a real one. "Real time" networking would be used infrequently when the immediacy of the subject matter called for simultaneous national presentation.

At the time this aspect of the Carnegie proposal was incorporated in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, the Friendly/Ford/NET interests strongly opposed it, but held their peace knowing that their leverage would control once CPB was established.

B. Underwriting Station Operating Expenses

To assure the financial independence of local stations, the Carnegie Commission proposed that HEW help underwrite their nonprogramming operating expenses. The level of this support was estimated to be roughly \$30 million a year through 1972 and \$53 million by 1980. With a steady supply of funds made available directly to the local stations, it was anticipated that they would be a viable and effective counterforce to CPB. The Corporation would provide financial assistance to local stations only for local programming.

At the Senate hearings Dr. Killian justified this split in funding (i. e., programs funded by CPB and station operations funded by HEW) for the following reasons:

1. the level of funding (i. e., \$30 to 50 million annually) was considered too great to be met with an excise tax;
2. the Corporation should not be involved in classroom programming "and it would be most difficult to confine operating funds to public television purposes since all educational stations are engaged in instructional television;"
3. the Corporation should focus on its important programming function and support of operating expenses would dilute its overall effectiveness; and, as Dr. Killian stated,
4. "One of the things that certainly led us to this separation of funding was the concern that this corporation not grow too big or not become too central, and that we have a . . . distribution of responsibility in this total system of public television."

"We felt that the corporation should not become too dominant in the organization. We sought to construct the kind of entity here that would be a leader in educational broadcasting, particularly in supporting television programming. But that again, every local station must not look to the corporation for its daily requirement. If it had to look to the Corporation for its daily requirement, I fear that this would lead naturally, inevitably, to unwise, unwarranted and unnecessary centralization of educational broadcasting."

Despite the urgings of the Carnegie Commission members and others, the Public Broadcasting Act lodged responsibility for station operating support with CPB and the legislative history of the Act shows that CPB was supposed to devote a significant portion of its funds to general station support. However, through a combination of lack of funding and lack of interest, CPB has not made station operating support one of its substantial undertakings.

II. Critique of CPB's Present Approach to Public Broadcasting

The principal criticism that could be made of CPB, without involving an ideological dispute over its programs, is that it has not made enough of the opportunity for public broadcasting that was envisioned by the

Carnegie Commission and reflected in the Public Broadcasting Act. The intended emphasis on "localism" has been lost and the flowering of the local broadcast stations has never taken place. While the situation has improved for public broadcasting on the national level, the local stations are not much better off than they were in the pre-CPB days.

CPB and PBS have used interconnection facilities in much the same way, albeit on a smaller scale, as CBS or NBC, because they want to be a fourth national network. The control of the local stations over their own schedules has been largely illusory in the face of this centralized program network operation. Moreover, local stations have not achieved the financial independence that would have resulted from a steady supply of federal funds to underwrite operating expenses. The stations are at the mercy of CPB for programs, program funds and operating expenses.

The task before the Administration is to introduce legislation that will direct Federal financial support for public broadcasting in such a way as to emphasize the role of the local stations. This would not be done to punish CPB for past excesses but simply to make adjustments in the existing legislation in order to stress the basic principles that underlie that legislation. *

The legislative goals have always been: (1) to keep public broadcastings from falling under government control, (2) to preserve the autonomy of the local stations, and (3) to achieve these objectives without sacrificing the prestige of the national organization of the quality of the programming it underwrites and distributes. The new legislation must be presented to CPB, and others in public broadcasting, as furthering these goals by giving the local stations direct, substantial financial support in a manner consistent with the original principles of the Carnegie Commission and the Congress.

The following legislation proposals would accomplish this and would also expand the application of these principles to nonbroadcast "public" communications entities.

III. Proposals for Changes in Draft "Public Telecommunications Act of 1971"

The legislative objectives discussed below are intended to make adjustments in the "balance of power" presently prevailing in the public broadcast system. Generally, this would be accomplished by direct funding of local stations and by making the national "network" more responsive to the control of local stations by having them pay a fee to

PBS for that "network" service. Like the Associated Press, PBS would be a creature of its "members" rather than a creature of CPB -- a central entity that inherently emphasizes the network's interests instead of the stations' interests.

A. Objectives for HEW Under Title I

1. Continuation of the broadcast facilities construction program with funds at 75% matching level, but with increased appropriations (e.g., \$15-17 million).
2. Expanding the facilities construction program to include nonbroadcast facilities. To encourage construction, these facilities grants could be made on a more generous matching basis than applies for broadcast facilities and could use a separate appropriations "kitty" (e.g., \$5 million for the first year).

However, this would be offset by making such nonbroadcast entities ineligible for operating funds grants. Such an approach would be consistent with the approach taken in the broadcast area, where construction of facilities was supported for 5 or 6 years before other activities were subsidized. Once experience is gained as to nonbroadcast educational telecommunications, especially cable, an amendment to the Act could work the nonbroadcast entities into the operating support program.

This more gradual approach to nonbroadcast funding would also win the support of the public broadcasters, who fear that the appropriations pie would be sliced too thinly if they had to compete for funds with a multitude of ITFS, close circuit and CATV entities.

3. Authorization of HEW to make operating fund grants to licensees of public broadcast stations at a maximum level of 1/3 of the nonfederal (and non-CPB) contributions received by such licensees, with a maximum grant limitation of \$150,000 - \$200,000 per station. The legislation would make clear that such grants would be received as a matter of right, with no restrictions placed on the use of the grant. Approximately \$35 million would be the first year's approximation for this program.

4. HEW would be given no responsibility for classroom and instructional programming beyond what it has already under existing legislation. However, HEW could be directed in this bill to coordinate or consolidate its existing Office of Education and other programs for support of classroom programs, demonstration projects, etc. A small amount (e.g., \$5 million) could be provided for furthering these activities and engaging in demonstration projects, planning, and developing "community services" programming.

B. Objectives for CPB Under Title II

1. Fund programming activities of national production centers and local stations, as in the past.
2. Precluded from support of programming primarily intended for classroom use.
3. Arrange for interconnection services to be paid for, at least in part, by fees charged local stations.
4. "Permanent" financing from a fund in the Treasury with annual disbursements from the fund in the amount of \$20-\$25 million, plus an amount equal to nonfederal and nonpublic broadcasting contributions to CPB directly.

STATEMENT BY
CLAY T. WHITEHEAD, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
ON
PUBLIC BROADCASTING AUTHORIZATIONS

Box 2
Folder 1973
11

before the

Subcommittee on Communications and Power
Honorable Torbert H. Macdonald, Chairman
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives

June 12, 1973

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the proposed authorization for public broadcasting.

As you know, OTP supports the principle of long-range financing and acknowledges the inadequacy of current funding arrangements for public broadcasting. We have, nevertheless, taken the position that long-range funding cannot be undertaken before there exists a greater proximity between the goals of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act and the public broadcasting system's present structure and operation.

Appearing before this Subcommittee in February of 1972, I attempted to outline the areas in which the public broadcasting legislation and public broadcasting operation had gone their separate ways.

I noted at that time that lack of CPB financial support for station operations seriously undermined the autonomy of local stations, the keystone of public broadcasting; that a fixed-schedule, real-time network was coming to

pass, despite the plain meaning of the 1967 Act; that homogeneity through centralized program centers and mass audience techniques existed where the Act called for diversity; that public broadcasting too often failed in striking a reasonable balance between local and national programming, and among cultural, entertainment, informational and instructive programs.

Now this is not to say that public broadcasting did not have many substantial achievements. Along with the achievements there has been continued support from the Administration in the form of requests for appropriation from \$5 million in 1969 to \$45 million in 1974. I think this demonstrates a real recognition of the achievements of public broadcasting, and demonstrates the falsity of the charge that we are trying to dismantle the system. We must recognize, however, that public broadcasting is meant to be more than a government-funded, high-class variation on the commercial network theme. Therefore, we have taken the position that, until there is wholehearted compliance with the policies of the 1967 Act and the future directions for public broadcasting are clear, the Congress should not be expected to adopt a plan of long-range insulated funding.

Permit me then, against such a background to turn to the CPB-PBS agreement, which has dealt with some of these concerns, and which, I am delighted to say, has made progress in some areas. For example, OTP had called for a graduated distribution formula to assure local stations of financial support for their local operations. The CPB-PBS compromise incorporates this proposal, and strengthens the autonomy and independence of local public television stations by permitting local stations to share CPB funds on a proportion which increases as the level of Federal funding increases.

The consultative process created by the Agreement may not be the final answer to the problem of local station participation in program decision making, but it does remove some of the obstacles and inspires confidence that CPB and the local stations can work together in finding an equitable solution. Yet the strength of local stations in a public broadcast system of checks and balances will not be felt until the stations have realistic programming alternatives to the programs fed by the national network. We shall continue to work toward that goal.

Similarly, the Agreement's approach to the interconnection problem is a positive step in attempting to minimize the dangers of a fixed-schedule, real-time network, although there remain questions which only time and experience can answer. Whatever your opinion of the CPB-PBS compromise, several major areas require watchful waiting; indeed, if the compromise itself calls for quarterly review by the Partnership Review Committee, is it not appropriate for Congress to review that partnership in an authorization hearing one year from now?

But there are additional reasons why a one year authorization would be appropriate at this time. The future of public broadcasting is still left somewhat uncertain by this compromise. It is only realistic to adopt a wait and see attitude when faced with something which promises to do so much in so vast an enterprise as public broadcasting. It was appropriate in 1967 when Congress wrote the Public Broadcasting Act; it is appropriate now. Indeed, it is not inappropriate to recall that the one time Congress did provide multi-year authorizations, public broadcasting moved to centralized program production and fixed-schedule networking, the two major causes of our present difficulties.

Although the CPB-PBS agreement represents a step forward in dealing with such problems, the new PBS must use caution or else it could itself become a centralized bureaucracy, unresponsive to the needs of its members and forcing them to remit a portion of their grants from CPB to finance PBS operations.

Further, still unresolved is the question of journalistic public affairs programming on a taxpayer-supported broadcasting system. While the Agreement's plan to monitor objectivity and balance in programming is a good faith effort to deal with the problem, it is still fraught with danger.

If Federal funds are used to produce controversial public affairs programming without strong assurances of the objectivity and balance called for in the 1967 Act, the government has abdicated its responsibility to see that public broadcasting is used for all citizens. If the government itself oversees the balance and objectivity, it by that very fact has a chilling effect on vigorous broadcast journalism. It is a dilemma inseparable from government-funded news and information programming.

With this background, let me turn to the specifics of H.R. 2742 and H.R. 5045, which are identical, as well as S. 1090, which was passed by the Senate and referred to the House. First, the level of funding in these bills is too high. When all other demands in the federal budget are considered, it is unfortunately not possible to devote \$340 million to public broadcasting for Fiscal Years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977 (H.R. 2742; H.R. 5045), or \$130 million for Fiscal Years 1974 and 1975.

Appropriations at this level would represent an extraordinary increase in the rate of funding. Moreover, until the basic problems underlying public broadcasting are resolved, and until the CPB-PBS Agreement can be assessed in its operation over a year, the Congress should review the funding authorization next year and observe the Corporation's progress in its new partnership role with PBS.

The Administration's bill, H.R. 4560, provides for the healthy development of public broadcasting by extending for one year and by significantly increasing CPB's current authorization. This period would allow public broadcasting a real test under its new agreement and allow Congress time for evaluation. The Administration's bill requests \$10 million increased funding for public broadcasting, for a total of \$45 million. In addition, the HEW request for Fiscal Year 1974 funding of the Educational Broadcast Facilities Program will be at a \$13 million level, even though other HEW programs are feeling severe budgetary pressures.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Killian has referred to the CPB-PBS compromise as beginning a new era in public broadcasting. I have noted necessary reservations to certain provisions of that Agreement, but I should like to say for the record that public broadcasting has demonstrated real progress in getting its house in order. The time is now right for the Administration, the Congress and the CPB Task Force on Long-Range Funding to renew our joint efforts at achieving a meaningful, long-range funding program for public broadcasting. We hope that with all of us facing up to the problems there can be a more constructive mood among government, CPB, and the local educational stations.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: June 13, 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: RON ZIEGLER
HANK PAULSON

FROM:

DAVID PARKER

RE:

Corporation for Public Broadcasting
and Public Broadcasting Service

The attached is being sent to you for your advice and
recommendation.

Would you advise as soon as possible.

Thank you.

COMMENTS:

Box 2

folder ~~2044~~

11

15
Audience

JAMES R. KILLIAN, JR.

77 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139

June 6, 1973
ACTION
T/D
SCHEDULE ED.
DATE RECEIVED
JUN 11 1973
RMN MESSAGE
SPEAKERS BUREAU
OTHER

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

An agreement providing for a close partnership relationship has been reached between the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Public Broadcasting Service, representing the 146 autonomous local television licensees spread over the United States.

It should now be possible to make substantial progress in achieving the objectives of Public Broadcasting shared by so many people from all walks of life throughout the nation.

We would deeply appreciate your willingness to meet with us at your convenience to discuss how your Administration can properly, promptly, and effectively assist in the realization of these objectives.

Respectfully yours,

J. R. Killian, Jr.
J. R. Killian, Jr.
Chairman, Corporation
for Public Broadcasting

Ralph B. Rogers
Ralph B. Rogers
Chairman, Public
Broadcasting Service

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 14, 1973

Box 2
Folder *DPW*
11

MEMORANDUM FOR: DAVE PARKER
FROM: HANK PAULSON
SUBJECT: Public Broadcasting

James Killian, the current CPB Chairman, and Ralph Rodgers, the PBS Chairman, have requested a meeting with the President to discuss public broadcasting objectives.

James Killian is a Johnson appointee who was recently elected CPB Chairman in a display of independence by the Board, after the previous Chairman, Tom Curtis, resigned charging the Administration attempted to influence the Corporation to preclude funding of news and public affairs programs. Under the leadership of Killian, who supports the airing of public affairs shows, CPB worked out a compromise with PBS which established procedures for the broadcast of public affairs programs.

Ralph Rodgers, the PBS Chairman, is a wealthy Texas businessman, former Finance Chairman of George Bush's Senate campaign and a self-proclaimed supporter of the President. Nonetheless, he has opposed almost every aspect of the Administration's public broadcasting posture, actively working to re-establish public affairs shows and criticizing the Administration for putting public broadcasting on a "starvation diet."

I do not believe that the President should meet with these men now. The recent and stormy public broadcasting controversy and the present uncertainty regarding both the level of CPB funding and the way in which the CPB-PBS compromise will actually function, would make it difficult for the President to hold a meeting now. Killian has already announced his intention to resign before the end of the year and we are actively looking for a new Chairman. (We will appoint 7 new Board members over the next year.) At the end of the year, a public broadcasting meeting with the new Chairman would be more appropriate, because the funding problem will be resolved, we will know for sure whether or not the CPB-PBS compromise is a step in the right direction, and Tom Whitehead will have initiated new discussions to fashion a long-term solution to the public broadcasting problems.

cc.: KEN COLE

Handwritten initials

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20504

June 14, 1973

To: Tom
From: Hank *H.C.*
Subject: Rogers/Killian Meeting with the President

I have seen a letter to the President, dated June 6, from Messrs. Rogers and Killian requesting a meeting to discuss the new public broadcasting compromise and the joint objectives of CPB and PBS for public broadcasting. They state that they would like to have the President associate his Administration effectively and promptly with these objectives.

Apparently, Ziegler, and perhaps Garment, support the notion of such a meeting. Cole has been asked for his recommendation and Paulson's gut reaction is to oppose such a meeting at this time. Among the reasons for his opposition is that the meeting which Rogers and Killian requested is an end run around the President's communications and domestic affairs advisors and that it is premature for the President to discuss this subject. I suggested that the President may wish to wait until the current controversy over fiscal 1974 funding is resolved and until there is a new Chairman of CPB, which should come about sometime during the early fall.

cc: Brian Lamb

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20504

David CPB
Wick

June 15, 1973

DIRECTOR

MEMORANDUM FOR

Honorable Dave Parker
The White House

It has come to my attention that James Killian, the Chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and Ralph Rogers, the Chairman of the Public Broadcasting Service, have requested a meeting with the President to discuss public broadcasting.

As you know, I have had the principal responsibility for dealing with the public broadcasting controversy as it has developed over the past two years. Both Killian and Rogers have shown a marked disinclination to discuss their objectives with us. Indeed, over the past few months they have been strongly critical of the Administration's goals for public broadcasting and have accused us of attempting to starve or suffocate public broadcasting in order to undercut public broadcasting's ability to criticize the Administration.

In this regard, I think it would be a big mistake for the President to meet with these men, especially with the CPB funding still pending on the Hill, and I strongly oppose such a meeting. What is called for is a letter from the President to Killian and Rogers begging off on any meeting and urging them to meet instead with me. For your information, Killian and Rogers have not seen fit to discuss these matters with me or with Ken Cole.

Finally, while I can appreciate the present circumstances which may have led to a breakdown in the normal staffing procedures, it is disturbing to have to learn about this request for a meeting with the President through the White House grapevine rather than a direct request for

my views on this matter. In the future, I hope that we can return to the established procedures for staffing all issues dealing with public broadcasting and other communications matters that fall within the purview of my office.



Clay T. Whitehead

Rogers - Box 1 - Folder 1

R...
3... - 10...

Royers - Renane I

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages (Approximation)</u>
Open Meetings	200
Options Paper/Airlie Paper	50
Notes on Meeting w/House Staff	2
Notes on Meeting w/Senate Staff	2
Public Broadcasting Act	10
George Linn Paper	60
PBS (General)	60
PBS (Releases)	20
Radio Set-Aside	10
Satellite Access	75
Senate Mark-Up	50
Station Managers Meeting	10
Station List	40
Status Report and New York Times Article	10
Supplemental Approps	10
Title VI	25
Van Deerlin EEO Letter	5
Van Deerlin Comments on H.R. 9620	1
Van Deerlin NPR Speech	10
Waxman	6
Wirth Letter	2
Washington Post Editorial	1
"Section 399"	40

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages (Approximation)</u>
Misc. drafts of "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1978"	250
Public Broadcasting Committee Reports and Bills	150
Title VI and IX	35
Misc. Legis. Material	300
Master Copies A & S Package	200

Material requested by
Cainegie.

OTP Public Broadcasting Files-1969

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
<u>1968</u>		
11/25	NY Times article: "Noncommercial TV Faces a Period of Uncertainty"	1
<u>1969</u>		
1/13	NY Times article: "NET's Reply to Critic Disowns Favoring the left"	1
1/19	Newspaper article: "Petry Battles Programming"	1
1/--	Newspaper article: "Asks More Balance in FTV"	1
1/31	Letter: Wm. Duke to Thomas Whitehead re public relations benefits for Administration in public broadcasting and telecommunications	2
2/3	(Whitehead) Note to file: re phone conversation w/ Wm. Duke	1
2/10	Letter: Whitehead to Duke re meeting w/ Nick Zapple	1
2/24	(Whitehead) Note to file: re "people who have worked on PTV"	1
3/5	Note to file: re phone conversation w/ Wm. Duke	1
3/10	Note to file: re conversation between Whitehead and Arthur Albert of Public Broadcasting Lab	1
3/10	NY Times article: "Blueprint for Change"	1

<u>Date</u> 1969	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
3/13	Memo from Robert Ellsworth, Assistant to President, to H.R. Haldeman, D.P. Moynihan, L.A. DuBridge, H.G. Klein, and Robert Mayo inviting them to meeting with John Macy, CPB	1
3/18	Note to file: re meeting w/ Chalmers Marquis, NAEB	1
3/21	Notes on arrangements for meeting w/ John Macy (3/24)	11
3/25	Notes on arrangements for WH screening of 2 PBL films	4
3/25	Notes re reception w/ broadcast executives	3
3/26	Letter: Herbert Dordick to Whitehead re study Dordick was undertaking for CPB	2
3/28	Letter (and support material): Pres. Nixon to Sen. Pastore re TV violence	6
3/28	Letter: Marquis to Whitehead re NYC Conference (4/9/69). Attached to letter is 1969 educational broadcasting directory (128 pages)	4 128
3/31	Letter: Chas. Tower to Whitehead re Wrede Petersmeyer's testimony before Sen. Pastore. Attached to letter is testimony (19 pages)	1 19
4/2	Letter: Paul Laskin to Whitehead transmitting memo on TV and Children (7 pages)	1 7
4/3	Syracuse Post Standard article: "Retry to Balance Pro-Castro Film"	1
4/--	Article on "Three Faces of Castro"	2
4/30	Note on Pastore hearings	1

<u>Date</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
5/1	Memo from James DeLong, BOB, to Whitehead w/ draft article on subscription television	23
5/2	Note from Duke to Whitehead w/ Pace & Macy testimony (30 pages)	1 30
5/5	Memo from Whitehead to Rosel Hyde, Chairman, FCC re rules regarding commercial announcements on FTV	1
5/14	Telegram from Pres. Nixon to Univ. of Wisc. on occasion of 50th anniversary of educational radio at U. of Wisc w/ background material including 5/6 memo Whitehead to Dwight Chapin recommending that Nixon tape message	13
5/15	Note on conversation w/ Dr. Wm. Lyons re Marks testimony	1
5/19	Memo from Rosel Hyde to Whitehead re FCC policy regarding presentation of sponsored material or educational broadcasting	3
5/27	Letter: Whitehead to Duke transmitting check to cover expenses incurred at 4/7/69 meeting	1
5/27	Letter: Whitehead to Abbott Washburn transmitting check to cover expenses incurred at 4/7/69 meeting	1
5/28	Memo from Naomi Sweeney, BOB, to Whitehead transmitting draft bill and accompanying material prepared by CPB to provide for long-term financing	11
6/3	Memo from Whitehead to Steve Hess re John Macy's proposal for a White House Conference on Potential Uses of Communications Technology, w/attachments	5
6/4	Letter from Flanigan to Pace responding to Pace invitation to the President to meet w/CPB Board, w/attachments	5

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
<u>1969</u>		
7/11	Memo on 7/10 meeting w/ Macy, Schildhouse, 1 Coston, Roth, Penell and Button re PTV and CATV	1
7/14	Memo to Dick Gabel and Walt Hinchman from Whitehead re Schramm articles on Mass Media, w/attachments	50
7/14	Memo to Whitehead from Bill Duke re Public Broadcasting's Relevancy in Helping Solve Domestic Problems	8
7/16	Letter: John Macy to President Nixon requesting Admin. support of and participation in a conference designed to explore uses of telecommunications technology in solving domestic problems, w/attachment	10
7/17	Letter: John Macy to Peter Flanigan transmitting memo on how public broadcasting could be used to solve domestic problems, w/ attachment	9
7/17	Memo to Whitehead from Duke re types of participants at proposed telecommunications conference	4
7/18	Letter to Pres. Nixon from Chuck Marquis inviting Nixon to address NAEB, w/attachments	18
7/20	NY TIMES article: "Money is the Root of Coexistence"	1
7/23	Memo to Bill Timmons from Whitehead re hearings on frequency allocation	1
7/23	Memo to Flanigan from Whitehead w/draft reply to Macy letter of 7/16, w/attachments	9
8/7	Memo to Flanigan from Whitehead re Public Television and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting	7

<u>Date</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
8/25	CPB Change of Address Announcement	1	
9/10	Memo to Len Garment from Whitehead re opening of performing arts centers in Milwaukee, Wisc., Youngstown, Ohio, and Ames, Iowa	6	
9/15	Schedule entry re mtg w/ Peter Flanigan	1	
9/18	Schedule entry re meeting w/ A. James Ebel and Henry Goldberg	1	
9/19	Notes re cut in ERFPP funding	2	
9/25	Memo to Whitehead from Richard Nathan, BOB, re draft authorization bill for CPB	5	✓
9/28	Letter to Wm. Wood from Peter Flanigan re Broadcast Institute proposal	4	
9/29	Draft memo to Flanigan from Whitehead re working group on public broadcasting	3	✓
10/1	CPB change of address announcement	1	
10/3	Note on request for Presidential message to be sent to ceremonies marking opening of Md. Center for Public Broadcasting, w/attachments	36	
10/3	Note on inquiry from Bill Timmens' office regarding the President's feeling about an extension of CPB authorization	2	
10/13	Memo to Whitehead from Jonathan Rose re proposed working group on Public broadcasting	1	
10/16	Memo to Hazel _____ from Eva Daughtrey transmitting copies of correspondence w/CPB	1	
10/20	Memo to Len Garment from Eva Daughtrey transmitting draft Whitehead memo of 9/29 re public broadcasting working group	6	

<u>Date</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
10/21	Memo to Whitehead from Richard Nathan w/ revised version of a draft bill providing a 3-year authorization for CPB	5	
10/22	Draft memo to the President on meeting w/ CPB Board Chairman (Pace) and Director (Cole)	3	
10/22	Memo to the Staff Secretary from Flanigan w/agenda and brief for Nixon meeting w/ Pace and Cole	4	✓
10/23	(Whitehead) memo for the record re conversation w/ Lee DuBridge (White House science advisor)	1	
10/24	Memo to Robert Mayo, Director, BOB, from Flanigan re the President's meeting (that morning), with Frank Pace and Al Cole	1	✓
10/27	Notes on telephone calls re signing of FY 70 CPB authorization bill	3	
10/27	Note on telephone call from Jim Blum, BOB, re draft financing bill	1	X
10/27	(Flanigan) Memorandum for the President's file on 10/24 meeting w/ Cole & Pace	1	✓
10/30	Memo to Flanigan from Whitehead re noncommercial television programming sources	2	✓
10/31	Memo to Flanigan from Whitehead re public broadcasting working group	2	
11/3	Memo to Whitehead from Flanigan responding to Whitehead memo of 10/30	2	✓
11/4	Memo to Flanigan from Whitehead re public broadcasting working group	2	✓
11/4	Notes on telephone call from Paul Baltay re follow-up to Flanigan to Mayo memo of 10/24	3	

<u>Date</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
11/21	John Macy testimony before Senate Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee	29	
11/21	William Harley testimony before Senate Labor-HEW Appropriation Subcommittee	24	
11/22	Letter: Macy to Flanigan re 11/17 mtg	1	
11/22	Letter: Macy to Whitehead re 11/17 mtg	1	
11/22	Memo to the Staff Secretary from Peter Flanigan re Clark Molenhoff's proposal for legislation to require the networks to make complete transcripts of every show touching on government or politics, w/attachments	6	
11/24	Memorandum to Kenneth Cole from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments	1	
11/24	Notes on attendance at working group meeting	14	
11/24	Memo from William Harley w/press release on his 11/21 testimony	3	
11/26	Note on telephone call from Ed Roth, CPB, to Whitehead re ATS-1 and ATS-3 satellite experiments	1	
11/26	Note on telephone call from Em Elliott to Whitehead re public broadcasting	1	
11/26	Memo from Bill Duke to Peter Flanigan w/PBS public affairs program schedule, w/attachment	10	✓
11/26	Memo from Bill Duke to Whitehead w/PBS public affairs program schedule	2	✓
12/2	Letter: Chuck Marquis to Whitehead thanking Whitehead for letter from President Nixon to NAEB, w/attachment (63 pages)	1 63	

<u>Date</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
11/7	Notes on telephone calls re Nick Johnson speech to NCCB	1
11/10	Letter: Whitehead to Herb Dordick in response to Dordick's letter of 11/7 re use of PTV in vocational training and rehabilitation programs, w/attachments	4
11/10	John Macy speech, NAEB	13
11/12	Lee DuBridge speech, NAEB	19
11/12	Memo from Flanigan to Nancy Hanks, Charles McWhorter, Leonard Garment, Ray Price, Frank Shakespeare, and Clay Whitehead re Administration working group on public broadcasting	2
11/14	Notes on telephone calls re 11/17 meeting w/Whitehead, Flanigan and Macy	4
11/17	Note on telephone call from Jim Blum re draft financing bill	1
11/18	Memo to FCC Chairman Dean Burch from Whitehead inviting Burch to join Administration working group on public broadcasting	3
11/18	Memo to Flanigan from Leonard Garment accepting invitation to join working group	1
11/19	Notes on telephone calls from Jim Blum, BOB, re draft financing bill, w/ attachments	8
11/20	Note on telephone call to Bill Duke's office re getting background material on CPB for 11/24 working group meeting	1

<u>Date</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
12/3	Note to Whitehead from Marquis w/NAEB survey of financial and operating reports of PTV stations, w/attachments (26 pps.)	1 26	
12/4	Note on telephone call from Pat Gray re Flanigan to Secretary Finch memo of 11/17 concerning location of EBFP	2	
12/5	Letter: Macy to Whitehead re 12/1 meeting w/Bill Duke & Ralph Nicholson	1	
12/8	<u>U.S. News</u> interview w/John Macy	4	
12/15	Memo to Whitehead from Victor Zafra, ROB, w/draft Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970	5	
12/17	Memo to Whitehead from Bill Duke re reactions to "Sesame Street"		
12/18	Memo to Ray Price from Whitehead re paragraphs on public broadcasting for inclusion in 1970 State of the Union message	5	
12/18	Memo to John Campbell from Whitehead re CPB budget for FY 71, w/attachments	11	✓
12/18	Letter: Macy to President Nixon re FY 71 budget request for CPB	2	✓
12/20	Letter: Whitehead to Carl Shipley, Republican National Committee, re Pay TV, w/attachments	4	
12/20	Letter: Whitehead to H.S. Dordick re Dordick's letter on public broadcasting	1	
12/22	Memo to Ray Price from Flanigan re Whitehead memo of 12/18	1	

<u>Date</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
12/23	Letter: Flanigan to Jay Heifetz, UCLA, re television programming and the desirability of a public network in the U.S.	3
12/29	Memo to Whitehead from John Macy w/CPR's comments on the proposed Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970	
12/30	Letter: Macy to Whitehead re EEO, w/attachments	21
Undated	Material re ETV Demonstration and Interference Measurement	63
Undated	Washington Post editorial about WETA	1
Undated	Paper by William Duke on "A Model Cities Approach to Telecommunications Technology"	14
Undated	List of CPB Board of Directors and their terms	3

OTP Public Broadcasting Files - 1970

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
1/7	Memo to BOB Director Mayo from Flanigan re FY 71 budget for CPB, w/attachments (6 pages)	7
1/7	Whitehead telephone log	1
1/8	Memo to Whitehead from Macy w/CPB filing in support of free rates for television interconnection w/attachment (13 pages)	14
1/8	Memo to James Keogh from Whitehead re 1969 CPB report, w/attachment	5
1/10	Letter: Whitehead to Macy re Macy testimony before House Subcommittee on Education, w/attachment (19 pages)	20
1/10	Letter: Whitehead to Bill Duke re Macy testimony, w/attachment	8
1/12	Memo to Chester Finn from Whitehead re 1969 CPB report	
1/12	Letter: Whitehead to Herb Dordick re use of PTV in remedial and/or vocational high school training	4
1/13	Misc. notes re Flanigan memo of 12/17/69	17
1/27	Whitehead telephone log re "Today Show"	1
1/28	Whitehead phone log re FY 71 budget for CPB	
2/2	Memo to Flanigan from Mayore private contributions to CPB	2
2/2	Whitehead phone log re Nutrition Conference	1

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
2/3	Whitehead telephone log re mtg w/FCC and Nixon	1
2/6	Memo to Flanigan, Garment, Hanks, Shakespeare, McWhorter from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments	2
2/7	Letter: Cole to Flanigan re CPB Board appointments	1
2/9	<u>Broadcasting Magazine Article</u> : "FCC drops by for chat with Nixon"	1
2/9	Whitehead phone log re "Today Show"	1
2/10	Letter: Flanigan to E. Ralph Ivey re profane language on TV, w/attachments	4
2/10	CPB Report: "Public Broadcasting and Environmental/Ecological Education"	30
2/11	Memo to Whitehead from McWhorter re CPB Board appointments	1
2/11	Memo to Whitehead from Harry Flemming re CPB Board appointments	3
2/13	Memo to Whitehead from Flanigan w/BOB draft authorization for CPB, w/attachments	20
2/16	Memo to Whitehead from Duke w/transcript of Macy "Today Show" interview	9
2/16	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Duke, w/attachment	2
2/17	Text of remarks by John Macy, Columbia, SC	11
2/17	Letter: Duke to Whitehead re BOB draft authorization for CPB	2
2/18	Whitehead telephone log re CPB authorization	1

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
2/20	Memo to Checker Finn from Whitehead re State of Union message	2
2/24	Letter: Flanigan to Macy re Corporations Report on the experiment in the use of TV in connection w/the Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health	11
2/24	Letter: Flanigan to Macy re Administration's telecommunications reorganization plan	3
2/25	Whitehead phone log re Dick Moore	1
2/25	Memo to John Ehrlichman from Edward L. Morgan re CPB authorization	
2/25	Letter to Paul Bartlett, Variety Magazine, from Whitehead re article on communications	3
2/26	Whitehead phone logs re meeting w/Macy and CPB authorization	5
2/26	Letter to FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson from Whitehead in response to Johnson letter of 2/11 to Nixon re public broadcasting, w/attachments	6
2/27	Letter: Bill Casey to Flanigan re CPB Board appointments	1
2/28	Memo to James Keogh from Whitehead re President's statement on space	1
3/2	Memo to Whitehead from Henry Loomis re Variety Magazine article, w/attachment	5
3/2	Letter: Winter Horton, Jr., to Whitehead re NET, w/attachment	4
3/3	Whitehead phone log re meeting, w/Duke and Herb Dordick	1
3/3	Notes re CPB Board appointments	7

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
3/4	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/John Macy	1
3/5	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/John Macy	1
3/5	Whitehead phone log re Roscoe Carroll, CPB Board member	1
3/6	Whitehead phone logs re CPB Board appointments	2
3/10	Memo from James Blum to Whitehead w/excerpt from Congressional Record on introduction of the "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970"	2
3/10	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
3/13	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
3/13	Whitehead phone log re conversation w/Duke about nutrition film	1
3/13	Note to Whitehead from Macy re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	13
3/16	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
3/16	Memo to John Price from Whitehead re CPB film prepared for White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health	4
3/21	Whitehead memorandum for the record re CPB Board appointments	1
3/23	Memo to Bill Timmons from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	6
3/26	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	3

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
4/1	Notes re FCC testimony on "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970"	9	
4/3	Memo to Bryce Harlow, John Ehrlichman, H.R. Haldeman from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	11	✓
4/9	Memo to Bob Brown from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	4	
4/10	Letter: Dordick to Whitehead re television and vocational education	11	
4/10	Notes re HEW and FCC testimony on "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970"	10	
4/17	Whitehead telephone log re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	8	✓
4/17	Whitehead phone log re call from Bill Duke	1	
4/21	Memo to Flanigan and Harry Flemming from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	5	✓
4/22	Washington Post article re WETA firing	1	
4/23	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1	
4/24	Memo to Whitehead from Flanigan re Sloan Foundation Cable Commission	2	
4/24	Memo to Whitehead from Flanigan re CPB Board appointments	1	✓
4/28	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/ Bill Duke	1	
4/29	Memo to Haldeman from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments	1	✓
5/1	Memo to Bill Timmons from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments	3	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
5/4	Broadcasting article on CATV	2	
5/11	Letter: Whitehead to Dr. Paul Leithart re CBS TV program on health care	4	
5/11	Memo to Bill Casselman from Whitehead re Pay TV Legislation, w/attachments	5	
5/11	Letter: Whitehead to Nordick re vocational education, w/attachments (59 pages)	61	
5/13	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1	
5/15	Memo to Flanigan from Whitehead re CPB Board appointments	1	✓
5/18	Whitehead phone log re dinner w/ Walt Hinchman	1	
5/18	Press release on CPB Board appointments	1	✓
5/19	Whitehead telephone log re CPB Board appointments	2	✓
5/21	Memo to Whitehead from Casselman re CPB Board appointments and pay TV	1	
5/27	Whitehead phone log re John Johnson and CPB	1	
5/28	CPB press release on film grants	3	
6/5	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1	✓
6/8	Memo: William M. Lyons to Whitehead re "Current Problems in Broadcasting-- Public Broadcasting"	5	
6/10	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Duke	1	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
6/15	Whitehead phone log re Pay TV	1
6/16	Memo: Wolf Rommel to Whitehead re Pay TV, w/attachments	10
6/19	Memo: Whitehead to Nathan re CPB authorization	1
6/25	Remarks of John Macy before American Home Economic Association	
6/25	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Duke	1
6/26	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	3
6/26	Misc. notes on CPB authorization bill	4
6/29	CPB press release on 3 TV grants	3
6/30	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Macy and Frank Gillard	1
6/30	Letter: Everett Parker to Whitehead re UCC report, "Racial Justice in Broadcasting," w/attachment (16 pages)	17
7/6	Letter: Whitehead to Duke w/comments on Duke proposal for Bi-Centennial Workshop, w/attachment (8 pages)	9
7/8	CPB Press release re fellowships to study abroad	4
7/10	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
7/13	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
7/17	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
7/17	Draft memo: Whitehead to Flanigan and Flemming re CPB Board appointments	1

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
7/23	Memo: Whitehead to Harlow re subscription TV, w/attachments	4
8/11	Whitehead phone log re Sept 29 reception	1
8/20	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
8/21	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
8/24	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Duke and Ralph Nicholson	1
8/24	Whitehead phone logs re CPB Board appointments	5
8/24	Handwritten note: " <u>Bob Nieman took our papers,</u> " w/attachments (24 pages)	25
8/26	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Pace, w/attachments	3
8/26	Whitehead phone logs re meeting w/Duke and Nicholson	2
8/28	Memo: Bob Niemann to Whitehead re Administration posture w/respect to public broadcasting	4
9/1	Whitehead phone log re National Gallery reception	1
9/8	Misc. notes re CPB authorization	3
9/8	Whitehead phone log re paper on political broadcasting	1
9/9	Whitehead phone log re "Sesame Street" taping	1
9/9	CPB Report: "Federal Financing for CPB"	95

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
9/9	Letter: Whitehead to Macy re Richard Gould	1
9/14	Letter: Macy to Whitehead re Richard Gould	1
9/17	Letter: Joan Ganz Cooney to Whitehead re out-of-school programming, w/attachment	10
9/18	Whitehead phone log re National Gallery reception	1
9/21	Misc. notes re 3/26 meeting w/broadcast group	7
9/23	Whitehead phone log re CPB authorization	1
9/25	Memo: Stephen Doyle to Whitehead re CPB authorization	1
9/30	Whitehead phone log re NAEB convention	1
10/12	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/ Cong. Arends constituents	1
10/14	Memo to Whitehead from Eileen Nicosia, CPB, w/draft signing statement on S. 3558, CPB authorization	4
10/14	Memo: Lyons to Whitehead re 10/12 meeting in Cong. Arends' office	10
10/19	Memo: Stephen E. Doyle to Whitehead re "Mister Rogers Neighborhood"	2
10/19	Whitehead phone logs re CPB Board appointments	2
10/21	Letter: Whitehead to William D. Wright, National Coordinator, BEST, re 10/8 meeting w/Ozzie Davis and Ted Ledbetter	4

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
10/21	Whitehead telephone log re NAEB	1
10/22	Memo to Record re meeting w/ Representatives of Network Affiliates	6
10/27	Memo: Whitehead to Bruce Owen w/draft NAEB comments on 4 FCC dockets	5
10/29	<u>Wall Street Journal</u> article: "Is Free Speech Possible on TV?"	2
11/2	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
11/3	Whitehead phone log re CPB Board appointments	1
11/3	Whitehead phone log re 11/20 CPB Board meeting	1
11/4	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Duke	1
11/5	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/CPB Board	1
11/5	Memo: Bruce Owen to Whitehead re radio deregulation	1
11/5	Draft letter: Whitehead to Duke re information booklets on CPB, w/attachment	4
11/6	Memo: Owen to Whitehead re National Laboratory for Urban Communities	1
11/9	Whitehead phone log re 11/10 meeting w/ Richard Heffner, w/attachments	3
11/13	Memo: Owen to Dr. George Mansur re CPB financing	3
11/18	Letter: Whitehead to Cong. Tiernan re CPB financing, w/attachments	3
11/18	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Paul Bartlett concerning overseas broadcasting	9

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
11/21	Letter: Al Cole to Flanigan, responding to Flanigan letter of 11/9, attached, concerning "Banks and the Poor"	3	✓
11/23	Misc. notes re CPB Board appointments w/attachment (27 pages)	27	
11/24	Letter: Sen. Stevens to Whitehead re World Admin. Conference for Space Telecommunications	1	
11/25	Memo: Whitehead to Steve Doyle re meeting w/Chuck Marquis	10	
11/27	Letter: Whitehead to Dean Burch re Burch's proposed for long-range financing of public broadcasting, w/ attachments (23 pages)	24	✓
11/27	Letter: Whitehead to William Harley re 11/17 meeting w/attachment	2	
11/27	Letter: Whitehead to John Montgomery re 11/17 meeting, w/attachments	3	
11/30	Memo: Whitehead to Dr. Albert Horley, REW, re EBFP funding	1	
11/30	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan, Flemming, and Garment re CPB Board appointments	1	✓
12/1	Letter: Whitehead to Fred Weber, Rust Craft Broadcasting Co., re CATV, w/ attachments	4	
12/2	Whitehead phone log re CPB tape on drug project	1	
12/4	Whitehead phone log re meeting w/Duke	1	
12/7	Note on meeting w/Duke	2	
12/8	Letter: Whitehead to Eric Hager re WARC	1	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
12/8	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re "Advocates" program on guaranteed minimum income	11	✓
12/10	Remarks by John Macy before Annual Congress of Cities	8	
12/11	Letter: Whitehead to Ambassador Abbott Washburn re overseas broadcasting	7	
12/14	Letter: Whitehead to Mark Evans, Metromedia, re public interest programming, w/attachments	11	
12/15	Letter: Alan Steelman to Whitehead re National Advisory Council on Minority Business Enterprise membership	10	
12/15	Notes re CPB Board appointments	2	
12/19	<u>New York Times</u> article: "TV: An Enriching 'San Francisco mix'"	1	
12/24	Notes on 10/22/69 meeting w/John Hill re FCC matters	2	
12/24	Letter: Whitehead to Miss Evangeline Ward re kid vid, w/attachments	5	
12/24	Memo: Steve Doyle to Whitehead re CPB Board appointments, w/attachments	13	
12/29	Note to Dr. Mansur re phone conversation w/Bill Duke	1	
12/29	Memo to the file re phone conversation between George Mansur and Ken Goodwin concerning financing CPB, w/attachments	16	✓
12/30	Memo to Hinchman, Scalia and Doyle re financing CPB	1	✓

OTP Public Broadcasting Files - 1971

24

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
1/1	Legislation File	350 (approx)
1/5	Draft statement for inclusion in President's Budget message	3
1/5	Letter: Flanigan to Mr. L.E. Spry re "public interest standard"	
1/6	Whitehead telephone log re licensing study	1
1/8	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia re development of long-term financing proposal	1
1/11	Memo to File from George Mansur re mtg. w/FCC & OMB re long-term financing proposal	1
1/18	Letter: Alan Steelman to Whitehead w/biographical info on National Advisory Council on Minority Business Enterprise members for CPB consideration	15
1/25	Letter: Whitehead to Ronald Levine re political advertising	3
1/26	Letter: Steelman to Whitehead re CPB Bd Appts	6
1/26	Letter: Whitehead to Marquis re EBFP needs	8
1/27	Whitehead phone log re invitation from Duke	1
1/28	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Duke and Scalia	1
1/29	Letter: Whitehead to Cole re mtg with selected CPB directors, w/attachments	6

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
2/1	Letter: Whitehead to Charles R. Novitz re broadcast news operations, w/attachments	5
2/5	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia re ABC children's workshop	2
2/9	Whitehead phone log re transmittal of CPB annual report	1
2/11	Letter: Cole to Whitehead re mtg w/selected CPB directors	1
2/11	Whitehead phone log re transmittal of CPB annual report	1
2/22	Memo: Whitehead to Bruce (Owen?) re FCC-FTC study of deceptive advertising for children	1
2/23	Whitehead phone log re CPB Bd appts	1
2/25	Memo: Scalia to Whitehead re CPB Bd appts	1
2/25	Misc notes re CPB Bd appts	7
3/3	Whitehead phone log re Bill Buckley reception	1
3/4	Letter: Cole to Whitehead re mtg w/selected CPB directors	1
3/10	Letter: Gary Tredway to Scalia re re CPB Bd appts	6
3/15	Memo: Flanigan to Whitehead re mtg w/selected CPB directors	2
3/15	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia CPB re statement on cable TV	1
3/16	Whitehead phone log re CPB screening of "Sesame Street"	1
3/17	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re mtg w/selected CPB directors, w/attachments	2

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
3/19	Whitehead phone log re 4/6 mtg	1
3/23	Whitehead phone log re Buckley reception	1
3/24	Misc notes re 4/6 CPB/ACNO mtg	6
3/24	Memo: Bruce Owen to Whitehead re "Fourth Network"	8
3/24	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re CPB Bd appts, w/attachments	21
3/25	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/selected CPB directors	1
3/25	Letter: Scalia to Gary Tredway re CPB Bd appts	1
4/1	Whitehead phone log re Buckley reception.	1
4/5	Whitehead phone log re Duke	1
4/6	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/selected CPB directors (4/13)	1
4/6	Misc notes on mtg w/Joan Ganz Cooney	3
4/7	Whitehead phone log re CPB Bd appts	1
4/12	Whitehead phone logs re mtg w/selected CPB directors	2
4/13	Whitehead phone logs re mtg w/selected CPB directors	2
4/13	Misc notes re 2 p.m. mtg w/selected CPB directors	19
4/13	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia re letter to Pace	1
4/14	Whitehead phone log re Wrather request for Presidential mtg w/CPB directors	1

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u> ²⁷
4/22	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Macy and Duke	1
4/22	Misc notes re mtg w/ CPB directors	5
4/23	Whitehead phone log re Wrather request, w/misc notes	6
4/23	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Macy and Duke	1
4/23	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Henry Loomis, USIA	1
4/23	Memo: Chapin to Flanigan re Presidential Schedule Proposals	5
4/24	Letter: Henry Goldberg to David Lichtenstein re CPB Bd appts	4
4/28	Draft letter: Whitehead to Elliot Richardson re long-term financing bill	2
4/28	Misc notes re 4/29 mtg w/Duke & Macy & proposed mtg w/the President	6
4/30	Memo: Whitehead to Ken Cole re long-term financing bill	1
5/12	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Dr. Everett Parker	1
5/12	Whitehead phone log re long-term financing bill	1
5/13	Whitehead phone log re call from Al Snyder concerning news & public affairs on PTV	1
5/16	Letter: Macy to Whitehead re status of long-term financing bill	8
5/17	Memo: Whitehead to Herb Klein re dominance of liberal Democrats on panels at Federal Communications Bar Assn. mtg	1

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
5/20	Letter: Whitehead to Macy re status of long-term financing bill	3	
5/20	Letter: Whitehead to Jack Wrather re April mtg w/Al Cole	2	
5/20	Letter: Whitehead to Frank Pace re mtg w/selected CPB directors	1	✓
5/25	Memo: Scalia to George Crawford (Flanigan's Ofc) re Macy letter of 5/12, w/attachments	10	
5/25	Whitehead phone log re 6/2 mtg w/Flanigan, Wrather & Cole	1	
5/26	Whitehead phone log re 6/2 mtg w/Flanigan, Wrather, Cole & Pace	1	
5/27	Whitehead phone log re 6/2 mtg w/Flanigan, Wrather, Cole & Pace	2	✓
5/28	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re proposed exclusion of CPB from classroom programming	2	
6/1	Whitehead phone log re 6/2 (changed from 6/2) mtg w/Pace, Wrather & Cole, w/attachments	2	
6/4	(Scalia) Draft Memorandum to the President re "Reasons for long-term Financing of the CPB" <u>CLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL</u>	3	
6/4	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia w/handwritten notes (on 6/3 mtg (?))	2	✓
6/7	Letter: Wm Harley, NAEB, to Whitehead re NAEB resolution on long-term financing	2	
6/10	Letters: Scalia to Martin Faigin (OMB), Garry Cook (HEW), Kenneth Goodwin (FCC), George Crawford (WH), and Duke (CPB), transmitting draft long-term financing bill	5	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
6/18	Notes re Zelma George appointment to CPB Bd	2
6/18	Letter: Whitehead to Cole re June 3 mtg	2
6/18	Note on CPB Bd appts	1
6/18	Letter: Whitehead to Pace re 6/3 mtg	2
6/18	Memo: Flanigan to the President re Corporation for Public Broadcasting	4
6/18	Scalia draft of Flanigan memo	4
6/21	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Dr. James Killian (6/22)	1
6/22	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia re mtg w/Killian	1
6/24	Letter: Whitehead to Zelma George re CPB Bd appt	2
6/24	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Bill Duke	1
6/28	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Bill Duke	1
6/29	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Pace & Killian prior to 7/16 CPB Bd mtg	1
6/30	Whitehead phone log re 7/1 mtg w/Bill Duke	1
7/2	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia, w/Wrather to Flanigan letter of 6/22 re replacement of CPB personnel	3
7/3	Memo: Frank Shakespeare to Whitehead re television executives to contact	1
7/7	Whitehead telephone log re 7/9 mtg w/Colson & Flanigan, w/attached "Action Memorandum re CPB"	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	30
7/8	Letter: Herb Dordick to Whitehead re Bavarian TeleKolleg & other matters	3	
7/10	Memo: Scalia to Colson & Flanigan re CPB expenditures	1	✓
7/12	Memo: Alvin Snyder to Colson, Flanigan, Scalia, Whitehead re <u>NY TIMES</u> article on PTV, attached	4	
7/15	Memo: Henry Goldberg to Scalia re July 9 "Action Memorandum" and July 10 memo concerning CPB	6	✓
7/26	Letter: Macy to Wilfred Rommel, OMB, w/CPB comments on Administration's draft "Public Telecommunications Act of 1971"	21	
8/3	Whitehead phone log re viewing tapes at CPB	1	
8/4	Whitehead phone log re viewing tapes	1	
8/9	(Scalia) draft memo: Flanigan to the President re options concerning CPB	5	✓
8/13	Letter: Richard Nathan, BoB, to Whitehead re long-term financing for CPB		
8/16	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Frank Pace	1	
8/17	(Scalia) draft memo: Flanigan to the President re options concerning CPB	13	✓
8/25	Letter: Whitehead to Prof. D. Mullally re funding public broadcasting	1	
8/31	Letter: Whitehead to Duke re Duke letter of 8/23 concerning long-term financing	4	
9/3	Letter: Robt Larsen, WGBH, to Henry Goldberg re funding for PTV	2	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
9/3	Memo: Goldberg to Whitehead re "CPB's Proposed Changes in OTP Public Telecommunications Bill"	3
9/7	Memo: Wrather to Whitehead w/letter to Wrather from Macy re Bill Moyers and Martin Agronsky	2
9/8	Letter: Whitehead to Robert Larson, WGBH, re instructional technology	1
9/9	Letter: David Ives, WGBH, to Scalia re funding for public television	1
9/10	Memo: Whitehead to Taft Schreiber re "Station-Ownership Ties in the 92d Congress"	2
9/15	Whitehead phone log re CPB Bd mtg and long-term financing bill	1
9/16	Whitehead phone log re 9/20 mtg w/John Macy	1
9/22	Letter: Macy to Scalia re CPB preview reception	1
9/23	Three (Whitehead) drafts of Memorandum for the President re CPB	27
9/23	Memo to Peter Flanigan from John M. Huntsman, Staff Secretary, for the President, re CPB funds	2
9/24	Whitehead phone logs re request from Al Snyder for copy of 9/23 Memo to the President, w/attachment	10
9/27	Letter: Goldberg to David Davis re "network" programming	1
9/27	Memo: David Parker to Peter Flanigan re scheduling mtg for President w/CPB Bd	2

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	32.
9/28	(Whitehead) draft memorandum for the President re public affairs programming of public broadcasting	5	✓
9/28	Whitehead phone log re Jack Wrather call	1	
9/29	Whitehead phone logs re Jack Wrather call	2	✗
9/30	Whitehead draft memorandum for the President re CPB	4	✓
10/4	Whitehead phone log re 10/7 mtg w/John Macy	1	
10/4	Letter: Wrather to Whitehead re NPACT	15	✓
10/5	Letter: Whitehead to Burch, FCC, re radio deregulation	2	
10/5	Memos: Whitehead to Ehrlichman, Haldeman, Garment & Colson re CPB, w/draft memorandum to the President attached	10	✓
10/6	Memo: Garment to Whitehead re draft residential memo	1	✓
10/6	Memo: Ehrlichman to Flanigan re draft Presidential memo	1	✓
10/6	Memos: Whitehead to Robert Finch, HEW; George Shultz, OMB; Ron Ziegler, WH; and Herb Klein, WH, w/draft memorandum to the President, attached	9	✓
10/7	Memo: Finch to Whitehead re draft Presidential memo	1	✓
10/7	Memo: Klein to Whitehead re draft Presidential memo	1	✓
10/7	Memo: Flanigan to Ehrlichman re letter from Wrede Petersmeyer	9	
10/12	Whitehead phone log re draft Presidential memo	2	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	33
10/12	Whitehead phone log re Klein's 10/7 memo	1	✓
10/12	Memo: Colson to Flanigan re Presidential memo	1	✓
10/12	Revised draft Memorandum to President from Whitehead through Flanigan re Public Broadcasting	3	✓
10/12	Memo: Wrather to Whitehead w/Macy memo to CPB Bd re "Great American Dream Machine"	3	✓
10/14	Memo: Linda Smith to Eliska Hasek re Presidential Message to NAEB	4	
10/15	Memo: Jon Rose to Larry Higby re CPB	3	✓
10/19	Memo: Whitehead to Gene Cowen re 10/15 memorandum to the President	1	
10/19	Material on CPB budget	2	
10/20	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Fred Malek re CPB	1	
10/20	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan w/revised draft of Presidential memo attached	9	✓
10/20	Whitehead: Remarks to NAEB	12	✓
10/21	Whitehead phone log re call from Dr. Warren Wade concerning PTV	1	
10/26	Letter: Whitehead to Michael Collins re EEN mtg.	3	
10/26	Misc notes re CPB invitation to suggest names for NFACT Bd	5	
10/29	Note: Bruce Owen to Whitehead re book by Peck, Noll & McGowan on television, w/excerpt on PTV	10	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
10/--	Memo: Scalia to Whitehead re Marquis memo to NAER Bd re financing legislation	4
11/4	Memo: Whitehead to Colson re memo to the President	1
11/4	Whitehead phone logs re memo to the President	2
11/4	Letter: Jim Karayn, NPACT, to Whitehead re NPACT	3
11/5	Whitehead phone log re 11/9 mtg w/Frank Pace	1
11/5	Memo: John P. Witherspoon, CPB, to Station Managers re Whitehead Oct. 20 Miami Speech	10
11/5	Letter: Whitehead to Wrede Pertersmeyer re IRTS speech	5
11/8	Whitehead phone log re 11/11 mtg. w/Tom Moore	1
11/9	Whitehead Memorandum for Record re CPB Bd appts	1
11/9	Memo: Linda Smith to Scalia w/ 11/4 Karayn letter	4
11/12	Whitehead phone log re 11/15 mtg w/Bill Harley	1
11/15	(Whitehead) Memorandum for the President re Public Broadcasting	5
11/16	Whitehead phone log re Pace	1
11/16	Whitehead phone log re status of memo for the President	1
11/22	Memo: Alvin Snyder to Flanigan re examples of bias in public broadcasting	5

✓
✓

✓

✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
11/23	Letter: Russ Raycroft to Henry Goldberg re Whitehead IRTS & Miami speeches	9	
11/24	Memo: Whitehead to Haldeman re "Vanocur/MacNeil situation"	1	✓
12/1	Whitehead phone log re memo on CPB salaries	1	
12/1	Memo: Flanigan to Haldeman re public broadcasting options	3	✓
12/1	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re salary issue	6	✓
12/2	Memo: Whitehead to Fred Malek re "Great American Dream Machine" Sequence on the American Communist Party	2	
12/2	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re Flanigan to Haldeman memo of 12/1	1	✓
12/3	Memo: Whitehead to Klein re salary issue, w/clippings	6	
12/3	Memo: Whitehad to Haldeman re salary issue, w/clippings	6	
12/7	Memo: Flanigan to Whitehead, Garment, Colson, Shakespeare, Malek re Flanigan to Haldeman memo of 12/1	1	✓
12/7	Whitehead phone log re Bill Harley appt 12/10		
12/8	Letter: Whitehead to Warren Wade re NAEB speech	3	
12/17	Whitehead phone log re 1/4 mtg w/Pace & Macy	5	
12/17	Notes on proposed Presidential mtg w/Broadcast executives	5	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	36
12/17	Whitehead phone log re 12/22 mtg w/Flanigan & Tom Moore, CPB	1	
12/20	CPB Budget estimates	1	
12/22	List of Ford Foundation grants in the field of non-commercial broadcasting	1	
12/22	Memo: Whitehead to Richard Cook, Deputy Ass't. to the President re CPB	2	✓
12/22	Memo: Flanigan to Whitehead w/minutes of CPB Exec. Comm. mtg 12/15 & 12/16	11	✓
12/23	Memo: Scalia to Whitehead analysis of Admin plan for CPB	4	✓
12/23	Draft letter: Flanigan to Cong. Springer re 1/72 CPB Bd mtg	1	✓
12/28	CPB Report	100	
12/	CPB Resolution on news & public affairs programs	4	
Undated	Whitehead handwritten notes	3	
Undated	CPB Budget info	5	
Undated	Memo re political use of fairness doctrine	5	

OTP Public Broadcasting Files - 1972

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
1/1-12/31	Legislation File	350 (approx)	
1/5-12/22	List of Whitehead phone calls re CPB	15	
1/4	Whitehead log re mtg w/Bill Harley	1	
1/6	Whitehead log re 1/12 mtg w/Flanigan and Tom Moore	1	
1/7	Whitehead log re 1/11 mtg w/Jack Wrather	1	
1/10	Letter: Russ Raycroft to Henry Goldberg re Oct 1971 NAEB speech	6	
1/10	Memo: Flanigan to Whitehead re Cong. Springer's conversation w/Frank Schooley	3	✓
1/14	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re PTV funding for FY 73	2	✓
1/14	Memo: Ehrlichman to Whitehead re FTC	3	
1/17	Memo: Tom Moore to Whitehead re "Channel One: newsletter	4	
1/17	Letter: Whitehead to James Krogh re Win Horton's "Plan for PTV" w/attachment (17 pp)	18	
1/19	Memo: Linda Smith to Whitehead re Wrede Petersmeyer position on cable compromise w/attachments	7	
1/20	Whitehead log re 1/20 mtg w/Pace & Macy	1	
1/20	Memo: Henry Goldberg to Whitehead re mtg w/NPT Exec Comm	1	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
1/--	Draft CPB Bd resolution re public affairs programming	1	
1/24	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan w/draft memo to the President re CPB Bd action on news & public affairs programming	6	✓
1/25	Memo: Macy to Whitehead transmitting copy of CPB Bd resolution of 1/22	4	✓
1/25	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan, Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Colson re mtg Whitehead had w/Wrede Petersmeyer	2	
1/25	Letter: Taft Schreiber to Whitehead re Prime Time Rule w/attachments	26	
2/1	(Whitehead) Memo for the Record re Conversation w/Colson concerning "Fairness Doctrine"	1	
2/4	Memo: Jonathan C. Rose to Whitehead re Wrede Petersmeyer's comments on CATV compromise, w/attachment	9	
2/4	Letter: Macy to Moore re national programming funded by CPB w/attachment	14	
2/7	Schedule proposal for meeting between Whitehead & the President re communications matters	1	
2/7	Memo: Goldberg to Whitehead re proposed mtg w/Russ Raycroft of HEW	1	
2/8	Whitehead log re 2/11 meeting w/Tom Gherardi	1	
2/9	"CONFIDENTIAL" Letter: Moore to Whitehead re CPB program funding status, w/attachment	30	✓
2/10	Memo: Whitehead to Klein re mtg Whitehead had w/Wrede Petersmeyer, w/attachments	10	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
2/14	Whitehead log re conversation w/Jack Wrather's ofc concerning date of CPB Exec. Committee mtg	1	
2/16	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Jack Wrather	1	
2/18	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Jack Wrather	1	
2/21	TV Digest Article on ACLU report re White House manipulation of public broadcasting	1	
2/22	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/Jack Wrather	1	✓
2/22	Memo: Brian Lamb. to Whitehead re FCC & CPB Board appts	3	✓
2/22	Memo: Goldberg to Whitehead re ACLU report on PTV	1	
2/22	Memo: Scalia to Whitehead re CPB Bd appts	2	
2/23	Memo: Eva _____ to Whitehead re PBS study of national program funding	4	
2/24	Memo: Whitehead to Malek re CPB Bd appts	9	✓
2/25	Letter: Whitehead to Cong. Philip Rupe re CPB funding	5	
2/25	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/ Jack Wrather	2	
2/28	Memo: Whitehead to Malek re CPB Bd appts	3	
2/28	Whitehead log re proposed mtg with the President	1	
2/29	Whitehead phone log re 3/2 meeting between Whitehead, Moore and Wrather.	1	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	40.
3/1	Memo: Goldberg to Lamb re Kallm (FM) interview on public broadcasting	1	
3/1	Hartford Gunn speech before Western Educational Society for Telecommunications	13	✓
3/2	Letter: Whitehead to Petersmeyer re recent Whitehead speeches	2	
3/2	Letter: Whitehead to Cong. Torbert Macdonald re Whitehead mtgs w/public broadcasting representatives	6	
3/3	Memo: Whitehead to Dan Kingsley re CPB Board appts.	1	
3/7	Whitehead log re 3/9 mtg. w/ John Macy	1	✓
3/8	Whitehead log re 3/10 mtg w/Frank Pace	1	✓
3/9	Whitehead log re 3/10 mtg w/Frank Pace	1	
3/9	Whitehead phone log re conversation w/Jack Wrather	1	
3/10	Memo: Whitehead to Kingsley re CPB Bd appts	1	
3/15	Whitehead log re instructions to Scalia concerning CPB		
3/17	Draft letter: Scalia to Professor L. Jaffe re use of public funds for politically controversial programming	3	
3/20	Kevin Phillips article (From Neal Freeman) "Populism & the Power Elite"	2	
3/20	Letter: Petersmeyer to Whitehead re Whitehead letter of 3/1	3	
3/21	Memo: Frederick Breitenfeld to Whitehead, w/resume	4	
3/22	(Scalia) Draft memo: "Administration Objectives on Public Broadcasting Financing," w/attachment	15	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	41
3/24	Memo: Whitehead to Scalia transmitting preliminary draft of PBS "Statement of Policy on Program Standards", w/attachment	14	
3/24	Letter: Scalia to Macy re 1972 Public Television Conference, w/attachments	8	
3/27	Memo: Brian (Lamb) to Whitehead re status of public broadcasting legislation	2	✓
3/27	Letter: Whitehead to Gov. Ronald Reagan thanking Reagan for his public support of the Admin position on public broadcasting, w/attachment	3	
3/27	Memo: Whitehead to Henry Kissinger re Presidential Visit to Canada	3	
3/28	Memo: David Parker to Colson, Ehrlichman, Flanigan, Klein, & Whitehead re proposed Presidential mtg w/broadcast executives	3	
3/29	Letter: Whitehead to John Boor re support of Admin's attempts to provide improved funding for public broadcasting, w/attachment	6	
3/30	Whitehead phone log re conversation w/Clark MacGregor concerning appointing Cong. Bill Springer to CPB Bd, w/attachment	2	✓
3/31	Memo: Chuck Marquis to Scalia w/material re station participation in CPB decision-making	6	
4/4	Letter: Macy to Whitehead w/copy of remarks to PTV convention	8	
4/4	Whitehead log re phone call from Neal Freeman	1	—

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	42
4/4	Memo: Eva _____ to Whitehead re 1971 Annual Report of CPB	1	
4/6	Gunn report to members of PBS	12	
4/10	Letter: Warren Kraetzer to Whitehead re PTV Conference	1	
4/11	Whitehead phone log re phone call from Jon Rose concerning CPB Bd appts	1	✓
4/14	Whitehead log re CPB Bd appts, w/attachment	4	
4/18	Draft reply for Colson to Cong. Brown's letter of 3/28 re public broadcasting & CPB appts	12	
4/19	Whitehead log re 4/20 mtg w/Tom Moore	1	✓
4/20	Whitehead log re 4/21 mtg w/Neal Freeman	1	✓
4/24	Whitehead log re 4/25 mtg w/Henry Loomis	1	✓
4/24	Memo: Brian Lamb to Elizabeth Burke re National Council on the Arts appts	4	
4/24	Draft letter: Ehrlichman to Wrede Petersmeyer re Presidential mtg w/broadcast executives	5	
4/25	(Whitehead) Draft Memorandum for the President, "Progress Report on Public Broadcasting"	3	✓
4/26	Whitehead log re phone call from Tom Moore	1	
4/26	Memo: Tod R. Hulin to Colson, Flanigan, Rose & Whitehead re Ehrlichman letter to Petersmeyer	4	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	43
4/27	Revised (Whitehead) draft memorandum for the President, "Progress Report on Public Broadcasting"	2	✓
4/27	Whitehead log re phone call from Tom Moore concerning NET funding	1	✓
4/27	Letter: Tom Moore to Whitehead transmitting CPB recommended 1973 TV Production Budget, w/attachment (118 pps)	119	✓
4/27	Letter: Tom Moore to Whitehead re CPB Bd regulation of programming	4	✓
4/27	Letter: Whitehead to Sen. Hansen re Admin position on public broadcasting	4	
4/27	Letter: Whitehead to Petersmeyer re Whitehead's Colorado Broadcasters speech w/attachments	10	
4/28	Letter: Whitehead to Cong. Robert Michel re appropriations for CPB for FY 73		✓
5/1	Whitehead phone log re CPB Bd appts	1	
5/2	Whitehead phone log re mtg w/ Mr. Ted Braun	1	
5/10	Draft letter: Robert Finch to Thomas P. Pike re public broadcasting, financing, w/attachments	16	
5/10	NAEB newsletter with item on CPB's cut of NPACT's funding. Sent to Whitehead by Tom Moore.	6	✓
5/11	Letter: Ralph Vinovich to Brian Lamb w/answers to questions Cong. Michel submitted to NAEB	7	✓
5/11	Letter: Tom Moore to Whitehead transmitting material sent Frank Pace concerning NPACT	24	✓

Date	<u>Brief Description</u>	Pages	44
5/17	Memo: Whitehead to Jim Loken w/ <u>Variety</u> article on US aid to film industry	2	
5/17	Whitehead log re 5/17 meeting w/Patrick Buchanan & memo to Buchanan	7	✓
5/18	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan w/ <u>Memphis Press Scimitar</u> article, "PBS to Televis Nude Ballet"	2	
5/18	Whitehead phone log re call to Dan Kingsley concerning CPB Bd appts	1	
5/22	Memo: Kingsley to Whitehead re CPB Bd appts w/attachments	16	
5/25	White House press release re CPB Board appts, w/attachments	8	✓
5/30	Letter: Melsyn M. Muchnik to Scalia re political & public affairs programming on public broadcasting	1	
6/1 (approx)	Material OTP prepared for House floor debate on public broadcasting authorization including memo on public broadcasting, legislative history, memo on CPB's use of Federal funds, draft Floor Statements, draft amendments, vote tallies	127	✓
6/--	Misc material re CPB Bd appts	14	
6/2	<u>Washington Post</u> article: "CPB: Under Fire Again"	1	✓
6/2	Letter: Warren Wade, KTEH, to Whitehead re CPB Bd appt	2	
6/2	Memo: Whitehead to Joseph Hughes w/ <u>Washington Post</u> articles "CPB: Under Fire Again"	2	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
6/2	Memo: Goldberg to Eliska Hasek, WH, re Presidential Message to the Citizens of Nebraska on the occasion of the Dedication of the Nebraska Telecomm Center, w/attachments	6	
6/5	Memo: Whitehead to Peter A. Michel re network antitrust suits	3	
6/6	Whitehead phone log re CPB Bd appts	1	
6/9	Whitehead log re mtg w/Jack Wrather	1	✓
6/9	Whitehead log re mtg w/Ted Braun	1	✓
6/9	Whitehead log re mtg w/Gloria Anderson	1	✓
6/15	Whitehead log re mtg w/Henry Loomis	2	✓
6/15	Whitehead log re mtg w/Harry Dent	2	
6/16	Whitehead log re mtg w/Henry Loomis		✓
6/19	Memo: Herb Klein to Whitehead re mtg w/broadcast owners	8	
6/20	Memo: Whitehead to the President re "Current Broadcasting Issues"	2	
6/20 (approx)	Draft Minority Report on S. _____, Public Broadcasting Financing Act	11	✓
6/20	Whitehead log re mtg w/Wm Heimlich	3	
6/20	Whitehead log re mtg w/Herb Klein	1	
6/21	Whitehead log re mtg w/Wrede Petersmeyer, w/attachments	8	
6/22 (approx)	Draft floor statement (used by Sen. Thurmond)	4	✓
6/22 (approx)	Draft floor statement (used by Sen. Beall)	4	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	46
6/23	(Whitehead) memorandum for the Record re 6/22 mtg w/Flanigan, Klein and six broadcasters, and re 6/22 Presidential mtg w/broadcasters	10	✓
6/26	Whitehead log re 6/27 mtg w/Irving Kristol		✓
6/26	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan w/memorandum to the President recommending veto of CPB authorization bill	9	✓
6/27	Draft memorandum for the President re: "Status of Issues Raised in (6/22) Broadcasters mtg" (10 drafts)	60	
6/27	Whitehead log re conference call w/Jon Rose & Tom Curtis	1	
6/27	Memo: Robert Miller, WH, to Whitehead w/selected news clips	4	
6/27	Letter: Whitehead to Theodore Black re CPB Bd appt, w/attachments	4	
6/28	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan w/final draft memorandum for the President re "Status of Issues Discussed in Broadcasters mtg"	5	
6/28	Memo: Whitehead to Ray Price re veto of public broadcasting bill	1	
6/28	Memo: Flanigan to Colson, Ehrlichman, Klein, MacGregor, Weinberger & Whitehead re veto of public broadcasting bill, w/proposed veto message	4	
6/28	Second draft proposed Presidential veto message	3	
6/28	Memo: Bob McDermott, WH, to Whitehead re veto of public broadcasting bill w/3 drafts of proposed veto message	10	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	47
6/28	Drafts of proposed veto message w/Henry Goldberg margin notes	10	
6/28	Memo: Whitehead to Gerald Warren, WH, re "Background Regarding Public Broadcasting for the President's News Conference"	10	✓
6/29	Memorandum for the Staff Secretary from Peter Flanigan re veto of public broadcasting bill, w/proposed veto message	5	✓
6/29	Memo: Bruce(Owen) to Whitehead re "Fourth Network"	1	
6/29	Letter: Whitehead to James Conley re Meredith Broadcasting	4	
6/29	Letter: Whitehead to Cong. Bill Springer re Accuracy in Media complaint concerning NPACT program on Vietnam	9	
6/30	Whitehead phone log re conversation w/Ron Geisler about veto message	1	
6/30	Presidential veto message	2	✓
6/30	List of people Whitehead & Brian (Lamb) called re CPB veto	1	
6/30	Memorandum to the President from Whitehead re Conversation w/Frank Pace	1	✓
6/30	Memo: Bruce Owen to Whitehead & Scalia re "Picking up the pieces"	4	
6/30	Memo: Helen Hall to Whitehead re legislative summary for Joseph Hughes	8	
Undated	List of CPB Bd of Directors & terms	2	
7/1	Memorandum for the President from Flanigan re "Status of Issues Discussed in Last Week's Broadcasters Meeting" w/attachment	6	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	48
7/5	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re CPB Bd appts	3	✓
7/5	Log re call to Norman Cousins concerning CPB veto	1	
7/6	Log re call from Al Cole concerning Irving Kristol and Tom Curtis	1	✓
7/6	Log re memo to the President concerning 6/22 Broadcasters' mtg, w/attachment	3	
7/6	Memo: Pat Buchanan to Whitehead re material on public broadcasting	1	
7/7	Letter: Raymond Hurlbert, Alabama ETV, to Whitehead re Presidential veto, w/attachment	4	
7/10	Letter: Brian Lamb to David Webster, BBC, re children's programming	2	
7/13	Letter: Cong. Frenzel to Whitehead re CPB, Bd appts	3	
7/14	White House Press Release re appt. of Tom Curtis to CPB Bd	3	✓
7/15	Memo: Scalia to Michael Smith, WH, re mail on Presidential veto	5	
7/17	Log re call from John Macy's secretary	1	
7/18	(Goldberg) Draft letter for Ron Ziegler's signature re Presidential veto	4	
7/18	Log re call from Joseph Hughes	1	
7/19	Copy of telegram to Thomas Curtis from NAEB re Curtis' appointment	1	
7/19	Memo: Norman Cousins to Whitehead w/attachments re National Programming Council for PTV	35	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
7/20	Letter: Tod R. Hullin, Asst to Ehrlichman, to Jim Barrett, NPR, re NPR	2	
7/20	Letter: Goldberg to Robert Hudson re report on "The Future of PTV"	1	
7/21	Letter: Goldberg to Nanette Otto re Presidential veto	2	
7/22	Letter: Brian Lamb to Richard Block re correspondence concerning WETA	3	
7/24	Letter: Lamb to John Schwarzwald, KTCI-TV, re Schwarzwald letter to <u>TV Digest</u>	3	
7/26	Letter: Lamb to E.B. Craney re Presidential veto	2	
7/27	Letter: Joseph Hughes to Whitehead re Long-Range Financing Task Force	5	
7/28	Memorandum For The President from Caspar Weinberger re Authorization Bill for CPB	2	✓
8/--	<u>Black Communicator</u> article: "Nixon Vetoes CPB Funding"	1	
8/1	Log re call from Jack Wrather's office requesting bio on Henry Loomis & Tom Curtis for CPB Nominating Committee	1	✓
8/1	"CONFIDENTIAL" Memo to Peter Flanigan from Tom Moore re CPB Board & public affairs programming	2	✓
8/1	Memo: John Wells, WH, to Tom Whitehead w/copy of 7/19 memo to Flanigan from Bruce Kehrli w/the Presidents' comments on 7/1 memo re mtg w/broadcasters	4	
8/1	Letter: Scalia to Hartford Gunn re Gunn's paper on PTV program financing	3	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	50
8/2	Floor Statement of Cong. Torbert Macdonald: "Inadequate Public Broadcasting Bill Better Than None"		✓
8/2	Letter: Lamb to Mrs. Joseph Mares re Presidential veto	2	
8/3	Memo: Judy Morton to Vivian Moriarty Curtis and Loomis bios	6	
8/4	Memo: Whitehead to Rose re comments on S.3824, interim CPB funding bill	5	✓
8/6	Letter to Editor, <u>Washington Star</u> re Presidential veto	1	
8/6	Article, "An Okay Veto" from <u>Washington Star</u> and <u>Chicago Daily News</u>	3	
8/7	Memo: Lamb to Bob Guthrie, House Commerce Comm, w/Administration views on S.3824, CPB authorization for FY 73	6	
8/7	Letter: John Schwarzwald to Scalia re response to Schwarzwald memo	1	
8/7	<u>Broadcasting Magazine</u> misc articles	6	
8/8	Whitehead log re 8/16 mtg w/Joseph Hughes, w/attachments	7	
8/8	Whitehead log re 8/11 mtg w/Tom Curtis	1	
8/8	Memo: Goldberg to Whitehead re Aspen Conference on Public Broadcasting Financing	9	
8/10	Whitehead log re 8/15 mtg w/Tom Curtis	2	✓
8/11	<u>Variety</u> article: "Nixon Scores Point Over Pub' casting"	1	
8/11	Whitehead log re 8/15 mtg. w/Bill Harley	1	
8/11	Letter: Whitehead to J. Ervin Gardner re need for Black owned radio station in Dubiin, Ga., w/attachment	4	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	51
8/14	Misc news articles re Macy resignation	3	
8/14	Whitehead log re Tom Curtis' Confirmation		
8/14	Whitehead log re call from Tom Moore's office concerning Special Report put out by Cong. Goldwater	1	
8/15	Misc material re Ralph Roger's request for Presidential mtg	9	
8/15	<u>NYT</u> article re PBS Bd appts	1	
8/17	Misc articles re CPB	3	✓
8/18	Memo: Whitehead to Wilfred Rommel, OMB, re S.3824	1	✓
8/18	Letter: Whitehead to Macy re Macy's resignation	2	✓
8/18	Whitehead log re CPB Bd appts	1	
8/21	<u>TV Digest</u> articles re CPB	2	
8/21	Memo: Michael Smith to Whitehead re "Gambling College Football Highlights Show"	20	
8/22	<u>Variety</u> articles re CPB	3	
8/22	Letter: Max Kampelman to Whitehead w/copy of letter to <u>NY Times</u> , w/attach.	6	
8/24	Letter: Goldberg to Donald Guimary re <u>WLBT</u> case	3	
9/5	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan transmitting Memorandum for the President re "Tax Exempt Foundation Support of Challenges to Broadcast License Renewals," w/attachments	6	
9/6	Memo: Whitehead to Brian Lamb re CPB staffing, w/attachments	6	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
9/8	Memorandum for the President from Whitehead re "Tax Exempt Foundation Support of Challenges to Broadcast License Renewals"	2	
9/12	Letter: Richard Nixon to John Gavin, Pres., SAG re network re-runs	1	
9/16	Memo: Charles Colson to Al Snyder, WH, re NET coverage of McGovern Speech	1	✓
9/18	Memo: Michael Smith, WH, to Whitehead w/copy of letter from Gavin, SAG	2	
9/18	Log re mtg. between Dick McCormack and Henry Loomis	1	
9/19	<u>W. Post</u> article: "New President for Public Broadcasting"	1	✓
9/20	Memo: Bob McDermott, WH, to Whitehead re CPB Bd. appts w/Whitehead response in margin	1	
9/21	Letter: Whitehead to Loomis re congratulations on appt.	1	✓
9/22	Letter: Whitehead to Thomas Curtis re congratulations an appt.	1	✓
9/22	Letter: Macy to Whitehead responding to Whitehead letter of 8-__	1	
9/26	Whitehead log re having drink w/Bill Duke	1	
9/27	Letter: Whitehead to Greydon Hyde, WHTV re Presidential veto	3	
9/28	Whitehead log re 9-29 mtg. w/Tom Gherardi	1	
9/29	Whitehead log re 9-29 mtg. w/Tom Gherardi	1	
9/29	Whitehead log re dinner w/Abbott Washburn, Tom Evans and Henry Loomis	1	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
9/30	Memo: Bob McDermott to Whitehead w/copy of Kehrli to Flanigan memo of 9/30 re "Tax Exempt Foundation Support of Challenges to Bdcst License Renewals"	2	
10/2	Whitehead log re 10/6 mtg w/Loomis and Curtis	1	
10/2	Letter: Whitehead to Richard Jencks, CBS, re radio deregulation	1	
10/4	Memo to Members of CPB Task Force on Long-Range Financing from Hartford Gunn re "Station Program Finance Plan"	2	
10/9	Letter: Mary N. Meyers to President Nixon re PTV	2	
10/10	Whitehead log re 10/26 luncheon w/Curtis and Loomis	1	
10/11	Log re mtgs Pres. Nixon had w/John Macy and Frank Pace	3	
10/11	Memorandum for Mr. Whitehead's Personal File re discussion w/Henry Loomis and Tom Curtis on 10/6	1	✓
10/11	Memo: Whitehead to Flanigan re statutory or other legal requirements for public affairs programming on PTV	2	✓
10/11	Memo: Whitehead to Harry Dent re cross-ownership	3	
10/11	Draft schedule proposal for Presidential mtg. w/Curtis and Loomis	2	✓
10/12	Revised schedule proposal for Presidential mtg w/Curtis and Loomis	3	
10/12	Memo: Lamb to Eliska Hasek, WH, with suggested Presidential message for NAEB convention	2	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	54
10/23	Courtesy copy of letter to Loomis from Marian P. Van de Griendt	1	
10/25	Log re CPB Bd appts.	1	
10/26	Log re luncheon mtg w/Curtis and Loomis	3	✓
10/26	Log re call to Jack Wrather's office	1	
10/26	Memo: Whitehead to Herb Klein re Orange County PTV station	4	
10/26	Letter: Whitehead to Philip Hess re CPB radio qualification for KUFM	4	
10/26	Letter: Whitehead to John Malcolm re Presidential veto	4	
10/27	Log re call to Jack Wrather	1	
10/27	Whitehead log re phone call from Tom Curtis re 11/3 mtg between Loomis and Flanigan	1	
10/27	Letter: Goldberg to Horace P. Rowley, III re CPB financing	1	
10/30	Whitehead log re 11/8 mtg w/Tom Curtis	1	✓
11/2	Whitehead log re 11/3 mtg between Flanigan and Loomis	1	
11/2	Letter: Whitehead to Irving Kristol re Kristol's letter of 10/17, w/attach.	3	
11/6	Whitehead log re 11/14 luncheon w/Tom Moore		
11/7	Note from Loomis to Whitehead w/276 pp National Program Profile containing initial CPB staff recommendations for series support in FY'74, and other attachments	281	✓
11/8	Note on 11/8 CPB Bd meeting and actions taken	1	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
11/8	Logs re 11/10 mtg w/Flanigan, Curtis, Loomis and Garment	2	
11/9	Whitehead log re 11/14 mtg w/Tom Moore	1	
11/9	Whitehead log re 11/15 mtg w/Mr. McWhorter	1	
11/9	Whitehead log re 11/10 mtg w/Curtis	1	
11/9	Memo: Henry Goldberg to David Young re TV Licensing	4	
11/10	Whitehead log re 11/13 mtg w/Loomis	1	✓
11/14	Letter: Whitehead to Lee DuBridge re support for CPB w/attachments	35	
11/14	Letter: Lamb to Albert Kihn re long-range funding for CPB	3	
11/14	Whitehead schedule for 11/14 NYC mtgs w/Tom Moore and Neal Freeman	1	
11/14	Whitehead log re 11/17 mtg w/Flanigan, Shakespeare, Garment, Curtis and Loomis	4	✓
11/15	Letter: Whitehead to Emil V. Mathews-Metuzskiewicz re involvement of Americans of Polish descent in broadcasting	2	
11/16	Whitehead log re mtg w/Flanigan, Garment, Shakespeare, Curtis and Loomis (moved from 11/17 to 11/28)	2	✓
11/17	Courtesy copy of letter from Loomis to Phil Hess, KUFM-FM re CPB qualification	2	
11/24	Whitehead log re call to Tom Curtis	1	
11/27	Whitehead log re call to Tom Curtis	1	
11/27	Whitehead log re call to Bill Duke	1	
11/28	Whitehead log re 11/30 mtg w/Loomis	1	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	56
11/28	Memo: David Parker, WH, to Flanigan re schedule proposal for Presidential mtg w/Curtis, Loomis and Whitehead, w/attachments	4	✓
11/--	Memo: "Outline of points for Flanigan on Public Broadcasting"	1	
11/30	Whitehead log re 11/30 mtg w/Loomis	1	✓
11/30	Whitehead log re mtg w/Virginia Duncan	1	
11/30	Whitehead log re calling Loomis the week of 12/4	1	
12/4	Whitehead log re mtg w/Virginia Duncan, w/attachments	5	
12/8	Memo: Philip A. Rubin, CPB, to Richard McCormack, w/attachment	11	
12/12	Memo: Henry Goldberg to Thomas Korologos, WH, re recess appt. of Irving Kristol to CPB Bd, w/attachment	4	
12/14	Whitehead log re 12/15 mtg. w/Tom Curtis	1	
12/18	Letter: Neal Freeman to Loomis re WNET program on abortion	3	
12/19	Memo: F.S. Ruddy to Henry Goldberg re recording of programs	1	
12/--	Transcript of Whitehead News Conference following Sigma Delta Chi Luncheon Speech	16	
12/21	Transcript of Whitehead <u>Today Show</u> interview	8	
12/26	Letter: Neal Freeman to Whitehead transmitting two columns by Steve Scheuer re PTV	5	
Undated	Lists of CPB Bd w/expiration dates of terms	5	

OTP Public Broadcasting Files - 1973

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
1/1-12/31	Legislation File	300 (approx)	
1/2	Memo: Goldberg to Roy E. Kinsey, WH, re President's power to make recess appts.	2	
1/4	Whitehead log re. 1/6 lunch w/Tom Gherardi	1	✓
1/4	Memo: Whitehead to Colson, re Prime Time Access	3	
1-11	Whitehead Itinerary for 1-11	1	✓
1-11	Minutes of the Coordinating Committee Meeting, Dallas, Texas, Jan 11-12, 1973	15	
1-18	Memorandum for the President from Colson transmitting Roscoe Drummond column, re networks	7	
1-18	Whitehead log re lunch w/Henry Loomis week of 1/29	1	
1-25	Committee Print: "Goals of the Committee on Commerce for the 1st Session of the 93rd Congress	65	
1-26	Whitehead log re 1/29 dinner with Brian Lamb, Henry Goldberg and Tom Gherardi	1	✓
1-26	Whitehead log re 2/5 lunch with Brian Lamb, Keith Fischer and Henry Loomis	1	✓
1-27	Memo: W.Richard Howard to Whitehead transmitting memo from Bruce Kehrli to Colson re Prime Time access	4	
1-31	Memo: Harry Dent to Whitehead trans- mitting Jan. 30 letter from Henry Cauthen (S.Car. ETV) to Dent	6	
2-3	Memo: To Dave Hooper transmitting "talking points" for 2-5 Presidential meeting	3	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
2-5	Whitehead log re 2-5 lunch w/ Loomis, Fischer, Goldberg and Lamb	1	
2-5	Whitehead phone log re call from Keith Fischer concerning Jack Wrather's travel plans	1	
2-5	Whitehead log re 11:00AM meeting with Colson and the President	2	✓
2-8	Draft Memorandum for the Record re 2-5 meeting with Haldeman, Colson, Whitehead and the President	3	✓
2-13	Memo: Whitehead to Colson transmitting 2-12 Draft Memorandum for the Record re 2-5 meeting with Haldeman, Colson, White- head and the President		✓
2-15	Letter: James Killian to Tom Gherardi, CPB, re "Partnership Principles"	1	
2-16	Letter to the President of the Senate transmittig FY74 Authorization Bill for CPB	3	✓
2-16	Letter to the Speaker of the House trans- mitting FY74 Authorization Bill for CPB	3	
2-17	Memo: Brian Lamb to Todd Hullin, WH re Whitehead memo on Prime Time Access Rule	1	
2-17	Memo: Brian Lamb to Ron Zieqler, WH, re Whitehead memo on Prime Time Access Rule		
2-17	Memo: Brian Lamb to Bruce Kehrli, WH, re Whitehead memo on "Re-runs and the Prime- Time Access Rule"	3	
2-21	Letter: Ralph Rogers to Tom Moore, James Killian, and Jack Valenti concerning Tom Gherardi's draft of "Partnership Principles"	4	
2-22	Memo: Lamb to Bruce Kehrli, WH, re draft Whitehead memo to the President concerning license renewal	4	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
2-22	Edited draft memo Whitehead to the President re license renewal w/ attachments	7
2-23	Memo: Goldberg to Hank Paulson, WH, re Re-runs and Prime-Time Rule	6
2-28	Letter: Tom Moore to Ralph Rogers re "Partnership Principles"	1
Undated	Memo to te files from Thomas Gherardi re telephone conversation w/Jack Valenti concerning "Partnership Principles"	
3-2	Memorandum for the President from Whitehead re "Broadcast License Renewal Bill"	7
3-2	Memorandum for the President from Whitehead re "Re-runs and Prime-Time Access Rule," w/attachments	6
3-5	Whitehead phone log re 3-6 meeting with Tom Curtis	
3-5	List of Participants in Chairmen's Coordinating Committee Meeting	2
3-6	Draft CPB/PBS "Principles of Organization"	3
3-7	CPB Board Resolution re committee to negotiate agreement with PBS	1
3-7	CPB Board Resolution re multiple public broadcast stations in particular markets	1
3-7	CPB Resolution re authorization levels for FY74 and FY 75	1
3-7	CPB Board Resolution re national program service for 1973-74	3
3-12	Goldberg memo to the file re CPB minority employment program	4

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
3-15	Draft memo: Henry Loomis to CPB Board re conversation with Ralph Rogers concerning CPB and PBS relationship		
3-21	Whitehead log re phone call from Dick McCormack concerning CPB	1	✓
3-21	Memorandum for the President from Whitehead re "Appearance at NAB Annual Convention"	2	
3-22	Whitehead log re 3-25 meeting with Tom Curtis	1	✓
3-22	Whitehead log re 3-22 meeting with Loomis, Goldberg and Lamb	1	✓
3-23	Whitehead log re 3-26 meeting with Curtis	1	✓
3-23	Letter: Goldberg to Arnold Foster, B'nai B'rith, re CPB minority training		
3-26	Letter: Whitehead to Congressman Tom Railsback re license renewal legislation	4	
3-27.	(Whitehead) memorandum For the Record re President's view of danger in existence of Federally funded broadcasting network	2	✓
3-27	Whitehead log re Presidential meetings with Tom Curtis	1	
3-28	Testimony of Henry Loomis on CPB Authorization Bill before Senate Commerce Committee	24	
3-28	Testimony of Tom Curtis on CPB Authorization Bill before Senate Commerce Committee	69	
3-31	Memo to CPB Board from Ralph Rogers re reorganization of PBS	35	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
4-3	Letter: Whitehead to Charles Tower, Corinthian Broadcasting, re broadcasting issues, with attachment	8	
4-5	Memo: Hartford Gunn and Sam Holt, PBS, to Ralph Rogers, PBS, re "Proposed National Program Process Under CPB/PBS Partnership"	6	
4-9	Dictated draft of 4-6 memo from Tom Moore to CPB Board re negotiations with PBS	1	✓
4-9	Memo: Henry Loomis to CPB Board transmitting majority report from CPB negotiating committee	2	✓
4-9	Whitehead log re 4/12 meeting with Tom Curtis	1	✓
4-11	Whitehead log re 4/12 meeting with Tom Curtis and Tom Moore	1	✓
4-11	Memo: Loomis to Whitehead with correspondence between Loomis and Ted Braun, CPB Board	7	
4-11	Memo: Dale Turza, CPB, to Henry Goldberg with CPB Board resolution from 1-10 Board Meeting concerning CPB decision-making	14	✓
4-12	Memo: Dick McCormack to Whitehead re removal of Loomis as CPB President	2	✓
4-16	Whitehead log re meeting with Neal Freeman	1	
4-16	Memo: Whitehead to Bill Timmons re letter to Charles Crutchfield	7	
4-16	Letter: Tom Moore to the President re Moore's resignation as CPB Chairman	6	✓
4-18	Whitehead log re 4-20 meeting with Neal Freeman	2	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
4-20	Memo: Brian Lamb to Dave Wimer, WH, w/suggested draft letter for the President to send Tom Curtis	8	
4-20	Letter: Whitehead to Tom Curtis re Curtis resignation	3	✓
4-20	Memo: Goldberg to Whitehead re "Public Broadcasting"	9	✓
undated	List of potential CPB Board candidates	1	
4-23	Letter: Whitehead to Jack Schlaefle re KAID-TV	3	
4-23	Letter: Whitehead to Joan Ganz Cooney re "Sesame Street"	2	
4-25	Letter: Goldberg to Arnold Forster, B'nai B'rith, re CPB minority training	4	
4-26	NYTimes Article: "3 Public TV Aides Deny Pressure From White House"	1	
4-26	Public Statement by David Ives, President WBGH Boston, re Federal Control of Public Broadcasting	7	
4-26	Letter: Arnold Forster to Henry Goldberg re CPB minority employment		
5-1	Letter: Whitehead to George Hall, Director, Va. Public Telecommunications Council re public broadcastig	1	
5-7	Letter: Virginia Duncan to Whitehead re film competition	3	
5-8	Memo: Goldberg to Bill Fisher and Will Taft re EBFP	6	
5-9	CPB Press Releases	9	✓
5-10	Whitehead log re Meeting with Bill Duke	1	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
5-11	Whitehead log re Public Radio Conference reception	1	
5-18	(Whitehead) Memorandum for the Record re discussion with Len Garment concerning communications issues	2	✓
5-31	Copy of PBS-CPB Partnership Agreement	3	✓
6-6	Memo: Whitehead to Hank Paulson with draft Memorandum to the President re public broadcasting	4	✓
6-7	Whitehead Memorandum to the Record re Whitehead's 2-17 Memo for the President re FCC Inquiry Into Network's Dominance of Programming	4	
6-14	Memo: Goldberg to Whitehead re Rogers/Killian request for Presidential meeting	1	✓
6-15	Whitehead log re 6-19 meeting with Jack Wrather	2	
6-15	Memo: Whitehead to Dave Parker, WH, re Rogers/Killian request for Presidential meeting.		✓
6-22	Memo: A.L. Moore to F.S. Ruddy re "History of Bills to Provide Grants for EBFP"	2	
7-16	Letter: Thomas J. Keller, OTP, to W.E. Rhodes re "See America First" film series	1	✓
7-16	List of possible CPB Board candidates submitted by James R. Killian, Jr.	5	
7-19	Memo: Whitehead to David Wimer, WH, re CPB Board Appointments, with attachment	4	✓
7-27	Memo: Whitehead to Wilfred Rommel, OMB, re signing of S. 1090, CPB authorization for FY74 and FY 75	2	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
7-27	(Goldberg) Draft signing statement	
undated	List of CPB Board of Directors	2
undated	List of CPB Board Candidates	1
8-7	Transcript of WH News Conference re signing of S. 1090	2 ✓
8-11	Letter: Whitehead to Killian re recent meeting between Whitehead and Killian	1
8-22	Letter: Goldberg to Horace P. Rowley, III, re balance and objectivity in programs made available by CPB	2
8-24	Memo re 1973 CPB hearing transcripts	1
9-6	Draft letter: Whitehead to Warren Braren, Consumers Union re CPB-PBS Partnership Agreement	6
9-11	Memo: John Schwarzwaldler to "A Favored Few in ETV" re PBS dues	4
9-12	Letter: Whitehead to Warren Braren, CU/re CPB-PBS Partnership Agreement	1
9-19	Letter: John A. Price, CPB, to Goldberg re ACNO paper on Public Broadcasting's "Mission and Goals"	6
9-19	Copy of Letter: Ralph Rogers to Warren Braren, CU, re CPB-PBS Partnership Agreement	1
9-20	Letter: Killian to Whitehead with copy of letter from Killian to the President re CPB Board appointments	2 ✓
9-24	Letter: Irving Kristol to Whitehead re CPB Board appointments	2
9-26	Letter: Goldberg to Horace Rowley re CPB	4

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
10-1	Memorandum for the President from Clay Whitehead re "Cabinet Committee on Cable TV"	7	
10-3	Memo: Whitehead to Ken Cole transmitting Memorandum for the President re Public Broadcasting	4	✓
undated	Draft long-range financing bill		
10-15	Memo: Hank Paulson, WH, to Goldberg transmitting Buchanan to Paulson memo of 10-14 re Whitehead memo of 10-3	2	✓
10-18	Copy of letter from Loomis to Braren re correspondence between Braren, Whitehead and Rogers	2	

OTP Public Broadcasting Files - 1974

66

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	
1/1-12/31	Legislation material	250 (approx)	
1/1-7/16	Drafts and Working Papers "Public Broadcasting Financing Bill of 1974"	600 (approx)	
2/1	Material on CPB funding levels	3	
2/6-3/21	Material on CPB Board Appointments	50 (approx)	
2/12	<u>Wash. Post</u> article: Filing "CPB Bd Positions"	1	
2/24	Letter: Frand Lloyd to the President re CPB Bd appts	6	
4/2	(Whitehead) Memorandum for the President re "Public Broadcasting Financing Bill"	2	✓
4/30	(Ken Cole) Executive Director, Domestic Council, Memorandum for the President re "Public Broadcasting Financing Bill"	2	✓
6/3	Letter: Warren Wade to Goldberg re CPB Bd appt 6-7	3	
6/7	Memorandum: Whitehead to General Alexander Haig re "Public Broadcasting Financing Bill" and CPB Board appointments	2	✓
6/10	<u>New York Times</u> Article: "Nixon Said to Reject Public TV Funding"	1	✓
6/11	AP story w/White House denial of <u>NYT</u> story of 6-10	1	✓
6/11	<u>Wall Street Journal</u> editorial: "Funding Public TV"	1	✓
6/12	<u>Washington Post</u> editorial "Mr. Nixon's Turnabout on Public TV"	1	✓

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	67
6/24	Letter: Henry Loomis to Whitehead re long-range financing, w/attachment	4	
6/26	Letter: W. Clinton Powell, CPB, to Whitehead re: minority programming, w/ attachment (40 pages)	41	
7/11	Memo: Cole to Whitehead re Whitehead's 4-2 Memorandum for the President	1	✓
7/16	Letter: Whitehead to the Speaker of the House transmitting "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1974" w/attachments	47	✓
7/16	Letter: Whitehead to the President of the Senate transmitting "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1974" w/attachments	47	✗
8/6	Whitehead Senate testimony on "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1978"	49	✓
8/7	White House Press Release re CPB Bd appts	1	
8/23	Letter: Frank Lloyd to Pres. Ford re CPB Bd appts.	11	✓
8/27	Letter: J.R. Killian, Jr., to Whitehead re CPB Bd appts	4	
9/23	Letter: Harry Dent to Dean Burch re CPB Bd appts	1	
10/10	Congressional Record re CPB Bd appts	2	
10/17	Memo: Goldberg to F. Lynn May re "Black Caucus Position Statement"	12	
10/28	Press Release: "CPB Announces New Public TV Funding Support	6	
11/5	Memo: Goldberg to Geoffrey Shephard re President Ford's Message to NAEB Convention	3	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>	68
11/16	President Ford's Message to NAEB	2	
11/18	White House Press Release re CPB Bd appts	2	✓
11/21	Memo: Thomas Keller, OTP, to F. Lynn May, WH, re Ralph Rogers request for a meeting w/the President	9	
7/16	"Public Broadcasting Financing Bill of 1974"		
Undated	List of CPB Board Members	1	
Undated	Bruce M. Owen Curriculum Vita e	2	

Inventory 1975

Date 1975	Brief Description	<u>Pages</u>
1/2	Letter: John Eger, Acting Director, OTP, to Roland Elliott, W.H., re: letter to James Killian from President Ford.	5
1/8	Letter: President Ford to Killian re: Killian's service as CPB Chairman.	1
1/21	Memo: Tom Keller, OTP, to Pete Fannan, OMB, transmitting draft of Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1975 and related material.	1*
1/21	Memo: Keller to Ralph Malvik transmitting draft of '75 Act	1*
1/21	Memo: Henry Goldberg, OTP, to J. Hyde, OMB, transmitting draft of '75 Act and related material.	40* (approx.)
1/27	Memo: John Eger to Wm. Walker re: CPB Board Appointments.	1**
1/27	(Eger) draft memo for the President re: "PB Financing Act of 1975".	4*
1/29	(Eger) draft memo for the President re: "PB Financing Act of 1975".	4*
2/3	(Eger) Memo for the President re: Public Broadcast Financing Bill	7*
2/6	Unsigned memo to Geoff Shepard re appointment of Don Santarelli to CPB Board with attachments.	5**
2/7	Memo: Craig John to Tom Keller re: Criminal sanctions for false non-federal income reports to CPB	2
2/13	Letter: Frank Lloyd to President Ford re: CPB Board appointments	6
2/13	Statement by President Ford upon introduction of "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1975".	1

Date 1975 (cont'd)	Brief Description	Pages
2/13	Letters to Speaker of House and President of Senate transmitting 1975 Act.	12
2/13	Material on CPB + PBS reactions to 1975 Act	6
2/14	Letter: Hon. Carl Albert to Eger acknowledging receipt of 1975 Act	1
2/14 6/30	Misc material on legislative developments relating to "public broadcasting financing act of 1975"	100* (approx.)
3/18	White House Press release on BPB board appts, w/attach.	4
6/13	Letter: Aryeh Neier, ACLU to Senator Pastore re CPB board appts.	4
6/26	Announcement of Senate Commerce Committee hearings on CPB nominations	1
7/1- 12/31	Misc. material on legislative developments relating to "PBF Act of 1975"	200* (approx.)
7/23	Memo: John Eger to Doug Bennett, WH, re CPB nominees	2**
7/24	Letter: Joseph Coors to Henry Loomis re PBS plan for satellite network	5
8/4	Memo: John Eger to Doug Bennett, WH, re CPB nominees	5**
8/20	CPB Press release on public participation	1
9/9	CPB press release on open meetings	2
11/12	CPB press release on first open board meeting	7
11/24	Letter: Diana Dougan to John Eger re CPB board nomination	6**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
7/14	Memorandum: Steve Simmons to Rick Neustadt re: "Public Broadcasting Decision Memo"	2*
7/15	Letter: Loomis to Jagoda re: CPB authorization, with attachments	30 (approx)
7/19	Memorandum: John Kramer to Frank Lloyd re: "Public Broadcasting Funding"	1*
7/19	(Draft) Letter: Jagoda to Loomis re: Loomis 7/15 letter	1
7/20	Draft "memo to the President on Public Broadcasting"	8*
7/21	"	8*
7/29	Draft Memorandum for the President re: Public Broadcasting from Eizenstat and Jagoda	9*
7/29	Lazarus and Neustadt comments on Draft Memorandum for the President	13*
8/4	Letter: Cort Anderson, CPB, to Jagoda re: correspondence with Loomis	1
8/12	Memorandum: Neustadt, Jagoda and Lloyd to Cutter & Woolsey re: "FY 78 Supplemental Appropriate for CPB"	1*
8/15	Memorandum: Lloyd to Neustadt and Jagoda re: "CPB FY 78 Supplemental Appropriation"	2*
8/15	Memorandum: Lloyd to Jagoda, Neustadt and Cutter re: "Objectivity and Balance Requirement"	4*
8/16	Memorandum: Robert Sachs to Neustadt and Lloyd re: public broadcasting legislation with Neustadt comments	9*

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
6/3	Memorandum: Rick Hutcheson to Neustadt transmitting Memorandum for the President re: Carnegie study	2*
6/7	Memorandum: Loomis to CPB Board re: "CPB's Responsibility for System Planning"	3*
6/12	Memorandum: Neustadt to Eizenstat re: "Public Broadcasting Status Report"	1*
6/12	Memorandum: Neustadt to Secretary Joseph Califano re: EBFP, with subsequent correspondence attached	13*
6/14	Memorandum: Jagoda, Neustadt and Lloyd to Bo Cutter re: "Public Broadcasting Proposal"	20*
6/14-6/20	Misc. news articles re: Carnegie study	3
7/1	Memorandum: Neustadt and Lloyd to Cutter and Peter Bell, HEW with draft memo to the President on Public Broadcasting	6*
7/6	Memorandum: Neustadt to Si Lazarus and Steve Simmons with revised draft memo to the President	4*
7/7	Memorandum: Neustadt and Lloyd to Bo Cutter with Draft memo to the President	5*
7/11	Memorandum: Lloyd to Bob Rothbard, OMB, with Draft memo to the President	1*
7/12	Memorandum: Si Lazarus to Neustadt re: "Public Broadcasting Decision Memo"	2*

Inventory 1976

<u>Date</u> 1976	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
1/2	Letter: Tom Keller to George Linn, CPB re: CPB Funding bill	5
1/6	<u>LA Times</u> Editorial: Keeping Public TV Independent	1
1/6	<u>N.Y. Daily News</u> article: "Ford Signs \$634M Funding for Public Broadcast-with Static"	1
1/7	Letter: Loomis to Jim Lynn, OMB re: CPB appropriations	2*
1/15	<u>Chicago Tribune</u> article by Patrick Buchanan: "The Electronic Pork Barrel"	1
1/29	Memo: Lynn May to Tom Keller, OTP, re: letter to Hartford Gunn, PBS	8*
2/6	Memo on PBS hearings w/attachment	16
2/25	Letter: Loomis to Keller re: affirmative action	9
3/19	Letter: Robert Ross to Eugene Kennedy re: CPB Funding	5
3/30	Letter: Howard Hupe, HEW, to John Eger re: data base	2
1/21-7/21	Misc. material on CPB Board appointments	75**

*Exempt under 5 U.S.C. §552(b) (5).

**Exempt under 5 U.S.C. §552(b) (2).

Inventory 1977-78

<u>Date</u> 1977	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
4/18	Memo: Frank Lloyd to Bill Thaler re: public broadcasting w/draft of proposed memorandum to Stuart Eizenstat	23*
4/25	Draft memorandum: Lloyd to Eizenstat re: public broadcasting	9*
5/10	"	8*
5/13	"	12*
Undated	"	13*
5/13	Draft memorandum: Lloyd to Eizenstat re: public broadcasting w/Nick Miller's comments	12*
5/18	Draft memorandum: Lloyd and Rick Neustadt to Eizenstat and Barry Jagoda re: public broadcasting	8*
5/19	"	8*
5/20	Memorandum: Lloyd and Neustadt to Eizenstat and Jagoda re: public broadcasting	16*
5/25	Memorandum of scheduled meeting to Bert Lance	1*
5/25	Memorandum: Lloyd and Marian Dix to Neustadt re: "Recommendations for Future Federal Agency Funding of Public Broadcasting Programming"	4*
5/26	Memorandum: Neustadt to Lance re: 6/2 meeting	1*
6/3	Memorandum: Neustadt and Lloyd to Bo Cutter and Sue Woolsey, OMB, re: 6/8 meeting on public broadcasting	4*

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
8/29	Memorandum for the President from Eizenstat, Jagoda, and Cutter re: "Public Broadcasting" with the President's comments	29*
9/2	Memorandum: Dix to Neustadt re: "Open Allocations"	2*
9/6	Memo: Lloyd to Neustadt re: "EOB Meetings w/Public Broadcasters"	1
9/6	Memo: Robert Sachs to Mary Jo Manning re: "National Town Meeting on the Future of Public Broadcasting"	4
9/13	Letter: Rick Breitenfeld to Neustadt and Lloyd re: station managers meeting	2
9/15	Memo: Robert Sachs to Neustadt and Lloyd re: "FY 78 Supplemental Appropriation for CPB"	*
9/17	Memorandum: Neustadt to Eizenstat and others re: "Public Broadcasting Bill"	2*
9/21	Memo: Robert Sachs to Carolyn Sachs re: CPB Board composition	4
9/23	Memo: Robert Sachs to Steve Simmons re: "Openness Requirement for Public Broadcasters"	7*
9/26	Memorandum for the President from Eizenstat, Cutter, Jagoda & Neustadt re: "Public Broadcasting" w/the President's comments	4*
9/27	Memo: Lloyd to Neustadt and others re: "The President's Commitment to Public Broadcasting as Governor of Georgia"	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
Undated	Draft letter to Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill re: "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1978"	3
10/6	"Dear Friend" letter from Stuart Eizenstat re: "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1978"	1
10/20	Memo: Neustadt to Woolsey re: HEW Telecommunications Demonstration Program	1*
10/20	Memo: Neustadt to Eizenstat, Cutter & Woolsey re: "Public Broadcasting-Status Report"	1*
11/1	Memo: Dix to Neustadt re: HEW Funding Procedures"	1*
11/3	Memo: Kathleen Criner to Robert Sachs re: EBFP	2*
11/15	Memo: Marian Dix to Sachs, Neustadt & Criner re: "NAEB Instructional Council Briefing"	6*
12/20	Memo: Neustadt to Eizenstat, Cutter & Jagoda re: "Public Broadcasting Status Report" w/Eizenstat comments	2*
<u>1978</u> <u>1/19</u>	(Draft) Memorandum for Eizenstat, Cutter & Jagoda from Robert Sachs re: "Status Report on Public Broadcasting Bill"	15*
1/23	Memo: Neustadt and Sachs to Eizenstat and Cutter re: "Status Report on Public Broadcasting Bill"	4*
2/17	Memo: Sachs to Woolsey re: EBFP	4*
9/1-10/1	Drafts of Presidential Message on Public Broadcasting	100* (approx)

1977-78 Subject Files

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages (Approximation)</u>
Facilities Program	650
New Technologies	10
Instructional Programming	50
NPR	250
HEW Program Funding	50
EEO	300
Underwriting	10
Independent Producers	25
Financial Data	150
First Amendment	200
Funding Options	150
National Structure	30
Community Stations	50
National Program Production Problems	100
All-Channel Radio	10
Public Affairs	100
General Correspondence	25
BBC	5
State Networks	10
Goals	10
Options Papers Request	5
Open Meetings	150

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages (Approximation)</u>
House Options & Hearings	75
News Articles, Clippings	2000
Arieff Article	20
Black Caucus Presentation	100
Bloc Grants	150
Carnegie Commission	300
Communications Subcommittee Hearings (September 1977)	20
CPB Board List	25
CPB Budget Figures	150
CPB Directory	25
CPB Report	100
EEO Sequence	100
FCC Public Broadcasting Dockets	10
FL Correspondence	50
Financial Records	40
GAO Material	50
Geller Testimony (9/78)	20
Guidelines Project	150
House Mark-Up	50
National Programming Set Aside	1
NCTA	5
Nominees	5
OMB	100

Rogers - Box 1 - Folder 2

Reyers - May 6, 1969

May 6, 1969

Broadcasting

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. DWIGHT CHAPIN

The National Association of Educational Broadcasters has requested that the President give a three-minute address for their ceremony commemorating the 50th anniversary of educational broadcasting to be held at the University of Wisconsin on May 15th. This would be a good opportunity for the President to say some kind words about educational broadcasting. I think it is desirable for the President to be associated in an affirmative way with public broadcasting.

I believe a wire released to the press would serve almost as well, but thought the President might like the opportunity to express a more personal interest.

Clay T. Whitehead
Staff Assistant

Attachments

cc: Mr. Hofgren
Mr. Whitehead ✓
Mr. Rose
Central Files

CTWhitehead:ed

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 28, 1969
Time: 11:30 a.m.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

FOR: P. Flanigan

cc (for information):

Reyers - May 28, 1969

*Mr. Whitbeck
to see how far
with next week
of work, also
P.*

FROM THE STAFF

SUBJECT (see attached): Letter from Frank Pace, Chairman of Corporation
for Public Broadcasting.

ACTION AND REMARKS:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Necessary Action | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft Reply |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prepare Agenda and Brief | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft Remarks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> For Your Comments | <input type="checkbox"/> For Your Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> For Your Recommendations | |

Other:

Please reply to the writer of the attached letter and provide this office with a copy of your correspondence.

DUE: Date: June 3, 1969

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Please attach this copy to material submitted.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material please telephone the

0
V R COLE JR

100-100000-100000
100-100000-100000

Corporation for Public Broadcasting

545 Madison Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10022

(212) 688-0

May 21, 1969

Frank Pace, Jr.
Chairman of the Board

incl

The Honorable Richard M. Nixon
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

H

As I become increasingly involved in the requirements and potentials of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting my conviction as to its real value if properly developed increases. There are three areas where a contribution can be most compelling. First, in terms of educational and moral development of children between the ages of two and six. Second, in supporting and strengthening the present formal educational system together with providing educational opportunities beyond the school period. Finally, in exposing and helping to resolve some of the difficult problems faced by our communities today.

In discussing this matter with Al Cole, whom you recently appointed as a member of our Board, we both felt that television constituted a new and unique opportunity to break out of some of our educational limitations. I enclose a brief memorandum on this subject which I hope you will find time to read. After that, if it were possible for Al and myself to discuss with you the values that we see in the system it would be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully,

Frank Pace, Jr.
Frank Pace, Jr.

FP/dh
Enc

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting was established by an Act of Congress and organized on March 27, 1968.

In creating this Corporation the Congress was convinced that it was important to improve the quality and effectiveness of the programs presented on 180 educational TV stations and on 400 Radio stations. All of these stations operate as non-profit businesses and without commercials.

Many of these stations provide programs designed to use the very effective tool of electronic broadcasting to help all educational institutions (elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities) to do a better job of teaching students. They also provide programs for children between the ages of two and six who now spend up to thirty hours a week sitting in front of commercial TV with a chance to see on TV and to hear on radio material that will be infinitely more effective in teaching these children the kind of things they should know and also inspiring them to want to learn more.

A further responsibility of these stations, beyond supplementing the present formal educational system, is to help educate the dropout and the disadvantaged and those who desire to be educated after formal schooling has ended. Such broadcast programs help people to develop skills, to use leisure time intelligently, and to develop appreciation of art, music and other cultural activities. America is sometimes called the best educated nation in the world which we are statistically - and yet our quality of education today is inadequate for the present and for the future.

Educational broadcasting can be a mighty force in improving the education of all Americans. And the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, created by Congress to help to do that job deserves strong and continuing financial support from the U.S. Government which recognizes that education in today's ever more complex world is almost the number one need of the nation.

Attached is a list of the Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. They serve without compensation and are dedicated to the importance of their mission. They were appointed by the President of the United States subject to approval by the U.S. Senate.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<u>MEMBERS</u>	<u>DATE APPOINTED</u>	<u>TERM EXPIRES</u>
Joseph A. Beirne	March 13, 1968	March 13, 1972
Robert S. Benjamin	"	" 1974
Roscoe C. Carroll	"	" 1970
Albert L. Cole	March 14, 1969	" 1974
Michael A. Gammino, Jr.	March 13, 1968	" 1972
Saul Haas	"	" 1970
Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby	"	" 1972
Joseph D. Hughes	"	" 1972
James R. Killian, Jr.	"	" 1974
Erich Leinsdorf	"	" 1970
Frank Pace, Jr. (Chairman)	"	" 1974
John D. Rockefeller 3rd	"	" 1970
Carl E. Sanders	"	" 1972
Frank B. Schooley	"	" 1970
Jack Valenti	"	" 1974

*Corp for
Public Broadcasting*

June 4, 1969

Dear Mr. Pace:

The President has asked that I reply to your letter of May 21st regarding potential contributions of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to some of our important educational and social problems.

I think the President would indeed find it useful to meet with you and others from the Corporation, but this probably should wait until we have a firmer idea about the desirability of a White House conference on uses of communications technology in domestic problems and a better idea of the Corporation's future plans.

I hope we can get together soon to discuss the Corporation's activities and plans.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Flanigan
Assistant to the President

Mr. Frank Pace, Jr.
Chairman of the Board
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
345 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

cc: Ken Cole
Mr. Flanigan
Mr. Hofgren
Mr. Whitehead ✓
Central Files

CTWhitehead:ed

type

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

Regers - June 17, 1969

June 17, 1969

MEMO

EAD

Subject: Long-term financing for the Public Broadcasting Corporation

As you know, the Corporation prepared at our request a proposal for the long-term Federal financing of the Corporation. This proposal, in the form of a draft bill, was circulated among various Federal agencies for their reactions. We have now received the agency comments, and the attached staff paper summarizes their positions.

A number of major issues are raised by the agencies. Treasury and CEA are opposed to the proposed excise tax on radio and TV sets. There is also opposition to the measures proposed to insulate the Corporation from the annual appropriation process.

I believe we must find a solution this year to this problem of long-term financing for the Corporation. My staff is preparing a comprehensive proposal which I think we can support. As soon as it is ready, I'll send it to you.

Mark W. Alger
Mark W. Alger
Acting Assistant Director

June 9, 1969

LONG-TERM FINANCING FOR THE
CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

This paper discusses (1) specifics of the Public Broadcasting Corporation's proposal for long-term Federal financing of its activities; (2) the major issues which this proposal raises, as identified by other Federal agencies; (3) some possible alternative financing proposals, and (4) alternative strategies for presenting an Administration proposal to Congress.

Corporation proposal:

The Corporation's draft bill would provide for permanent Federal financing for the Corporation through (1) an earmarked 2% manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television receiving sets and (2) an annual Federal matching payment from general revenues equal to twice the excess over \$50 million of the total non-Federal contributions to public broadcasting stations and other supporting entities.

The funds derived from these sources would be put into a special Treasury fund automatically, and would be paid to the Corporation in full at the beginning of each fiscal year. There would be no annual review of these payments by the Congressional appropriations committees. There are no ceilings proposed for the level of annual payments, and no expiration dates.

The earmarked manufacturers' excise tax on television sets and insulation from the annual appropriation process were also proposed by the Carnegie Commission in its 1967 report on public television. The Zwick Task Force also proposed both an earmarked tax (either a manufacturers' excise tax on TV and radio sets or on gross revenues of commercial broadcasters) and an automatic Federal matching payment to the Corporation equal to total, non-Federal contributions to local public broadcasting stations.

Issues:

Four major issues have emerged from the agency reports on the Corporation's proposal.

1. Should Federal payments to the Corporation be insulated from the annual appropriation process?

The Treasury Department and the Bureau's Office of Budget Review (OBR) oppose the earmarking of a special tax and the automatic appropriation of a Federal matching payment

as being against sound principles of budgeting and inconsistent with our system of government. "Attempts to insulate an activity from public officials are in reality attempts to insulate it from control by the people."

OBR also cites the Director's recent decision on "backdoor financing" announced in a budget procedures memorandum on May 6. This decision was as follows:

"The proposition that backdoor financing might be necessary to attain Administration objectives with regard to the scope and level of programs was specifically rejected. We will avoid bypassing the Appropriations Committees, except where the precedent has already been established."

The Corporation's proposal would require an exception from this decision.

The Corporation, the Carnegie Commission (Science Adviser Leo DuBridge was chairman of the Commission's committee on long-term financing), the Zwick Task Force, and the FCC argue that such insulation is both desirable and necessary to provide maximum protection to public broadcasting from extraneous political interference and control. The Zwick Task Force argued, for example, that this insulation is crucial for the sensitive area of programming activities, so crucial that unprecedented measures are in order. The hearings in both the House and the Senate preceding passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 identified the need for insulating the Corporation from the pressures and uncertainties that characterize the annual appropriation process. At the same time, it is argued that since Congress retains the power to terminate the arrangement at any time, its ultimate control over the expenditure of public funds is not impaired.

The Zwick Task Force believed that as necessary conditions for such insulation, certain additional mechanisms were needed to assure public accountability. The Task Force recommended:

- . that "blue ribbon" groups of advisers to the Corporation be established to oversee the contracts and grants for production of national program material;

- establishment of a rental system to support production of local-regional programs so that local stations can serve as a "market place" to control the quality of such programs.

Public accountability is further assured by the Corporation's proposal for Federal matching of other contributions, since these contributions will be an indicator of public support.

2. Should a special Federal tax be levied for the support of the Corporation's activities, or should this support come from general revenues?

The Treasury and the CEA argue against the proposed manufacturers' excise tax on receiving sets and prefer that Federal support of the Corporation come from general revenues. They argue (1) that the proposed excise tax is not a good mechanism for equating tax payments with benefits received, (2) that it would be a regressive tax, and (3) that it would be incompatible with the President's tax reform message of April 21.

The Corporation and the Carnegie Commission argue that, (1) on the contrary, the proposed excise tax is an equitable way of distributing the cost since the purchasers of receiving sets will be the direct beneficiaries of public broadcasting; and, moreover, the improved service made possible by the tax directly increases the real value of the set; (2) the proposed tax is only mildly regressive since higher income families tend to buy more receiving sets and replace them more often; (3) that, in any event, the amount of tax paid by a purchaser would be relatively small, especially when spread over the lifetime of the set; and (4) it would not be a new tax (there was a 10% manufacturers excise tax on radio and TV receivers between 1950 and 1965), so that it is easily specified and easily administered.

The FCC and Science Advisor Lee DuBridge support the proposed excise tax as the most satisfactory and equitable method of financing the Corporation's activities.

The Zwick Task Force recommended either a special tax on (1) gross revenues of commercial broadcasters (the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting recently came out in favor of this tax on the basis of a study done for them by Dick Netzer, an economist at New York University) or (2) on TV and radio sets manufactured, leaving the final choice to be made after an assessment of the political

advantages and disadvantages of each. The Task Force preferred the tax on gross revenues but recognized that it would be strongly opposed by commercial broadcasters.

A third major issue raised implicitly by the agency reports is:

3. What should be the level of Federal support for the activities of the Corporation?

The Corporation estimates that its proposal would initially yield \$80 million in Federal contributions. The Carnegie Commission recommended that Federal funding start at about \$30 million in the first year and rise to \$135 million in the fifth year and \$155 million by 1980 (these are adjusted estimates based on the changes made in the original Carnegie proposal by the Congress -- see attached table).

The argument for substantial federal support of public broadcasting rests primarily on the expected potential of this activity rather than on demonstrated ability of public broadcasters to serve more than a limited public demand or need. The FCC report is typical of this argument: "a substantial Federal contribution is necessary if public broadcasting is to achieve or even approach its potential for benefitting and enriching our national life." Secretary Finch and Science Adviser DuBridge concur in the view that public broadcasting has great potential.

The CED, in a recent policy statement, calls for heavier public subsidy of public television stations so that they can schedule more prime time for political education, including appearances by candidates, as one important means of financing a better election system.

A more skeptical view is offered by the CEA which believes that the beneficiaries of the Corporation's activities will be "a small minority of the population, mostly the better educated and wealthy minority". And the GAO believes that insufficient justification has been given by the Corporation in its proposed Speaker letter for the large amounts of money its proposal would generate. Such skepticism supports Treasury's and OBR's arguments for not insulating the Corporation from the annual appropriation process, at least until the Corporation proves it is deserving of such insulation.

Related to this issue are two minor issues raised in the agency reports.

- (a) Should there be ceilings on the level of Federal support or open-ended as the Corporation proposes?

The Corporation and the FCC believe that an open-ended Federal contribution is desirable. GAO and OBR believe that annual ceilings should be set, especially for the Federal matching contribution. The Zwick Task Force proposed annual ceilings for the matching payments, leaving the tax revenues open-ended.

- (b) Should a specific expiration date be included in any long-term financing proposal?

Under the Corporation's proposal, Federal payments to the Corporation would go on forever unless Congress takes additional action to repeal the law. OBR recommends that a specific expiration date (possibly 3 or 5 years after enactment) be added so that the financing arrangement be subject to periodic review by the Congress. This would assure greater public accountability for the Corporation's activities. The Zwick Task Force also suggested that specific expiration dates could be included in any long-term financing proposal.

The fourth major issue raised by the agency reports is:

4. Should a Federal matching scheme be included in the long-term financing proposal, and if so, what should it be?

The Treasury and GAO point out that the Corporation's proposed matching scheme could result in substantial variations in the amount of Federal contributions from year-to-year, since the Federal matching payment would be determined largely by the vagaries of non-Federal philanthropy rather than on the basis of program needs and sound budgetary planning. OBR goes further and argues that: "We should not put it in the hands of private donors to determine how our general tax revenues will be spent from year to year."

The Corporation argues that its matching scheme serves two purposes: (1) it provides incentive for raising additional non-Federal funds for public broadcasting, and (2) it limits general Federal revenues to an amount reflecting the value placed on public broadcasting by the public. The latter purpose was believed especially important by the Zwick Task Force, that there should be an opportunity for the public to register its views of public broadcasting at the local level. The Task Force felt a matching scheme would give the consumer of public broadcasting considerable leverage in judging the quality and interest of public broadcasts.

The automatic Federal matching of private donations has some successful precedent in the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. In that agency, donations made to the Federal Government are matched, up to limits specified in the annual appropriations act, by Treasury payments to the Foundation.

Some specific changes in the Corporation's matching scheme which were proposed by the agencies are:

- (i) Treasury suggests that Federal matching payments should decrease as non-Federal support for public broadcasting increases.
- (ii) Science Advisor DuBridge would prefer that \$25 million be used as the base for Federal matching purposes on the grounds that \$50 million is a rather large sum to be raised from private sources.
- (iii) OBR would prefer to have specific annual ceilings included in any matching scheme, as proposed by the Zwick Task Force.

A number of minor issues were raised concerning the technicalities of the Corporation's draft bill which can be addressed after the major issues are resolved.

Possible Alternative Financing Proposals:

Possible alternative ways of providing Federal contributions to the Corporation include the following:

1. Regular annual appropriations:

This is clearly the preference of the Treasury and OBR. This would require legislative authorization, either annually or periodically, with certain maximum annual sums probably being specified. This alternative would be the antithesis of the Corporation's proposal and the Carnegie Commission recommendation.

2. Multiple year appropriations:

The Zwick Task Force proposed that multiple year appropriations be included in the long-term financing of the Corporation. Specifically the Task Force recommended that a general fund payment be made to the Corporation equal to \$70,000 per public television station each year under a single appropriation action covering a three-year period. The multiple year appropriation would be renewed at the end of three years, but the legislation

and appropriation would include an automatic fall-back provision providing appropriations for the fourth year equal to 2/3 of the annual entitlement and 1/3 for the fifth year. The Task Force recommended that these funds be associated with the interconnection, research, training, library, clearinghouse, and administrative expenses of the Corporation, but the \$70,000 per station could be raised and this approach be used for the entire Federal payment.

3. Federal matching of total non-Federal contributions

The Zwick Task Force recommended \$1 for \$1 Federal matching of all non-Federal contributions to local stations, with specific annual limitations. These matching payments were to be associated with local station operating costs, with one-half of the annual Federal payment to be distributed to local stations on the basis of \$1 Federal to each \$2 received in non-Federal support. The other half would be distributed to stations on an equalizing basis, as determined by giving patterns, extent of public broadcasting services, and per capita income in each community. This scheme could be revised to form the basis of the entire Federal payment to the Corporation, perhaps serving as the authorization basis for multiple year appropriations.

4. A Federal tax on the gross revenues of commercial broadcasters

The Zwick Task Force and the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting have argued that on the merits of possible alternative Federal taxes, the best case can be made for a tax on the gross receipts of commercial broadcasters. The rationale for this tax is that a linkage can be made between the use of a public resource for private commercial purposes and public broadcasting; i.e., we raise revenue for public broadcasting by allowing commercial activities to use part of the spectrum.

Dick Netzer chose this tax source on the grounds that it did better than the manufacturers' excise tax under year-to-year stability, growth over time, and neutrality criteria. However, the commercial broadcasting companies and local stations would surely mount a major attack against this proposal, it does less well on linkage with benefits criteria, and would be more difficult to administer than the proposed excise tax.

Alternative Strategies for Presentation:

Two issues are involved: (1) the timing of an Administration proposal to the Congress and (2) who testifies on behalf of the Administration.

A. Timing

The 1970 appropriation authorization is pending in the House; Committee hearings are not likely to be called until after the July 4th recess. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is particularly interested in long-term financing for the Corporation, and questions about this are expected to come up in the hearings.

Possible timing alternatives include:

1. During, or just before, the House committee hearings on the 1970 authorization next month.
2. After the 1970 authorization has been enacted, probably in September.
3. Next January, when the Administration presents its legislative program for 1970.

If either (2) or (3) are selected, the Corporation could be asked to respond to the inevitable question on long-term financing during the House hearings by describing the proposal it has submitted to the Administration, and thus sound out the Congress on this proposal. This would give the Administration an opportunity to test the water before it has to submit its own proposal. The Corporation would prefer that alternative (2) be selected.

B. Who testifies for the Administration

The Secretary of HEW, in deferring to Treasury on the techniques adopted for long-term financing for the Corporation, would clearly prefer not to be the lead Administration witness for any proposal in this area. The Secretary fully supports the purposes of the Corporation and the potential of public broadcasting, but would argue that Treasury or the Budget Bureau are better equipped to present and defend any proposal for long-term financing.

The Corporation's proposal would create a special Treasury fund to be known as the "Public Broadcasting Fund" which would be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury. If this feature were retained in the Administration's proposal, it would be appropriate for the Secretary of the Treasury to testify on behalf of the Administration.

On the other hand, OBR argues that this special fund should be administered by the Secretary of HEW since he is the Federal official most closely related to the purposes of the fund, which is to finance primarily an educational activity. On this basis, the Secretary of HEW would be the appropriate Administration spokesman.

Attachment

ATTACHMENT

LEVELS OF FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTINGTable 1

A Public Broadcasting Cost Model
(Based on Carnegie Report)

(Dollars in millions)

	<u>1969</u> <u>est.</u>	<u>1st yr.</u>	<u>2nd yr.</u>	<u>5th yr.</u>	<u>1980</u>
<u>The Corporation</u>					
Programming	3	20	31	62	74
Operational grants	1	6	31	50	57
Inter connections	1	4	7	9	9
Other	2	3	7	13	15
Subtotal	7	33	76	134	155
<u>HEW: Capital grants</u>	5	48	48	45	40
Federal total	12	81	124	179	195
<u>Other Contributions</u>	75 ^{a/}	54	54	69	75
Model, Grand total	87	136	178	247	270

Note: Does not include an allowance for radio broadcasting.

Source: Zwick Task Force report.

^{a/} The 1969 estimates of "other contributions" was provided by NAEB; of the \$75 million, \$53 million is expected to go to local stations and \$22 million for industry support activities such as NET, NIT, PBL, etc..

Rogers - June 20, 1969

June 20, 1969

*Public
Broadcasting*

MEMORANDUM FOR

**Mr. Richard Nathan
Assistant Director
Bureau of the Budget**

I have received the staff paper on long-term financing for CPB from Mark Alger of your staff. As I think I have indicated to you before, I agree with the Council of Economic Advisers' criticism of the Corporation's proposal.

The lack of interesting alternatives over the last six months, and in fact the last several years, has not produced a very fertile debate and does not appear likely to be terribly fruitful. The Administration would like to be identified in a positive way with public broadcasting, but I do not see how in good conscience we can be very favorable on any of the proposals so far advanced.

Would you please see if your staff can develop some ideas along the following lines:

1. A relaxation of the FCC requirement that the so-called ETV stations be noncommercial; this requirement could be replaced by a limitation on the amount of advertising time and a stipulation that the station be run on a nonprofit basis.
2. Limited matching funds for the Corporation.
3. Provision of subsidies to these stations (through the Facilities Act, the Corporation, or some other mechanism) for the costs of air time so that producers of television shows that were not acceptable to either the commercial networks or subsidized by the Corporation or other sources could have the opportunity to be seen.

The point I am trying to get at is that public broadcasting should be relatively self-sufficient in order that it will be independent of the appropriations process (and therefore of the inevitable political pressures) and so that there will be the appropriate incentives to develop programming that is responsive to public interest.

Clay T. Whitehead
Staff Assistant

Mr. Flanigan
cc: Mr. Trent
Mr. Hofgren
Mr. Whitehead
Central Files

CTWhitehead:ed

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Rogers - July 1, 1969

July 1, 1969

get Finn
info. on public

MEMORANDUM FOR DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN

From: *CF* Checker Finn

Concerning: Public Television

The Wisconsin conference on public television programming was most enlightening, and I'm very glad I went. John Macy, Bob Wood, Hartford Gunn and Charles Frankel all send their regards.

There are over 160 public television stations in the country, loosely tied together by the National Educational Television network and by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. As you well know, they aren't known for imaginative programming or effectiveness in the past, but it's pretty clear to me that they're ready for a great step forward. They have a number of highly imaginative ideas--the Children's Television Workshop that we saw being one example--and plans. Among other things, television is the principal medium that reaches into the ghettos, and the broadcasters are groping for new ways of turning their stations into really effective "urban communications systems". Macy thinks that there may be something here for the Urban Affairs Council. I do, too.

They also have some good ideas for cultural and educational programming, for public service shows, and for a better mix between local and national programming.

Although the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was a Johnson creation, it is clear that this Administration has the opportunity to put its stamp on public television, and for it to really flourish in the next few years. Heaven knows, it's a small investment; this year's federal subsidy to the Corporation will be a mere \$10 million. (It was to have been \$20 million, but got cut in half during the budget revision.)

Because it is such an inexpensive program, public television risks falling between the boxes in the Administration. It needs a man in the White House, seems to me, who is interested in cultural affairs, in communications, in public relations for the President, in education, in urban affairs and in the relationship of the government to the media in general. It needs, in short, someone for John Macy and Hartford Gunn and their cronies to turn to, no matter what their problem or idea. In the previous Administration, this was Douglass Cater. I know that Macy has talked on occasion with Peter Flanigan and with Herb Klein. I'm wondering whether this is something Mr. Garment would be interested in. And wondering also whether you, Flanigan, Garment, Macy and possibly Dick Nathan might have lunch together sometime soon to talk about public television in general.

_____ yes, arrange lunch

_____ no, but:

cc: Jon Rose ✓

7/2(7)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

copy

Date _____

TO: *Tom Whitehead*

FROM: Peter Flanigan

FYI

Draft reply _____

Please Handle _____

File _____

Other remarks

Apparently there was a conference in Michigan on public-TV broadcasting. Macy called Moyzish who sent Finn. Why didn't Macy call us?

I suggest we maybe
send Moynihan a
memo under PMF
signature saying
that Garnett + we
will handle it.
I talked to Garnett
+ he doesn't want it
in his lap right
now.

J

Public Broadcasting
1

July 4, 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. MOYNIHAN

I have received a copy of Checker Finn's memorandum to you of July 1st on public television and thought I would pass on a little of our activities in that area.

This office has been handling White House concerns relating to the communications industry and the FCC. This also has included the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and I recently organized a briefing on their present activities and future plans, to which you were invited.

There are two major problem areas here that the White House should be concerned with. One is the pressing issue of long-range financing for the Corporation, which is currently operating on year-to-year authorization and appropriations from the Congress -- clearly not a healthy long-run situation. There has been considerable sterile talk in the press about alternatives for long-range financing, but nothing particularly imaginative since the Carnegie Report. The Budget Bureau has prepared a proposal for long-run financing which met with criticism both from myself and the Council of Economic Advisors.

The second problem area is tying together the efforts of the Corporation, the FCC, and EHW into some coherent national policy toward public broadcasting. Long-range financing is an important part of this policy, but Government use of television and radio media is another important area. EHW funding of educational TV facilities also has to be tied in.

A final consideration is the relation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to the Smithsonian Institution, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and other related Federal activities. The Administration would clearly like to be identified in a positive way with all of these activities for obvious reasons, and we are considering the possibility of more interrelationship among these activities.

We are currently trying to coordinate this area in conjunction with Len Garmant, and we welcome any thoughts you might have. I have talked to Steve Hess on one or two occasions about this area since it has clear relationships to some of the problems you are trying to deal with.

Clay T. Whitehead
Staff Assistant

cc: Mr. Flanigan
Mr. Rose
Mr. Hofgren
Mr. Trent
Mr. Whitehead
Central Files

CTW/Whitehead:ed

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. FLANIGAN

RE: Public Television and the Corporation for Public
Broadcasting

Rationale

The theory behind an expanded view of the function of public television was stated by the Carnegie Commission, which said: "we seek for the citizen freedom to view, to see the programs that the present system, by its incompleteness, denies him." While the public broadcasters recognize that the commercial broadcasters do provide a choice in types of programming and do program for minority groups, they believe: that real options should be consistently made available to viewers; that unique places (the forgotten small towns) and interest groups of every variety have a right to representation over the public airwaves; and that a commitment to education must be carried on outside classroom walls.

History and Development

Public broadcasting in America has always been considered primarily a locally oriented endeavor. Public broadcasting stations were mainly started to aid in the process of formal education. However, through the years since the first educational station opened in 1953, the public stations have assumed a role of providing programming that suits the needs of many segments in the community beyond the school child. Today the average station is on the air for 56 hours weekly, devoting on the average 50% of its programming time to the general audience. Each station's programming orientation reflects its ownership and source of income: Thus, there are school stations, licensed individual schools or school systems; state stations, licensed to state boards of education; community stations, licensed to any non-profit corporation or even to a city, as in the case of WNYC in New York City.

The sources of programming vary. The majority of all programming is not national, and is done by the state and the six regional networks.