International Journal of Political Education, 1 (1977) 73–88

THE GLORY AND THE BURDEN: TEACHING A COURSE ON POLITICS AND THE MEDIA

DAVID L. PALETZ
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

ABSTRACT

The article describes the genesis, purposes and construction of an innovative course relating politics and the media of communication. Focusing on authority, the course (the glory) is designed to assist students to understand, on the one hand, how and why the media depict authority systems, structures, positions, individual authority wielders, and sanctioned policies in particular ways; and, on the other hand, to understand how public officials in the United States and other nations try to use the mass media to enhance their authority. Feature and "documentary" films, videotapes of television news and political campaign commercials are analyzed for their structures, codes, and possible effects. The success of the course is indicated by the range and quality of original, media-using, student projects.

The teacher of such a course encounters a heavy"burden". It includes administrative difficulties, technical obstacles, and the unavailability of visual material. Facing such problems directly, the Task Force on Audio-Visual Instruction in Political Science of the American Political Science Association (of which the author was a member) issued a series of sweeping recommendations in the areas of information and evaluation of technological resources and media material production, exhibition, distribution, circulation, and preservation. Most of these recommendations have thus far encountered benign neglect.

Introduction

This is a brief report of a course which tries to relate politics and the mass media of communication. I make no claims for the course other than to suggest that it is somewhat unusual and some colleagues may therefore be interested in its genesis and content, problems encountered, and future prospects for the most important of the problems to be resolved. Since the issue of most concern to the profession is, in my judgment, the unavailability of politically relevant visual material, readers disinterested in course construction may wish to skip to the paper's third section.

It would be gratifying but inaccurate to report that the politics and media course was consciously and thoughtfully developed during my sojourn in graduate school. In my day, most graduate students were expected to pass courses not devise them (have things really changed?). Nonetheless, inclined by nature and conviction to moderate innovation, discontented during my

student career by the rigidities of the traditional lecture and seminar teaching methods, I immediately mumbled something about politics and the mass media when the Duke Political Science Department Chairman asked me whether, if hired, I would innovate any courses. Concern lest a negative response create an unfavorable impression may also have tickled motivation.

Although I thought the choice inspired, I later realized that my topic selection had been predictable. At UCLA I had audited film courses, written about movies for academic publications, periodically, indiscriminately and guiltily indulged in television, and inveterately read newspapers and books on the media. Although I had sometimes pondered the relationship of media and politics, I regarded my immersion in the media as a distraction from legitimate academic pursuits. Faced with the opportunity to innovate a course, however, I hastily opted for the media.

When I was offered the position, the chairman reminded me of my commitment and said that the course would be scheduled for the spring semester. Now came the problem of devising a syllabus.

The initial problem was how to integrate mass media material with political science. Most visual products customarily used in the classroom are instructional films or filmstrips, or film and television documentaries specifically designed to be educational. However, I was seeking to use visual aids neither as course supplements nor as textbook alternatives. My hope was to take work produced in the film, broadcasting, press, magazine, and recording industries which was not necessarily designed for pedagogical purposes, and to try and determine-analyze-speculate on its political meaning and effects.

Glory (The Course)

I organized the course generally to give students the skills to analyze and explain media content, and to help them try to appraise the effects of this content on the political system. But immersion in the content of the mass media led me to the conclusion that when they are explicitly political, and often when they are not, the media treat people in authority. The course was specifically designed, then, to assist students to understand, on the one hand, how and why the media depict authority systems, structures, positions, individual authority wielders, and sanctioned policies in particular ways; and, on the other hand, to understand how authority holders (public officials) in the United States and other nations try to use the mass media to enhance their authority.

The course begins with a discussion of the nature of communication and research methods. The students are required to read Hobbes on the uses and abuses of speech [1] (a particularly felicitous choice I have always

thought), unpublished research papers by Doris Graber (1974) and Jay Blumler (1973), and Holsti (1969) on content analysis. The next section is on authority and reading is taken from Benn and Peters (1959), Bierstedt (1954), Lasswell and Kaplan (1950), and Max Weber (1947). Milgram's provocative experiments on the conditions leading to authority obedience and disobedience and the implications of his research for authority in the larger society are examined at length (Milgram, 1966). Distinctions are made between regimes, formal positions of authority, incumbents of such positions, the public policies they propound, and so on.

So far the course follows the orthodox approach but we now turn to film. The students first see a series of film excerpts designed to alert them to the technique of film making (sound, shot, visual content, editing, etc.). It is commonly believed that students are visually sophisticated because they have been nurtured on television and are frequent filmgoers. Nonetheless, my experience with the course suggests that their understanding of the film medium and their sensitivity to the nuances of shot, montage, and sound is quite limited. It may be that television and many films are so visually barren that they require no perception from the viewer. And that just like literature, an intelligent understanding of the medium requires cultivation and training. Whatever the reasons, it has become necessary to use film excerpts early in the course to develop the students' visual acuity. Subsequently, the students see a variety of films and are required to analyze the way they depict authority and to try to determine their effects.

The course continues with an examination of authority in the autocratic societies of Czarist Russia and Nazi Germany. For the former, the reading is Dostoyevksy's "Grand Inquisitor" section (pp. 288–311) from *The Brothers Karamazov* (1958) and Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* (1969). As is well known, "The Grand Inquisitor" contains an extraordinarily persuasive explanation and defense of autocratic rule, while Lenin's tract both defines the role of the press in fomenting revolution and defends the creation of a revolutionary elite. The film shown and discussed is Eisenstein's *Strike* which, aside from a pyrotechnical use of virtually every device known to filmmakers, has the advantage of being silent and thus demanding a visual concentration from the audience. More important, *Strike* is both an attack on the Czarist-Capitalist autocracy ruling Russia during the time when the strike occurs and an affirmation of the proletariat as hero. It also illustrates many of the ideas developed in Lenin's book.

The film shown during the part of the course devoted to Nazi Germany is naturally, Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* depicting the 1934 Nuremberg rally. *Triumph of the Will* is analyzed against the description of Nazi Germany and Hitler given by Nolte in *Three Faces of Fascism* (1963) and Neumann in *Behemoth* (1966) in terms of its filmic construction and its

affirmation of authority – it is one of the few films made by a notable cinematic artist in flagrant praise of a regime (and an autocratic regime at that). And it enables us to probe the nature of propaganda. It is contrasted to Alain Resnais' *Night and Fog*, a luminous evocation of the horror of the Nazi extermination camps.

We next turn to the United States and spend some time examining the nature and organization of the press in this country and analyzing assorted arguments about its politically relevant effects. Leon Sigal's *Reporters and Officials* (1973) and readings in Dexter and White's *People, Society and Mass Communications* (1964) are useful here, as are Andrew Kopkind's more polemical comments in *The New York Review* [2]. At this point we compare and contrast the kinds of coverage or lack thereof given various issues in the local press and the *New York Times*. It is invariably instructive, for me at least, to discover that most students read newspapers with both suspicion and credulity. That is, they believe that somehow the news is biased but they do not know how and they find it difficult to isolate instances. Perhaps one of the benefits of the course is to make them more aware of the importance of sources (who says what to whom and with what effects, as Lasswell formulated it), the significance of journalistic norms in contributing (in some cases at least) to enhancing a ruler's authority, and the role of "gatekeepers" – to mention just a few important factors. The films used are *J.F. Stone* and *San Francisco Good Times* which permit us to compare two alternatives to conventional journalism with each other and with the establishment press.

After press, we videotape television news on the same night from the three networks. We spend several hours analyzing each newscast individually, then compare each to its competitor, and then to local and major newspapers appearing on the same and following days. Finally, we relate the television newscasts to the ideas about and explanations of television content advanced by Fairlie (1968) and Epstein (1974).

After television news, we examine the television industry in the United States. We seek to explain the prevalence of particular program genres and content and speculate on their possible effects. Intellectually respectable or even controverisal works in defense of television are not easy to find, so I utilize Muriel Cantor's instructive interviews with television producers (1971) and Roper Research Associates', *Trends in Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media, 1959–1976* [3]. The National Association of Broadcasters' *Television Code* often facilitates understanding of omissions and inclusions in the content of many television programs.

The two themes of the presentation of authority in the media and attempts by those holding such authority to employ the media to their advantage (or at least prevent its use to their detriment) are continued with reference to elections, the presidency, judges, legislators, mayors, and the military. On the one hand there is the nature of the media news gathering processes,

definitions of news, access to and relations with those involved in the political system and so on. On the other hand, people with authority vary in their needs for media coverage, their accessibility, the extent to which they can call down secrecy on their activities, and the symbolic effectiveness of the settings within which they operate. Thus, students are required to compare the relations of the media and the various governmental institutions and their members along these dimensions. The reading is diverse and includes, among others, the Langs, (1968), Wyckoff (1968), Moynihan (1971), the effusions of Vice-President Agnew (a brief encounter), Matthews (1960) Wiebe's seminal article on "Responses to the Televised Kefauver Hearings" (1952) and Newland's informative but somewhat dated piece on the Supreme Court (1964). But the most significant book is by Murray Edelman (1964). Most students taking the course find this book's analysis of symbols and ritual as used (not necessarily consciously) by men in public life to be so enlightening and persuasive that it is difficult for the instructor to convince them to view Edelman's position critically. I therefore require students to write a critique of the book.

On elections, the students view examples of television commercials culled from a wide range of campaigns, "documentary" films made for the 1972 presidential election lauding Senator McGovern and President Nixon respectively, and *The Manchurian Candidate* – with its comedy-night-mare view of American public figures and the electoral process. On the presidency, the students see Bruce Connor's "underground" short *Report* on the Kennedy assassination and then a television memorial to the slain president entitled *The Burden and the Glory*. The first film initially provokes disorientation with its frequent use of loops (which result in an oft repeated scene) and blank screen. But it subsequently becomes the topic of animated discussion because of the ambiguity of its images and the complexity of their juxtaposition. The latter film, perhaps because its makers lacked time and sometimes had to make do with inadequate footage, and because it is, after all, a memorial, is vulnerable to criticism – which it receives – for its omissions, distortions, the staleness of some of its images (perhaps they were not stale in 1964) and its reverence for the presidency. More striking to one who was in graduate school when President Kennedy was killed and who was shattered for weeks after, is the way the students treat the Kennedy administration as ancient history; but then most of them were between six and ten at the time.

In view of our present dolorous economic condition at home,and overseas defeats, I shall next semester add *Gabriel Over the White House* to the course. This film, made in the 1930s, depicts a President (played by Walter Huston) who, armed with dictatorial powers and directed by divinity, achieves domestic and international peace and prosperity.

The film on legislators is *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*. Written by Sydney Buchman, who was later blacklisted for his supposed communist affiliations and activities, and directed by Frank Capra, this story of an innocent (James Stewart) who saves the Senate from its evil ways (temporarily at least), represents the contradictory impulses with which many Americans have regarded our politics and politicians. In some parts the film is a powerful indictment of mendacity and corruption in high places and implies they are ineradicable. At other times, the movie tells us that our traditions, symbolized most graphically by Lincoln, can and will be preserved.

The part of the course devoted to State governors considers Huey Long and explicitly tries to compare Sindler's useful *Huey Long's Louisiana* (1956), and Williams' magisterial biography (1969), Warren's novel (1953), the film of the same name, and a documentary entitled *The Longs of Louisiana*. The important questions here concern whether differences in approach and emphasis (ideas, personality, social background) can be traced to the characteristics of the different media.

The course concludes with three interwoven parts. The first is an analysis of the activities of the police and how they are portrayed in the media. The police, after all, are the most obvious manifestations of authority in a society. And, fortunately, there is a burgeoning literature on police roles and functions, most notably the work of Allan Silver and James Q. Wilson (1967) [4]. We also videotape several of the law-enforcement shows proliferating on television and analyze the images of police behavior and authority they convey. They are compared with Wiseman's putative "documentary" on the Kansas City police entitled *Law and Order*.

The second part of the final section is a consideration of violence (real and fictional) as depicted in the media and as utilized both by those in authority and those who oppose them. Again there is a growing literature, especially reports to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (Baker and Ball, 1969). Films shown here are Buster Keaton's short *Cops* (1922) in which the hero, through a series of misadventures, spends much of the film being pursued throughout an otherwise deserted Los Angeles by an army of policemen; a four-minute animated short entitled *Claude* in which a sloppy, distracted child destroys his nasty bourgeois parents by turning the handle of a bland box with which he has been tinkering; Jansco's meditation on revolution, *Red Psalm*; and Franju's remarkable "documentary" *Blood of the Beasts* about the slaughterhouses of Paris, which shows us that institutionalized violence can be both beautiful and banal. These films portray violence quite differently and encourage discussion of its nature, when it is legitimate, and how it is related to authority.

Finally, there is an all too brief section on citizenship, censorship, and restraint, in which the views of J.S. Mill in *On Liberty* are compared to

Rousseau's (1968) argument for a limitation on freedom of speech. Students with rare exceptions, and despite the instructor's sympathy with Rousseau's position, discover their views to be consonant with those of Mill, and many of them look with dismay upon any restraint on expression. Watergate has reinforced their convictions.

Students relish the course. They diligently attend class sessions, study the films, comment enthusiastically on course evaluation forms. They do so despite my penchant for assigning inordinate amounts of work and awarding (relatively) low grades. But the greatest glory comes from the class projects in which students seek to display their understanding of the effects of media structure and processes on authority. Some of the more original examples include a project in which Kissinger's "Peace is at Hand" press conference was compared to its coverage on the three network news programs; an experiment on effects in which then President Nixon's Houston press conference before the National Association of Broadcasters' Convention was videotaped and then shown to matched groups of students only half of whom saw the subsequent "instant analysis"; an analysis of anti-drug and military recruitment public service advertisements; television coverage of the 1972 Democratic National Convention compared with the impressions and reactions of North Carolina delegates to the Convention; a comparison and analysis of the propaganda techniques used in the 1972 compaign films of then President Nixon and Senator McGovern; and a videotape on the conflict in Harlan County in which the students, taking the same material, tried to present the issues first from the point of view of the strikers and then from that of the employer (Duke Power) by manipulating the material through editing and soundtrack.

The course is successful, it seems to me, primarily because it capitalizes on material which is familiar to the students but not consciously understood. They are reasonably well acquainted with the mechanics of American government, and media are a pervasive part of their lives (newspapers less so than television and movies). The course shows the students how politics and the media are linked and gives them the skills and technical tools to make additional connections themselves. And yet, the temptation to cease offering it is very strong because of the inordinate burden it places upon my time and energy and the perpetually bedevilling problems it generates.

Burden

Aside from the obvious difficulty of trying to cover too much in too short a time and the resulting frustration among students and teacher, the course encounters three kinds of problems: administrative, technical, and the

unavailability of visual material. Administrative difficulties include the scattered nature of much of the reading. This results in students having to spend hours in the library reserve reading room waiting for the limited number of xerox copies (limited by law and library funds) of fugitive articles to become available – some students even express the desire for a textbook. There is also the complication of increasing the weekly course hours from three to six in order to accommodate the films. My expedient is to designate the film showings as "lab" [5].

Technical problems arise because Duke, like most colleges and universities, is not equipped to teach social science courses in any other than the traditional lecturing or seminar format. Thus, it is difficult to obtain adequate funds to pay for the non-theatrical film rentals; projection facilities have to be borrowed (and sometimes begged) from the better-endowed physical or natural sciences (we show films in the Chemistry Auditorium); and, to avoid the expense of university projectionists, we frequently use students in whom enthusiasm and technical competence do not always coincide.

Indeed, our initial problem was the unavailability of equipment. Film projectors were few and operating ones fewer. Video-recorders and playbacks appeared not to exist on the campus until we discovered them in such out-of-the-way sanctuaries as the Schools of Law, Medicine, and Divinity. Eventually, the Duke administration was prevailed upon to establish a Media Center to acquire, distribute, and operate technical equipment with which visual material could be produced, recorded, and shown. Unfortunately, instead of having its costs equitized across the University, as is done with the library, the Media Center was required to be self-sustaining by charging recipients for its services. The Center failed to break even because its on-campus clients could not pay the equipment rental fees required to sustain it, and the acquisition of too many off-campus customers could reportedly jeopardize the University's non-profit status. The Center is apparently now being phased out and at this time the fate of the equipment is uncertain.

The unavailability of visual material remains the most important problem. Many films are simply priced beyond our budget and would still be too expensive were our expenditures doubled. Other films are taken out of non-theatrical distribution (as *Citizen Kane* was for several years) for various entrepreneurial reasons. Often the foreign films I wish to use are not acquired for showing in this country [6]. Furthermore, students need to see a film more than once if they are to analyze it in detail. But rental charges for more than one showing are costly and, besides, Duke possesses no equipment for frame-by-frame film analysis.

If the problem is serious for movies, it is crucial for television. Television shows a variety of material bearing on the political process. The most obvious examples are politicians' press conferences, speeches, and nationwide addres-

ses. Frequently these appearances have been made by the president. For many years our Sundays have been cluttered with interview programs such as *Meet the Press*. These appearances and programs are directly political. No less significant are Congressional hearings (Army-McCarthy, Vietnam) and the networks' nightly newscasts [7]. It is ironic that university and college libraries are filled with obscure newspapers and magazines, while scholars interested in what politicians have said and how they have looked and sounded on television, and what news has been presented nightly to millions of Americans, do not have access to raw data. Similarly, material of a less direct political nature is also unavailable. A scholar wishing to conduct research on the political socialization content of children's cartoons, but lacking a video-recorder, must simply rise on Saturday mornings and watch them with his progeny. Campaign commercials appear to fall into a different category because copies are often retained by the advertising agency responsible for their creation. Nonetheless, these also are very difficult to obtain.

Prospects

What are the prospects of universities and colleges acquiring the kind of equipment which might obviate some of the problems just discussed? And what is being done to make available the television material which scholars presently find virtually impossible to obtain?

In *Innovations in Liberal Arts Colleges* Brick and McGrath (1969) refer to "Learning Resource Centers" which provide "for the storage and transmission of knowledge in audio and visual forms such as tape recordings, records, photographs, slides, motion pictures, and television (pp. 65–66). They mention a few examples of such centers. They do not, however, indicate how the data are to be obtained. With many colleges and universities in straitened circumstances, it is doubtful that finances will be expended to develop many more of these centers or to purchase films. The fate of Duke's Media Center may indeed be instructive in this regard. Thus I envisage little improvement in the logistical situation.

This leaves us with the vital question of television data. It is possible that educational institutions with resource centers will possess video-recorders and therefore be able to tape appropriate programs. The cost of doing this over a sustained period and of *retaining* the material is prohibitively expensive for any one institution. Nonetheless, attempts are in progress to record television content. The Pentagon periodically advertises for bids from small business firms in the Washington, D.C. area to record network newscasts [8]. Apparently it has contracted since 1963 with private firms to monitor network news broadcasts in Washington for stories dealing with military matters

(legislation, appropriations, Vietnam). Somewhat more ambitiously the Signal Corps, at the behest of the Nixon administration, attempted to record every reference to the Nixon family made on television [9]. This material has been earmarked for the National Archives but a duplicate is likely to go into the Nixon library, if and when it is established.

What is needed, of course, is the accumulation of past television programs and the recording of present and future ones. Ideally, this material would be placed in four or five centers strategically located throughout the United States where it could be distributed to scholars at minimum cost for research and teaching [10]. Neither the Defense Department nor Signal Corps endeavors are likely to fulfil this purpose.

One solution would be for the networks voluntarily to establish the centers, or at least provide copies of the programs either free or at a minimum charge. This solution is unlikely to occur [11]. The networks' reluctance may be due to a belief that making the material available might make them vulnerable to Agnew type attacks ("Look, that newscaster really did raise his eyebrows every time he mentioned the president."). With the possibilities of congressional or FCC actions affecting their profits, broadcasters may also be unwilling to expose their activities to more detailed and sophisticated scholarly scrutiny. And of course many members of the broadcasting industry probably do not wish to incur further unnecessary expense or to take unproductive political risks [12].

There are some other activities which suggest that the issue is, if nothing else, at least becoming more salient to scholars and politicians. Prompted by alumnus Paul Simpson, and sustained by funds from Simpson, other alumni, and some modest foundation grants, Vanderbilt University has been recording network nightly news programs as they appear in Nashville since August 1968. The project was partly designed to demonstrate that a national agency such as the Library of Congress could and should be the permanent custodian of the project. Legislation to this effect was introduced in Congress but not enacted. Consequently, the Vanderbilt Archive has become an extremely important resource for scholars. The nightly newscasts are indexed and made available for analysis in Nashville. More important, the Archive staff compiles, duplicates, and distributes excerpts for a modest fee to qualified scholars who request particular material for research purposes.

On December 21, 1973, Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) filed suit against Vanderbilt University alleging copyright violation. Meanwhile, the National Archives accepted a royalty-free license to tape the CBS news shows and make them available to scholars and researchers at its seventeen branches [13]. Subsequently, CBS has made a two-year agreement to deliver a videocassette of its regularly scheduled and special news programs to the National Archives "for copying and distribution to libraries around the country under the workings of the American Library Association Inter-

library Loan Code " [14]. Since the suit was instituted, moreover, CBS has been keeping copies of its evening newscasts on three-fourths inch tape. And the network "is now granting non-exclusive licenses to school systems permitting them to make off-the-air videotapes of regularly scheduled network hard news television broadcasts for in-school educational and instructional purposes" [15]. Apparently, CBS wants to assert its ownership of the newscasts and to stop Vanderbilt from editing or renting the tapes for use outside the University. Irrespective of the suit's final disposition, the importance of the preservation and distribution of at least television news programs is finally being acknowledged.

There are numerous other possible sources of media material which probably should be available to scholars for teaching and research but they are not easy to tap. For example, material stored in the National Archives is not distributed outside the Archives and its regional branches and, although the Audio-Visual Division will make copies for a reasonable fee, one often needs first to make time-consuming and costly arrangements for use with the original producers or other companies that have purchased the rights. This is particularly applicable in the case of newsreels whose commercial potential is increasingly apparent to the denizens of Hollywood.

Responding to these problems, in January 1974, the Task Force on Audio-Visual Instruction in Political Science made its Report to the Steering Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE) of the American Political Science Association [16]. Observing that in a 1951 Report the APSA Committee on the Advancement of Teaching had bemoaned the lack of use of visual resources in the classroom and proposed several steps to rectify the situation, none of which had been implemented, the 1974 Report optimistically offered twenty-four recommendations designed to diminish, if not rectify, all the problems and difficulties I have discussed, and others I have scarcely envisaged. Recommendations were made in the areas of information and evaluation of technological resources and media material production, exhibition, distribution, circulation, and preservation of relevant media material for use by political scientists in their teaching and research – no matter whether the source be scholars (videotapes produced by political scientists), politicians (campaign advertisements) or commercial (films, television news, public affairs, and entertainment programs).

These recommendations are sweeping and innovative. I reprint them here because they bear directly upon the subject of this paper and because they have, in the main, encountered benign neglect [17].

Recommendations

That the American Political Science Association:

1. Act as a central clearing house for information about visual media resources relevant to our discipline.
2. Encourage and regularly publish critical reviews of new and existing media materials in an appropriate APSA publication.
3. Under the direction of a media coordinator, prepare, distribute, and regularly update a comprehensive annotated media bibliography.
4. Regularly sponsor panels, discussion and exhibitions of relevant visual media materials, especially those produced by political scientists.
5. Encourage and facilitate the display of visual materials and equipment by commercial distributors.
6. Commission the production and distribution of a monograph which critically evaluates and explains the use of existing media, recording, and projection technologies of relevance to our discipline.
7. Explore the possibility of putting into circulation documentary materials now held by major non-theatrical archives, including the Library of Congress, the Audio-Visual Archives Division of the National Archives, and the Presidential Libraries.
8. Establish liaison with commercial distributors of materials for the purpose of informing them of the needs of political scientists, and to encourage them to be more active in the publication and distribution of visual media materials.
9. Identify and participate in the creation of a political campaign visual materials archive, and facilitate the distribution of those materials to the profession.
10. Where appropriate, coordinate distribution related activities with other interested parties such as the American Anthropological Association and the Committee on Film and Television Resources and Services.
11. Actively participate in the creation of a consortium of regional media libraries specifically committed to the task of distributing selected visual materials and in some cases reproducing and distributing professionally developed materials from whatever source, to interested members of the profession.
12. That political science as a discipline encourage its members to join with the audio-visual technicians at their own schools in the development of opportunities for the rigorous use of visual materials by students as media for the transmission of political intelligence.
13. We recommend that the Association explore the development of a fellowship program in communications, in which political science students will be able to spend a year working with television or documentary producers. This program should intially focus on advanced undergraduate and graduate students, but might be expanded to include post-doctoral fellows as well.
14. We recommend that SCUE reaffirm its support for the development and funding of the proposed Media Production Project.
15. We recommend that a special audio-visual production fund be established, for the preparation of teaching materials, and for research purposes. The fund might be administered by APSA and could provide expenses to cover costs of production materials and leave of absence time.

16. We recommend that the Association commission a "How-To-Do-It" manual directed toward the use of low level media technologies in political science instruction.
17. We recommend that the Association institute a series of fee-sustained media training workshops, held in conjuction with the annual meetings of the Association.
18. It encourages individuals to share their experiences in trying to obtain permission [to use copyright materials] to hope that some general policy can emerge in the future.
19. It suggests that a set of guidelines be prepared to aid module producers in their quest for permission to use copyrighted material. These might be included in the proposed Media Bibliography . . . .
20. That SCUE recommend to the APSA Council that the Association's legal counsel make contact with Vanderbilt counsel and be prepared to offer an amicus curiae brief should it prove useful.
21. That appropriate officials of the Association begin formal conversations with the networks in an effort to obtain permission to use taped segments of broadcast news in our teaching.
22. That the Association prepare a statement in favor of having broadcast news made available to educators as part of the public domain and that this statement be used as the basis of an informational program aimed at obtaining statutory provision for the "fair use" of broadcast news.
23. We therefore recommend that the Association develop and distribute a videotape series, perhaps entitled "Personalities and Issues in the Development of Political Science."
24. A media coordinator be obtained on a half-time basis to work with [the APSA] in implementing the recommendations contained in this report dealing with the creation of a film bibliography, the creation of regional archives and distribution centers, and other tasks that are deemed appropriate.

Notes

1 Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1960), part 1, chap. 4. Obviously only some of the reading and films required for the course will be mentioned.

2 See for example his review of James Reston's, "The Artillery of the Press" in *The New York Review* 8 (May 4, 1967), 12–14.

3 Available from the Television Information Office.

4 See for example the articles by Silver and Wilson respectively in David J. Bordua, ed., *The Police* (New York: John Wiley, 1967), pp. 1–24 and 137–62. In the course, Wilson's essay is related to "The Police and the Press," section in Daniel Walker's *Rights in Conflict* report on events surrounding the 1968 Democratic Party Convention in Chicago.

5 It is perhaps a mark of my adherence to tradition that I increased the course hours to show the films. As a result the regular time periods for lecturing are not reduced. Indeed, the course meets for an additional forty hours. Therefore, I am not vulnerable to accusations of filling up class periods with visual divertissements.

6 The vagaries of the acquisition, pricing, promotion, and non-theatrical distribution of films in the United States have been diligently investigated by Darcy Paletz for her as yet unpublished M.A. thesis (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1974).

7 Educational Television programs should not be neglected, particularly the interview shows of Elizabeth Drew (no longer shown) and Bill Moyers.

8 *Commerce Business Daily*, May 20, 1971.

9 *Washington Post*, September 24, 1971, That the White House under President Ford still retained the capacity, although did not use it so extensively, is suggested in a recent article about President Ford's television advisor. Robert Mead, a former producer for CBS News, "commands the fanciest TV set in the White House complex.... It sits in the old Executive Office Building, displaying color bars that dissolve – on Mead's instructions – into videotaped replays of any news or public affairs program that engages his interest . . . . Military technicians assigned to the White House Communications Agency maintain this highly exclusive TV reference library." *New York Times*, March 16, 1975.

10 Peter M. Bardach, Vice-President of the Foote, Cone and Belding advertising agency reportedly has been trying for a decade to organize an archive where original radio programs could be identified, catalogued, and preserved for those wishing to do research or simply be entertained (the two are not always synonymous). See *Variety*, January 27, 1971.

11 It should be pointed out that the National Broadcasting Company has established NBC Educational Enterprises to make many recent NBC documentaries and network specials available at relatively low rental rates for classroom use. And some of the programs have been available from twelve universities scattered throughout the United States. It would be splendid if the network extended its offerings to the kinds of political materials described in this essay.

12 Emile De Antonio, who has made such films as *Point of Order, Rush To Judgment*, and *The Year of the Pig*, obtained most of his footage from television networks. Indeed, for *Point of Order* he is reported to have paid CBS $50,000 for kinescopes of the Senate Army-McCarthy hearings. However, as De Antonio has become more controversial, partly as a result of his association with Mark Lane on *Rush To Judgment* which severely questioned the accuracy of the Warren Commission's report, the networks have become reluctant to sell him material. According to De Antonio, CBS and NBC have established a new policy and will not sell their footage to any one. See Colin J. Westerbeck, Jr., "Some Out-Takes From Radical Film Making: Emile De Antonio, "*Sight and Sound* (Summer, 1970): 141–43. Out-takes (footage that is not shown on the air) provide a more complicated problem. Clearly the material would be of considerable use to scholars (as would a gatekeeper analysis of why it was not used). Indeed, it is sometimes shown by television station management to law enforcement agencies interested in the activities of criminal types, malcontents, activists and others deemed worthy of attention. Although most political scientists do not share such interests with the constabulary, any project to establish centers for television material should attempt to include out-takes.

13 For background to the conflict see "The Network Vs. The University," *TV Guide* 22 (June 29, 1974): 2–6.

14 *Daily Variety*, March 5, 1975.

15 Ibid.

16 Members of the Task Force were:

Richard Blue, Minnesota, Chairman
John S. Jackson, III, Southern Illinois (Carbondale)
Eugene Lichtenstein, MIT
Patrick O'Meara, Indiana
David L. Paletz, Duke
Richard Pride, Vanderbilt
Ithiel de Sola Pool, ex officio, MIT
Mark F. Ferber, ex officio, APSA

17 There is always the possibility of a technological break-through which can make some of the problems discussed here obsolete. This was the expectation for video-cassettes. Now hope is pinned on video discs to eliminate the mechanical, geographical, temporal, and economic barriers to the effective use of film. Intriguingly, video discs can give us ways of studying cinema that are literally impossible with motion picture film or videotape because the discs are amenable to speed-ups, slow-downs, frame-by-frame replay, reverses, freeze frames that can be held indefinitely, etc. Despite its potential, however, for several years, the video disc is most likely simply to add one more element to the myriad of incompatible systems for storing, distributing, and exhibiting visual material now extant.

References

Baker, Robert K. and Sandra J. Ball (eds.) (1969). *Violence and the Media,* Staff Report No. 9 to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Washington, D.C.: US, Government Printing Office.

Benn, S.I. and R.S. Peters (1959). *Social Principles and the Democratic State*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Bierstedt, Robert (1954). "The Problem of Authority," pp. 67–81 in Morroe Berger et al., *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*. New York: Van Nostrand.

Blumler, Jay G. (1973) "Audience Roles in Political Communication: Some Reflections on Their Structure, Antecedents and Consequences," paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Montreal, August 19–25.

Brick, Michael and E.J. McGrath (1969). *Innovations in Liberal Arts Colleges*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cantor, Muriel G. (1971). *The Hollywood TV Producer.* New York: Basic Books.

Dexter, Lewis A. and David M. White (1964). *People, Society, and Mass Communications.* New York: Free Press.

Dostoyevsky, Fyodor (1958). *The Brothers Karamazov.* Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books.

Edelman Murray (1964). *The Symbolic Uses of Politics.* Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Epstein, Edward J. (1974). *News From Nowhere.* New York: Vintage Books.

Fairlie, Henry (1968) "The Unreal World of Television News," pp. 127–136 in David Manning White and Richard Averson, (eds.), *Sight, Sound and Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Graber, Doris A. (1974). "Approaches To Content Analysis of Television News Programs," paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Lake George, N.Y., May 30–June 2.

Holsti, Ole R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Lang, Kurt and Gladys Engel Lang (1968). *Politics and Television*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Lasswell, Harold D. and Abraham Kaplan (1950). *Power and Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lenin, V.I. (1969). *What Is To Be Done?*. New York: International Publishers.

Matthews, Donald R. (1960). *U.S. Senators and Their World*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.

Milgram, Stanley (1966). "Some Conditions of Obedience and Disobedience to Authority," pp. 243–262 in I.D. Steiner and M. Fishbein, (eds.), *Current Studies in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Moynihan, D.P. (1971). "The Presidency and the Press." *Commentary* 51 (March) 41–52.

Neuman, Franz (1966). *Behemoth*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Newland, Chester A. (1964). "Press Coverage of the United States Supreme Court, *Western Political Quarterly* 17: 15–36.

Nolte, Ernst (1963). *Three Faces of Fascism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1968). *Politics and the Arts: Letter to M.D'Alembert on the Theatre*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Sigal, Leon V. (1973). *Reporters and Officials*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, Co.,

Sindler, Allan P. (1956). *Huey Long's Louisiana*. Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins Press.

Warren, Robert Penn (1953). *All the King's Men*. New York: Random House.

Weber, Max (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Talcott Parsons, (ed.). New York: Free Press.

Wiebe, G.D. (1952). "Responses to the Televised Kefauver Hearings," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 16: 179–200.

Williams, T. Harry (1969). *Huey Long*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wyckoff, Gene (1968). *The Image Candidates*. New York: Macmillan.