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You think the current television season is bad? Wait 'til next fall. Right now there are seven nights of movies in "prime time," the peak viewing hours from 7:30 to 11:00 p.m. While good feature pictures make money for everyone and obviously pull a large audience, the supply is necessarily limited. Even tossing in the "made for TV" epics which several of the motion picture studios are grinding out to take up the slack, there aren't enough of the better pictures to go around. For every superior film in a TV package, there just have to be many, many 'dogs.'

In the face of this, the NBC network has courageously taken over the seventh and final available night, Monday, to spool off more movies. There's even talk that another network will pit movies against movies at least one night a week rather than try to develop any new series or material. This is the state of television, circa 1968. A battle for the left-overs of another medium!

Who's responsible for this gutless attitude? Where are the villains? Incredibly, it's almost impossible to find them. Everyone has his answers and his arguments. Without any control whatever, how can the creative people—the writers, directors or actors—be faulted? Or how can you blame the motion picture studios for making extra revenue out of films which, for the most part, would be gathering dust and storage fees in their vaults? Or the television networks for purchasing products that are far superior to what they can produce themselves for anywhere near the same price? Or who can criticize the advertising agencies for recommending that their sponsor-clients hop on this bandwagon where they can reach the largest number of people with their message for the least cost? It's private enterprise, isn't it?

Or should we expect the Federal Communications Commission to jump into the breach and protect the "public airways" against films which have already been shown in the public theaters, minus a few "cuts" which are too sexy or violent for the living room?

Or does the problem rest with the rating services who indicate through a small sampling of homes that people apparently prefer films over whatever else is being offered at the same time? But the rating services aren't forcing people to watch anything, are they? In truth, don't viewers prefer films? And, if that's the case, is the audience to be condemned for choosing movies, even poor ones, over whatever else is on? If that's what they like, why shouldn't they choose them?

So it goes, the merry-go-round of non-responsibility. Yet, somehow, everyone everywhere apparently wants something done. They want to see better things, more often. Why doesn't it happen? What is it in the nature of television that makes for virulent mediocrity?

Let's look at how a network television program gets on the air. Note we are carefully distinguishing between a network show which reaches the entire nation and the local programs which have their own specific problems and headaches.

First, of course, someone has to create an idea for a show. A property, as it is called. It's interesting that even at this early juncture, the program is not a script or a work but, in good business parlance, a property—something to be bought and sold—merchandise, pure and simple.

After the writer creates his property, he takes it to his agent. There's no direct pipeline without this first of many intermediate steps to possible production. One of several courses are open. The agent might submit the property directly to the networks but not usually. The chance of getting lost in the shuffle at this stage is much too great. If the writer is with a large agency, which includes actors, directors, producers and other creative personnel, they will first want to form a package. Here's another handy merchandising term, which somehow manages to transform creativity into saleability—for additional fees and percentages, naturally.

The packaging venture will mean that the agency takes the property and combines it with a star or two, a currently "hot" director and a producer with some recent top credits. This usually necessitates changes in the original format to suit the personalities involved but, considering the extra benefits to be derived from such a strong "team" of creative people, the possibilities of a sale should be mightily enhanced.

Now, in this form, the package is ready to be presented to the potential purchasers. This means either ABC, CBS, or NBC. What you want them to do is make a pilot film, present the finished product to potential sponsors and find a good time slot on the tight network schedule where your show might reach a loyal audience.

However, there could be another approach. You might "freeball" your package. This means produce the pilot through one of the major Hollywood studios or one of the independent companies. First you'd have to convince them it was a worthwhile gamble, but this can be done providing, of course, you give them a percentage of the action and certain creative controls. This may mean more fixing
something done

up and changing around to suit the new part-owners but, after all, they are putting up the money for the pilot and their confidence will carry a bit of extra weight when you eventually present the property, the package and the pilot to the networks.

However, for our purposes, let's assume we've come up with a winning combination in our first trip out to the network. They like the property and the package and, after a few changes, they agree to produce the pilot and see if they can market it.

At this point, we should pause to see how a network, or a studio or independent company for that matter, arrives at the decision to shoot the pilot. What attracts them? Quality? Originality? Well, we might just take a short glance back to the spring of 1967 when the pilots for this current season were being made. Consider that the year before had also been a disaster. The only bright spots were a few of the long running situation comedies—The Lucy Show, Petticoat Junction, Gomer Pyle, The Beverly Hillbillies—a couple of Westerns, Tarzan, The Fugitive, and several early evening shows with animals and children prominently featured, like Lassie and Flipper. So, in their search for new directions and new program ideas, the following shows got to the pilot stage:

*Alfred of the Amazon* (a take-off on Tarzan), *Taygar of the Jungle* (ditto), and *Walter of the Jungle* (ditto, ditto). *Rhubarb* (a cat), *Maya* (an elephant), *Dhondo* (another elephant), *Gentle Ben* (a bear), and *I Married a Bear* (which happily was about a pro football player), and several others.

As you are aware, if you follow the annual TV war, only a few of the gems mentioned above "made the grade", i.e., ever got on the tube at all. Of those that did, the majority failed and were cancelled.

However, an even larger disaster took place. This was supposed to be the Year of the Special! Something truly different. A break in the old patterns of TV. It sounded mighty promising. Even exciting. But then came the reality. After a few well conceived programs, we were treated to such thrilling subjects as three complete programs on *Twiggy in America*; an hour devoted to the burning question: "Do Blondes Have More Fun" (sponsored by Clairol, no less); a half dozen recreations (via film clips) of the fall of various parts of Germany during World War II; over a dozen bland, no-point-of-view reports on the war in Vietnam and the racial crisis in America, sev-

Films such as "Becket," starring Richard Burton, are far superior to what the networks can produce themselves.
eral David Susskind remakes of old plays and movies; and some foreign movie stars taking us on tours of their home- 
lands which were totally inane and uninformative.

When the rating soon showed that the audience was deserting wholesale, the networks, sponsors and ad agencies quickly pointed out that the people obviously weren't ready for mature, intelligent, cultural programs. Rather than admit what they offered was tripe and trash in equal portions, a few executives were summarily fired and every-
thing returned to normal: situation comedies, variety shows and old movies . . . and less people tuning in despite the increase in the number of sets purchased and available.

But back to our masterpiece. The network has produced our pilot and is showing it to the ad agencies who, in turn, will recommend it to their clients, the potential sponsors. Because ad agency execs know the people they must convince, they insist on a certain number of changes and guarantees but, finally, they do manage to round up a number of sponsors. Of course, there are certain adjustments and compromises they will demand but when you are this close to paydirt, who's going to fight? After all, you've made a deal. The show will go on.

If this seems like the end of the problems, it's actually only the end of the beginning. Now 31 additional episodes of the series must be prepared. Thirty-one episodes of a program which, at this stage, has been so adjusted, changed, altered, finagled, finessed and fixed that it is highly improbable that it remotely resembles the original concept. Still, it must go on. Huge sums of money have been allocated, reputations and careers are on the line. There's no turning back now.

Out goes the call for the free-lance writers to come in and look at the pilot and come up with plots and storylines which will fit the format. Here a key factor begins to emerge to demonstrate how and why the television system differs radically from the other art forms. It is generally accepted that any series will stand or fall on the quality of the scripts, whether it is the most intensely dramatic show or the most wildly farcical. The relationship of the individual writer to the series then is a vital element. At least it should be. Yet, in the normal course of events, over two dozen different writers will be responsible for turning out the 31 scripts we will need. During the same period, most of these two dozen writers will also be working on scripts for two, three or four completely different series. Rarely will a producer gamble on signing a single writer to a guaranteed contract for several scripts on a specific series. It's too great a risk in case the writer doesn't work out satisfactorily. But, to make a living, the writer must keep jumping from one series to another as rapidly as possible during the "buying season". This hardly leads to any sort of loyalty or appreciation for a particular series.

Even more discouraging is the attitude and atmosphere in which the writer must function. Fundamentally he has no right whatsoever over what he puts on paper. Any and every word, speech, action, character or situation can be altered or changed at the will and whim of the producers who are, in turn, at the complete mercy of all the individuals we've mentioned before — sponsors, ad agency execs, studio hierarchy, and network personnel (including
the real and unique TV experiences?

a mysterious individual known as the director of continuity acceptance, a euphemism for censor).

Under these circumstances and conditions, how deeply committed can any single writer be for a specific script? If, despite the odds, he should choose to do battle over a particular portion of his script, he may earn a grudging respect for his integrity and possibly even a concession here and there but, if he has delayed production and cost anyone extra money, he will rarely be hired again by the same people and he gets the reputation of being a troublemaker. Unfair? Perhaps. But, remember, basically and contractually, he doesn't have the right to protest. He has been hired to do a particular job for a set wage and is expected to deliver like a professional. He is in the same category as a carpenter, a plumber or a secretary. He owns no part of his script at any time.

Contrast this to the position of the playwright or the novelist who are the final and absolute authority on any changes in their work and we get a clearer picture of the low estate of the Hollywood writer. True, a new playwright will often have to battle an imaginative and arbitrary director or the novelist might bitterly complain about the comments of his publisher but still, when all is said and done, the work belongs to the author and to no one else. If a TV writer balks at even the most outrageous mutilation of his work, it is merely taken out of his hands and given to someone else. It wasn't his in the first place so he has no right to make waves!

Here, then, we are at the crux of the problem. Face it, if the person who fathers either an idea for a series or one of the scripts within the format has no actual control over what he has created, the result can only be chaos by committee—a committee of dissenters at that, each with vested interests and personal prejudices. The final result necessarily must be the most watered-down, overly-compromised and meaningless version possible. And, triumphant of triumphants, nobody in particular is responsible! The circle is complete. From beginning to end everybody has a cop-out. It's not me, it's the other guy. 'Round and 'round we go and don't let yourself ever get pinned in a corner.

Are there any bright spots in this otherwise dismal carnival? Well, there's National Educational Television with its Public Broadcast Library. Certainly this effort presents a wide open opportunity to see new and experimental ideas put into practice with a minimum of interference. However, in less than 60 days of operation last winter, the producer of the first three of the programs was informed that the P. B. L. Board intended to "exert more control" over the content of what was to be broadcast. Oh my, here we go again.

But perhaps P.B.L. can overcome this temporary hang-up and, if it does, it can be hoped it will have more success than the poorly conceived and badly executed plans for Pay-TV which offered so much promise and has almost expired amid its own over-blown aspirations. Fee-vee simply tried to outdo regular TV on its own terms by offering a little wider selection of sports events, newer movies, and either filmed or "live" coverage of concerts, plays, ballets and other cultural events. But this is all derivative. Everything is borrowed. Sure, the irritating commercials are gone, but why pay money to see a camera follow actors walking around a box set on a stage? Or why pay for any other essentially non-visual performance? Certainly it's interesting to watch great artists perform in their own medium, particularly as a filmed record of what they were like, but it is a substitute experience for the viewer of TV.

Where are the real and unique TV experiences? It is a separate and distinct form of communication and art. It needs to find itself and be itself. Except for the first burst of intimate drama during the early '50s, still referred to as the Golden Age of TV drama, and the immediacy of news coverage, no real search is being made to expand and realize the potentials of the medium itself.

Perhaps we are expecting too much too soon. After all, sound movies are only beginning to know their strength and maturity. But it seems certain the TV giant will continue to make tinny, squeaky, ineffectual noises until some of the basic attitudes are radically overhauled. Fear can't govern decisions. The creators must have the encouragement and the right to stand or fall on their own efforts. The businessmen must have faith in their own judgments and choices and, throughout the entire course of the collaboration of such a wide divergence of types and personnel, there must be a prevailing and prevailing sense of trust. A team cannot succeed, nor even function, when every member demands that things be done his way. It is co-operation and contribution at a level at which each person functions best that brings achievement.

Fair warning, nothing much is going to happen in the immediate future. But don't give up. The businessmen are beginning to feel the pinch in their pocketbooks. This alone might motivate them to reappraisal. Better days could be on the way. But don't hold your breath.

Walter Brough, who has lived and worked in Hollywood since he was graduated from La Salle in 1949, has written a score of TV and film scripts. Most recently, he has written scripts for the "Mannix" TV series and for two forthcoming films, "The Desperadoes" and "The White Colt." He is now at work on the screenplay for Dean Martin's next Mat Helm film.
A thirteen-year-old boy assaults an eight-year-old girl, tying her hands above her head as he has seen on TV assaults.

A seven-year-old boy sprinkles glass in the family's lamb stew to see if it would work as well as it did on television.

A six-year-old son of a policeman asks for real bullets so his little sister will "die for real," as when his TV hero "kills 'em."

Do these examples (from Leo Bogart's book The Age of Television) indicate a widespread perversion of the juvenile audience by television entertainment? Or are they isolated cases telling little or nothing about the typical effect of televised violence?

This question, and a number of related ones, has increasingly plagued educators and students, critics and communications specialists, sociologists, psychologists, psychiatrists—as well as parents, politicians and the general public.

Concern over the effect of mass media in stirring up aggressive and criminal tendencies pre-date television by a number of years. Beginning in 1907, when an automobile theft was attributed to the film The Great Automobile Robbery, movies, radio and comic books in turn, have come under attack for glorifying crime, sex and brutality. But video violence, available as it is hour after hour to anyone able to twist a dial, seems to many especially villainous. Since 1952 a special Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has, on a number of occasions, held hearings on the effects of television's shootings and knifings and beatings. After the 1962 hearings, several objectionable series disappeared—including The Untouchables and Bus Stop—and one network president—ABC's Oliver Treyz—went with them.

Public concern over the standards of quality in the TV fare it is served has run in cycles. Today, our society is more disturbed than ever about the wildness that has broken out across this land, and "law-and-order" has become a major issue. Experts may disagree whether the incidence of violence actually is rising, or if we are simply more aware of its existence, as we see it highlighted daily in living color and black and white. In either case, violence is one of our foremost contemporary social problems; one that requires the utilization of the resources of our society, including those of the behavioral sciences, if we are to bring it under responsible control.

Medical science has progressed to the stage where polio, tuberculosis, diphtheria and other infectious diseases are no longer striking down large numbers of our youth. Today, the leading causes of death among adolescents are automobile accidents, suicide and murder: tragedies that we cannot expect medicine and biological science to avert. The war in Viet Nam also faces our young men as they move into the early adult years—a grim reminder that we are still groping for alternatives to force in settling international disputes.

Anyone seeking to bring about (or prevent) social change within our nation also faces the struggle for the power necessary to produce change. Ideally, this is accomplished through peaceful democratic political processes. Actually, physical force is a tempting way to alter the course of events, and our history testifies to the many who have yielded to this temptation. The murders of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy remind us that they were all men dedicated to social change. So were Medgar Evers and Malcolm X. So are many of the instigators of riots in our cities and student disturbances in our colleges.

In part, then, television is simply mirroring the turbulence taking place in our world. Eric Hoffer vehemently denies that Americans are a violent people: "How often," he asks, "have you seen neighbors fighting with one another?" But television reminds us incessantly of the challenge posed by the question, "who is my neighbor?" We are becoming a "global village" in which suffering and conflict and upheaval anywhere is felt everywhere.

This experience of seeing so vividly the ills of our society is a painful and upsetting one to many, and the response to it is often an emotional one. Our nation is undergoing the experience of a person in the early stages of psychotherapy who has concealed from himself faults and failures and conflicts. As he becomes acutely conscious of these,
Effect?

anxiety rises and his self-concept is threatened. At this stage a number of reactions are common: he may become horrified and disgusted with this new view of himself that he sees; he may lash out at a convenient scapegoat on which to blame his misery; he may overreact against this threat to his ego by raising defenses and denying that he has ever had any problems.

We hear echoes of each of these reactions in America today: in the breast-beating of those who cry that ours is a sick society; in the overzealous defenses of those who refuse to consider needed changes; in the search for someone or some group to condemn for the nation's troubles.

For some critics, television, with its murder and mayhem for fun and profit, is a handy whipping boy. Certainly, there is much that is cheap and shoddy on television, as well as some fine and distinguished programs. Assuredly, there is considerable violence. Cleveland Amory cites a single program, *The Virginian*, which on Christmas night 1963 presented an estimated 10 million viewers with 13 killings by shootings, stabbing or clubbing.

Richard L. Tobin, in the June 8, 1968, *Saturday Review* tells of an eight-hour watch of ABC, CBS and NBC, plus a half dozen local New York stations. He saw "93 specific incidents involving sadistic brutality, murder, cold-blooded killing, sexual cruelty and related sadism—". Indeed, it is estimated that the typical American child viewing the most popular TV programs for the average period of time during his formative years will witness the jarring destruction of some 13,000 individuals. With a recent survey finding that the favorite type of show among young people is the adult crime thriller (75% of first choices) this figure can hardly be considered an exaggeration. To what extent this diet deadens the sensibilities to human suffering and makes cruelty an accepted routine we do not really know. To ignore television's influence would be as foolish as to denounce it for all of the nation's ills.

Defenders of TV brawling and gunplay have not limited their argument to the plea that "we are only giving the public what it wants." They emphasize that its influence has not been scientifically proven. Granted that additional research is sorely needed, we cannot help being reminded

"The Virginian"—13 murders for Christmas.
of the response of the advertisers and the cigarette industry to the findings on smoking and cancer (where a far more substantial research investment has produced more conclusive evidence). Often the response has still been a monotonous "the relationship has not yet been definitely proven."

Another defense of dramatized aggression, which some trace back at least to Aristotle who saw in the Greek tragedy ... "incidents arousing pity and fear in such a way as to accomplish a purgation of such emotions." This is analogous to catharsis in psychotherapy in which the individual's hostility is dissipated by discussing it openly. Can watching televised violence have such an effect? In replying to a questionnaire at last year's meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, the 313 psychiatrists split sharply on their opinions. Twenty-four percent felt that fictional violence helps to reduce aggression, 30 percent held that it encourages violence, and the other 46 percent were undecided.

A number of survey studies have been conducted in an attempt to get at the influence of TV; results are generally inconclusive. It has been found that children who are more aggressive prefer more violent programs (but which is cause and which effect is unknown). It has been noted that emotionally disturbed and sensitive children are often particularly susceptible to scenes of brutality, (but which children are potentially upset is uncertain).

In recent years, psychologists have brought the problem of man's violence into the laboratory in an attempt to better comprehend it. Although a variety of procedures have been used, they commonly involve obtaining some measure of the participants' aggressive tendencies before and after they have witnessed a scene of violence. Investigators have used children and adults as subjects; motion picture films and live actors as stimuli.

A first experiment by Dr. Seymour Feshbach showed a 10-minute fight sequence from the film *Body and Soul* to one group of college students and a neutral film to another. Half of each group had been deliberately angered by the investigator at the beginning of the experiment. These students, after seeing the fight film, showed a drop in aggressiveness in ratings of the experimenter and on a word association test.

"Get Smart"—Violence deleted.
does contribute to crime and disorder

Science, an apparent increase in aggressiveness was found even without arousing anger or a feeling of justification. Hospital attendants served as subjects and punitive electric shock was again used as the measure of aggression. Half of the group watched the switch-blade knife fight from the James Dean movie Rebel Without A Cause. Members of this group “punished” errors made by another subject far more severely than did members from the second half of the group, who had seen a more peaceful film.

That aggressive behavior is readily imitated has been demonstrated by the research of Dr. Albert Bandura of Stanford University and a number of his colleagues. Children engaged in busy-work, saw adult models enter a room and react to a variety of toys. In Group A, the adult used the playthings constructively; in Group B he responded destructively, taking a “Bobo-doll” and punching, kicking and otherwise mauling it. The difference in the children’s reaction was striking; in each case they imitated the model they had observed to a marked degree, often employing identical movements—even uncommon and awkward ones—that the model had included in his act.

Also supporting this finding is a relationship based on decades of research in child study: children who frequently experience harsh physical punishment almost invariably become aggressive and hostile. Apparently the more a child is punished, the more he learns the lesson that force is to be used when someone irritates you. On the other hand, children with warm and loving parents, who see them restrain themselves when annoyed or provoked, typically develop better control of their own impulses.

Although the weight of this experimental research is more impressive than that based on subjective opinion of experts, clinical cases, or survey findings, these laboratory studies have limitations. They have not, of course, attempted to get at the ways in which exposure to nonviolent aspects of television may contribute to frustration and hostility. For example, the rising tide of expectation of the poor, which has outrun actual progress, has been attributed by some to the constant projection of the “good things of the American way of life” on television advertising and entertainment.

Even if we confine ourselves to the consequences of observing violence, however, we find a number of questions yet unanswered as we move from the laboratory to the living room: (1) finding such a wide variety of programs that could be classified as “violent”; we might investigate the diverse effects of the slapstick humor of “Sock it to Me Time,” the mayhem on Sunday of professional football, the spookiness of Dark Shadows, and the killings of The Avengers; (2) because the influence of a stimulating situation will vary from person to person, the research needs to be extended to samples of subjects differing in such factors as age, level of sophistication, intelligence and emotional stability; (3) since fictional horror and fury typically occur in the context of a story, rather than in an isolated sequence, we want to learn what distinguishes a dramatization that elicits sympathy and understanding for the human dilemma, and for the victims of suffering, from one that evokes violence or develops callousness; (4) as the playwright usually provides several characters in any story, we would like to learn why given viewers identify with and imitate different members of the cast (some research has shown that the protagonist portrayed as having power over others is most likely to be imitated); (5) since anger has been demonstrated to combine with viewing violence in affecting behavior, it raises the question of the influence of other conditions that reduce inhibitions, such as fear, fatigue, sexual arousal, alcohol and drugs; (6) finally, knowing from other research on communications that the effect of a message on the recipient depends on the reaction of others to that message, we want to explore the manner in which opinions of family, friends, teachers and critics modify the impact of a program on the viewer.

Despite such unanswered questions, combining and evaluating the evidence from all sources points to the conclusion that television and movie violence does contribute to the crime and disorder in our society. It is true that other factors such as poverty, discrimination, inadequate education, poorly supported social service and scanty rehabilitation facilities may be more important; we must move ahead in each area as we are able. But steps can be taken immediately to tighten the limits of tolerance for violence on the public airways, either by the television industry or by the action of public agencies.

Walter Lippman, for example, has commented on the need for public controls: “For my own part, believing as I do in freedom of speech and thought, I see no objection in principle to censorship of the mass entertainment of the young. Until some more refined way is worked out of controlling this evil thing, the risks to our liberties are, I believe, decidedly less than the risks of unmanageable violence.”

This possibility of government regulation is resented and resisted by those involved in the mass communications industry for a variety of reasons: the dramatic artist bridles at prohibitions, which stifle his creative instincts; the news-
caster opposes censorship, which interferes with his obligation to inform the citizenry; the commentator (like the educator) struggles against limitations on issues to be discussed, in his attempt to enlighten the public; the sponsor resents any restriction which might reduce audience appeal of programs through which he plugs his product.

Yet the rights of freedom of the press and freedom of speech, like academic freedom, the right to protest, and the right to bear arms, do not provide for unlimited license. Inherent in their nature is the responsibility to exercise them in a restrained and enlightened manner; for no single right can be considered in isolation, but must be balanced, against the rights of others and the common good.

HOPEFULLY, responsible action will come from within the communications industry itself; in fact, some progress has been made both in news coverage and entertainment.

Following the urban riots, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders sponsored a conference of representatives from all levels of the newspaper, news magazine, and broadcasting industries at Poughkeepsie, New York in November, 1967. President Johnson, in appointing this Commission, had asked specifically: “What effect do the mass media have on the riots?” and the Commission was seeking to find some answers. Representatives of the professions represented found a number of instances where—in the turmoil and pressure of events—news coverage of the riots had been misleading or inflammatory. There were even reports of television newsmen stirring up the crowd by staging events, coaxing youths to throw rocks for the camera, and otherwise behaving irresponsibly in order to obtain an exciting story. These, of course, were exceptions. Television representatives, sent into a potentially explosive spot, are well aware that they can make the headlines instead of simply reporting them, and have usually attempted to avoid inflammatory or offensive behavior.

On the question of whether television and newspaper coverage caused riots to spread, the Commission had this to say: “No doubt, in some cases, the knowledge or the sight on a television screen of what had gone on elsewhere lowered inhibitions or kindled outrage or awakened desires for excitement or loot—or simply passed the word. Many ghetto residents we interviewed thought so themselves. The Commission believes that none of these private or official reactions was decisive in determining the cause of the disorders.”

Negro residents in several cities surveyed considered media coverage as incomplete in not reporting the many cases of Negroes cooperating with public officials in helping to prevent or minimize the rioting, and in assisting the injured. They felt that instances of excessive force or brutality by police and National Guard, and the molesting of innocent Negro residents by white vigilante groups was largely unreported. They believed that the background conditions which led to the disturbances were inadequately explored or communicated.

Since that time a number of programs have been produced dealing with racial and urban problems, including Poverty in America, Of Black America, and Black Journal. These are sorely needed steps toward improving communications between the Black and White communities. Unfortunately (like the Kerner report itself), these are ignored by many who most need them; they also have created resentment among some whites who feel that the Negro is being given too much attention and that he is gaining this attention through social disorder.

Although controversy continues over the industry’s handling of news and documentary programs, constraints on dramatic productions produce the hottest arguments. Self-regulation of some kind exists in all of our mass media. Since 1952, an industry-wide voluntary television code, established by the National Association of Broadcasters has been in effect. About two-thirds of the nation’s television stations subscribe to it, and the three major networks have program-screening departments to implement it. Here moral values compete with pragmatism as script changes are considered at various levels. Some of the flavor of this give-and-take may be found in comments of broadcasting executives on various programs under their aegis, as listed in the report of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency:

“I wish we could come up with a different device than running the man down with a car, as we have done this now in three different shows. I like the idea of sadism, but I hope we can come up with another approach to it” (Note to a script writer).

“This scene is the roughest I have even seen and I don’t know if we can get away with it, but let’s leave it in. Have a feeling you may have to kill the girls off camera.” (Note to a producer).

CRITICS HAVE generally been unhappy with the present procedures of self-regulation. Senator Thomas Dodd commented in a report of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency issued in 1964: “The industry’s claim that this Code is an effective vehicle cannot be substantiated in the light of evidence of chronic violation. Network programming policies which deliberately call for the insertion
of violence, crime and brutality are hardly conducive to building respect for any central authority within the industry.” Dr. Frederic Wertham, a New York psychiatrist who has been an outspoken opponent of cruelty and horror in the mass media, recommends the double-barreled approach of legal control with the power of license revocation and the improvement of the industry's facilities for implementing its own code.

A rash of recent articles have appeared calling for some kind of action. One by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson suggests retaliation against the sponsors of TV violence as the only defense parents have.

Brutality in motion pictures, which many consider more savage, has also come under attack, particularly since today's movies will be run and re-run on tomorrow's television.

Concern is growing among sponsors, writers, actors, producers and executives. BUSINESS WEEK reports that some of the mayhem-filled cartoons have been cancelled from Saturday morning programs by NBC and CBS and that violence will be stripped from future episodes of at least one series (NBC's Get Smart).

Will self-regulation suffice? Or will society have to search for other means of controlling the new dimensions introduced into personal and social life by the advancing technology of mass communication? The answer depends on how effective self-policing is in satisfying the public and the critics. In 1963, Bernard Berelson (in his foreward to Gary Steiner's The People Look at Television) stated: “For about fifteen years now, television has been at, or close to, the center of attention in America. The people have been watching television, and the critics, commentators, and educators have been watching the people watching television. On the whole, the one has liked what it saw; the other, not.”

Today, rumblings for censorship are heard coming from the mass majority as well as the critical minority.

Whatever the methods of regulation adopted, those exercising them would benefit from more definitive information concerning the impact of “videoviolence” than scientific studies are presently able to provide. Stepped-up research programs need to be launched in colleges, universities, and other laboratories where the patient, painstaking work required to answer such complex questions can be carried on.

At the same time society must act on the basis of the best evidence currently available to produce balanced and effective restraints on its mass media. Human advancement has always demanded that men reach some agreement on the values they want to live by and then support those values by prudent and appropriate means. Today the progress, and perhaps the survival, of our civilization requires concerted efforts to understand and control the fascinating and frightening puzzle of man’s violent tendencies.

Dr. Rooney, who holds master’s and Ph.D. degrees in psychology from Temple University, has been a member of the La Salle staff since 1947. He is a past president of the Personnel and Guidance Assoc. of Philadelphia.
Understanding today’s media is one way of understanding today’s teenagers, the first generation to be reared on television since birth. Such an understanding is one that parents and educators alike can ill afford to dismiss as irrelevant if they really want to make contemporary life meaningful to the modern adolescent. According to Marshall McLuhan, the controversial media analyst, today’s teenagers are radically different than the teenagers of the ’40s and even the ’50s. An examination of the content and technique of the television medium alone reveals some interesting facets of the modern teenage personality.

For one thing, says McLuhan in his best-selling book, Understanding Media: the Extensions of Man, “part of the cool dimension of TV is the cool, deadpan mug that came in with the teenager. Adolescence, in the age of hot media, of radio and movies, and of the ancient book, had been a time of fresh, eager, and expressive countenances.” (Expressed, presumably, in the Mickey Rooney-Andy Hardy approach to life.) “No elder statesman or senior executive of the 1940s,” McLuhan continues, “would have ventured to wear so dead and sculptured a pan as the child of the TV age.”

Teenagers, McLuhan asserts, imitate the cool characters encountered on a cool medium. By “cool medium” he means one in which very little information is given and therefore allows room for more participation and involvement on the part of the viewer. McLuhan explains that “the TV image is visually low in data . . . [it] offers some three million dots per second to the receiver. From these he accepts only a few dozen each instant, from which to make an image.” Since the TV image is rough and eclectic, so too should be the ideal TV personality. “Anybody whose appearance strongly declares his role and status in life is wrong for TV,” says McLuhan.

A survey of recent TV series shows the cool personality to be the most popular with teenagers. One long-running series, The Man from UNCLE, featured two agents, Napoleon Solo, an American, and Illya Kuryakin, a Russian, working together to preserve the world order. Besides being fascinated with UNCLE’s electronic gadgets, teenagers responded to the two agents’ unperturbed handling of crisis after crisis. At the start of the series, Robert Vaughn, who played the title role of Solo, received top billing and performed most of the exploits on his own; David McCallum, who played Illya, was merely his assistant. But as TV critic Ned Hoopes has pointed out, although Solo was cool enough, he still had one weakness—his penchant for women. Illya, on the other hand, had complete control over all situations, including his love interests. Whether he got the girl or not was inconsequential.

As the series continued, the reserved, almost mystical Illya received a bigger piece of the action, so much so that by the time the show had run its course its title had become an anomaly. Which man from UNCLE was the title referring to?

If two antithetical nationalities, American and Russian, could work together, as The Man from UNCLE had demonstrated, why couldn’t two antagonistic races, black and white, work in tandem? So runs the formula for another highly successful series, I Spy. (Again NBC had a misnomer—after all, there were two of them.) I Spy dropped the gimmickry of UNCLE, concentrating this time on realism and character development. The casting of Bill Cosby, at first thought of as something of a gamble by producer Sheldon Leonard, turned out instead as the program’s greatest asset. The mumbling, low-keyed Cosby emerged as the wittiest and coolest of the two agents. White, as well as black, students identified with him easier than they did with the more sensitive, unstable Robert Culp.

Two series currently popular with students, Mission: Impossible and Star Trek are further extensions and variations of The Man from UNCLE and I Spy. Instead of only two characters engaged in daring exploits, Mission: Impossible boasts a five member team. All the members of the IM Force are proficient, resourceful individuals, including Cinnamon, the only female member of the team of experts. Cinnamon, unlike most heroines, is not given to hysterics. She is something of a first for television—the cool female character. "Most TV stars are men," McLuhan observes, "while movie stars are women, since they can be presented as 'hot' characters. Men and women movie stars alike, along with the entire star system, have tended to dwindle into a more moderate system since TV."

Star Trek extends the teamwork of Mission: Impossible
to the future. The motley crew of the exploratory spaceship Enterprise is composed of both sexes and nearly all nationalities and colors, suggesting that perhaps true equality has been attained on earth at long last. But this series contains a further dimension in the most popular member of the crew, the green-skinned, pointed-ear creature from the planet Vulcan, Mr. Spock. Leonard Nimoy as Spock is merely a further development of McCallum and Cosby, but one better; Vulcanites have no emotions, a fact which Mr. Spock boasts about continually. He is, as it were, a human computer, much like Hal in 2001: a Space Odyssey. But unlike Hal, Spock is still deeply concerned about the welfare of his fellow crewmen to the point of self-sacrifice. Mr. Spock represents what McLuhan calls "a paradoxical feature of the 'cool' TV medium," namely that television "involves us in moving depth, but it does not excite, agitate, or arouse. Presumably, this is a feature of all depth experience," he concludes.

Although the young adolescent may be living "mythically and in depth," he senses that it is unrealistic to suppress his emotions, even though he would like to. For models who cope with everyday problems, the teenager looks for shows with more contemporary settings, the so-called "family shows." Such a program is Family Affair, a favorite of the younger teenage set, according to a recent article in TV Guide. Uncle Bill, as played by Brian Keith, is the great problem-solver for his three wards, one of them a teenager. Since he is un-married, Uncle Bill's wise decisions are not complicated by any female point of view, an advantage he shares with Fred McMurray of My Three Sons and Lorne Greene of Bonanza. (This season, interestingly enough, it is mom's turn to be seer, with Lucille Ball, Diahann Carroll, and Doris Day starring in series in which they are either divorced or widowed.)

Shows like Family Affair are not family shows at all; they are "half-a-family" shows. With no suitable mom-dad relationships on the screen, the adolescent, as he grows older, soon disdains such programs and graduates to the shows that epitomize his characteristically cynical nature. He delights, then, in the political, social, and ethnic irreverencies of Rowan & Martin's Laugh-In and The Smothers Brothers Show. Both of these shows in the mind of the teenager "tell it like it is" and are "with it," the latter expression one which McLuhan says came into vogue with TV.

Laugh-In itself has given teenagers a whole new jargon ("Sock it to me, baby," "Here come the judge," and "very interesting"). Not since Get Smart, with its "Would you believe?" and "Sorry about that," has a program changed the speaking patterns of youngsters. McLuhan offers a possible explanation of the phenomenon when he says: "Slang offers an immediate index to changing perception. Slang is not based on theories but on immediate experience."

One such "immediate experience" that lends credence to a McLuhan theory is Laugh-In's approach to humor. Laugh-In abounds with one-liners and non sequiturs. In McLuhan's view of modern humor the "cool" joke drops the story line because it is not involving enough. His favorite example of a cool joke is the following: "'What is purple and hums?' Answer, 'An electric grape.' 'Why does it hum?' Answer, 'Because it doesn't know the words.'" Such repartee sounds very reminiscent of a typical Laugh-In sketch.

Laugh-In utilizes the quick-cutting technique of Mission:
Impossible, but for a different effect. This rapid editing, which fascinates youth and annoys older viewers, is derived, of course, from the television commercial. Virtually a “mini-art” in itself, which TIME Magazine analysed in a recent cover article, the commercial has broken down the viewer’s sense of continuity and progression. The viewer now accepts quicker jumps in thinking. For example, in a 15-minute newscast the viewer may pass from Vietnam report to deodorant commercial, back to riot report and mouthwash commercial, and so on, with very little difficulty in adjusting his attention.

The commercial has also indirectly affected the motion picture industry. Many high-brow films (like Fellini’s 8½ and Juliet of the Spirits) and even occasional low-brow pictures (such as Point Blank and Mirage) owe their subtle transitions between reality and illusion to the influence of the commercial, both in making the technique possible and in conditioning the audience to accept such an approach. One former commercial director, ex-Philadelphian Richard Lester, has used the jump-cut almost exclusively as his personal cinematic style in the Beatles movies (a technique borrowed for TV’s The Monkees) and more recently in Petulia. Two of the year’s most popular films with young people, Bonnie & Clyde and The Graduate, utilized the elliptical cut in a number of scenes. “The story line is dropped from ‘cool’ jokes and ‘cool’ movies alike,” says McLuhan.

Movies themselves are a favorite of the older teenage TV viewers. A recent TV GUIDE article, “Who Watches What?” places the network movie nights in positions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 9 of the top ten shows watched by those 18 and older. (This season there are seven network movie nights.) That the film medium should serve as the staple for the TV medium would come as no surprise to Marshall McLuhan. This phenomenon is simply an application of his so-called “rear-view mirror” theory, which states that the older medium inevitably becomes the content of the newer medium. Plays and novels were the bases for movies and now movies themselves are the bases for television series. According to this theory, the newer technology, not quite sure of its own capabilities, looks back at the accomplishments of the past for security, via McLuhan’s rear-view mirror, and in so doing, helps to define the specific properties of the preceding medium. The motion picture has only recently been regarded as an art form by the general public.

Many schools are now accepting the challenge that the image-conscious student presents to the text-book-oriented curriculum. (The TV youngster sees 15,000 hours of television by the time he graduates from high school, as comp-
pared with the 10,000 hours he has spent in the classroom, according to one estimate.) Film-TV study courses are being thought of more in terms of needed courses and not simply as classes that are “nice” or “enriching” or to impress evaluating committees. The thrust of this movement seems to be coming from the English teacher, who again, as always, has that one more thing to do. The National Council of Teachers of English, for example, has already published two paperbacks in this area (The Motion Picture and the Teaching of English and Television and the Teaching of English). And Exploring the Film, heralded by its publishers as the first “non-text text,” makes its appearance in several high schools this year.

The modern student will not be satisfied with just learning about movies and television; he already knows quite a lot about them—probably even more than the teacher does. Their sense of involvement urges them to produce their own TV shows and movies. An increasing number of schools have their own television and motion picture equipment, providing their students with the opportunity of making video tapes and films. In most cases, student-made films and tapes mirror their own experiences in the contemporary world or imitate their favorite movies and TV series (parodies of Bonnie & Clyde and Mission: Impossible were very popular last year). These projects are simply experiences in perception, a getting a feel for the media, in much the same way that imitating the styles of novelists and poets has been an exercise in the forms of the written and printed media.

Television and movie courses in the schools help the modern students to bridge the gap between his electronic world and the world of the 19th Century classroom, but such courses are only temporary expedients at best. TV and films are only two components of the “electronic environment” that includes computers, ‘boss’ radio, and shopping center background music. The inter-relatedness of things, including those things we call subjects in schools, has become a vital concern. The walls separating the various disciplines are crumbling and being replaced by cooler means of instruction that involve the students more. The orderly, print-like lines of desks are giving way to discussion tables and the lecture is giving way to the seminar. Until such time as the schools finally decide to explore the total environment, they should at least, as McLuhan observes, “ease our transition from the fragmented visual world of the existing educational establishment by every possible means.”

Brother Charles McClelland, a 1962 graduate of the College and the recipient of a master’s degree in 1963, entered the Christian Brothers in 1958. He teaches English at La Salle High School and this fall conducted an honors seminar in experimental film at the College.
Coach Gola: After God, then what?

GOD is not dead, notwithstanding the reports of some contemporary theologians. He is alive and well and coaching basketball at La Salle College.

Thomas Joseph Gola, who was selected All Everything by everybody during a Frank Merriwell college and professional basketball career and is now a state legislator, was named La Salle's head basketball coach late this summer.

In an effort to salvage what remains of the College's basketball program after a succession of four coaches in as many years, Gola was appointed to succeed Jim Harding, who resigned to become coach of the professional Minnesota Pipers.

Harding provided what was perhaps a predictable conclusion to a cycle that began with the Glory Days of Gola and the NCAA title, included several seasons of great promise but lethargic court performances, and ending with Harding's superlative won-loss record (20-8) marred by the worst press commentary the College has ever received.

In a single year, Harding managed both to quench La Salle's thirst for victory while simultaneously invoking the wrath of several sports columnists who saw in Harding's spartan methods and irresponsible remarks a desire to "win at any cost." It was Harding's brash comments to the press concerning revoking scholarships that brought the Frank Scott case (see La Salle, Spring 1968) to the attention of the NCAA, which has yet to announce its reaction (if any) to the entire situation.

Gola, trim and fit at age 35, is counted among the great basketball players in the history of the game. From the early days at La Salle High, where he scored an incredible 2,222 points under coach Obie O'Brien, he was destined for stardom. Sought by some 75 colleges and universities, he became a three-time All American at La Salle and five times was an All Pro selection with the Philadelphia (now San Francisco) Warriors. He retired in 1966 while with the New York Knickerbockers.

He is, of course, familiar with the myriad of problems faced by La Salle's court program since he left the campus 13 years ago. And particularly those of the Jim Harding Era.

"I don't think I'm coming back to create a new La Salle," Gola says. "But I do want to bring La Salle back to where it belongs... to erase the image of La Salle as a 'renegade' school."

"Last year's situation was the Jim Harding story," he continued. "What Jim Harding had in mind isn't strictly what I have in mind. If anybody else in the city had a 20-8 record and went to the NCAA tournament, it would have been a great season." He adds that his teams will "play strictly as a family. I don't want to be a tyrant."

Gola, whose winning personality and
lusterous career should be a great asset in recruiting, still admires the coaching methods of Ken Loeffler, his La Salle mentor whom he calls "the best coach in the world."

"For myself," Gola says of recruiting. "I want a basketball player but I also want a boy who's going to be a student. I don't want to flounder a scholarship in front of a boy who we'll lose after one or two years. I want to talk to his friends, his family. If he's a bad boy, I don't want him. I don't care if he's the greatest basketball player in the world. A bad boy will hurt the team and himself."

A state representative (of Republican persuasion) who is up for re-election this fall, Gola seems unconcerned about finding time to coach the varsity Explorers through a tough 24-game schedule that opens December 4 at the Pal-esta.

One got the impression Gola felt the Republicans' chances weren't too good at the time of his coaching appointment, but at press time Richard Nixon appeared capable of carrying many GOP state candidates along to victory. And Gola also has his own insurance agency.

It will be a tough task, even for Everybody's All American and even though Gola has a veteran team with proven talent returning—plus a promising sophomore.

Dave Ervin, who with frosh coach Curt Fromal will assist Gola, is the only 1967 letterman lost to graduation. Returning are guards Bernie Williams and Roland Taylor, forwards Larry Cannon and Stan Wlodarczyk, and center Ed Szczesny—for most games last season's starting lineup.

Also, add sophomore Ken Durrett, a 6-7 high school All American, who is regarded as a top prospect—even at a school that has become jaded by mediocre performances by reported "super stars."

Despite the personnel at his disposal, legislator-insurance agent-coach-ex-Super Star Gola will unquestionably have a good deal on his mind at the height of the court season. Fortunately, this year is a "light" year for traveling (the cycle of long trips—Miami, New Orleans, Creighton—occurs on alternate seasons).

One can't help wondering if even Gola's All American shoulders can bear a burden most men would not even consider. Also, even the most fervent Gola fans can't seem to avoid the obvious question: "Can he coach?"

Many of the foregoing questions would arise no matter who La Salle's new coach might have been. What is particularly worrisome in the case of Gola, however, is still another nagging query—if "God" is hung in effigy, then what? RWH

---

Innovations for '68-69 Academic Year

Two new major programs, four new honors courses, and 16 new faculty members in the day division and 17 new courses in the evening school highlight the College's 106th academic year this fall. A combined total of more than 6,600 day and evening students were expected for 1968-69.

The day division enrolled some 800 freshmen, raising overall day enrollment to some 3,200—a slight increase over last year's enrollment. The evening division welcomed some 500 freshmen when it opened its 22nd academic year on Sept. 11.

Among the evening students, who were expected to total more than 3,400 this year, are some 200 new freshman coeds.

Female students, accepted for the first time in La Salle history in the evening division last year, total some 15 percent of the enrollment.

New major programs in correctional work and in theology, plus 16 new faculty members, highlight the day school's academic year.

The new program in correctional work, under the aegis of sociology department chairman Dr. Thomas M. Coffee, includes a two semester field seminar in correctional work entailing two hours of classroom and six hours of field work per week. The seminar will examine the correctional process through field work in law enforcement, judicial and correctional agencies, and classroom sessions.

A new theology program has been initiated under the direction of Brother James Kaiser, F.S.C., S.T.D., chairman of the theology department. Although theology courses have always been available to La Salle students, this program will provide the first full four-year curriculum in the subject for students who wish to major in theology. The program will require 36 hours in the subject for majors.

The new honors program courses include The City, conducted by Dr. Digby Baltzell, of the University of Pennsyl-
Five new associate professors were named, among them three from the psychology department. Appointed associate professors of psychology were Dr. Victor Brooks, Dr. Joseph D. Kovatch and Dr. John A. Smith.

Other associate professors named and their fields were Dr. Bernhardt G. Blumenthal, German, and Dr. Raymond J. Pierzchalski, philosophy.

New assistant professors named were William J. Farnon and Eugene Lashchky, both philosophy; George A. Perfecky, Russian; Miroslav Labunka, history, and Peter Frank, English.

**Conboy Asst. A.D.**

John J. (Jack) Conboy, '50, has been appointed to the newly-created position of full-time assistant athletic director at La Salle.

Conboy, 44, recently retired from the U.S. Army after 20 years service with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. A veteran of World War II, Korea and Vietnam, Conboy also served on the ROTC staff at La Salle as assistant professor of military science and tactics, from 1960 to 1964.

Conboy was a member of St. Joseph's Prep's last city championship football team in 1939. He also played basketball at the Prep before graduating in 1942. After three years of World War II service in Europe, Conboy enrolled at Georgetown, where he played football for two years before transferring to La Salle.

Conboy was assistant football coach at St. Joseph's Prep from 1948 to 1950. He also coached Army football and basketball teams in Europe and Hawaii and organized a triathlon team at La Salle which produced three present members of the U.S. Army modern pentathlon team — Don Walheim, Bill Conroy and Gary McNulty. He holds an MBA degree in Industrial Management from Temple University.

**Nixon Poll Victor**

Former Vice President Richard Nixon was the victor in a presidential mock election by evening division students at La Salle.

Ex-Alabama Gov. George Wallace surpassed by two votes the ballots cast for Vice President Hubert Humphrey in the poll, which was conducted by the evening division’s student Marketing Association during registration this fall. Only 1,462 of the school’s over 3,000 students voted.

No candidate received a clear majority in the election, which utilized paper ballots. Nixon received 614 votes or 42% of those cast, while Wallace netted 378 (25.8%) and Humphrey 376 (25.8%). Ninety-four write-in votes were also cast. The average age of those voting was 26.8 years.

**Fund Aide Named**

PHILIP T. ARCHILLES has been appointed associate director of development at La Salle. Archilles, 42, succeeds Thomas M. Bruce, who relinquished the post to devote full attention to his law practice.

A graduate of Emory University, Archilles had been director of development for Child and Family Services of Connecticut prior to joining the La Salle staff. He previously held fund raising and public relations posts with Holland, Estill and Co., New York City, and the Heart Associations of Georgia and New York State.

**'68-'69 Court Slate**

La Salle's new basketball coach, Tom Gola, will make his debut with a 24-game schedule in 1968-69, it was announced by Athletic Director James J. Henry.

The Explorers open their 39th season of varsity intercollegiate competition at the Palestra, Wednesday, Dec. 4, against the University of Baltimore, one of four new additions to the schedule. Detroit, Hofstra and St. Francis (Pa.) are the other newcomers.

La Salle will also compete in the ECAC Quaker City Tourney at the Spectrum. Dec. 27-30, against an impressive field that includes St. Joseph’s, Niagara, DePaul, South Carolina, Indiana, Rhode Island, and Penn State.

Highlighting the 13 game Palestra schedule will be appearances of such powers as Miami (Fla.), Canisius, Creighton, Western Kentucky, Loyola (New Orleans), Duquesne and Detroit, as well as the traditional Big Five opponents.

The 1968-69 varsity basketball schedule:

**DECEMBER—4, Baltimore: 9, at Rider; 11, Miami (Fla.); 14, at Niagara; 18, Canisius; 21, at albright: 27-28-30, ECAC Quaker City Tourney (Spectrum).**

**JANUARY—4, Hofstra; 8, Creighton; 11, at syracuse; 18, Western Kentucky; 22, Pennsylvania; 25, Temple; 28, at St. Francis (Altoona, Pa.). FEBRUARY — 1, Loyola (New Orleans); 5, at Lafayette; 8, Villanova; 12, at american U. (Fort Myer, Va.); 15, St. Joseph’s; 19, Duquesne; 21, Detroit; 25, at West Chester.**
La Salle was honored at this summer's national conference of the American Alumni Council where the magazine received the second annual Newsweek Magazine Award for "the highest achievement in relating the institution to public affairs."

The $500 cash award and plaque was presented during the Miami Beach conference by Mel Elfin, the magazine's Washington bureau chief.

The award cited the special issue of La Salle devoted to "Crisis in the Cities," which appeared in the fall, 1967 issue.

La Salle was the Middle Atlantic district representative in the national competition, which also included the magazines of Yale University, Oberlin College, University of California (Berkeley), Notre Dame, and Washington University.

"This year's winning entry," Elfin said at the presentation ceremonies, "tackled the greatest problem facing our country today—our cities. This magazine directly related the problems of the city to the campus itself. Many off-campus and alumni publications have tackled this problem in great depth, but few with as great skill and sense of 'being there' as did this year's winner."

Alumni editors at all AAC member institutions had been invited to submit any article, series, or special issue published between March 1967-68, probing a public affairs issue—such as the urban crisis or student unrest.

Judges for the competition included Dr. George Gerbner, dean of the Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania; Newsweek Education Editor Peter Janssen; Newsweek art director Fred Lowry; John E. Lee, assistant to the publisher of Newsweek, and Jean Williamson, manager of the magazine's college newsletter, "On Campus."

Perhaps equally extraordinary was the selection by the American Alumni Council of two photographs as among "the 20 best photos of 1967-68." Both photos were taken by Lawrence Kanevsky and each appeared in the urban crisis issue.

In addition, one of the photographs (below) was selected in a special competition to choose the "20 best of all of photos—more than 100—that have received awards since the competition started in 1963. Kanevsky, whose photographs have often appeared in La Salle, is a graduate of Temple University.
CLASS NOTES

'41
William H. L. Sullivan, Pittsburgh-area vice president of Wellington Distributors, Inc., moved up to executive vice president of the Philadelphia subsidiary of Wellington Management Co.

'48
James B. Hattman, who has recently been named a vice president of the Davison chemical division, W. R. Grace & Co., will also be responsible for the Petroleum Chemicals Department.

'49
Army Reserve Lt. Col. John G. Gallagher was graduated from the command and general staff officer course at the Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, Kan. Carmen F. Guarino was elected president of the Water Pollution Control Association of Pennsylvania at its 40th Annual Conference in August at University Park, Pa. Leroy A. Johnston received his master of science degree in education from Temple University early this year. John F. Moross received his master of business administration degree from Temple University at the June commencement. John J. Schnepp has been appointed to the new position of manager of news and information services for RCA Service Company, which is headquartered in Cherry Hill, N.J. Charles J. Trois has left the U.S. Internal Revenue Service after 14 years of service to join the firm of Richard P. Haring.

'50
LEROY E. DURKIN has been named vice president and general manager of the Tube-O-Flex division of Warner Packaging at Bridgeport, Conn. John Jackson has been appointed Supervisor of Elementary Education for the State of Delaware.

'51
Maurice Rudden has been elected vice president, manufacturing at Lock Seam Tube, Inc., Montgomeryville. James F. Monahan has received his master of education degree from Temple University.

'52
Army Maj. G. Michael Girone is waging a two-pronged battle in Vietnam—the treatment of injuries to both military personnel and Vietnamese civilians. Maj. Girone assists in a comprehensive hospital program that has resulted in aiding more than 1,000 civilians in the last six months. William A. La Plante received his doctor of education degree from Temple University in June. Maj. Joseph E. Martin, a member of the Military Airlift Command, has been certified as a master navigator at Norton AFB, Cal.

'53
Michael P. Montemuro recently received

Homecoming Weekend Nov. 22-24

The Fifth Annual Alumni Homecoming Weekend will be held this year on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, November 22-24.

Following last year's successful experiment, the Weekend again will be coordinated with two major student activities: the final game of the Club Football season (Scranton University, November 23) and the annual Tap Off Rally and Parade (Sunday, November 24).

An alumni hospitality center again will be set up in McCarthy Stadium for these events. In addition, the usual Alumni Stag Reunion will be held in the College Union Friday night and the Dinner-Dance on Saturday evening.

Alumni President Daniel H. Kane has named Thomas J. Lynch general chairman of the Weekend. Roy J. Barry and Francis P. Brennan will be chairmen of the Stag and Dinner-Dance.
Some 300 key alumni attended the annual Leadership Conference held on the campus this fall.

J. E. Villlo has been appointed assistant manager of marketing—east coast for the Columbia Hallowell Division of Standard Pressed Steel Co.

William J. Quaintance received his doctor of education degree from Temple University last February. Raymond T. Vasoli is now associated with his brother, Edward, ’52, in the Vasoli Electric Company, Inc. Marriage: John William McMunigal to Marilyn Louis Fauber.

Philip E. Becker received his master of education degree from Temple University. James I. Gillespie, who has been associated with the firm of Jenkins, Fetterolf & Co. since 1955, has been admitted to partnership. James Towson, presently assistant principal for curriculum & instruction at Rancocas Valley Regional High School, Mount Holly, N.J., has been appointed principal of Clearview Regional High School, Mullica Hill, N.J.

Lawrence L. Maguire received his master of business administration degree from Temple University. John Marella recently received his master of arts (teaching) degree from St. Louis University. Frank E. McGuigan recently received his master of education degree from Temple University. Lcdr. Jack Sechler has returned to the U.S. after having served with the military assistance advisory group in Oslo, Norway for three years. He is now with the chief of Naval Material in Washington, D.C.

Russell C. Middleton

Army Maj. George E. Keneipp, Jr., completed an ordnance officers advanced course at the U.S. Army Ordnance Center and School, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. Russell C. Middleton has been named manager of cost accounting at Atlas Chemical Industries, Inc., Wilmington, Del. Gabriel J. Pascuzzi, former assistant principal of the Jay Cooke Junior High School, Phila., has been appointed assistant principal of Springfield Senior High School, Montgomery County. The following members of the class received master's degrees from Temple University: John A. Carroll, Paul J. Diesenbruch, Jr., William A. Fynes, Jr., Edward M. Sullivan and Henry W. Zakrzewski.

Jose M. Biascorchia died in a car accident early in August. James B. Garvin has been appointed district sales manager for the New York area of Business Management Magazine. The following members of the class received master's degrees from Temple University: Abraham U. Flores, Joseph J. Larkin, Vincent D. McCrane, and Milton A. Washington.

Thomas J. Boyce has been elected assistant treasurer of Beatrice Foods Co. John E. Daly and Leo A. Donahue received master's degrees from Temple University. Francis E. Gleeson, Jr., is a candidate for the Pennsylvania Legislature from the 172nd
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Army Capt. John F. Smart, Jr., has attained membership in the 1968 Million Dollar Round Table, an international organization of leading life insurance underwriters. The following members of the class received masters degrees from Temple University: FRANCIS J. COOK, PATRICK J. CRONIN, and DAVID J. SWANKOSKI. Marriage: TERENCE HEANEY to Madeline Hawley.

THOMAS D. DE LUCCA received his master of science in commerce management sciences from St. Louis University. JAMES A. GELLO received his degree of doctor of dental surgery degree and will intern at Wilmington General Hospital, Wilmington, Del. DAVID B. KNESS received his master of engineering science degree from Pennsylvania State University. DR. DENNIS L. METRIK has been named an instructor in philosophy at Marietta College, Marietta, O. JOHN F. MULLEY was appointed to practice law before the Supreme Judicial Court of Mass. and the Federal District Court. VINCENT J. PANCARI was installed in the Vineland, N.J. Exchange Club in August. DR. JOHN A. PIEPSZAK received the degree of doctor of dental surgery and plans to serve his internship at Allentown, Pa. Hospital. JOHN E. POLITOWSKI received his master of science in mathematics degree from Fresno (Calif.) State College and is now employed at Pacific Missile Range Pt., Muau, Calif., as a mathematician in the data processing department. Capt. ALBERT RUPPERT, an aircraft maintenance officer, has been assigned to Hill AFB, Utah. First Lt. JOHN D. SNYDER received the U.S. Air Force Commendation Medal at March AFB, Calif. Lt. Snyder was decorated for his meritorious service as a personnel officer at 15th Air Force headquarters at March, Calif. The following members of the class received masters degrees from Temple University: JOHN K. COGAN, JOHN D. DI MASCIO, and WILLIAM A. VOTTO, Jr. Marriages: PETER J. KIERNAN to Christine Ann Kelly; LT. ANTHONY F. WALSH, USNR, to Angela Mihadas.

John E. Brown was named co-publicity director of the Virginia Inter-service Conference at a meeting of the Executive Board in August. JAMES L. FOREMAN was recently appointed district sales manager in Rohm and Haas Company coatings department. Mr. Foreman will direct the sale of Rohm and Haas coatings resins in Southern New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland and Virginia. Michael B. GORMLEY received the degree of doctor of dental surgery and will intern at Wilmington, Del. Medical Center. JAMES J. KLINE died in May while in Vietnam. The following members of the class received masters degrees from Temple University: EDWARD A. McCOOL, VINCENT A. PINTO, and JOSEPH P. PURCELL. Marriages: EDMOND J. DORAN, Jr., to Maria E. Bello; CAPT. JOHN M. E. FERET to Jane E. Gillis; EUGENE C. LANG to Suzanne M. McGrath; ALFRED J. MAURIELLO to Susan Joyce Patterson.

FRANK R. BRESLIN has been named to the position of manager of traffic operations for Scott Paper Company. J. RICHARD CAHILL received his master of business administration from Xavier University, Cincinnati, O. JOSEPH M. GAFFNEY was awarded his master of arts degree from the American University, Washington, D.C. HAROLD V. N. LANCE was promoted in June to Army Capt. while assigned to the 57th artillery near Ilesheim, Germany. The following members of the class received masters degrees from Temple University: HOWARD DANDO, PETER J. GARITO, WILLIAM HAMMILL and THOMAS SINES. Marriages: MICHAEL T. CARR to Anne Elizabeth Griest; JOSEPH J. LUBONSKI, Jr., to Patricia M. Maguire; JAMES A. McMahan to Nancy Ellen Culligan; LEO J. MULLEN, Jr., to Mary C. Briggman; HENRY P. STOBRENAU to Barbara G. Ensninger.

LOUIS G. ALAMAN, Jr., has been promoted to First Lt. in the Army while stationed in the Panama Canal Zone. ROBERT G. ALLEN, Jr., has been commissioned a Second Lt. in the U.S. Air Force upon graduation from officer training school at Lackland AFB, Tex. WILLIAM L. LEAHY, Jr., was assigned to the 87th Engineer Battalion near Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam. Second Lt. ROBERT P. OBRIEN has graduated from the U.S. Army engineer officer candidate school at Ft. Belvoir, Va., and has been commissioned a Second Lt. in the Transportation Corps. THOMAS R. RYAN received his master of arts degree in social studies from Colgate University in August and will begin teaching this fall at Central High School, Trenton, N.J. Marriages: PFC. LAWRENCE LEAHY, Jr., to Karol Ann Kosteksi; HENRY Rzemieniewski to Elizabeth Ann Duffy.

JOSEPH H. PUTRO received his master of arts degree from Temple University. THOMAS J. ANDERSON was recently appointed "housing intern" by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and has been assigned to its region II office in Philadelphia. Marriage: HARRY F. KUSICK, Jr., to Susan F. Epstein.
"Originally, radio broadcasters sought the biggest possible audience. Now, most seek just a select portion," according to Joseph A. Grady, '40, director of operations for WPEN radio and for some 30 years a leading figure in Philadelphia radio. Grady attributes the "decline" of radio (relative to its "Golden Days" in the '30s and '40s) to the proliferation of stations with the advent of FM radio, rather than to TV. "Music has been completely wiped-out of the picture on AM," he adds. "Now the emphasis (on AM) is on public affairs programs—talk shows, all news stations, and telephone response shows. But in the brief period since the appearance of these programs, they have already become passé, while the entertainment era of radio continued for nearly three decades." The founder of WPEN's "950 Club"—the number one show in the area for some 10 years—Grady began his radio career at WHAT while still an undergraduate. He later joined WIP's "Dawn Patrol" staff and in 1944 went to WPEN. Grady, a past Grand Knight of the Knights of Columbus, this fall began a new career (in addition to his position at WPEN)—teaching. He is conducting a four-year college course in oral communications at St. Charles Borromeo Seminary. He, his wife Patricia, and their two daughters live in suburban Broomall.
Jack Bresnan /

greater challenges

“I’ve been concerned about La Salle, mainly because it has historically been a college which was approachable by a Catholic minority who looked upon large universities as alien places.” Thus, John J. Bresnan, ‘50, a program officer for the Ford Foundation, conveys his concern for the future of La Salle, and most other Catholic colleges. “I think La Salle was playing the role of moving large sections of the Catholic minority into the middle and upper class,” he continues. “For La Salle to continue today, it means working with an entirely new population group—middle class people. There are probably greater challenges than that for La Salle.” Bresnan, who was editor of The Collegian while an undergraduate English major and had a news career before joining the Foundation in 1953, is acutely aware of the financial problems faced by small colleges, but he contends, “You can’t worry about money. If you have an ideal, a commitment, there are all kinds of ways to raise the money.” In his position as a program officer for Asia and the Pacific, Bresnan is actively involved in the Foundation’s economic and social programs throughout Asia. He holds a master’s degree in government from New York University and his major interest is in the social sciences. He, his wife Barbara, and their four children make their home near New York City.
Coach Gola: After God, then what?