A RHETORICAL/INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF EDWARD R. MURROW'S CRITICISM OF BROADCAST JOURNALISM: IMPLICATIONS FOR BROADCAST JOURNALISM EDUCATORS

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Aaron Dale Quanbeck

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Department:
Communication

November 2012

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

A RHETORICAL/INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF EDWARD R. MURROW'S CRITICISM OF BROADCAST JOURNALISM: IMPLICATIONS FOR BROADCAST JOURNALISM EDUCATORS

By

Aaron Dale Quanbeck

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Mark Meister, Ph.D.
Chair

Zoltan Majdik, Ph.D.

Paul Nelson, Ph.D.

Abby Gold, Ph.D.

Kevin Brooks, Ph.D.

Approved:

Nov. 2, 2012
Date

Mark Meister, Ph.D.
Department Chair

ABSTRACT

Corporate influence has been an ongoing concern for working journalists. Even in the early days of television, Edward R. Murrow saw a bleak future for society if broadcasters succumbed to corporate greed and failed in their responsibility to inform the public. This rhetorical study of Murrow's 1958 speech to the Radio-Television News Directors Association, guided by Perelman's theory of the universal audience and presence, argues that Murrow's speech prioritized broadcast journalism's obligation to a democratic society and warned that commercial intrusion was impacting the profession's moral obligations. At the same time, in appealing to a particular audience, Murrow deemphasized the role of individuals in the process, including both working journalists and the viewing audience. I apply the findings of my rhetorical analysis to a qualitative case study analysis of three collegiate broadcasting textbooks to examine how closely Murrow's vision for the industry is being passed on to the next generation of broadcast journalists. My findings suggest that tensions exist between the two, including Murrow advocating a more proactive rather than a reactive approach to broadcast journalism. I conclude by offering recommendations to broadcast educators in helping young journalists balance the obligations Murrow envisioned for the industry and the corporate realities of broadcasting.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank my wonderful wife and children, who showed unending patience and support throughout my graduate studies. I never would have made it without your love, encouragement, and understanding. I also want to thank my advisor, Mark Meister, whose guidance and advice every step of the way made this possible. Lastly, I want to thank the Mass Communications Department at Minnesota State University Moorhead for its ongoing support. The faculty members there were always encouraging, gave me great advice, and did whatever they could to help me along the way. I'm so glad to be working with such a great group of dedicated professors who were so supportive of me completing my degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Since its inception, broadcast journalism has had to balance two distinct and what often appear to be contradictory objectives. On one side is the journalistic ideal of informing the public and keeping it abreast about an ever-changing world. On the other is the requirement to attract viewers and bring in the dollars necessary to satisfy the corporate entities that own and operate broadcasting stations. The clash between these two sides creates a push and pull that invites criticism of broadcast journalism and puts into question its true obligation to society.

These opposing forces related to broadcast journalism have led many to question the industry's primary objective. Much of the public has its concerns about how the push for profits influences journalistic pursuits. The last time the Pew Research Center asked its respondents how they think the media selects its stories, it found that by a wide margin most Americans believe that news organizations decide what stories to cover based on the size of the audience it will attract, not on whether the public needs to stay informed (Pew Research Center for the Press, 2005). When it concerns the state of broadcast news, viewers have complained that advertisers have too much influence over coverage, bowing to commercial pressures (Tompkins, 2009).

Media critics have also been outspoken over what they perceive as the erosion of journalism's role in supporting a democratic society. Some have worked to expose how the corporate structure impacts journalistic practices. Croteau and Hoynes (2006) describe several cases where a media entity's corporate interest has gotten in the way of the public's need to know. They discuss the example of CBS's *60 Minutes* decision in 1995 to not air an interview with a tobacco company executive that exposed how it was hiding the truth about the addictive effects of tobacco. Even though the story was sound, CBS was up for sale, and Croteau and

Hoynes contend a lawsuit would have made the network less attractive to potential buyers and therefore the interview was dropped.

In addition to criticism concerning stories that broadcasters omit because of the desire to avoid controversy, others have highlighted how the stories that are included are often done for commercial gain, not for their journalistic merit. An analysis of the newscasts of 294 network-affiliated stations revealed that 90 percent included at least one instance of stealth advertising (Upshaw, Chernov, & Koranda, 2007). The authors believe this trend to be problematic because when these commercial themes are included in the actual newscast, rather than limited to the traditional commercial blocks, it occupies the time that could have been devoted to independent journalism that benefits the public good.

Another complaint concerning the content of newscasts is the selection of story topics during “sweeps,” the specific times of the years when audiences are measured and advertising rates are set for stations. Deborah Potter, the president and executive director of a non-profit journalism resource center NewsLab, contends that sweeps periods often bring out the worst in local and national news (Potter, 2001). She cites examples of a television news report in St. Louis about thong underwear for men and another in Houston warning how a person’s cat can make them crazy. To see what kind of pressures broadcast journalists face during sweeps week, Ehrlich (1995) compared two newsrooms during a November sweeps period, one a medium-sized market and the other a top 20 market. While the medium sized market at least tried to produce a meaningful series of reports, the top 20 market resorted to titillating topics. Interviews with the leaders in the top-20 market newsroom revealed that “managers did not see their decision to run sexy and lurid series as necessarily violating the public interest or the loyalty of their viewers” (p. 44). The desire for higher ratings and giving the public what they wanted based on market research data outweighed the station's journalistic responsibilities. Ehrlich contends that newsrooms could attract viewers during sweeps by producing stories of quality and substance, but instead waste the opportunity of by airing reports they think their viewers desire.

Outspoken media critic Neil Postman provided his evaluation of the problem of television being used to distract the public from important issues in his book, *Amusing Ourselves to Death* (1985). He asserts that information has become a form of entertainment, and in doing so, has lost its value. He provides a particularly harsh critique of the on-air personalities who deliver the news: "Most spend more time with their hair dryers than with their scripts, with the result that they comprise the most glamorous group of people this side of Las Vegas" (p. 4). Postman contends that looks and camera appeal far outweigh journalistic merit when it concerns the selection of broadcast news anchors.

Outside of the newscasts, media critics have also lamented the decline of meaningful news programming in primetime. The longtime CBS news magazine *60 Minutes* showed the networks that newsmagazine programs could actually be profitable. This encouraged a lot of copycats such as *20/20*, *Prime Time Live*, *Turning Point*, *48 Hours*, and *Eye to Eye with Connie Chung*, but critics argue those programs often had more in common with tabloid shows like *Hard Copy* and *A Current Affair* (Hatchen, 2005). Croteau and Hoynes (2006) contend that most "failed in both journalistic and commercial terms" and that "they soon borrowed strategies from the playbook of yellow journalism" (p. 167). Alger (1998) shares that opinion, and points to *Dateline NBC* especially as an example how there was little news in many of those newsmagazines. With its emphasis on crime, celebrities, and celebrity trials, Alger called it "tabloid TV masquerading as a newsmagazine" (p. 176).

The decline of meaningful news at the expense of the pursuit of profits has led some to wonder if broadcasters are shirking their responsibility to keep the public informed. This obligation has its roots in the days of radio, when licenses were granted to station owners by the Federal Radio Commission on the condition that they broadcast in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity," words that had an ambiguous meaning even at that time (Barkin, 2003). Barkin (2003) asserts that what was determined to be in the "public interest" came from the networks themselves, airing the "least objectionable" material to attract the largest audience possible, even tracking which individual stories in a newscast gained or lost viewers (p. 180).

The debate concerning the journalistic obligations of the broadcast journalism profession versus the commercial realities related to the career is one I have long been involved with as both a television news reporter and presently as a broadcasting educator. Working in a newsroom opened my eyes to the great responsibility a broadcast journalist has in serving the public. I experienced this during the spring of 1997 while working as a television news reporter in Grand Forks, ND, when much of the town was devastated by floodwaters. Our station interrupted regular programing and provided non-stop coverage of the disaster so residents evacuated to outlying areas could know what was happening to the city. Our station won an Edward R. Murrow award for its service to the community during that difficult time.

I have also experienced the commercial side of the profession, however. Not long into my broadcasting career, I recall going into work one day only to find that a long-time colleague with an on-air position had been fired and another demoted. The reason given was that the ratings were flat. A new anchor team was soon brought in to provide a fresh look to the newscast in hopes of attracting more viewers. A co-worker who had welcomed me when I first arrived at the station was suddenly gone. There was no going-away party, no cake to wish the person well, just a short meeting to make the announcement and the concern that it might some day happen to me.

Those experiences have fueled my interest in the dual responsibilities of broadcast journalism as a news source that should be informative, but do so in a way that will attract viewers. As a broadcast journalist educator, I also must strike that balance in the way I teach my students. I attempt to inform them of the obligations they have to the public to maintain high journalist standards, but also of their obligations to their station and owners do what they can to attract and keep viewers. The journalistic ideals must work in accordance with the corporate realities.

There are those in the profession who have criticized how the corporate side of media has continually encroached on its journalistic responsibilities. An early critic of corporate media's growing influence on broadcasting was Edward R. Murrow, who many acknowledge as establishing broadcast journalism as a profession. He is "the man credited with inventing television journalism in America" (Barnett, 2008, p. 38), its "founding father," and even "the patron saint of American broadcasting" (Edgerton, 1992, p. 75). Towards the end of his news career, he also became one of broadcasting's greatest critics. In a 1958 speech before the Radio-Television News Directors Association (RTNDA), he warned that the industry was headed for disaster if it did not fulfill its duty to inform the masses about the serious issues that impact our society. He saw television as becoming a medium that in the future would be looked upon as providing little more than "decadence, escapism and insulation from the realities of the world in which we live" (Murrow, p. 28).

Murrow's situation was unique in that he was lambasting an industry that he helped to create, and in many ways, had turned against him. Murrow's style of broadcasting, which often exemplified urgency and worry, was fitting for World War II and immediately after, but came across as antiquated by the late 1950s (Baughman, 1981). His Emmy-award winning documentary program, *See It Now*, had also recently been cancelled prior to his RTNDA address and his time slot replaced by a game show (Grossman, 2002). He had in effect become “the founding father” of a child that was disowning him.

Over the years Murrow has also risen to iconic status within the industry and beyond to exemplify all that is good with broadcast journalism. Edgerton (1992) argues that Murrow has now become "a moral barometer" for all other broadcast journalists to follow (p. 75). They see his journalistic integrity as the ideal and a compass in navigating the difficult path of a broadcaster in today’s corporate-controlled media. An example of this moral guidance was a panel discussion at the 2008 RTNDA conference titled "What Would Murrow Do?" (Potter, 2008), which is strikingly similar to the popular phrase among Christians: "What would Jesus do?" The next generation of broadcasters is also looking to Murrow for guidance. While his name is certainly brought up in many journalism classes, Fordham University in New York began offering an entire course about the legendary broadcaster (“Journalism Class,” 1989). His alma mater, Washington State University, went a step further by naming its entire communication college after its famous student (“Murrow School,” 2008).

I use Perelman’s and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s (1969) rhetorical theory of the universal audience and presence to argue that Murrow’s RTNDA speech plausibly invoked the universal audience to argue for broadcasting’s moral obligation to society while resonating with a particular audience—broadcast journalists. In doing so, Murrow placed much of the blame for what he believed was wrong with the profession at the corporate level, while deemphasizing the responsibilities of viewers and individual journalists. I incorporate a case study of several of the most popular broadcast journalism textbooks to see if Murrow's rhetoric concerning broadcasting continues to be taught to students today.

Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's (1969) theories of the universal and particular audience provide a useful tool in analyzing Murrow's speech. Murrow sought to lay out a rational argument for his views that broadcasting had a moral obligation to society to provide worthwhile programming. Even today many see the value in Murrow's arguments, which speaks to the universality of his reasoning beyond his particular time and situation. His other task was to bring about a response to the particular audience of broadcasters in the room. In doing so, he used rhetorical strategies that he presumed would resonate with other broadcast professionals. This includes Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's concept of presence, which allows the speaker to give more credibility to specific elements of a speech at the expense of others. Murrow placed certain facts and illustrations to the fore in his speech, while holding back or deemphasizing other information in order to make his argument. This included highlighting his own journalistic career high points, while ignoring what some consider to be his own professional compromises to his high journalistic standards.

The sum total of these strategies led to a speech that has set the tone for the broadcast profession today, but in many ways is a construction based on Murrow's journalistic ideals. It emphasizes the corporate dangers to society while ignoring many of the realties of the profession. This includes a viewing audience that may be ambivalent towards hard news reports or the requirement of a newscast to be successful in the ratings and turn a profit. While his speech is an ongoing inspiration for those in the professional, for many of them it has also become, using Murrow's words, an "insulation from the realities of the world in which we live" (Murrow, 1965, p. 28). The idealism that was illustrated throughout his career is reflected in his

RTNDA speech, and by using it as an inspiration for today's broadcast journalists, it fails to provide a full and accurate picture of the profession. In essence, Murrow's ontological stance was that humans were rational beings who would make wise decisions if given the proper information. His epistemological position was that broadcasting held a special place in enlightening the populace and allowed them to become democratically engaged. While these viewpoints provide an inspirational foundation for the broadcast journalism profession, they also tend to downplay the corporate and commercial realities of the industry.

Murrow holds an important place among journalists because of his history and status in the field of broadcasting. He is also rhetorically significant because of his idealistic view of journalism and its potential impact on society. It was those convictions that drove him throughout his career, and later perhaps led to his alienation from others in the profession. Today however, he is remembered and revered for those unwavering journalistic principals, making him a historical figure that retains rhetorical significance.

Previous Murrow Research

Murrow has also been a popular subject among scholars, who have studied him and his career in various ways. Edgerton (1992), for example, examined the discourse surrounding Edward R. Murrow, and considered how it has contributed to his legendary status. He asserts that much of the discourse related to Murrow tends to be in the form of hagiography, which is the term given to the study of saints. He asserts that this form of hero worship has perpetuated over the years so that today we have a "reified version of the historical man" (Edgerton, 1992, p. 77). We see the idealized person of Murrow, who has been transformed into a saint through the perceptions of others and the writings they have produced about him and his life.

Instead of considering the written works about Murrow, Stout (2010) analyzed the movies and documentaries about his life and career. Like Edgerton, he maintains that the depictions of Murrow have added to his legendary status. In particular, he points to the 2005 film *Good Night and Good Luck* as contributing to the deification of Murrow because it depicts such a narrow part of his career-- the *See It Now* broadcast that criticized Joseph McCarthy. He believes the film has "succeeded in continuing and perhaps even adding to the 'larger than life' mythological figure of Murrow" (Stout, 2010, p. 15). The iconic, journalistic hero was seen on the screen with none of the flaws of the actual person.

O'Conner (1986) focused exclusively on the McCarthy *See It Now* telecast, and analyzed its content, production, and reception. The author employs a shot-by-shot content analysis of how the McCarthy segment was edited together and concluded that "the effectiveness of Murrow's attack was based upon the cinematic form of the program and the subtle emotional (and unconsciously communicated) messages of certain of the images and series of images" (O'Conner, 1986, p. 62). Going beyond its technical merits, O'Conner (1986) supports using the telecast as an example to future broadcast journalists that those in the profession "must do what they think correct according to the creative conventions, the standards, and the ethics of their own profession regardless of what scholars or other viewers think" (p. 72). Like other historians, the author sees the broadcast as an example of Murrow taking the moral high ground in spite of the risks involved.

Rosteck (1989) goes well beyond O'Conner's analysis of the single McCarthy broadcast and devotes an entire book to four *See It Now* telecasts that confronted McCarthyism in various ways. The author conducts a rhetorical analysis of the documentary form that Murrow used in his broadcasts. As is typically done with considering any rhetorical artifact, Rosteck reflects on the historical backdrop of the broadcasts and their impact. This helps in his ultimate goal, which was to "understand these discourses rhetorically: to read them so as to explain how they are structured and organized and to examine the kind of potential meanings" (Rosteck, 1989, p. 175).

In his findings, Rosteck (1989) concludes that the McCarthy broadcasts do act rhetorically in that they become a form of persuasive art. He contends that the documentary form accomplishes this by its "relationship to the 'real' and to conventions of interpretation" (Rosteck, 1989, p. 191) When the audience watches a documentary, he argues that there is an expectation that what they are seeing are the realities of the world. The documentary form, such as was found with the Murrow telecasts, becomes a believable account of the events of the day.

One of Murrow's later television programs, *Small World*, is the focus of a more recent article by Kathleen Collins (2012). In her historical review of the program, Collins argues that the program that brought together celebrities and newsmakers in a four-way conversation with Murrow deserves more attention, both for its technical achievements and its subject matter. She contends that with *Small World*, Murrow and Friendly tried to bridge the gap between what viewers might find as both entertaining and informative: "The two were among the first to engage in the perpetual challenge of finding a balance between education and diversion on American television" (Collins, 2012, p. 10). Though *Small World* was short-lived, she believes the program is historically significant because it paved the way for other discussion programs like *Face the Nation* and *Meet the Press*.

Leslie (1988) considered the totality of Murrow's career and through it asserts that he practiced his own ethical "theory." Through analysis of his life and career choices, Leslie compiled what he believes are Murrow's methodological assumptions:

1. Existence is God-given life.

> 2. Human knowledge results from a variety of life experiences, each increasing our store.
>
> 3. Morality is the strict, religion-based code — a set of values and conduct guidelines by which one regulates a life.
>
> 4. Reality is the observed state of men and the world.
>
> 5. Integrity is the application of morality to reality.
>
> 6. Reason is the analytical, cognitive means by which one makes decisions in the world and determines whether integrity has been properly applied. (Leslie, 1988, p. 10)

Leslie (1988) applies these assumptions to the McCarthy broadcast on *See It Now*, arguing that Murrow "was operating out of morality, integrity, and reason" and that based on those ideals Murrow "had no choice" but to oppose McCarthy (p. 15).

Godfrey (1993) applies Murrow's ethical foundation as identified by Leslie to his World War II radio reporting. By considering two of Murrow's reports, Godfrey argues that he used similar ethical practices when he covered the war on radio by reporting on it as a "moral cause" in which he was "emotionally involved" (Godfrey, 1993, p. 113). Even though Murrow was acting as a reporter, he did not free himself of his moral obligations and Godfrey sees that attitude reflected in how he conveyed the information to listeners back in the United States.

Journalism historian Matthew Ehrlich (2007) examined another aspect of Murrow's radio career-- his *Hear It Now* program, which aired for a short time on CBS radio before it turned into television's *See It Now*. Despite its brief six month run from 1950-1951, Ehrlich argues it is an under-researched aspect of Murrow's career that deserves more attention because it covered important topics of the day. That included the Korean War and the controversial firing of General MacArthur on April 11, 1951. Ehrlich (2007) also highlights the program's creative use of audio and believes the program "foreshadowed the future of long-form radio journalism," such as Public Radio's *All Things Considered* (p. 451). Even as he was about to make the transition to television, Ehrlich believes Murrow was still breaking new ground in radio.

Cull (2003) goes beyond Murrow's journalistic career and examines his time as the director of the United States Information Agency under the Kennedy administration. By using declassified papers from the Kennedy library, along with interviews of former USIA employees, the author goes through key events during Murrow's tenure at the USIA director, including the Bay of Pigs, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and the Civil Right Movement. Cull's (2003) conclusion is that there was "politicking, compromises and weakness in Murrow's tenure at USIA, but there are undeniable flashes of principle too" (p. 42). He compares his comprises to those he made during his journalism careers when he hosted the celebrity interview program *Person to Person*.

Rhetorical Criticism as Research Perspective

As illustrated above, researchers have focused their attention on various aspects Murrow's career, but his 1958 RTNDA address is one pivotal moment that is under-studied. Despite its historical significance in being his public indictment of the industry soon before his departure from CBS, and its relevance today as an inspiration for those working in broadcasting, few scholars have examined the rhetorical strategies Murrow employed in the speech. Murrow's RTNDA address was a message to the broadcast industry at the time, and is often quoted even today when describing what is wrong with current state of broadcasting (Cochran, 2008; Potter, 2008). It is worthy of more scholarly attention and this dissertation seeks to fill that gap in the research dealing with Murrow.

This dissertation is guided by the broad research question: How does Murrow's RTNDA address create a perspective of broadcasting that resonates with those in the industry today? To achieve that goal, I incorporate rhetorical criticism to examine the strategies he incorporated to create a world in which broadcasting is elevated to almost a higher calling, one that is needed to keep society on the right path. Moreover, I incorporate the rhetorical and critical ideas gleaned from analyzing Murrow's RTNDA speech into a case study analysis that considers whether Murrow's view of the profession are reflected in some of the more popular broadcasting textbooks used to educate college students for broadcasting careers. Thus, a second broad research question addressed in this dissertation is: How is Murrow's vision of broadcasting rhetorically represented in textbooks used to train future broadcast journalists?

This study contributes to scholarship on Murrow by examining the rhetorical strategies he used to construct his dire warning to the broadcast industry. By incorporating Perelman's concept of the universal audience I argue that Murrow created an address he hoped would resonate beyond his immediate audience by laying out a rational argument for broadcasting's moral obligation to society. By drawing on his own ethical foundations and his experiences within the industry, he made an appeal that meant to convince those who were to hear the address now and in the future that broadcasting had a higher calling beyond mindless entertainment.

This dissertation also considers how Murrow appealed to the particular audience of broadcast journalists he was addressing. Perelman's rhetorical strategy of "presence" as it relates to persuasive messages, aids my rhetorical analysis that illustrates how Murrow brought certain elements to the fore in his RTNDA address that he knew would resonate among the audience, but he also carefully excluded others. He emphasized the moral responsibilities broadcast journalism has to society, but deemphasized the need to balance that with its corporate obligations. He also laid the blame for broadcast journalism's shortcomings at the top, while downplaying the impact of individual journalists and the audience on news coverage. They become more the victims of the corporate machine and had little influence on bringing about positive change.

I argue that Murrow's vision for broadcasting as reflected through his RTNDA address is only partially reflected in the textbooks I examined. Overall, there is little meaningful discussion of the moral obligation that Murrow envisioned for broadcasting and the foundations of the industry. Aspiring broadcasters are taught based on changing audience preferences triggered in part by technological advancements. Unlike Murrow's address, which stressed broadcast journalism's moral obligations, students are told in the textbooks to fulfill their duties to both the public and their employers, but there is little meaningful advise on how to balance both requirements. Murrow's contention that change could only come from the top down is also not reflected in the texts. The authors ascribe more influence to the audience, and in the case of one of the textbooks, also to individual journalists to impact the coverage.

To accomplish the goal of examining Murrow's RTNDA address as it relates to Murrow's vision for broadcast journalism, this dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter two considers the historical context of Murrow as he relates to broadcast journalism. This includes the highlights of his career, his eventual disillusionment with the profession, the contextual setting of his speech, and fallout it created. Chapter three provides the rhetorical analysis of the speech, also including an overview of the rhetorical critical theories I use to examine the speech. Chapter four applies the findings of my rhetorical analysis of Murrow's speech to a qualitative case study of three collegiate broadcasting textbooks to consider how Murrow's views about the industry are being represented today. Finally, chapter five discusses the implications and conclusions related to my rhetorical analysis and case study and provides recommendations for broadcast journalism educators based on my findings.

CHAPTER TWO: TEXT AND CONTEXT

Introduction

In this chapter, I further discuss Murrow's legacy as it relates to broadcast journalism. In order to provide a foundation for his strong ethical stance as it relates to the profession, I first consider his upbringing and how it informed his future career. I then provide an overview of the history of broadcast journalism and detail Murrow's legacy in shaping the profession both on radio and television.

Murrow's transformation from a young man of conviction with a talent for public speaking to an iconic broadcaster included a gradual progression, with many separate instances contributing to his legendary status. Edgerton (1992), however, points to three instances in his life that have helped to shape how both his contemporaries and historians have come to view Murrow and his impact on journalism. He singles out Murrow's radio reporting during the London blitz during World War II when Murrow reported live from the rooftops as German bombers flew overhead. Edgerton also highlights Murrow's *See It Now* broadcast from 1954, in which he attacked Senator Joseph McCarthy tactics in hunting down Communists in America. Lastly, Edgerton focuses on Murrow's RTNDA address in 1958 that attacked the industry's commitment to the public, and which signaled Murrow's departure from broadcasting. I focus on each of those aspects of Murrow's career in detail and discuss how they relate to his status as a broadcasting icon.

In addition, I also include what many consider to be a lapse in his high journalistic standards-- his participation in the *Person to Person* celebrity interview program. While this is often overlooked by many who choose to remember the uncompromising, idealistic Murrow, it is an indication of Murrow's recognition of the necessities of the corporate side of broadcasting.

Finally, I describe the historical context of his RTNDA address, including his decline in status at CBS and his eventual departure.

Murrow's Early Years

Murrow's strong moral stance and his rhetoric related to journalism may have its roots in his upbringing. He was born in 1908 as Egbert Roscoe Murrow in Guilford County, North Carolina, the youngest of three brothers in a family of Quaker abolitionists living in what once was a slaveholding state (Edwards, 2004). His mother Ethel believed it was her responsibility to raise her sons as God-fearing and honest. Part of Murrow's upbringing included praying before every meal, reading from the Bible aloud every night, and attending church regularly (Sperber, 1986). His mother's strong moral code also forbade the boys from smoking, drinking, playing cards, or dancing. On the Sabbath the list expanded to banning fishing and playing ball. Also included in their strict upbringing was the expectation that they needed to amount to something when they came of age (Persico, 1990).

The Murrow's worked hard for what they had, but lived very simply. They had no electricity, plumbing, telephone or car (Edwards, 2004). While the profitable crop to raise in North Carolina at the time was tobacco, as a devout Quaker, Egbert's father Roscoe refused to grow the plants and instead raised corn and wheat. This made make it harder to make ends meet (Sperber, 1986). The result was that Egbert and his brothers worked hard during their childhood to help the farm survive. Later in life Ed Murrow would say that not working made him feel "miserable" and that he had never been "equipped to have fun" (Kendrick, 1969, p. 81). But despite their limited means, Egbert's mother Ethel was more concerned about her sons being morally poor. Murrow once described that the first money he had earned came from toiling all day in his father's field, hoeing corn in the hot sun. His father rewarded him with a fifty-cent piece, but his mother made him put the money in the missionary box (Persico, 1990), an indication that moral responsibility was to come before earthly gains.

At the age of five, Egbert's family moved from South Carolina to the state of Washington, where the government was still granting land to homesteaders (Edwards, 2004). His farther began working for the railroad, and while the family had money for necessities there was little left for much else (Sperber, 1986). Since there were no Quaker meetings where they lived in Blanchard, Washington, Ethel rejoined the Methodist religion of her youth, passing on the faith to her sons and created an atmosphere at home that was an "amalgam of both sternness and forbearance" (Kendrick, p. 85). With their father gone so much, Ethel became the main disciplinarian, and was not afraid to use corporal punishment. If one of the boys were to misbehave, "she sent them out to cut a fresh switch for whipping" and hit them around the ankles so it would be painful without being harmful (Persico, 1990, p. 27).

Murrow biographer A. M. Sperber (1986) believes such a firm upbringing instilled in young Egbert "a sense of guilt, an awareness of sin and the need to for atonement" (p. 16). He contends, however, that Murrow's childhood gave him even more.

> Underlying formal piety, however, was the strong social conscience brought from southern Guilford—the uncompromising sense of right and wrong; of the right to disagree, basic to both Quaker doctrine and American liberalism, and of individual responsibility: the feeling of a direct connection between one's actions and what happened in the world. (p. 16)

Sperber clearly sees how the values young Egbert learned as a child influenced his convictions as an adult Edward Murrow.

Even in Washington, work continued to be a constant in the Murrow household. When each of the sons reached 12 years of age, their father would hire them out to nearby farmers, who felt they were getting a bargain because the Murrow brothers worked so hard (Persico, 1990). After Egbert graduated from high school, he spent the next year working for the timber industry to raise money for college. By this time he had started going by Ed, a name he thought would be safer to use among lumberjacks (Persico, 1990). While Murrow was growing up, the Industrial Workers of the World, or "the Wobblies," had been trying to unionize, but had been thwarted by corporate and government forces, with organizers often being beaten, jailed, or lynched (Edwards, 2004). When the union staged a strike during World War I, they were charged with sabotaging the war effort and the Justice Department stepped in with nationwide raids, trials and deportations of migrant workers (Sperber, 1986).

As a part of the Washington lumber industry himself, Murrow had sympathy for the plight of labor. Kendrick (1969) described how these experiences would later shape Murrow's professional career. "Four decades later one of Murrow's most powerful television documentaries, *Harvest of Shame*, revealing the plight of migrant farm labor, was in one sense an evidence of the psychological impression left by this boyhood recollections" (p. 92). Hearing government officials label union members as Bolsheviks would also serve as a foundation for his CBS *See It Now* broadcast where he criticized Senator Joseph McCarthy's Red Scare tactics (Edwards, 2004).

In 1926, Murrow began college at Washington State University. There he pursued his interest in public speaking and was heavily influenced by his speech instructor, Ida Lou Anderson. She introduced Murrow to the works of Roman philosopher-emperor Marcus Aurelius, and encouraged him to follow the philosophical ideas of service and duty laid out by

Aurelius (Persico, 1990). This included passages that touted the value of basing one's actions on strong moral convictions.

> If thou workest at that which is before thee, following right reason seriously, vigorously, calmly, without allowing anything else to distract thee, but keeping thy divine part pure, as if thou shouldst be bound to give it back immediately; if thou holdest to this, expecting nothing, fearing nothing, but satisfied with thy present activity according to nature, and with heroic truth in every word and sound which thou utterest, thou wilt live happy. And there is no man who is able to prevent this. (Aurelius, trans. 2005, 3.12)

Later in life, when asked who he would like to be if not himself, Murrow replied "Marcus Aurelius, a great mind and a good man" (Lezlie, 1988, p. 9).

Edward R. Murrow's experiences growing up clearly laid the foundation for the moral stances he took as a professional. His strict, religious upbringing provided him with a strong work ethic, a sense of right and wrong, and the courage to stand up to injustice. He was taught to strive to better himself, but also recognize the plight of others and work towards the greater good. His philosophical perspectives were reinforced through his college years as he looked to the works of Marcus Aurelius for inspiration. This moral code and sense of obligation would shape his journalistic career, his status as a broadcasting icon, and his rhetoric concerning the state of broadcast journalism.

Advent of Broadcast Journalism

Edward R. Murrow holds the distinction of being involved with broadcast journalism in two mediums—radio and television—and his views concerning their obligations to the public were shaped by his involvement with both mediums. Each share a similar path in that the technology was in place to become popular forms of communication among the public, but war and battles over patent rights delayed them from being adopted into general use. Once radio and television became available and affordable, their rapid growth ushered in new opportunities for disseminating news across the airwaves.

The first radio transmission of a voice over a great distance dates back to Christmas Eve of 1906, when Canadian Reginald Fessenden surprised telegraph operators off the Atlantic coast by broadcasting his voice and music (Hilliard & Keith, 1992). While a major milestone for the technology, potential investors viewed the incident as more as a novelty and instead continued to focus their attention on the telegraph. Wireless transmission via the telegraph had already proven itself useful when it came to ships in distress, but it was the sinking of the *Titanic* in 1912 that demonstrated to the world the necessity of wireless technology.

On April 10, 1912 the *Titanic* struck the iceberg on its maiden voyage in the north Atlantic Ocean. As it was sinking, one of the ship's wireless operators sent out SOS messages, but because it was late at night most of the radio operators from nearby ships had retired for the evening. The closest to receive the message was the *Carpathia*, 58-miles and three-and-a half hours from the *Titanic's* location. The *California* was less than twenty miles from the *Titanic*, but its wireless operator was already asleep at the time. By the time the *Carpathia* arrived it could only rescued those on the lifeboats (S. Douglas, 1987).

In the meantime, 21-year-old David Sarnoff, the future chairman of RCA, was working as a wireless operator in New York for Guglielmo Marconi, who is credited by many as being the key inventor of modern radio. Legend has it that after Sarnoff picked up the radio signal that the *Titanic* had hit an iceberg, he stayed at his post for 72 hours, recording the names of both those who perished and those who survived (Hilliard & Keith, 1992). The veracity of the details of the story has since come into question, but Sarnoff used the notoriety he received from the incident to eventually propel him into one of the business pioneers of the emerging broadcast radio industry (Bergreen, 1980).

An investigation into the *Titanic* revealed two major findings. First, if it had not been for the radio transmissions that reached the *Carpathia*, more than likely all of the passengers on the *Titanic* would have been lost. Secondly, had the other nearby ships picked up the distress signals, many more lived could have been saved (G. Douglas, 1987). The tragedy revealed the potential power of wireless transmission if used to its full potential. As radio historian George Douglas (1987) explains, “If there had been any doubt before, the general public now knew that radio was no playboy’s diversion, but a technical device of inestimable value” (p. 6). That value was to transmit news of importance across great distances.

The revelation of the power of wireless transmissions also brought about renewed interest in developing technology that would carry voices, not just telegraphy. While Fessenden’s early work in this area had gone unheralded, Yale researcher Lee De Forest took the idea to the next level through many advancements and demonstrations, including tests for the Navy (Lichty & Topping, 1976). The self-proclaimed “father of radio” had already broadcast his voice from the radio antenna on top of the Eifel Tower in 1908 and in 1916 briefly became a journalist when he announced election returns from his experimental tower in New York City. DeForest erroneously announced Charles Hughes as the winner over Woodrow Wilson, but the incident made *The New York Times* the next day (Bliss, 1991).

In these early years of radio, those working towards creating a viable device for public use were often entangled in lawsuits over patent rights to the technology necessary for radio’s development. The American Telephone & Telegraph Company sued the Marconi Company, for example, claiming that the audion tube, a device DeForest developed for Marconi, was actually a variation of its own Fleming valve (G. Douglas, 1987). Meanwhile, General Electric had developed its own improved audion tube and filed its own patent. The litigation tied up the development of radio for years, but its introduction to the public was delayed even further when the United States entered World War I in 1917. At that time, the Navy appropriated all radio equipment, both commercial and amateur, and put it towards the war effort. This included all privately owned broadcast stations that had begun to operate at the time. Once the war was over, the U.S. government returned all the stations back to their owners, and issued thousands of private licenses to operators of both amateur and experimental radio stations (Hilliard & Keith, 1992). While some of them were still using telegraph technology, others had moved on to broadcasting voices and music.

In 1920, radio made two more steps forward towards what could be considered broadcast journalism. A station in Detroit called 8MK covered a primary election and KDKA in East Philadelphia broadcast the returns of the presidential election in which Warren Harding defeated James Cox (Bliss, 1967). Likely only a handful of people actually heard the reports, but the publicity they received encouraged further forays into broadcast journalism. KDKA became among the first stations to offer nightly broadcasts on a regular basis and helped spark a demand for people who could receive the signals to purchase their own radios (G. Douglas, 1987). The station's success encouraged General Electric, AT&T, and the recently formed Radio Corporation of America to accelerate their efforts in taking advantage of the coming radio boom (Barnouw, 1970).

Commercial radio began in 1922, when AT&T's New York station, WEAF carried a paid, 10-minute talk promoting a new housing development. It aired five more times that day, resulting in many sales of apartments (Hilliard & Keith, 1992). While consistent sales of on-air advertising did not catch on until a few years later, this broadcast established the viability of commercial radio. This commercial system would become the primary source of revenue for privately owned stations.

The advent of commercial broadcasting also encouraged the growth of the major entities in radio. RCA established the National Broadcasting Company in 1926, which actually became two radio networks, NBC Blue and NBC Red, named for the colored pencils engineers used to indicate the hook-ups for each network. By the end of the year, NBC Blue grew to 16 stations and NBC Red to 25 (Bergeen, 1980). As 1927 began, the two networks were already supplying their affiliates with highly produced programs such as the *Maxwell House Hour* and the *General Motors Family Party* (Barnouw, 1970). Sponsors were getting on board the new medium.

In January of 1927, another radio network emerged. United Independent Broadcasters, Inc. was formed, and would later become the Columbia Broadcasting System (Lichty & Topping, 1976). The fledgling 16-station network floundered until the Congress Cigar Company, owned by the family of William Paley, bought a majority in the company for $300,000. Paley would become the network's first president and later its chairman (Hilliard & Keith, 1992).

As the number of stations grew during the 1920s, so did the problems associated with such rapid expansion. Crowded airways meant that broadcasts would drown each other out, and more stations were applying for licenses every day. The government stepped in the with the Radio Act of 1927, which established that the radio waves and channels belonged to everyone and should be operated in the public interest (G. Douglas, 1987). The law created the Federal Radio Commission, the precursor to the Federal Communications Commission, to oversee the airwaves. It required that stations operate in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity," and it voided all previous licenses, forcing all existing stations to apply for new ones (Sterling &

Kittross, 2002). The end result was that most of the larger, more influential stations remained on the air, while smaller stations were forced off or assigned less-desirable frequencies (Hilliard & Keith, 1992).

The law also never defined what was meant by the "public interest, convenience, and necessity," leaving it largely up to the discretion of the Commission to determine if stations were meeting that criteria. There were some who did make early attempts to try to fulfill that requirement through broadcasting news. In 1929 NBC hired fast-talking Floyd Gibbons, a former newspaper correspondent who had lost an eye covering World War I, to announce a 15-minute newscast six nights a week called *The Headline Hunter* (Bliss, 1991). Gibbons had gained national recognition with his war stories and his eye-patch, but his rapid style of delivery was not very suitable for a suppertime newscast, and the sponsors of the program quickly started looking for a replacement (G. Douglas, 1987). Meanwhile, Paley and CBS wanted their own news announcer, so they hired war correspondent Lowell Thomas, who ended up broadcasting for the network for half a century (Hilliard & Keith, 1992). Others emulated the dramatic broadcasts of the day. Rather than just reading copy, programs like *The March of Time* "treated the listener to dramatic versions of events the news," thus transforming the news into a type of reenactment entertainment program (Lichty & Topping, 1976, p. 303).

The early success of radio news the early 1930s was not lost on the newspaper industry, which viewed it as a threat to their sales. In 1933, the newspaper industry convinced the Associated Press to pass a resolution that it would not distribute news to any radio or radio chain. The other major wire services soon passed similar resolutions (Bliss, 1967). The two major radio networks were also under pressure to limit their news coverage. In 1935 at the "The Biltmore Conference," named after the New York hotel in which it was held, CBS and NBC caved into the newspaper industry's demands. They promised they would not have their reporters gather their own news, would not engage in "hard news," and would broadcast commentaries supplied by the wire services (Hilliard & Keith, 1992). The pact between the radio networks and the print news industry dissolved in less than a year, however, as advertisers pressured the radio industry to supply news (Persico, 1990). Radio was once again on a path to developing legitimate newsgathering departments.

Murrow's Radio Broadcasts

Murrow's connection with radio began in the early 1930s. He began his post-college career with the National Student Federation of America and later became the assistant director of the Institute of International Education. His duties included arranging radio broadcasts with scholars, poets, and educators and he acted as the liaison between the educational community and the radio networks. He also was involved with helping refugees that were being displaced by the rise of Hitler in Germany (Kendrick, 1969). He had considered going into education, but in 1935 applied at CBS radio where he was hired as "director of talks." His duties were to line up educators to help fill the hours devoted to public affairs programming (Persico, 1990). As the network covered the growing troubles in Europe in the 1930s, Murrow's contacts were paying off for CBS. When the CBS European director decided he wanted to return, the network asked Murrow to fill his spot, an offer that Murrow had to be convinced by his colleagues to accept (Edwards, 2004).

Even after the end of the pact between the newspaper industry and radio to limit news broadcasts, broadcast journalism had yet to become a serious pursuit. When Murrow began his career in news radio, the industry was in its infancy and few news professionals in the 1930s understood how the medium could be used to deliver information in a way that would be different from print (Rudner, 1981). Murrow biographer Alexander Kendrick, who also worked alongside Murrow during those early days, described how radio was still mostly reserved for entertainment programming.

> But news broadcasting was still not being taken very seriously. It was true that on CBS there were three news broadcasts a day, five minutes at noon and 4:00 PM and fifteen minutes at 11 P. M. (…) But "news" in general consisted of either 'talks' or 'special events,' and one inevitably infringed upon the other. (Kendrick, 1969, p. 133)

These "special events" were often trivial in nature. NBC broadcast coverage of an international singing mouse contest, with entrants from the U.S., Canada, and Britain (Kendrick, 1969). In 1932, Cesar Saerchinger, who Murrow was replacing as the CBS European director, had won an award from American radio editors that year for "the most interesting broadcast" by broadcasting the song of a nightingale from Kent, England (Edwards, 2004). Radio at that time was still trying to discover what constituted news and the best way to cover it.

Murrow, only 29 years old and with little on-air experience himself, was asked by CBS news executives Paul White and Edward Klauber to assemble a team and prepare to cover news events in Europe as they happened (Rudner, 1981). Murrow was under orders that he and his team were not to broadcast themselves, but rather to arrange for others to do so. Murrow, however, possibly anticipating what was to come, informed CBS that his intention was still to put together a group of reporters, not just announcers. This established a tradition at CBS that carried into the network's television news days (Kendrick, 1969).

Murrow began with veteran print journalist William Shirer, with Shirer stationed in Vienna while Murrow stayed in London. Early on, their assignments included arranging special events broadcasts that promoted "international understanding," such as concerts of children's choirs (Kendrick, 1969). On March 13, 1938, Murrow finally got a chance to cover serious news. Austria had been in talks with Germany about annexation, and on that day Austria capitulated, naming a Nazi as the new chancellor. Shirer could not find a place to immediately broadcast in Vienna, so Murrow had him fly to London and Murrow flew to Vienna to replace him (Persico, 1990).

William Paley, the founder of the CBS radio network and the head of news operations in New York, wanted to get the reaction from several of the European capitals in the same newscast. This sort of live coordination had never been done in a radio newscast, and with only a few hours to prepare, it was a challenge for the engineers to make it technically possible (Sperber, 1986). Meanwhile, Shirer and Murrow had to line up correspondents in Berlin, Paris, Rome, London, and of course Vienna. Since he was operating alone, it is uncertain whether Murrow actually tried to acquire a print journalist to conduct the Vienna broadcast, or whether he was fulfilling his own ambitions to go on air, but either way Edward R. Murrow made his debut that day as a news correspondent (Persico, 1990).

> This is Edward R. Murrow speaking from Vienna… I arrived here by air from Warsaw and Berlin only a few hours ago… From the air Vienna didn't look much different than it has before, but nonetheless, it's changed. The crowds are courteous as they've always been, but many people are in a holiday mood; they lift the right arm little higher here than in Berlin and the 'Heil Hitler' is said a little more loudly. (Bliss, 1967, pp. 4-5)

Even in his debut as a broadcast journalist Rudner (1981) contends that Murrow's signature style already started to show through:

> By concentrating on the small details of Viennese life, he noted how these details reflected the larger story… there was, as Murrow noted, 'an air of expectancy' in Vienna

as her citizens awaited the arrival of the German Chancellor, and the reporter wanted to verbalize what he felt and observed. (p. 99)

The broadcast was an instant success, and CBS quickly ordered another news roundup for later that day and the several days to follow. The broadcasts marked a distinct transformation from previous attempts at radio news. CBS would now shift its attention away from covering "special events" like concerts and recognize the power correspondents have in describing events as they happen (Persico, 1990). Cloud and Olson (1996) believe much of the credit lies with Shirer and Murrow, who made the change happen: "They proved that radio was not only able to report news as it occurred but also to put it in context, to link it with news from elsewhere – and to do all that with unprecedented speed and immediacy" (p. 36). Shirer and Murrow had helped to set in motion the emergence of a new medium for news, and Murrow would soon take it to another level.

Murrow's emergence as a broadcasting icon began with England's involvement in World War II. During the conflict, he developed a reputation as a journalist that would do whatever was necessary to bring the news to the radio listener, and that notoriety grew as the war progressed (Godfrey, 1993). By the time Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 and England subsequently declared war on Germany, Murrow had already started gathering a group of journalists that would become known as "Murrow's Boys" to cover the war in Europe, including notable reporters Eric Sevareid, Charles Collinwood, and Howard K. Smith (Cloud & Olson, 1996). It was his own broadcasts during the London blitz, however, that have come to exemplify the power of radio during World War II.

On August 24, 1940, Germany began bombarding military targets near London with a fleet of 1000 planes filling the skies around the city (Sperber, 1986). Murrow and his team had already prepared to broadcast live from several locations around London to cover the inevitable German blitz, and on that night Murrow stood in front of Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields with a microphone in his hand.

> This is Trafalgar Square. The noise that you hear at this moment is the sound of the air-raid siren. A searchlight just burst into action, off in the distance, an immense single beam sweeping the sky above me now. People are walking along very quietly. We're just at the entrance of an air-raid shelter here and I must move the cable over just a bit, so people can walk in. (Kendrick, p. 173)

Murrow then put his microphone to the ground to let it pick up the sound of Londoners' footsteps making their way into the shelter. With the streetlights blacked out to thwart the German bombers, Murrow described them as "ghosts shod with steel shoes" (Sperber, p. 163).

As the German *blitzkrieg* on London progressed, Murrow was willing to put himself in more danger to cover what was happening to the city. CBS in New York encouraged Murrow to broadcast from the safety of the underground bunker at BBC studios, but he refused, instead choosing to go to the rooftop so he could describe what was happening as he saw it (Rudner, 1981). For weeks he had been working on getting permission from the Ministry of Information to conduct live broadcasts from the rooftops of London during the air raids, but had been denied his request for fear that it might give the enemy vital information (Persico, 1990). Finally the Ministry allowed Murrow to conduct test broadcasts and review them to see if he would give away any information that would let German bombers know they were hitting their targets.

For six nights in a row German planes bombed London, and Murrow described what was happening from the rooftops. He submitted the recordings to the Air Ministry for review, which lost them (Persico, 1990). After submitting another collection of sample recordings he was again denied even though his reports gave away no vital information. Murrow appealed to Winston Churchill himself, who approved the request realizing the importance of Murrow's broadcasts in bringing England's plight into the homes of America (Bernstein & Lubertozzi, 2005).

By September 21, 1940, Murrow was finally ready to go live from the rooftop. As he waited to go on the air, German bombers were pounding the city around him, but by the time his broadcast began they had moved on to other parts of the city (Edwards, 2004). Murrow took the opportunity to fill in the silence with his own descriptions of the situation:

> I'm standing on a rooftop looking out over London. At the moment everything is quiet. For reasons of national security, I'm unable to tell you the exact location from which I'm speaking. Off to my left far away in the distance, I can see just that faint red angry snap of antiaircraft bursts against the steel-blue sky, but the guns are so far away that it's impossible to hear them from this location. (Kendrick, 1969, p. 207)

As searchlights sprang up around him, Murrow prepared for the London defense to start up again.

> I think probably in a minute we shall have the sound of guns in the immediate vicinity. The lights are swinging over in this general direction now. You'll hear two explosions. There they are! That was the explosions overhead, not the guns themselves. I should think in a few minutes there may be a bit of shrapnel around here. Coming in, moving a little closer all the while. (Kendrick, 1969, p. 207)

That early rooftop report provided listeners with vivid details that would become an ongoing characteristic of Murrow's broadcasts. During this time he also adapted his signature opening line "This is London," and millions of Americans were tuning in each night to hear Murrow's descriptions of the German assault on the city. By the end of the year CBS announcer

Robert Trout contended that Murrow’s phrase had become the most famous three words of 1940 (Bernstein & Lubertozzi, 2005). In an interview after the war Murrow implied that those words had even greater meaning because once the blitz began people were wondering if London would survive. Each time he said those words, he was assuring people that London was still there (Godrey, 1993).

Murrow’s wartime broadcasts were significant for several reasons, and each helped to establish him as a broadcasting icon. These included his style of reporting, his willingness to risk himself for the story, and the moral conviction that came through in his World War II reports. These aspects of his radio broadcasts added to his legendary status both during his career and the years that followed.

Murrow’s used a descriptive, eyewitness style of reporting, which he encouraged his team of reporters to follow. He believed radio required a different style of reporting than print, and stressed the need for simplified language that all walks of life could understand (Cloud & Olson, 1996). He also focused on the concrete and specific, which journalist Bill Moyers said helped to transport the listener.

> The world came to me through Ed Murrow's voice, through Ed Murrow's reporting. Language came alive to me because he was so precise. He named things as they were. And it was that language that was so vividly descriptive of what was happening 5000 miles away. (Steinberg, 2005)

Rudner (1981) describes Murrow as a documentarian, who used the details of common life to provide insight into the broader impacts of global affairs. In reporting in this way he helped “convey to his radio audience far removed from the events he observed a sense of what it was like to be caught up in events” (Rudner, p. 98). This attention to the everyday details often led to him focusing his attention on what he called “the common man,” such as a London firefighter, because he was convinced that brought the war closer to Americans (Smith, 1978).

Murrow also set himself apart from other journalists in the way he was willing to put himself at risk to cover the story. Other reporters of the time certainly were placing themselves in danger to cover the war, but with millions of listeners tuning in to hear Murrow’s voice live each night describe the bombs bursting around him, his status as a brave journalist grew. After his first broadcast from the rooftops of London, the New York *PM* newspaper carried the headline “Murrow Ducks Bombs in London” and printed his report (Culbert, 1976). Murrow’s biographers have also contributed in creating this bravado image. Persico (1990) asserts that Murrow “faced danger with stoicism, avoiding shelters, standing on rooftops, sketching word pictures of a man-made hell as it happened” (p. 176). Kendrick (1969) contends that some of his colleagues thought he was reckless and was “exhibiting a death wish,” but Kendrick instead paints a picture of a man devoted to his profession: “His courage came, not from any lack of sensitivity to or awareness of danger, but from the deliberate clinical ignoring of it. As danger increased, he became grimmer of visage and drier in comment” (p. 206). Sperber (1986) details how as the war progressed American journalists coming to London wanted to interview Murrow because “he had become an American hero, as much a part of the story as the blitz itself” (p. 175).

On December 3, 1943, he would display his courage again by reporting from inside a British bomber as it flew over Berlin to hit its targets, even though a typical bombing run was likely to lose five percent of its planes resulting in more than 200 casualties (Persico, 1990). He once again used his descriptive style to convey what he saw to American listeners.

> The small incendiaries were going down like a fistful of white rice thrown on a piece of black velvet. As Jock hauled the Dog up again, I was thrown to the other side of the cockpit, and there below were more incendiaries, flowing white and then turning red. The cookies- the four-thousand-pound high explosives- were bursting below like great sunflowers gone mad. (Bliss, 1967, p. 73)

Murrow would do other reports on similar bombing runs, and by the end of the war flew on 25 combat missions (Edwards, 2004). One of "Murrow's Boy's," Howard K. Smith, expressed his admiration for Murrow: "I often wondered about the tremendous physical courage that caused him to fly more than one bombing raid. If you describe one bombing raid you really have described them all, but he went on doing it" (Steinberg, 2005). Others who knew Murrow would also help to perpetuate the image of the brave combat journalist in describing these bombing missions. William Paley, the head of CBS news operations in New York during the war, wrote in his memoirs that he worried about Murrow's safety, particularly when it came to the reports from the flight missions over Germany: "Ed seemed unable to refrain from putting himself in danger. He did not want to report on danger without having experienced himself" (Paley, 1979, p. 152).

Another aspect of Murrow's wartime radio reports that is noteworthy is that they were a display of his moral conviction. Seib (2006) contends that despite the unstated goal of a journalist to maintain objectivity in reporting, with his radio reports Murrow encouraged Americans to get involved in the fight against Germany. Having lived alongside Londoners since the beginning of the German blitz, Seib argues that Murrow became empathetic to their cause, and within his broadcasts subtly prodded America away from isolationism and towards defending England. This came through in his New Year's Eve broadcast of 1941:

> Most of you are probably preparing to welcome the New Year. May you have a pleasant evening. You will have no dawn raid as we shall probably have if the weather is right. You may walk this night in the light. Your families are not scattered by the winds of war… You have not been promised blood and toil and tears and sweat, and yet it is the opinion of nearly every informed observer here that the decisions you take will overshadow all else during this year that opened an hour ago in London. (Seib, 2006, p. 112)

The decision Murrow refers to in this broadcast was America's debate over whether to enter the war, and while the United States was supplying aid to Britain, many Americans did not feel the need to get more deeply involved in a foreign conflict. They were more concerned about domestic affairs, such as recovering from the Great Depression, and in the fall of 1940 had elected Franklin Roosevelt to a third term partly based on his commitment to keep the U.S. out of Europe's war (Bernstein & Lubertozzi, 2005). Through his broadcasts, Murrow attempted to chip away at this isolationism. Holbrook (1976) asserts that more than any other broadcaster at the time, Murrow's reports clearly depicted what England was going through during the German blitz, and each night he "made clear the urgent need for additional American assistance" (p. 196).

The attack on Pearl Harbor suddenly changed Americans' opinions, but Seib (2006) asserts that Murrow was already preparing Americans for the coming fight:

> …he awakened America and helped steel its resolve. While some believed that appeasement and isolation could buy peace, Murrow never had any doubts about the evil of Adolph Hitler, and in concert with Roosevelt and Churchill he did his best to ensure that wishful thinking would not obscure reality. (p. 172)

Even though it took a Japanese attack to fully convince America to enter the war, Murrow had worked for years to inform U.S. citizens of the oncoming danger. He had long believed America should enter the war (Persico, 1990), and based on his moral convictions that Hitler needed to be stopped, used a microphone as a way to awaken others to the reality that he was witnessing in London firsthand.

The Birth of Television News

Even as radio was growing in popularity before and during World War II, inventors were already developing the technology that would later become the modern television. In 1927 Philo Farnsworth patented his "dissector tube," a device that would facilitate the creation of all-electronic television (Barnouw, 1970). Others were working on their own technologies related to television, and just as had occurred with the development of radio, patent fights ensued. RCA President David Sarnoff, who also operated NBC, had hired Russian inventor Vladimir Zworykin to develop electronic television. RCA contested Farnsworth's patents in court, but lost (Wheen & Fiddick, 1985).

Television made its debut in the U.S. at the New York's World Fair on February 26, 1939, when NBC unveiled the new device. The event included an address by President Franklin Roosevelt and a telecast of an episode of the radio hit *Amos 'n' Andy* with the actors in blackface make-up (Barnouw, 1970). Sarnoff and NBC began offering about ten to fifteen hours of programming a week, but the debut of the new device was premature. The FCC had not yet established the technical standards of the new medium, and in 1940 ordered that NBC return to "experimental" status (Wheen & Fiddick, 1985). In 1941, the FCC authorized the first full operation of television, and set the standard to 525 lines of resolution and 30 frames per second following the recommendations of the National Television Standards Committee. With a standard format in place, CBS and the newly created DuMont network were also able to move from experimental status and began regular commercial broadcasts in July of 1941 (Hilliard & Keith, 1992). Few people were watching, however, with the price of a television averaging several hundred dollars for a 5 or 8 inch picture screen (Sterling & Kittross, 2002).

Just as television began, it was suddenly put on hold. World War II broke out and much of the technology and manpower that was being used to bring television to the masses now had to be diverted towards the war effort. The FCC dropped its commercial status for television from 15 hours of broadcasting to four, and only six stations in the country continued regular program service during the war (Sterling & Kittross, 2002). Television had to wait until the war was over.

Once the war ended in 1945, stations were eager to go on the air. By allocating channels too quickly, however, the FCC caused more technical problems. They granted the same channel allocation to stations that were too close together and the signals were drowning each other out. The situation became so bad that the FCC issued a television "freeze" from 1948-52, keeping the number of stations at 108 (Sterling & Kittross, 2002). The expansion of television had been hindered once again.

Meanwhile television was trying to take advantage of the post-war interest in news. CBS began the first regularly scheduled newscast in 1948 with *CBS-TV News with Douglas Edwards.* NBC followed in 1949 with *NBC Newsreel* with John Cameron Swayze. Later, ABC and the DuMont network started their own newscasts (Lichty & Topping, 1976). Many of these early offerings of television news styled themselves after the newsreels of the day, since much of their film was supplied by the newsreel divisions of the wire services. Broadcast news historian Ed Bliss, Jr., described how the reliance on newsreels influenced the news: "The result was a preponderance of fashion shows, ship arrivals, and fires. These stories gave camera crews time to set up their cumbersome gear. Live reports were rare" (Bliss, 1991, p. 226). The films supplied by the wire services therefore dictated what became newsworthy on television. Murrow would later help to change that tradition and use the pulse of the nation to decide what was newsworthy.

***See It Now* and Murrow vs. McCarthy**

Edward R. Murrow was able to make the transition from radio to television with the documentary news program *See It Now.* The most remembered of all his *See It Now* broadcasts took place on March 9, 1954, titled *Report on Senator McCarthy,* in which he took a stance against McCarthy's Red Scare tactics. Edgerton (1992) contends that this episode in his career has added to Murrow's status a broadcasting legend, conveying the message "the broadcaster as a public servant risks all and wins" (p. 85). The story has become so elevated in the annals of broadcast journalism, Hollywood turned it into a feature film in 2005 with the Warner Brother's release *Good Night and Good Luck*, with the title inspired by Murrow's famous closing lines to his *See It Now* broadcasts. Stout (2010) argues that the film's narrow focus on Murrow's confrontation with McCarthy has contributed to the current generation having a "skewed collective memory of Murrow" and added to his iconic status (p. 15). This recent attention to Murrow's stance against McCarthyism has therefore become salient in people's minds when they think of Murrow, making it a significant incident in his career.

See It Now did not confront controversial issues such as McCarthyism when it first hit the airwaves in November 18, 1951, partly because Murrow was still trying to understand the capabilities of the new medium of television. The *See It Now* documentary series was his first full transition from radio to television. It was meant to be a television version of a weekly radio newsmagazine called *Hear It Now*, a program he made with Fred Friendly, who had collaborated with him on series of successful photograph recordings compiling the voices of the biggest newsmakers of the time (Edwards, 2004).

With radio personalities and technicians making the leap to television, the early broadcasts were experimental. Murrow himself admitted at the start of the premiere episode that "this is an old team trying to learn a new trade" (Kendrick, p. 337). Murrow seemed fascinated with the technology at his disposal, treating viewers to skylines from both New York and San Francisco. It was the first time images from both coasts were shown simultaneously on television (Persico, 1990). The rest of the first program was fast-paced, with both filmed and live segments. The show included a report from Paris, London, and Washington, and closed with a segment showing a day in the life of combat soldiers in Korea (Sperber, 1986).

Americans knew Murrow well before the *See It Now* broadcasts, but the program helped to elevate his standing as a journalist even further. He had made occasional appearances on television before, but with his new weekly documentary millions of American were seeing the man behind the famous voice for the first time and now had the chance to see him every week (Sperber, 1986). A review of the program in *Variety* magazine during the early days of the program proclaimed that Murrow "brings to the TV cameras a sureness, naturalness, and deep understanding of what he's talking about" (Kendrick, 1969, p. 337).

Rosteck (1994) asserts that even the opening the *See It Now* broadcasts helped to reaffirm Murrow's status as an iconic journalist. In a textual analysis of the opening sequence from the 1953-54 season, Rosteck (1994) contends that the images of Murrow seated inside the control room in front of a group of television monitors invites an image to the viewer that "whatever we will learn from the world will come over the images that glow before him" (p. 50) and that he has "special and privileged knowledge" (p. 51). In the opening sequence the announcer says

Murrow's name four times, including the descriptors "distinguished reporter and news analyst" (Rosteck, p. 50). The images and narrated text combine to create what Rosteck (1994) argues is an image of Murrow as "the gatekeeper and our access to the world outside of the control room" who has the power to frame and contextualize the stories that he will present (p. 51).

Even though it was an experiment in early television, Murrow and Friendly set high standards for *See It Now*. It was the first program to shoot its own film for its own use rather than rely on stock footage from newsreels and only about five percent of the film that was shot was actually used (Kendrick, 1969). The result was a program that provided viewers with excellent visuals, but that devotion to high production standards came at a price. Each episode of *See It Now* cost $100,000 to produce, which was nearly twice what its sponsor, the Aluminum Company of American (Alcoa), paid each week to support the program. CBS made up the difference and that became a frustration to the network accountants despite the program's critical acclaim (Kendrick, 1969).

During the first couple of years of *See It Now*, the program typically featured stories on several different subjects and rarely touched on controversial topics. Baughman (1981) asserts that the program often had "the trappings of a civics class" with segments on topics such as the workings of Congress or the Declaration of Independence (p. 108). The early seasons did have a few noteworthy telecasts, including an entire program devoted to what life was like for U.S. soldiers fighting in Korea during Christmas of 1952.

Before the *See It Now* crew traveled to Korea that winter, Murrow's told his staff that the goal for the program was to "try to portray the face of war and the faces of the men now fighting it" (Persico, 1990, p. 321). Like he had done himself during World War II by bringing the plight of Londoners back to America, Murrow wanted to do the same for troops in Korea. He told his reporting crew he "wanted to narrow the distance between the doughfoot out there and the people at home" (Persico, 1990, p. 321). The *Christmas in Korea* broadcast would be *See It Now's* most ambitious project to date, with a full hour devoted to the program rather than its typical 30 minutes, and brought viewers television's first ever combat report (Kendrick, 1969).

The *Christmas in Korea* program aired on December 28, 1952, just days after the film had been shot on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day. It showed television viewers aspects of the conflict that were not typically covered by news reports. John Crosby from *The New York Herald Tribune* wrote that instead of the expected footage of bombs dropping on the Korean landscape, the broadcast instead "focused on the soldiers… catching them as they ate and slept and gambled and groaned and joked, catching the tedium of warfare" (Persico, 1990, p. 322). Even the opening shot of the program was an indication that the broadcast would focus more on the everyday concerns and frustrations of the soldiers, showing a marine unsuccessfully trying to dig a foxhole in the frozen Korean ground (Roberts & Birnbaum, 2005).

The Korea broadcast brought more critical acclaim to *See It Now* and Murrow himself. Variety's headline on the program read, "Murrow's Korea: The New Journalism," (Kendrick, p. 352) implying that just as he had done with his World War II radio broadcasts, Murrow was once again breaking new ground with the medium of television. Such broadcasts also helped to establish *See It Now* as the preeminent news program at CBS. It had a much larger staff and budget than its nightly 15-minute newscast *Doug Edwards and the News* (Matusow, 1983).

In 1953, *See It Now* went through some dramatic changes. It had been airing at 3:30 p.m. on Sunday afternoons, known by those in the industry as the "intellectual ghetto" because it typically attracted a small number of viewers (Persico, 1990). CBS switched it to 10:30 p.m. on Tuesday nights in order to fill a previously unoccupied timeslot, but it meant that viewers had the chance to see the program in primetime. Murrow and Friendly also changed the show's format, and sometimes featured a single subject during the broadcast rather than three or four (Merron, 1988).

Out of all the topics *See It Now* covered during its seven year run on CBS, the most memorable and critically acclaimed broadcasts were those that addressed the tactics Sen. Joseph McCarthy was using to uncover Communism in America. Murrow's criticisms came relatively late, after several other journalists had taken a stance against McCarthy. Elmer Davis and Eric Sevaried had already been denouncing McCarthy in their radio broadcast commentaries (Gates, 1978), but Murrow's condemnation is the one that many people associate with McCarthy's downfall (O'Connor, 1986).

The years leading up to Murrow's McCarthy broadcast were a period of fear and suspicion for American citizens. As the decade of the 1950s began, Communism was a growing threat in the minds of both government leaders and the public. After World War II, the Soviet Union had consolidated its grip on the nations of Eastern Europe and also successfully detonated an atomic bomb, meaning that America was not the only nuclear power (Rosteck, 1994). In addition, by early 1950 mainland China had fallen to the Communist forces of Mao Tse-Tung and American supported Nationalist Chinese troops were forced to retreat to the island of Taiwan. A few months later, the U.S. committed its forces to support the United Nations effort to halt the spread of Communism in Korea (Rosteck, 1994). After just a few years following the end of World War II, America was at war again, this time against Communist invaders in a foreign land.

The concern over the spread of Communism abroad was also reflected in the worries many Americans had about it spreading at home. People began to wonder if Communists were trying to do the same thing here and somehow subvert democracy in the United States. In October of 1949 leaders of the American Communist Party were tried and convicted of teaching others to overthrow the American government through violence, and a year later Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were sentenced to death for wartime espionage (Rosteck, 1994). These high profile cases led to an effort to uncover other potential threats to the American way of life.

The result was the creation of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which began questioning the loyalty of people involved in government, education, and entertainment (Paley, 1979). In addition, an anti-Communist newsletter called *Counterattack* published *Red Channels: The Report of Communist Influence in Radio and Television*, and included in it a list of 151 people who supposedly had Communist affiliations (Rosteck, 1994). Such publications ushered in the period of blacklisting, where individuals who were suspected of having ties to Communism were suddenly shunned by those in their professions. Others were asked to take a "loyalty oath" to prove their allegiance to a democratic government and refute any un-American ideas (Paley, 1979).

During this period, Sen. Joseph McCarthy from Wisconsin had arisen to become the voice of the anti-Communist movement in America. His ascension began after he unexpectedly announced in February of 1950 that he had a list of 205 Communists who were working in the State Department (Rosteck, 1994). Over the next four years McCarthy set out to prove these accusations and many others, becoming the central figure in the hunt for Communist infiltrators. As the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations, McCarthy had become known for his interrogations of people he suspected of Communism. Baughman (1981) describes McCarthy as having "conveyed contempt for civil liberties, to say nothing of good manners," (p.

108) which was displayed in the way he badgered those who appeared before his committee and accused them of Communist ties despite having little or no evidence.

Rosteck (1994) asserts that McCarthy had a shrewd understanding of the media, often demanding stations give him air time under the “equal time provision” to respond to any criticism of his tactics. These mandates made some broadcasters nervous about criticizing McCarthy too harshly for fear that in a rebuttal he might brand them as anti-American. Even though he failed to produce proof of his claims, McCarthy’s unsubstantiated allegations received a lot of attention. At the height of his power, the press covered the senator and his efforts to uncover Communists on a daily basis, and in 1954 it was not unusual for a paper to carry fifteen to twenty stories a day where McCarthy was the central newsmaker (Bayley, 1981).

While the March 9, 1954, *See It Now* broadcast is the most remembered of Murrow’s stance against McCarthy, he had briefly addressed the senator’s tactics as early as a month into the start of *See It Now*. The television viewing audience was still rather small in 1951, however, and the report garnered little response (Sperber, 1986). A second segment in March of 1952 featured Murrow interviewing McCarthy live for three minutes, but the senator used the time to dodge the questions and attack his opponents (Rosteck, 1994). A third and more direct swipe at Senator McCarthy aired in March of 1953 when *See It Now* broadcast footage of McCarthy questioning Reed Harris, the director of the Voice of America, about radical opinions he had published in 1932 but had since disavowed (Sperber, 1986). Footage of the committee proceedings showing the senator’s interrogative, accusatory tactics would later air as part of the famous *Report on Senator McCarthy* broadcast the following year.

The mood that McCarthy helped to foster often led to individuals being found guilty in the public eye despite there being no actual proof to their ties to Communism. Such was the case with 26-year-old Milo Radulovich, who had served eight years as a lieutenant in the Air Force Reserves, but was to be severed from the military because of “close associations” with suspected Communists (Edwards, 2004). These associations he was being penalized for were his father and sister. His father was accused of being a Communist sympathizer because he had once read a foreign newspaper now labeled as “subversive.” Any other supposed evidence was remained sealed in an envelope kept in the hands of the Air Force, unavailable to him or his family (Persico 1990). Radulovich was asked to renounce his family members to remain in the reserves, which he refused (Sperber, 1986).

Murrow had read about Radulovich’s situation and decided this was the case study to use to illustrate the negative impacts of McCarthyism and the fear it generated (Friendly, 1967). Unlike the other segments concerning McCarthyism, however, *The Case of Milo Radulovich* would clearly go beyond taking an objective look at a subject and instead constitute a definite stance on an issue. Taking sides on a controversial issue is something Murrow himself said he would not do, and even had a no-editorializing policy written into his contract as a pledge that he would not give his opinions on the air (Paley, 1979). At its outset, *See It Now* was meant to let viewers “see” an issue without bias and let them make a judgment for themselves, but the nature of the Radulovich program meant Murrow and Friendly would be supporting a certain point-of-view and asking viewers to do the same (Friendly, 1967).

On October 20, 1953, Murrow devoted the entire *See It Now* broadcast to Radulovich. Camera crews went to the Lieutenant’s hometown of Dexter, Michigan, and interviewed his family and neighbors to help illustrate the absurdity of the military’s decision (Paley, 1979). Radulovich himself spoke on camera asking, “If I am being judged by my relatives, are my children going to be asked to denounce me?” (Edwards, 2004, p. 111). At the end of the program

Murrow made it clear he believed Radulovich was treated unfairly: “We believe that the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, even though that iniquity be proved, and in this case it was not” (Persico, 1990, p. 372). The broadcast drew a positive response from both the public and the press, with Jack Gould of the *New York Times* calling it “the first time that a major network… consented to a program taking a vigorous editorial stand in a matter of national importance and controversy” (Friendly, 1967, p. 16).

Five weeks later, the secretary of the Air Force appeared on *See It Now* and announced that Radulovich would be allowed to remain in the reserves (Paley, 1979). *The Case of Milo Radulovich* broadcast had demonstrated the growing influence of *See It Now* in the public eye and was a precursor of what was to come months later in a more direct attack against McCarthy and his tactics. For more than a year Murrow’s friends and colleagues had been urging him to use the power he wielded with both his reputation and the medium of television to go after McCarthy. Murrow decided to wait, instead gathering up enough footage of the senator in public appearances and committee hearings so that the clips would let McCarthy expose himself (Gates, 1978).

Taking a stand against the popular senator from Wisconsin had its risks. Martin Agronsky, a radio reporter who had a daily 15-minute news program in 1953, had monitored McCarthy’s activities and criticized them in his commentaries. As a result he lost more than half his sponsors, and the ABC radio network and its affiliates lost money on his broadcasts (Bayley, 1981). Instead of just condemning the senator’s tactics, Murrow would allow the viewers to see them for themselves.

On March 9, 1954, *See It Now* began with Murrow explaining to the viewers what was to come.

> Good evening. Tonight *See It Now* devotes its entire half-hour to a report on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, told mainly in his own words and pictures. Because a report on Senator McCarthy is by definition controversial we want to say exactly what we mean to say and I request your permission to read from script whatever remarks Murrow and Friendly may make. (Sperber, 1986, p. 436)

Murrow followed by offering the senator time to reply on a future broadcast, an idea inspired by Paley, who knew that McCarthy would demand the time anyway (Paley, 1979). The program showed footage of McCarthy contradicting himself, making misstatements, and displaying his willingness to trample on civil liberties to root out Communists. It aired clips of him making unproven claims in speeches and replayed segments of him grilling Reed Harris, the director of the Voice of America, about his views written decades before. The Harris segment illustrated the indifference McCarthy often showed to those who were trying to defend themselves, as he appeared distracted and obviously was not listening to Harris's testimony (Kendrick, 1969). In between, Murrow offered his thoughts on McCarthy's methods.

> On one thing the senator has been consistent, often operating as a one-man committee, he has traveled far, interviewed many, terrorized some, accused civilian and military leaders of the past administration of a great conspiracy to turn over the country to Communism... (Birnbaum, 2005).

Fred Friendly, the co-producer of *See It Now*, described the strategy he and Murrow used in the *Report on Senator McCarthy* broadcast:

> The viewer was seeing a series of typical attacks by the senator, which they had seen many times before, but for the first time on television there was a direct refutation-

> Murrow's correction of McCarthy's 'facts.' Each time the senator was his own worst witness; each time the facts countered his distortions. (Friendly, 1967, p. 40)

After showing a variety of McCarthy clips and pointing out the many errors in the senator's statements, Murrow closed the broadcast with his concluding thoughts, which clarified to all where he stood on the issue.

> This is no time for those who oppose Senator McCarthy's methods to keep silent, or for those who approve. We can deny our heritage and our history but we cannot escape responsibility for the result… The actions of the junior senator from Wisconsin have caused alarm and dismay amongst our allies abroad and given considerable comfort to our enemies. And whose fault is that? Not really his. He didn't create this situation of fear. He merely exploited it; and rather successfully. Cassius was right. "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves." Good night and good luck. (Sperber, 1986, p. 438, 439)

The broadcast brought an immediate response. The CBS switchboard was flooded with calls from viewers. It became the largest-ever spontaneous response to any program CBS had aired up until that time with 12,348 comments, and by a 15-to-1 ratio they were in favor of Murrow (Kendrick, 1969). The switchboard at CBS in New York was still flooded with calls nineteen hours after the *See It Now* broadcast had ended (Sperber, 1986). Between the letters, telegrams and phone calls, more than 75,000 people responded to the *Report on Senator McCarthy* broadcast, and most were in favor of Murrow (Persico, 1990).

Much of the press response was also positive, particularly from more liberal-leaning television critics. Jack Gould from the *New York Times* wrote that the broadcast was "crusading journalism of high responsibility and genuine courage" (Merron, 1988, p. 9). John Crosby of the

New York Herald Tribune wrote that Murrow "put his finger squarely on the root of the true evil of McCarthyism" (Sperber, 1986, p. 440). Other media critics, however, questioned whether Murrow had misused the medium of television, providing an opinion piece rather than a factual report (Kendrick, 1969). Still others chided him for waiting so long to take a stand. Dorothy Schiff of the *New York Post*, who had been vocally critical of McCarthy for some time, used Murrow's final statement against him: "This is no time for men who oppose Senator McCarthy's methods to keep silent, said Ed as he leaped gracefully aboard the crowded bandwagon" (Sperber, 1986, p. 441).

The *See It Now* broadcast and the public reaction that followed could not be ignored by McCarthy. He accepted Murrow's offer of a rebuttal, but told reporters he was too busy to prepare a reply. Instead he wanted William F. Buckley, Jr., the co-author of *McCarthy and His Enemies*, a book that supported the senator's tactics, to fill in for him (Friendly, 1967). Murrow refused, saying that the invitation was "not subject to transfer" (Sperber, 1986, p. 447). The senator agreed to appear on the April 6th broadcast of *See It Now*.

McCarthy's reply was unpolished and unfocused. While it did mention Murrow and the *See It Now* broadcast, much of it became a history lesson on the spread of Communism throughout the world (Merron, 1988). When the senator did talk about Murrow, it was to offer personal attacks rather than to counter any of the factual information offered in the *Report on Senator McCarthy.* He referred to Murrow as "the leader and the cleverest of the jackal pack which is always found at the throat of anyone who dares to expose individual Communists and traitors" (Friendly, 1967, p. 55). He made the wild accusation that Murrow "as far back as twenty years ago, was engaged in propaganda for Communist causes" (Persico, 1990, p. 389). McCarthy's accusations of Murrow's Communist ties were based on two instances in Murrow's early life. The first was when he worked in the lumber camps as a youth and was allegedly involved with the Industrial Workers of America. The second was when he held the position of the acting director of the Institute of International Education, a group that once sponsored a learning trip to Moscow (Kendrick, 1969). When the broadcast was over, McCarthy had not refuted any of the points of the *See It Now* broadcast, but instead had thrown out more unsubstantiated allegations and reaffirmed his own commitment to stand against Communism.

Murrow had been able to acquire a copy of McCarthy's rebuttal beforehand, and immediately after the broadcast held a press conference to refute all of the senator's accusations that connected him to Communism (Sperber, 1986). Murrow also denied ever being a member of the Industrial Workers of America, and only admitted to knowing some of them in the logging camps (Persico, 1990). He also explained how the exchange program had taken place before the Communist revolution and was effectively cancelled by the Russians themselves, calling the Institute of International Education "the center of international propaganda for American reaction" (Kendrick, 1969, p. 66). The Soviets obviously did not see the same connection to Communism that McCarthy did. Murrow's statement to reporters was based on fact and went through each point made by the senator, unlike McCarthy's rebuttal of Murrow's broadcast. As part of his prepared statement he pointed towards the historical evaluation of his confrontation with McCarthy:

> When the record is finally written, as it will be one day, it will answer the question, 'Who has helped the Communist cause and who has served his country better, Senator McCarthy or I?' I would like to be remembered by the answer to that question. (Friendly, 1967, p. 58)

On April 22, 1954, a Senate subcommittee began hearings looking into the dispute between McCarthy and the Army, which stemmed from accusations that McCarthy used his influence to help give preferential treatment to a former aide who later enlisted (Persico, 1990). The hearings were broadcast on both ABC and the DuMont network for nearly two months and allowed viewers to watch McCarthy's tactics for hours on end (Friendly, 1967). One of the hearing's most notable moments came after McCarthy went after a young lawyer who had nothing to do with the issue. Joseph Welch of the same law firm snapped back at McCarthy, "Have you no shame?... Until this moment, Senator, I think I never gauged your cruelty or your recklessness" (Edwards, 2004, p. 118). Viewers were able to see a very different McCarthy than the bold senator who had made shocking accusations concerning Communist infiltrators. In December of 1954, the Senate voted to censure McCarthy for conduct "contemptuous, denunciatory, unworthy, inexcusable and reprehensible" (Sperber, 1986, p. 471). McCarthy's unbridled power in the Senate and throughout the government had come to an end.

To what degree the *See It Now* broadcasts contributed to the downfall of Senator McCarthy is difficult to measure. A survey of studies by Baughman (1981) related to McCarthy's decline in power and influence found that only one mentions *See It Now* and "none ties the program to the Senator's subsequent fall from grace" (p. 108). Regardless, Rosteck (1994) asserts that Murrow's broadcasts worked at "shifting the topic of debate about McCarthyism from the question of ends to the question of means" and that "public opinion seemed to quicken against the tactics of McCarthyism" (p. 181). Other voices were certainly crying out against McCarthy, but with his status and the medium of television at his disposal, Murrow was able to let viewers see for themselves the senator's tactics on display. This exposure coincided with the growing disillusionment with the senator and for many people perhaps validated what they were already thinking.

The creation of *See It Now* and the McCarthy broadcasts add to the significance of Murrow as an iconic broadcasting figure and contributed to his legendary status. For many, Murrow's work with *See It Now* helped to reveal the power of television as a medium for news, reaffirmed Murrow as the brave journalist they knew from World War II, and bolstered his reputation as a news reporter who was willing to stand up his for convictions. The radio news legend had fully established himself on the television airwaves.

As he had done previously with radio, for many Murrow's work with *See It Now* helped to show the potential of television as a credible news source. After the McCarthy episode, the editor of *Broadcasting* magazine asserted that "they'll have to rewrite the definition of journalism now. No greater feat of journalistic enterprise has occurred in modern times…" (Friendly, 1967, p. 52). Baughman (1981) contends that the *Report on Senator McCarthy* "boosted the standing of the both *See In Now* and the infant that was television news. Nothing Murrow had done since London burned so impressed his colleagues and critics" (p. 109). There was skepticism about how effective television would be at covering the affairs of the day, even initially from Murrow himself (Persico, 1990), but the response to his *See It Now* McCarthy broadcasts confirmed both in his mind and others that television could become a valuable tool for decimating news.

Murrow's work with *See It Now* also reestablished him as a reporter who was willing to put himself at risk. Unlike his work on the rooftops of London, where foreign enemies were the danger, his *See It Now* broadcasts generated threats from other Americans who supported McCarthy. Despite the favorable response to the program, Murrow also received plenty of hate mail because he spoke against the senator. It got to the point where he told his wife Janet that their son Casey was to never be left alone. CBS also offered protection for the family, but Murrow declined (Sperber, 1986). Murrow biographer Joseph Persico contributes to Murrow's image of the brave reporter by crediting him with having the nerve to risk his own journalist credibility and that of the new medium he was trying to establish: "Murrow's contribution to the defeat of the demagogue was that he had had the courage to use television against McCarthy. He had taken a young medium, skittish over controversy, and plunged it into the hottest controversy of that era" (Persico, 1990, p. 393).

The McCarthy controversy also shows Murrow as a reporter of conviction. Leslie (1988) sees his actions connected to his belief that television could, and should, be used as a tool for advancing truth. Leslie contends that Murrow "realized the power television had and he reasoned that he had every right, actually a responsibility, to use it toward positive ends" (Leslie, 1988, p. 15). His decision to take on McCarthy, therefore, became a demonstration of several of his convictions: that the senator's tactics were immoral, that a powerful format like *See It Now* had an obligation to show that to America, and that viewers would make the right decision once they saw the truth for themselves.

The "Lower Murrow" and *Person to Person*

While historians and broadcasters tend to remember Murrow based on his high-profile journalistic accomplishments, he had another side that is often downplayed. Biographer Joseph Persico (1990) describes this chapter in the broadcaster's career as "Another Murrow" (p. 343). Gates (1978) goes as far as to refer to this aspect of Murrow's broadcasting legacy as the "Lower Murrow" (p. 14). Each title is indicative of the stark contrast between the lofty journalistic standards he established with his radio broadcasts and his McCarthy telecasts, and the lowbrow nature of what would become the *Person to Person* program.

Person to Person began with an idea from Johnny Aaron and Jesse Zousmer who had worked with Murrow on his radio programs for six years (Kendrick, 1969). After two successful segments on *See It Now* where Murrow conducted remote interviews with newsmakers, the two developed the concept of making it a weekly program. The idea was for Murrow to "visit" the homes of celebrities and other prominent people in their homes through the use of television. Murrow would remain in the New York studio, but the celebrities would be in their own homes. Murrow would interact with them through a "picture window," which created the illusion that he was peering into the celebrity's home, even though it was all done electronically (Merron, 1988).

Aaron and Zousmer approached Fred Friendly first since he had helped establish Murrow's career in television. Friendly dismissed their proposal, believing that it was beneath Murrow "to satisfy the voyeurism of the masses" (Persico, 1991, p. 343). The two then took the idea directly to Murrow himself, who, despite the objections of Friendly, accepted their offer to host the program. *Person to Person* debuted on October 2, 1953, nearly two years after Murrow's first leap into television with *See It Now*.

The program was a hit among viewers who loved getting a sneak peek into the homes of celebrities such as actress Mary Martin, baseball player Roy Campanella, and comedian Sid Ceasar (Edwards, 2004). *Person to Person* also attracted much larger audiences than *See It Now*. One week in 1956, the Nielsen ratings of *See It Now* sat at 11.3, while *Person to Person* came in at 23.4 (Persico, 1991). Audiences were clearly drawn to the lighter side of Murrow.

While *Person to Person* was a favorite among the television audience, many media critics, who saw it as a frivolous show unworthy of Murrow, panned the program. Gilbert Seldes, a long-time friend and admirer of Murrow and a television critic for the *Saturday Review,* stated his opinion of *Person to Person* in a 1953 column. Seldes praised Murrow for the *See It Now* Milo Radulovich broadcast, but then followed with words of disappointment:

> This makes it all the harder to understand how Mr. Murrow and his skillful co-workers should have gone so thoroughly wrong in his new program "Person to Person"… Mr. Murrow is too good to evade the obligations of his own instruments; he is too good to use them for purposes that go against their nature (Seldes, 1953, p. 38).

Time magazine also weighed in, calling it "substandard Murrow" with an "aimlessness and a degree of silliness" (Persico, 1991, p. 346).

The nature of many of the interviews likely contributed to the feeling among some that Murrow was debasing himself for the sake of his new program. When newsmakers did make an appearance on *Person to Person*, Murrow would ask some questions of substance, but the nature of show demanded that he focus on the frivolous, such as when the newly elected senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, made an appearance on the program on Oct. 30, 1953. An answer about the economy quickly turned into something else:

> Kennedy: If we start to slip in a recession we will have to reduce taxes and reduce government spending, but savings are at an all-time high now. In fact I think we are infinitely better off than in 1920.
>
> Murrow: I understand you had a lot of tea parties during your campaign. Are you still able to drink tea?
>
> Kennedy: Yes, I drank it then and I think I learned to like it. (Merron, 1988, p. 15)

The interview also included a question about whether the senator had opened all the gifts from his wedding yet and featured a tour of the couple's apartment.

The interviews on *Person to Person* were even lighter in nature when actors or actresses were one of the featured guests. Zsa Zsa Gabor opened up her refrigerator and revealed her love for Hungarian salami (Kendrick, 1969), Lauren Becall talked about the bracelet Humphrey Bogart had given her as a gift (Steinberg, 2005) and Marilyn Monroe opened up her closet so viewers could peek at what was inside (Sperber, 1986). Celebrities became attracted to the program, not only because the prestigious Edward R. Murrow was the host, but it also provided them with a venue to plug their latest film or other projects (Merron, 1988).

Murrow displayed various attitudes towards his involvement with *Person to Person.* On more than one occasion, he seemed to suggest that being the host allowed him to pursue the program he was truly proud of, *See It Now*. When asked by fellow journalist Dan Schorr why he did the show, Murrow replied: "I do *Person to Person* because that way I buy the right to do what I do on *See It Now*" (Persico, 1990, p. 352). On another occasion a friend asserted that he enjoyed "hamming it up on *Person to Person*" and Murrow angrily replied, "Do you know what I can get away with because *Person to Person* is a big hit?" (Sperber, 1986, pp. 425, 426). Murrow was also optimistic that hosting *Person to Person* might draw the television audience to *See It Now* (Edwards, 2004). Other times, he expressed disgust for being a part of it, but realized its value. In a fit of temper he once said "I hate that goddam show, it's so damn demeaning," but a moment later added, "But it really makes a lot of money" (Gates, 1978, p. 31). That money included a hefty salary for Murrow himself, who received upwards of $100,000 a year as the star of the program (Sperber, 1986).

Despite his supposed disdain for *Person to Person*, Murrow would often defend it in the face of criticism. He also displayed his passion for the program when CBS's election coverage in 1954 borrowed the "picture window" technique devised by *Person to Person*. In a memo to Sig

Mickelson, who was the director of CBS television news at the time, he chastised the news department for a “complete disregard of our desire to protect what we consider an essential element of the *Person to Person* show” (Merron, 1988, p. 12).

Person to Person helped to propel Murrow into a celebrity, but not the one he had hoped when he first decided to make the transition to television. While his desire was to be known for his work with *See It Now*, his popularity with *Person to Person* seemed to get in the way. CBS journalist Edward Bliss, Jr., described an instance that reflected Murrow’s growing television notoriety:

> I remember vividly one afternoon; it was about five o'clock. We came in waiting at national airport to get a cab and this man came up to Ed and he said 'I admire your program so much, I never miss your program,' and Murrow's face just brightened in a wonderful way. It was like a morning sunrise. And then man said ‘Oh, my wife and I would never miss *Person to Person*.’ And it was just as though a shade had been pulled down over his face. It just went dark. (Steinberg, 2005)

Murrow’s name also came to take on new meaning because of his work with *Person to Person*. As the show became popular, the phrase “to Murrow” came to mean to engage in social chitchat (Kendrick, 1969). The program that Murrow had hoped would give him leverage for his lofty journalistic pursuits was also creating the persona of a lightweight host who asks frivolous questions to celebrities.

Merron (1988) contends that *Person to Person* is as a big of part of Murrow’s television legacy as *See It Now*, even though many would rather see it expunged from his journalistic career. He argues that “the personality parade began with *Person to Person*” even though “nobody would like to admit it” (Merron, 1988, p. 29). Barbra Walters, whose later career was known for interviews with celebrities, seems to confirm Murrow as helping to create this televised fascination with the famous.

> Remember when Ed Murrow took a camera into somebody's house or apartment? That was as fascinating as the person he was interviewing… When Ed Murrow did *Person to Person* and took us inside those homes and treated the young politician like a John Kennedy the same way that he treated Sophie Tucker for example, and made us see that they were people, that was innovative. That was something we didn't have. (Steinberg, 2005)

Merron (1988) describes Murrow's involvement with *Person to Person* as a compromise of his journalistic standards and believes that over the years many who look back on his career, whether it be journalists or media historians, are blinded by the legend of Murrow. He contends that Murrow, who criticized the corporate structure and the ratings-oriented nature of television, was a part of the system he derided. *Person to Person* is an indication that Murrow not only played the ratings game, but was a willing participant.

Murrow's Fall at CBS

By the late 1950s the television industry experienced tremendous expansion and growth. The emergence of ABC, the third television network, meant that the other two, CBS and NBC, had to compete harder for advertising dollars. This led to an even greater emphasis on providing programming that would attract an audience at the expense of more educational and news-centered offerings (Kendrick, 1969). This also meant that programs like *See It Now*, which had enjoyed nearly unlimited financial resources from CBS despite low ratings, were now under greater scrutiny.

During this period broadcasting was also about to face one of its greatest scandals--allegations that some of the popular television quiz shows were rigged. CBS's *Dotto* and *The $64,000 Question*, along with NBC's *Twenty-One*, all faced accusations that players were given the answers in advance so that they could win more easily (Kendrick, 1969). The idea was that since the audience enjoyed watching a winner, it was to the benefit of the networks and their sponsors to guarantee a reigning champion whom viewers could cheer on night after night. The results of these investigations would not be revealed until October of 1958, and until then the networks were still eager to add more quiz shows to their lineups to satisfy viewer demand.

As quiz shows flourished, the networks began devoting less airtime to news and information programming. One of the causalities was Murrow's *See It Now*. In June of 1955 *The $64,000 Question* first aired just before *See It Now* and quickly emerged as a ratings success (Persico, 1990). The audience for this new game show was very different than the one that enjoyed *See It Now*, and few of them kept their televisions tuned to CBS to watch Murrow's program (Kendrick, 1969). The success of *The $64,000 Question* also greatly increased the value of *See It Now's* time slot. Alcoa was paying $50,000 to sponsor *See It Now* while Revlon was paying $80,000 for *The $64,000 Question*, and that amount increased as the show became more successful (Friendly, 1967). CBS realized that the audience's appetite for quiz shows and similar entertainment was too great to warrant giving up valuable primetime space for low-rated public affairs programming. Paley, who was now the Chair of the CBS board, announced to Murrow and Friendly that *See It Now* would change and become a full hour, but would only air eight to ten times a year at different times on the schedule (Persico, 1990). With the demotion from a weekly program to an occasional special, *See It Now* soon earned the unofficial title "See It Now and Then" (Grossman, 2002).

Another contributing factor was the controversy generated by the topics Murrow and Friendly chose to address with *See It Now*. The critical response to the McCarthy broadcasts encouraged the pair to take on other controversial subjects, including the desegregation of public schools, South African apartheid, and the growing link between cigarettes and lung disease (Friendly, 1967). But both the network and sponsors grew tired of the ramifications of confronting such issues. After a report on a land scandal in Texas that reached up to the highest levels of the state government, Alcoa announced that they were dropping the program in favor of a dramatic anthology series. At that same time, Alcoa was expanding operations in Texas, and needed the support of state officials who complained the report was giving the state a bad image (Persico, 1990).

See It Now was able to secure a new sponsor for its new hourly format in the 1955-56 season, General Motors. The automobile company had agreed to sponsor six to eight of the *See It Now* broadcasts, but Murrow and Friendly again ran into trouble with the controversial nature of their topics. The first episode of the season called *The Vice Presidency— The Great American Lottery* would focus on the arbitrary nature in which presidential candidates select those who might replace them (Sperber, 1986). In the meantime President Eisenhower suffered a heart attack, and with the vice presidency suddenly a hot topic, General Motors decided the subject of the program was an attack on Vice-president Richard Nixon's fitness for the presidency (Persico, 1990). Without warning General Motors pulled its sponsorship for the entire season. CBS did not contest the breach of contract, and *See It Now* was once again without a sponsor just four weeks before the first show was to air (Sperber, 1986). CBS had to hold a "fire sale" for the broadcast, which meant selling ads at a reduced cost to anyone who would buy them (Friendly, 1967). Murrow saw CBS's unwillingness to fight General Motors over the contract as a sign that *See It*

Now was becoming less of a point of pride for the network and more of a burden (Kendrick, 1969).

The next season *See It Now* was given nine hour-long broadcasts, but was taken off of prime time and placed on Sunday afternoons, a timeslot referred to as the “cultural ghetto” (Kendrick, 1969, p. 398). CBS continued to insist that it was having trouble finding sponsors for the program, even when it dealt with non-controversial topics. When sales representatives reported that they could not even find a sponsor for a profile on entertainer Danny Kaye, Friendly made a call to Pan Am Airlines and got them to sponsor the rest of the season (Persico, 1990). For Friendly and Murrow, it was perhaps another sign that the network was not trying very hard to help the show survive.

In the fall of 1956, Murrow made the decision to resign from the CBS board of directors, a position he had held for more than seven years (Kendrick, 1969). Murrow was about to sign a new contract with CBS and said publicly that he thought it might be a conflict of interest to remain on the board, but privately he was discouraged by the direction of the network and the unwillingness to fully support programs like *See It Now* (Sperber, 1986). His ideas for the network were no longer in line with the board’s objectives, and his exit put an even greater division between himself and the management at CBS.

Eight more episodes of *See It Now* aired in during the 1958 season, but by that time Pan Am had dropped its sponsorship (Persico, 1990). Despite the setback, Murrow and Friendly continued on, but became discouraged when the network was so quick to give equal airtime to opposing viewpoints even when it concerned marginally controversial topics. The issue came to a head with a subject the two producers considered to be more instructional that controversial– the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The president, both major parties, and most

Americans backed the inclusion of the two new states, but *See It Now* was still careful to include comments from a small minority of those who opposed the move (Sperber, 1986). That was not enough for John Pillion, however, a New York congressman who complained about a statement made by a union-leader calling him "crazy" for believing that Hawaii statehood was a "major part of the Communist conspiracy" (Edwards, 2004, p. 128). He demanded airtime from CBS, and they gave in without even talking about it to Murrow and Friendly. The decision drew the ire of William Egan, the Senator-elect from Alaska, who in a terse letter criticized CBS management for giving in to such an unwarranted request (Sperber, 1986).

Murrow and Friendly felt that the granting of equal time was a public chastisement of them and their program. Both wrote letters to CBS management saying that they could not continue to do the program if the network continued to undermine it with such generous offers of equal air time (Edwards, 2004). They insisted on first being consulted concerning such decisions. The debate culminated in an exchange among Paley, Murrow, and Friendly in June of 1958. According to Friendly (1967), Murrow was making his case for he and Friendly to be informed about decisions regarding equal time when Paley interrupted, "But I thought that you and Fred didn't want to do *See It Now* anymore" (p. 92). Murrow replied that of course they wanted to do the program, but needed to be a part of the decision process. Paley replied, "I thought we'd already decided about *See It Now*" (p. 92).

Friendly (1967) goes on to describe a 45-minute heated argument over the program that included this exchange that he contends "told it all" in regards to CBS's position regarding the program:

> Murrow: Bill, are you going to destroy all this? Don't you want an instrument like the *See It Now* organization, which you have poured so much into for so long, to continue?

Paley: Yes, but I don't want this constant stomachache every time you do a controversial subject.

Murrow: I'm afraid that's a price you have to be willing to pay. It goes with the job. (p. 92)

To the shock of Murrow and others involved in the highly acclaimed program, *See It Now* was taken off of CBS's schedule altogether. Its final broadcast aired in July of 1958, a program dealing with the reemergence of Germany (Edwards, 2004).

Murrow was also starting to fall out of favor at CBS. His style of broadcasting, which often exemplified urgency and worry, was fitting for World War II and immediately after, but came across as antiquated by the late 1950s (Baughman, 1981). Some critics even began referring to him as the "voice of doom," implying that his style no longer reflected the mood of the nation (Edgerton, 1992). Persico (1990) contends that Murrow was becoming "a nagging conscience, a public scold" and "an irritant to the corporation" that CBS wanted to expel (p. 426).

CBS did briefly give Murrow another program after *See It Now*. On October 12, 1958, *Small World* debuted. The program was a phone conversation between Murrow and three other prominent individuals over long distance phone lines. All four were filmed simultaneously and the footage was cut together later so that all four people could be seen as the conversation ensued, much like modern satellite hook-ups appear on television today (Edwards, 2004). By agreeing to do the program, Murrow and Friendly were able to keep about half of their *See It Now* staff, but Friendly (1967) asserts that "it was no substitute for *See It Now*" (p. 102). The program had a small, loyal following, but was cancelled just two years later. Murrow was occasionally allowed to pursue documentary-style programs, such as the 1960 critically acclaimed *Harvest of Shame*, which documented the plight of migrant farm workers (Kendrick, 1969).

Even though he still worked at CBS, Murrow's status at the network was clearly on the decline. As Murrow prepared for a lengthy sabbatical, CBS approached Friendly to head what would become the successor of *See It Now* called *CBS Reports*. Friendly was told he could ask Murrow to participate as a correspondent, but that Murrow could not have creative control (Sperber, 1986). Friendly (1967) recounts the conversation with CBS News Executive Sig Mickelson, who told them having Murrow be involved as a producer would create "problems" (p. 106). Friendly wanted time to talk with Murrow about the offer.

Persico (1990) contends that excluding Murrow from a leadership role must have been the lowest point of his relationship with CBS: "If there was single moment when Ed had to know that his marriage to CBS had finally failed, this was it" (p. 440). The network was creating a new news and public affairs program and wanted his involvement kept to a minimum. After consulting with Murrow, Friendly accepted the offer, and occasionally invited his longtime friend and colleague to report for the program. He had hoped Murrow would eventually be allowed to have much more involvement, a scenario that never occurred (Friendly, 1967). Murrow's discontent with the industry grew. He continued his radio commentaries up until 1961, and then left CBS to take a job heading up the United States Information Agency (Sperber, 1991).

In the wake of his falling out with CBS and his subsequent departure from broadcast news, Murrow began to symbolize within the industry what television journalism should represent. His evaluations of the industry he had helped to establish also became a barometer of how the profession was straying off course. Those within broadcast journalism especially began to perceive him as taking a fall to stand up for that cause. Baughman (1981) makes this observation concerning Murrow’s departure from broadcasting: "Former CBS colleagues and journalists have determined to describe Murrow as martyr, the Christlike victim of television's cultural reduction" (p. 106). Many saw Murrow as someone who stood up for his ideals and paid the price. "Murrow's uncompromising standards were no longer welcome at CBS," wrote Edgerton (1992) in an essay about his legendary status: "the source of his genius as a newsman had become his greatest liability with the passing of time" (p. 87).

Murrow’s RTNDA Speech

Murrow’s growing dissatisfaction with broadcast journalism culminated in a high-profile address to others within the industry. In 1958 the Radio-Television News Directors Association asked Murrow to give the keynote address at their annual convention in Chicago. Murrow’s legendary status made him an obvious choice for the honor. With his busy schedule, and his typical reluctance to agree to requests for personal appearances, the organization did not expect him to accept the invitation. To the group's amazement, he did agree to speak in front of the annual gathering of news directors from across the country.

The RTNDA invitation came just a few days after Murrow had received Senator-elect Egan’s protest letter over the Alaska-Hawaii decision to grant equal time, and Murrow was still upset about the network caving in to the demand. In a response letter to the organization, Murrow wrote that he “would love to try my hand at a piece… a speech… which would outrage all of our employers” (Sperber, 1986, p. 533). The organization was also surprised that he would be delivering a prepared speech, which went against RTNDA’s tradition of more informal, spontaneous addresses (Sperber, 1986). His intent was to have the speech distributed, and to that end he sent advance copies to news agencies and to the trade paper *Variety*, but did not send copies to Chair of the CBS board Wiliam Paley, CBS President Frank Stanton, and other top executives (Kendrick, 1969). The 21-page double-spaced speech was sent out on the morning of October 15, 1958, to the news outlets. Murrow wanted to make sure that newsrooms were fully prepared to cover the message he was about to deliver.

Bill Small, the program chairman for the 1958 RTNDA convention, recalled being surprised when Murrow arrived at the Sheraton-Blackston Hotel in Chicago because the broadcaster was so tall, a common shock for those who did not know him (Sperber, 1995). That evening he also appeared “weary” and “a little older than he seemed on the screen” with hands yellowed from constantly smoking cigarettes (Sperber, 1995, p. 50). During the reception he was “smiling but tense,” likely anticipating the furor that was to come from his address (Sperber, 1995, p. 50). The crowd was filled with local radio and television news directors from across the country, but not network broadcasters, which played only a minor role in the RTNDA at the time (Sperber, 1995).

By nine o’clock, with the dinner and formalities out of the way, Murrow approached the podium dressed in a gray suit with narrow lapels (Paper, 1987). Murrow gave his address to the RTNDA during a time when he believed broadcasting began emphasizing profits over quality programming, and his assessment of his profession was not flattering. He told his fellow radio and television journalists that he was “seized with an abiding fear regarding what these two instruments are doing to our society, our culture and our heritage” (Murrow, 1965, p. 27). He argued that the industry was headed in the wrong direction and needed to change its course. According to him, money and corporate influence had supplanted the desire to fulfill an obligation to the audience in providing it with programming that enlightened, not just entertained. He forewarned that broadcasters “shall pay for using this most powerful instrument of communication to insulate the citizenry from the hard and demanding realities which must be faced if we are to survive" (Murrow, 1965, p. 28).

During the entire speech, Bill Small, recalled no hint of anger in Murrow's voice, but Sperber (1995) writes that what he heard was rather "accents of despair" (p. 52). When the speech was finished, a few moments of silence ensued, then tremendous applause erupted from the broadcasters in the room. Small recollected, "we felt it was a good, tough speech" and "that he said what needed saying" (Sperber, 1995, p. 54). In the hours that followed, Murrow's address began to create a major stir within the industry. RTNDA was swamped with requests for copies of the speech, and portions of it were reprinted in magazines across the country (Sperber, 1995). Bill Garry, the news chief for CBS in Chicago and the regional vice president of RTNDA, told Murrow that "the thoughts expressed by you in Chicago will be quoted for months," but that "the most positive reactions will be reserved for the future" (Sperber, 1995, p. 54).

Executive at CBS were not impressed with the speech, however. Sig Mickelson, the director of CBS television news, describes how the speech was "calculated to cater to the self-glorification of directors," but was "a slap in the face" to CBS Chairman William Paley (Mickelson, 1998). Mickelson viewed the speech as more of a personal attack on Paley and the restrictions placed on him at CBS rather than an expression of Murrow's true concerns about the industry (Mickelson, 1995). In his memoir, Paley (1979) expressed his disappointment that Murrow did not come to him first with his concerns. "I didn't agree with Murrow's gloomy thesis at all," wrote Paley, and argued that the hundreds of documentaries CBS aired over the years were evidence of its commitment to quality programing (Paley, 1979, p. 295). Paley also saw it as a personal attack against him and his leadership at CBS that he "resented very deeply." (Sperber, 1986, p. 542).

Another response from a CBS executive to Murrow came a year later when CBS President Frank Stanton was also invited to speak at the RTNDA convention. By this time the quiz show scandal was the talk of the industry, with fourteen former contestants arrested and charged with perjury (Edwards, 2004). In his address, Stanton assured viewers that in the future the network would not do anything to deceive viewers and not engage in any "hanky panky" (Persico, 1990). In a follow-up interview for the *New York Times*, Stanton gave as an example of that deception programs that included questions and answers that had been rehearsed without telling the audience. He confirmed that he was referring to Murrow's *Person to Person* program, which would rehearse the interviews before the live telecasts. From that point on, Murrow's replacement on *Person to Person*, Chris Collinwood, read a disclaimer announcing that advance planning was made with guests on the program.

The implication was that Murrow and the producers of *Person to Person* had been duping the public for years, just as the quiz shows had deceived the viewers (Friendly, 1967). On sabbatical at the time, Murrow responded with his own comments in the *New York Times*, calling Stanton's criticism a revelation of his "ignorance of both news and the requirement of production" (Persico, 1990). It was a scathing rebuttal targeted at the head of the network. Paley sent a lawyer to London to try to persuade Murrow to retract his criticism of Stanton, but Murrow refused (Paley, 1979). Meanwhile, the creators and co-producers of *Person to Person*, Zousmer and Aaron, resigned from the network (Sperber, 1986).

Murrow's RTNDA speech had clearly perpetuated the disintegration of an already fractured relationship with executives at CBS. His dissatisfaction with the state of broadcast journalism was in proportion to the lack of support he saw from the heads of the network. By voicing that blame in a public forum, he in turn jeopardized whatever support remained from those in power at the network. Paper (1987) quotes one unidentified CBS executive as reacting to Murrow's speech as a type of betrayal: "He was the star of the CBS family. We all treated Murrow with a lot of respect and deference. And we felt he shouldn't criticize the company like that" (p. 189). CBS Vice President Richard Salant was in the boardroom when CBS executives read copies of Murrow's speech. "They were flabbergasted," recalled Salant, "It was kind of like the child you've nurtured turning on you" (Sperber, 1995, p. 52).

CHAPTER THREE: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF MURROW'S RTNDA ADDRESS

Introduction

Chapter one explained the rationale for considering Edward R. Murrow's RTNDA address as helping to formulate the debate concerning broadcast journalism's societal responsibility. Chapter two provided the historical background of his broadcasting legacy and the context of his RTNDA address. In this chapter, I first lay the theoretical foundation for the rhetorical analysis of his speech and profile the methodological steps I will follow in my analysis. I then review the rhetorical theory I will apply to Murrow's speech followed by my analysis of the speech.

Rhetorical criticism offers a useful method of considering Murrow's RTNDA address by analyzing how he rhetorically constructed his address not only for the crowd of news directors gathered in the room, but also for the lasting impact it might have on his profession. Through careful word selection and emphasizing some elements over others, Murrow formulated a speech that is quoted by broadcasters even today and for many has become the standard they use to carry out their profession. Thus, rhetorical analysis is uniquely applicable Murrow's speech because it aids scholarly understanding of history and rhetorical legacy from an interpretive rather than methodologically driven approach. In all, this project engages rhetorical criticism and its foundation as a humanities approach to understanding Murrow's rhetoric and then formulates these insights into how Murrow's view of the profession is reflected in contemporary broadcasting textbooks.

Rhetorical criticism is also an appropriate choice in analyzing Murrow because his career was one that was filled with rhetorical debates and obstacles. His confrontation with Sen. McCarthy illustrates the power of words and visuals to make an argument. McCarthy often resorted to labeling others as Communists so he could tap into people's fears, while Murrow attempted to use facts and reason to refute the senator's claims. Murrow also had the power of television at his disposal to use visuals to support his point of view. The rhetoric of McCarthy and Murrow ultimately collided with their *See It Now* debate.

Murrow's career is also one of rhetorical transformation. His World War II and *See It Now* broadcasts helped establish his reputation as a brave journalist who was willing to risk everything for his moral convictions. Over time, however, the network began to look at him as a liability. He was the seasoned journalist whose ideas were considered a part of a bygone era, and he ultimately left the profession as a result. His rhetorical significance lives on, though, in how he is remembered today, particularly by those in the profession who revere him as the symbol of all that is good in broadcasting.

Grounded in the humanities, many rhetorical theorists have advocated the scholarly benefits of analyzing speeches for broader and deeper historical understanding. Wrage (1947/2005) sees merit in trained rhetoricians analyzing historical addresses and relaying their insights to others. He asserts that "research in the ideas communicated through speeches needs doing as a means of contributing to knowledge and understanding generally" (p. 34). Wrage realized that a singular perspective of historical artifacts would limit the scope of understanding, and advocated for a broader consideration of the cultural context of speeches. New ideas and perspectives were warranted to generate new insights. Rosenfield (1968/2005) also supports multiple interpretive perspectives related to rhetorical criticism. He argued that rhetoricians often consider four variables of a speech–source, message, environment, and critic–in different combinations. Rosenfield provides the example of two different interpretations of a speech by General Douglas McArthur. He explains how these two distinct points of view of the same artifact can both provide legitimate interpretations. Two different rhetoricians with differing opinions each make worthwhile contributions to the understanding of McArthur's speech.

Rhetorical criticism has its origins in the development of rhetoric during the time of ancient Greece, when the Sophists offered their services to train individuals on how to debate effectively (Murphy, 1972). It was important at that time for citizens to know how to formulate a persuasive argument so they would have a voice within the emerging democratic society. Many grew critical of the Sophists, however, because they sold their services and advocated a subjective view of truth that emerged from the clash if ideas (Herrick, 2009). Greek philosopher Plato was especially outspoken against the work of the Sophists and viewed rhetoric not as an art, but simply a way to deceive and confuse the public (Kennedy, 1963).

One of Plato’s pupils would emerge to challenge his teacher’s ideas. Aristotle believed in the notion that rhetoric was a true art, and that it could move beyond the unsophisticated techniques of the Sophists (Herrick, 2009). He believed that rhetoric could be useful and in his classic work *Rhetoric* lays out techniques to formulate a rational argument. He supported the idea that rhetoric was not an evil and that citizens could benefit in a society by understanding rhetorical strategies (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001).

The traditions that emerged from the instruction of Athenian citizens in the art of rhetoric carried forward into Rome with the work of Cicero and Quintilian. What differentiated Roman rhetoric from that of the Greeks was its focus on the character of the orator, which was important for those held power (Herrick, 2009). The emphasis was on the legitimacy of the speaker and how the person should be virtuous and good in order to be convincing (Kennedy, 1972).

During the Middle Ages after the fall of the Roman Empire, Christianity spread throughout Europe and Greek and Roman rhetoric was looked at skeptically because of its pagan origins. Some wanted to even abolish all rhetorical teachings (Murphy, 1972). St. Augustine argued that rhetoric still has a place in a Christian society as a way for the church to educate and preach to the citizenry (Murphy, 1974). Rhetoric became a useful tool to minister to others the truth of the scriptures.

The Renaissance brought about challenges to the church, and rhetoric emerged as a humanities-based discipline that became popular at the university setting. A focus emerged on the individual and how humans could have the power to question and change the world around them (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001). The rhetoric of the 1400s and 1500s reflected these ideas with an emphasis on how creativity and individuality could influence the persuasive message.

The challenge to the church continued in the 17th and 18th centuries with the Enlightenment and the emergence of the scientific method, which included the use of rationality in uncovering truth (Herrick, 2009). During this time the Belletristic movement became associated with rhetoric, applying rhetorical studies to literature and poetry and seeking out the beauty in the language (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001). During the 18th century the concept of “the public” also became important in Europe, and rhetoric became a tool once again for citizens to use to influence their society, whether it was through public addresses or writing for popular periodicals (Herrick, 2009).

Modern 20th century rhetoric began to focus on the methods of argumentation and a connection between language and meaning. Rhetoricians such as Perelman made the connection between audiences’ values and their acceptance of the message (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001), while others such as Kenneth Burke introduced the need to fully connect with a target audience by identifying with it in any way possible within the message. For Burke rhetoric became a way of bringing individuals who might be separated in various ways together (Herrick, 2009).

In recent years post-modern rhetoric has developed to challenge those in authority. Rhetoricians such as Foucault argue that language brings with it a form of power and that knowledge emerges from the language and those who control the messages (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001). These concepts sparked the emergence of feminist critical theory.

Rhetoric has a long history as a scholarly pursuit and through the centuries has emerged as a way of examining the persuasive messages in our society. In keeping with that tradition, I use rhetorical analysis to consider Murrow's RTNDA address and his persuasive techniques. I place particular emphasis to his consideration of audience in formulating his argument.

Rhetorical Criticism of Murrow's RTNDA Speech

My rhetorical analysis of Murrow's speech follows three separate steps. The first step involves familiarizing myself with Murrow's speech. The second step involves critical inquiry into additional rhetorical theory or theories, which can aid in a greater understanding of Murrow's speech. The third step involves discussing and rationalizing the critical choices of rhetorical theory and how they will aid my analysis.

The first step in my rhetorical analysis was to examine Murrow's speech using the technique of descriptive analysis as outlined by Campbell and Burkholder (1997). As Campbell and Burkholder (1997) state, the goal becomes to answer two questions: "1) What is the apparent purpose of the discourse, or what aim or goal does the rhetor seek?" and "2) How does the discourse work to achieve that purpose, or what strategies does the rhetor employ to achieve the goal?" (p. 20). In order to achieve that goal, they recommend examining the artifact for seven key elements: purpose, persona, audience, tone, structure, supporting materials, and other strategies of the speech. To accomplish this task I read through Murrow's RTNDA seven times, keeping in mind each element as I analyzed the address. By considering each of these elements, I was able to gain more familiarity with the contents of the speech that led to a deeper understanding the text.

Descriptive Analysis

Murrow's RTNDA speech was clearly intended to turn the broadcasting industry away from a path that he thought was leading to the destruction of the higher purpose that he envisioned for the medium. This message builds up throughout the course of his speech. Early on Murrow (1965) simply states that he wants to talk "with some candor about what is happening to radio and television" and that he wanted to "express his concern" (p. 27) about the state of the industry.

Later on, it becomes apparent that he is calling for a change in course when he calls for broadcasters to produce programming that would challenge its viewers to take a critical look at their society and government. Murrow (1965) warns that television is being used to "distract, delude, amuse and insulate us" and that instead he called for broadcasters to "reflect occasionally the hard, unyielding realities of the world in which we live" (p. 32). Murrow's mission was to point out that the current state of broadcasting was failing the public, and that those in charge of selecting what goes over the airwaves have the responsibility to provide the audience with quality programming.

In making his argument, Murrow (1965) takes on the role of one who has been a part of the best that broadcasting has to offer, and therefore has the proper perspective in recognizing its digression. He alludes to his background as a legendary radio and television news personality when he reflects on his personal history: "These instruments have been good to me beyond my due" (p. 27). Murrow positions himself as the moral authority in trying to help the industry return to the course he believes it should be taking. In doing so, he also warns how history will view those in radio and television "fifty or a hundred years from now" (p. 27) and that if things don't change "history will take its revenge" (p. 32). Murrow's sees this revenge as leading to the demise of our society when he cautions that "the tube is flickering now and we will soon see that the whole struggle is lost" (p. 32).

Included in Murrow's role as the moral compass for the industry is an underlying sense of optimism within his warnings. These statements of hope are at times related to the audience: "I am entirely persuaded that the American public is more reasonable, restrained and more mature that most of our industry's program planners believe" (p. 28). When countering claims that people would not tune in to quality programming Murrow replies "There is, in one reporter's opinion, considerable evidence against that contention" (p. 32). Murrow displayed a conviction that the audience would make the proper choices when it came to informative programs if the networks would provide them.

In his address, Murrow (1965) often spoke directly to those in attendance at the RTNDA conference and others broadcast journalists. He makes reference to "you who labor in this vineyard that produces words and pictures" (p. 27), which acknowledges the news directors and others in the industry who were there that evening to hear him speak. They were not the sole targets of his address that night, however. Murrow also makes several third person references to groups that can be interpreted as messages to those individuals. He challenges "network spokesmen" to engage in critical commentary on what appears in newspapers and magazines since too often those in broadcasting think too highly of what appears in print (p. 28). He also admonishes the "big corporations who pay the freight for radio and television programs" (p. 30) and the "presidents and chairmen of the boards" (p. 31) of those corporations to be willing to sponsor some programming for the benefit of the public good. Murrow then addresses "the networks" by saying it is up to them to produce worthwhile programming that will enlighten and inform an audience (p. 31).

Murrow (1965) establishes the tone of his RTNDA address with his first words: "This just might do nobody any good" (p. 27). Immediately the audience was aware that his message was not going to be one of flattery and praise, but an admonition of some kind. A scolding was in order, and Murrow was preparing his listeners for it. He makes further allusions to what is to come by saying he will be relaying "heretical and even dangerous thoughts" (p. 27). He lays the groundwork for a speech that will be radical and controversial.

This gloomy tone continues with Murrow's (1965) expression of "concern" and "abiding fear" (p. 27). He speaks of the issue being one of survival, and tells the audience "I mean the word survive literally" (p. 28). He speaks of "tragedies" in reference to the lack of fortitude television news has in standing up for quality programming (p. 29). He warns that if corporations do not support quality programming that they are "done for" (p. 31). The atmosphere Murrow wished to establish was one of immanent peril for the broadcasting industry and society if the corporations and networks did not work to improve the situation.

Murrow (1965) incorporated a problem-solution structure to his RTNDA address. According to him, the television networks have forsaken their responsibility to the viewers in providing quality programs and that years from now historians will look back in disgust at what happened to the medium under their watch. He argues that the industry will "pay for using the most powerful instrument of communication to insulate the citizenry from the hard and demanding realities which must be faced if we are to survive" (p. 28). For Murrow, the problem is clearly that the industry has begun to put profit over their civic duty of providing information that viewers need to know.

Murrow (1965) offers his ideas for addressing the problem. First, he presents the concept that the broadcast industry should not solely be about making money: "I can find nothing in the Bill of Rights or the Communications Act which says that they must increase their net profits each year, lest the Republic collapse" (p. 30). Murrow argues that having a broadcast license carries with it a responsibility to provide programming that will enlighten the viewers. Since it is an obligation, Murrow suggests that corporate sponsors should take some of the financial burden in helping to fulfill that commitment.

In presenting his arguments, Murrow incorporated several strategies to help make his point. One recurring tactic was the use of quotes, including statements by actual people and others from his imagined interactions. When discussing a controversial program that he produced on Egypt and Israel, Murrow (1965) quotes well-meaning friends as saying "This you cannot do-you will be handed your head" (p. 28). In the same example he quotes Middle Eastern officials as saying: "It was a fair account. The information was there. We have no complaints" (p. 28).

Murrow (1965) also quotes network spokesmen regarding their response to airing programs about controversial subjects. "We are young; we have not developed the traditions nor the acquired the experience of the older media" (p. 28). This is one of two examples in the speech where this is not a direct quote, or even an actual encounter, but rather Murrow's imagining of how they would respond. He later imagines what network executives would say in response to supporting quality programming.

In contrast, Murrow (1965) does use direct quotes from individuals he mentions by name. He quotes Heywood Broun, a newspaper reporter and social activist as saying "No body politic is healthy until it begins to itch" (p. 30). He later quotes American writer Max Eastman as saying "that publisher serves his advertisers best who best serves his readers," although he admits he is unsure of the attribution (p. 32). Murrow ends his address with a quote from Stonewall Jackson to illustrate his point that television is in a battle for survival.

Murrow also uses several metaphors to support his idea that the television industry is in trouble. Early on, he says those who listen to his speech may accuse him of "fouling his own comfortable nest" (p. 27). He draws upon this metaphor again when he confronts his peers: "Do we merely stay in our comfortable nest…" (p. 30). The idea was that the current situation was one that many in the industry were content to keep in place. Murrow sought to stir up the nest.

Another recurring metaphor is the idea of comparing the industry to a body, with references to health, illness and mortality. Murrow speaks of literal survival (p. 28), meaning that broadcasting could be at mortal risk if some is not done. He speaks of a "diagnosis" (p. 29) in regards to radio, again implying that there is a sickness that needs to be healed. He later promotes the idea that he would like television "to produce some itching pills rather than this endless outpouring of tranquilizers" (p. 30). Murrow's contention is that the broadcasting industry was slowly killing people by numbing them to the realities of our world. Towards the end of his address, he twice accuses the industry of being "fat" (p. 32) implying that it has overindulged on a diet of mindless programming and corporate profiteering.

The findings of the descriptive analysis informed the next steps in the rhetorical process. Campbell and Burkholder’s (1997) first question asks the apparent purpose of the discourse. I conclude that the purpose of Murrow’s address was to liberate broadcasting from what he saw as the evils of corporate and commercial influence. To achieve that goal he made a rational appeal to a broader audience while formulating a vision of the industry that would appeal to more immediate audience of broadcast journalists. In this idealistic vision, practitioners are free to create informative programming and the public is willing to watch and respond appropriately.

His speech envisions broadcast journalism as the ultimate protector of democracy and if it is not unshackled from the corporate structure so it can fulfill that role, society pays the price.

Campbell and Burkholder’s (1997) second question concerns the strategies the rhetor employs to achieve the purpose of the address. I contend that Murrow accomplishes his purpose through the strategy of moralizing the profession of broadcasting journalism as virtuous and significant for maintaining a democracy. This strategy relates to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s (1969) theories of universal audience in that he makes a rational appeal to an audience beyond his immediate listeners, but he also appeals to the particular audience of broadcast journalists, who he knew would respond to such a message that gives the industry special status a protector of society. He called out the corporate entities that controlled the industry for ignoring what he saw as an overriding responsibility–to properly inform the public. This would have been a welcomed message to news directors in the audience who believed in the importance of broadcast news.

The descriptive analysis also reveals that Murrow places an emphasis on corporate responsibility in solving the problem. In doing so, however, Murrow downplayed the struggle of the individual. He fails to mention the circumstances concerning his frustrations with CBS and what some considered to be his own contributions to television programming that was more distracting than informative–the *Person to Person* program. This would suggest that Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s (1969) rhetorical strategy of presence is also an appropriate analytical tool.

Perelman's Universal and Particular Audience

The idea of framing specific messages for maximum persuasive effect is a central theme in the work of Chaim Perelman. Along with Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, he provided valuable insight into the formulation of persuasive messages by developing the concept of the particular and universal audience as it relates to making an argument. In rhetorical critical analysis, these strategies can reveal the way in which an argument can resonate with not only the immediate audience, but one that transcends time and space.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) emphasize the importance of audience and argue that a speaker must often be concerned with the audience beyond those who are physically present at the time. They provide the examples of a politician addressing parliament or a person granting an interview to a reporter (p. 19). In such cases the speaker may not simply be addressing the people in the same room, but is making an argument that is meant for an audience that is not there. Therefore Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca define audience as "the ensemble of those whom the speaker wishes to influence by his argumentation" (p. 19). This definition allows both for those who are present as well as those who may hear or read about the presenter's message at a different time or location.

It is this broader unseen audience that leads Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca to the conclusion that the audience becomes a construction in the mind of the speaker. The challenge for presenters, however, becomes formulating an argument that may be convincing to a broader audience, because as they contend, "audiences are almost infinite in their variety" (1969, p. 26). They therefore introduce the concept of the universal audience in order to create an argument that has the potential to be affective beyond the immediate time and setting. At they describe it, "Argumentation to a universal audience must convince the reader that the reasons adduced are of a compelling character, and that they are self-evident, and possess and absolute and timeless validity, independent of local or historical contingencies" (p. 32). An argument addressed to a universal audience is one that in the mind of the speaker possesses those qualities that would go beyond convincing only certain groups or factions, it is one that is all-encompassing and inclusive.

The universal audience provides a tool for the speaker to present an argument that may resonate beyond the audience at hand, but still relies on the background of the presenter. Frank (1998) addresses this aspect of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's universal audience:

> Consistent with the New Rhetoric's undergirding theme of pluralism, they suggest that there are many expressions of the universal audience that depend on and reflect the speaker's experience, culture and time-period. The universal audience, accordingly, is not independent of context, for it can be checked by a particular concrete audience or by an undefined universal audience. (pp. 121-122)

Frank establishes that arguments presented towards a universal audience are based on what the speaker would believe are convincing to all rational human beings outside of the immediate setting. The arguments, while constructed to appeal to a broader, rational audience, are still based on the perspectives of the speaker. Gross and Dearin (2003) also see a link between orator and the universal: "All arguments are subject to the paradox that speakers must presuppose a concept of timeless validity, a concept clearly subject to contingency" (p. 37). Speakers must rely on their own experiences and their evaluation of the world in which they live to formulate an argument that they would assume would appeal to the universal.

An argument that evokes the universal is one that a speaker must be also able to defend in the face of rational counter-arguments. Nicolas (2011) emphasizes this element by way of an imagined "interlocutor" (p. 52). In crafting an argument toward the universal, the speaker must put it to the test by anticipating any refutations to their assertions. Nicolas (2011) sees this as a way of potentially strengthening one's argument: "It boils down to endangering one's own speech by putting it to the test of confrontation" (p. 52). Through this interpretation of universal audience Nicolas emphasizes not the imagined audience of rational beings but what he calls the "generalized interlocutor" (p. 52). He contends that speakers who can anticipate justifiable contradictions and answer them in advance can better speak to the universal audience.

Often the goal in constructing arguments that target a universal audience is to bring groups together. Crosswhite (2010) believes this conflict-resolution aspect of the universal audience can be tailored to the situation:

> …the universality of a universal audience will vary in intensity and focus relative to the conflict it addresses; it will be a function of the focus and intensity of the conflict. In this reading, universality is an active and practical and structured aspiration that animates and informs argumentation and yields results by successfully opening up a hearing that satisfies the parties to the conflict. (p. 440)

In the instances described by Crosswhite, appealing to the universal becomes a way of unifying– an attempt to resolve conflict by presenting arguments on which everyone can agree. The greater the conflict in scope, the more universal the appeal must become.

Along with unification, an appeal to the universal often brings with it a call to action. Frank and Bolduc (2004) contend that this was an underlying component of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's universal audience:

> Action, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca argued, should be the result of a universal vision, one that was still rooted in the experience of life. Argumentation as an expression of reason had to have the pretensions of universality. The philosopher must create in his or her mind a universal audience; therefore, the philosopher's reasoning must be able to gain the support of all reasonable minds. (p. 80)

Frank and Bolduc (2004) see this type of argumentation as “reasoned action” (p. 78) since by appealing to the universal the speaker must make reasonable arguments for the action. The petition must be based on facts, ideas, and concepts that can attract broad agreement.

While the universal audience is described as one that would react to an appeal based on facts, reason, and truths, Perelman (1979) contrasts this with those who respond to specific values, such as shared standards. "Indeed, most values are particular in that they are accepted only by a particular group" (p. 15). This particular audience is made up of those with shared ideas that would respond to an argument other groups would not. The particular audience responds not to the real, but rather to the preferable, which Ray (1978) describes as dealing with "values, hierarchies of values, and lines of argument which refer to the preferable" (p. 365).

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) make a distinction between the terms "persuasive" and "convincing." For them a persuasive argument is one that is only valid for a particular audience, which is a specific group that the speaker is addressing that might only respond to certain words, talking-points, or qualities of a speaker. For an argument to be convincing, however, it is presumed "to gain the adherence of every rational being" (p. 28). According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, there are potentially two levels of argument at work, one that is agreeable to a specific group at a specific time and place, and another that people beyond that time and situation would find reasonable and convincing. When a speaker constructs an argument with the universal argument in mind, he or she does so with the idea that the message has the potential to be effective beyond the initial situation and setting.

The universal audience is one that Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) argue responds to the "real," which they define as "comprising facts, truths and presumptions," while the preferable encompasses "values, hierarchies and lines of argument related to the preferable" (p.

66). Gross (1999) maintains that the real is composed of facts, which are assertions that everyone must agree. Ray (1978) further explains that "the real" relates to "the concept we have of truth, which "is conditioned by the idea of certain agreements which relate to specific data, objective reality, and what is common to all" (p. 365). That which is connected to the real is therefore a line of argumentation to which everyone has the potential to relate to and respond. On the contrary, the particular audience may respond because of specific values they hold, such as beliefs that are unique to a particular group.

Speakers often address both the universal and particular within the same address. Gross and Dearin (2003) believe orators often have multiple persuasive goals when crafting a message:

> …discourse in public arenas is rarely addressed simply to particular audiences or to a universal audience; it rarely has as its goal either adherence to facts, truths, and presumptions or adherence to values. Usually, public address represents a mixture of goals, and therefore of rhetorical audiences. (p. 42)

There can therefore be multiple levels of persuasion within the same address, attempting to persuade both those individuals who respond to the rational and real and others that would be persuaded by adhering to particular values and beliefs.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's Theory of Presence

Another key concept of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) in creating an effective argument is the orator giving certain parts of an argument "presence," by which "the very fact of selecting certain elements and presenting them to the audience, their importance and pertinence to the discussion are implied." (p. 116). The idea is that those items that are closer or more apparent to the audience are the ones they will see as more important, and in many cases help win their acceptance. It is vital, therefore, for the presenter to make a series of choices in formulating an argument by selecting and highlighting certain components so that they come to the fore. By doing so they are endowed with a "presence" that makes those elements of the message more persuasive.

Perelman used the example of a Chinese proverb that scholars often reference (Tucker, 2001; Tompkins, 2003; Noe, 2005) to help provide readers with an example of how “presence” works. Perelman (1982) relays the story to provide an example of the impact of presence: “A king sees an ox on its way to sacrifice. He is moved to pity for it and orders that a sheep be used in its place. He confesses he did so because he could see the ox, but not the sheep” (p. 33). The king responded to what was before him rather than what was not. Noe (2005) explains how this illustration translates into the power of a message: “Through the psychological and often imaginative intercession of words, presence can bring an event to the fore that can become the real on which a structure of reality is based” (p. 431). Just like the king, listeners respond to the facts and illustrations that are before them and their realities are then shaped by them.

Exactly how this "presence" is endowed upon certain elements of an argument can encompass various strategies. For Perelman (1982) it seemed to simply mean what was included in an address, by "choosing to single out certain things for presentation in a speech" which "draws their attention to the audience" (p. 35). Oakley (1997) describes presence as working "consciously in the foreground" (p. 49) Karon (1976) goes beyond simple inclusion, however, contending that presence can be "created chiefly through techniques traditionally studied under the headings of style, delivery, and disposition" (p. 97). Presence can therefore be established through a combination of selection, placement, emphasis, and delivery, all working together to make certain components of an address more accessible and important to the audience.

One strategy Murphy (1994) highlights in his work on Al Gore's book *Earth in the Balance* is the use of analogies in conjunction with presence. He argues that by constructing the analogies of a nuclear threat, a dysfunctional family, and the Marshall Plan, Gore is able give presence to his arguments related to each one. Murphy asserts that analogies, when brought the fore by the speaker and accepted by the audience, can help provide a sense of what is real by providing "a framework through which the audience should view the world, judge arguments, and act upon those claims" (p. 3). Measell (1989) also sees the importance of analogies in Perelman's concept of presence, asserting that "the analogy which establishes real relationships (to the mind of the auditor) becomes by its very success, an argumentative rather than a stylistic feature of the discourse" (p. 187). Presence can allow persuasive strategies such as analogies to take on greater importance with an audience.

There is a connection between how presence works within an address and the setting in which the speaker delivers the address. Jenkins (2007) stresses the importance of the this link:

> Presence is not simply bringing one element to the foreground as the figure of our attention. *Presence depends on the timeliness and proximity of the arguments to the audience and the relationship and investments of the audience to the arguments.* So, in relation to time, duration, frequency, pace, and timeliness of argument all can contribute presence. (emphasis original, p. 407)

When a speaker endows certain elements of a speech with presence there is therefore a conscience awareness of the audience and the context in which the argument is presented.

Presence often carries an impact throughout a speech. Gross and Dearin (2003) make a distinction between first and second order effects of stylistic elements such as metaphors. They contend that when used pervasively or in conjunction with other strategies, presence can become pervasive: "…presence is not merely an isolated phenomenon; the various instances of presence in a text can also form patterns whose effect is synergistic" (p. 137). In such cases Gross and Dearin contend that presence moves beyond a first order effect of a single rhetorical strategy and into a second-order effect that permeate throughout the address, an occurrence they refer to as "superordinate presence" (p. 137). The individual first-order instances work together to form a greater pattern of argumentation.

Conversely, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) discuss the negative effects of presence. When certain facts or elements are suppressed or downplayed in making an argument, the audience may deem them as unimportant. Perelman (1982) argued that giving elements of a presentation presence "prevents them from being neglected" (p. 35), so therefore the opposite is also true. By not giving certain elements of an address presence, those components will tend to be the ones that the audience will deem inconsequential. Atkinson, Kaufer, & Ishizaki (2008) emphasize this give-and-take aspect of presence in that when some elements are given more prominence, others are downplayed: "…presence is also an activity associated with the manner of presentation, the way an element is given amplitude relative to other elements within an argument" (p. 360). This again highlights the idea of choice for the speaker. Not every component of the argument can be given equal weight. As presence is given to some, others are forced in the background.

This give and take aspect of presence can be used to hide or disguise elements that a presenter may not desire to be out in open. Gross (2005) utilizes this idea to explain how an Austrian museum is able to downplay the nation's participation in the Holocaust, therefore relieving its citizens of guilt concerning the Nazi atrocities. Through the language and positioning of the displays at the museum, he argues that a certain presence is created–one that deflects the burden of the Holocaust away from Austrians. Presence therefore becomes a tool of the rhetor to not only lend more credibility to certain aspects of an argument, but to deemphasize others the speaker may find undesirable.

Murrow's Appeal to the Universal

Within his RTNDA address, Murrow crafted a speech that he believed would make a rational argument for his assertions that changes needed to be made to the broadcasting industry as it was transforming in 1958. In doing so, he used a line of reasoning that drew upon his own background and reflected the concerns of the times. These primary appeals to the universal audience included the following assertions: a) distraction is dangerous, b) controversy can be constructive, and c) greed should not supersede societal responsibility. With each point, Murrow attempted to urge an audience that would respond to facts and reason so they would begin to question the status quo within the broadcasting industry and take action to change its course.

Distraction is dangerous. One of Murrow's key assertions is that a society will eventually find itself in danger if it becomes distracted and is ill-informed about the important issues of the day. Murrow (1965) alludes to this early on in his address when he talks of his "abiding fear regarding what these two instruments are doing to our society, our culture and our heritage" (p. 27). He makes a point of listing the three items as an indication that the dangers he fears from distraction are far-reaching and have the potential to impact many facets of America. For Murrow, the potential dangers to "our heritage" (p. 27) included not only the heritage of the nation as a democracy, but also the heritage of the broadcasting industry that he held in such high regard. He was concerned that the emphasis placed on entertaining the masses and distracting them from world concerns would be a legacy that he and others in the profession would not be proud to say they had a hand in establishing.

Murrow (1965) then looks ahead to the future and contends that historians will look back at the programming schedule of the three major networks and see "evidence of decadence, escapism and insulation from the realities of the world in which we live" (p. 28). He asserts that during primetime viewing hours in particular the networks are supplying only "fleeting and spasmodic reference to the fact that this nation is in mortal danger" and that by doing so "television in the main insulates us from the realities of the world in which we live" (p. 28). Murrow knew this to be the case from his own experiences with his *See It Now* program. At one time it was on the primetime schedule, but towards the end of its run was delegated to Sunday afternoons when few viewers were watching. As programs like *See It Now* were disappearing from the schedule, more game shows and similar lucrative entertainment offerings were filling up the time slots.

Within his address Murrow makes it clear that one of the realities that he believes viewers are being distracted from is the growing threat of Communism throughout the world:

> But this nation is now in competition with malignant forces of evil who are using every instrument at their command to empty the minds of their subjects and fill those minds with slogans, determination and faith in the future. If we go on as we are, we are protecting the mind of the American public from any real contact with the menacing world that squeezes in upon us. (p. 31)

Murrow's reference to the "faith in the future" leaders of Communist nations attempt to instill in their people is in contrast to the one Murrow saw for America. He envisioned a bleak future if the broadcasting industry continued to turn America's attention away from the global threats it was facing. He believed that if society was distracted from these ongoing threats, the results would be disastrous.

Murrow continues his vision of a dismal outlook for both the nation and the broadcasting industry if his concerns are not addressed.

> We are currently wealthy, fat, comfortable and complacent. We have currently a built-in allergy to unpleasant or disturbing information. Our mass media reflect this. But unless we get up off our fat surpluses and recognize that television in the main is being used to distract, delude, amuse and insulate us, then television and those who finance it, those who look at it and those who work at it, may see a totally different picture too late. (p. 32)

Murrow expands on the idea of distraction by including the word "delude," which implies a type of deception. This certainly would have been the case with the controversy over the game shows, which by October of 1958 were under investigation for being rigged so that certain contestants could continually win. For Murrow, who prided himself on being straightforward with his audience and upholding the truth, this was yet another example of television's betrayal to the American public. Another part of the delusion Murrow likely saw in television is that Americans were being lulled into thinking the threats to the nation were not as great as they seemed because they were not being exposed to them. Without the knowledge of these threats, there could possibly be a false sense of safety and security. This idea is carried forward with Murrow's choice of the word "insulate." Murrow worried that with lack of information, citizens were being placed in a protective shell, unaware of what was transpiring on the outside.

Murrow's warning about the dangers of distraction is also reflected in his transformation of the advertising slogan, "buy now, pay later" into the warning "look now, pay later" (p. 28) reflecting his belief that the nation will pay dearly for being diverted from issues of vital importance. By transforming an advertising slogan Murrow is also hinting at the commercialism that is part of this distraction. It was the growing commercialized nature of television that was forcing programs like *See It Now* off the air. Murrow foresaw a heavy price for that commercialism and the distraction it was causing.

The ongoing theme of the dangers of distraction is one that is fitting for Murrow to use as an appeal to the universal audience. His career was filled with instances where he attempted to illuminate the masses so they would be aware of potential menaces to their freedoms and way of life. He went to great lengths to assure that citizens were aware of these threats so that they could make the appropriate choices to confront them. Sometimes these perils came from external forces and in other cases they emanated from within.

When Hitler rose to power in Germany, Murrow had seen for himself the disastrous effects of the dictator's rule, first when he helped refugees who were fleeing Germany as director of the Institute of International Education (Kendrick, 1969) and later when he covered the assault on London as a radio broadcaster (Persico, 1990). Murrow was fully aware of the danger that Hitler posed, not only to Europe, but also to America if this fanatical leader was left unchecked. With his broadcasts from the rooftops of London, Murrow attempted to wake up an apathetic United States (Seib, 2006). He understood that many Americans were distracted with other concerns, such as recovering from the Great Depression, but he realized that the threat was too great for them to ignore. Murrow often put himself in danger to keep the public informed about the war (Persico, 1990), doing whatever he could to gain their attention from other distractions.

Murrow also witnessed for himself the atrocities committed by Nazi Germany he broadcast from Buchenwald concentration camp on April 15, 1945. He first warned listeners that what they were about to hear would be unsettling and then went onto describe the conditions at the camp:

> When I entered men crowded around, tried to lift me to their shoulders. They were too weak. Many of them could not get out of bed. I was told that this building had once stabled eighty horses. There were 1,200 men in it, five to a bunk. The stink was beyond all description. (Bliss, 1967, p. 91-92).

Murrow went onto to describe how bodies of 500 men and boys “were stacked up like cord word” (Bliss, 1967, p. 94). At the conclusion of his broadcast Murrow hinted once again at his belief that the public needed to know about the evils of the world, even if it makes them feel uncomfortable: “If I’ve offended you by this mild account of Buchenwald, I’m not in the least sorry” (Bliss, 1967, p. 94).

For Murrow the horrific revelations at the German concentration camps were another indicator of the dangers of being insulated from the real threats of the world. Rumors had been circulating among the Allies for many years about what was going on at these camps (Bernstein, & Lubertozzi, 2005), but many people refused to believe it thinking it was simply outlandish propaganda (Seib, 2006). Many German citizens themselves claimed they did not know the scope of the cruelties being committed by their own soldiers, an assertion Murrow found hard to believe (Bernstein & Lubertozzi, 2005). Whether it was the Allies or the German people themselves, Murrow’s visit to Buchenwald must have been a striking example to him of how dangerous it is to be distracted and deluded from the realities that exist in the world, as horrific as they might be.

After the war, Murrow focused his attention on different kind of threat to America. When the threat of Communism led McCarthy and others in power to trample on people’s civil liberties, Murrow again attempted to wake Americans from any diversions and make them fully aware of the risk to their freedoms. He did this first with his *See It Now* broadcast of *The Case of*

Milo Radulovich (Friendly, 1967), which highlighted the plight of one individual, and later with the *Report on Senator McCarthy*, which confronted the senator's Red Scare tactics head on (Persico, 1990). Murrow's broadcasts were his attempt to draw the public's attention away from the distraction that was the fear being generated by Senator McCarthy and his followers and focus it on the immediate threat to their liberties. Murrow certainly realized that the threat of Communism was real, but he also recognized the dangers that fear can have when it becomes a tool of manipulation. He attempted to wake America up to that reality.

Whether it was during World War II or during the Cold War, Murrow displayed a commitment to informing the public about impending dangers. For him, a willingness to do whatever was necessary to get Americans to focus on those threats was a reasonable and rational response. It would be expected that he would see distractions from serious world issues as imminent threat to the American public and the basis of a rational argument targeted towards a universal audience.

Controversy can be constructive. Another ongoing appeal to the universal audience in Murrow's address is that stirring up controversy by talking about issues that generate public debate can have a positive outcome. He believed that once citizens became aware of the important issues of the day, it would lead to a public discourse that would help in dealing with the problems that faced America. Murrow (1965) expresses this concept through quoting World War I correspondent and *New York World* columnist Heywood Broun:

> I am frightened by the imbalance, the constant striving to reach the largest possible audience for everything; by the absence of a sustained study of the state of the nation. Heywood Broun once said, "No body politic is healthy until it begins to itch." I would

> like television to produce some itching pills rather than this endless outpouring of tranquilizers. It can be done. Maybe it won't be, but it could. (p. 30)

Murrow wanted broadcasting not only to begin to lead people away from distraction, but stir up some positive anxiety. He wanted listeners and viewers to begin to feel uncomfortable about what was going on in the world. Murrow believed that only then might the public begin to be engaged in world affairs and confront the challenges that they had been hiding from through watching constant entertainment programming.

Murrow (1965) continues this line of argument by offering evidence from his past experiences that would support his assertion that covering contentious topics can lead to a positive outcome: “I have reason to know, as do many of you, that when the evidence on a controversial subject is fairly and calmly presented, the public recognizes it for what it is--an effort to illuminate rather than to agitate” (p. 28). Murrow goes on to describe a broadcast concerning relations between Egypt and Israel and the naysayers that urged him not to confront such a topic saying “it is an emotion-packed controversy, and there is no room for reason in it” (p. 28). According to Murrow the broadcast received a positive response from officials on both sides of the debate who described it as a “fair account,” and saying that “the information was there. We have no complaints” (p. 28).

This account is a description of a *See It Now* broadcast from early in 1956 with Murrow covering the Israeli side of the debate while Howard K. Smith filed a report from Egypt (Persico, 1988). The controversy began after the U.S. had withdrawn American aid for the Egyptians to build a dam at Aswan (Sperber, 1986). This move caused the Egyptians to turn to the Soviets for support, which led to more intense anti-Israeli sentiments (Kendrick, 1969). By late 1956, Egypt would nationalize the Suez Canal, which would lead to start of the Suez War.

Murrow and Smith were there beforehand to cover the controversy that would eventually lead to a military confrontation. Murrow interviewed Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion and Smith talked to Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. At the end, the two reporters joined together to present a balanced report on the region (Persico, 1988). The *See It Now* telecast titled *The Arab-Israeli Crisis* aired in March of 1956 and in July Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, setting off the Suez War (Persico, 1988). Despite the broadcast not leading to a resolution to the conflict, during that time Murrow wrote to a friend describing what he considered to be the goals of the broadcast: "I don't expect anybody to agree with all of it, but at least the Arabs and Jews get a better opportunity that they had…. to express their views (Sperber, 1986, p. 508). Murrow realized covering a controversial subject like Arab-Israeli relations would not always lead to definitive solution, but he saw value in creating a better understanding of such issues.

Murrow (1965) continues to appeal to a universal audience by offering another example in which a controversial subject was covered and received a positive response, this time dealing with the supposed connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer: "Both the medical profession and the tobacco industry cooperated in a rather wary fashion. But in the end of the day they were both reasonably content" (p. 28). Murrow covered the debate in two *See It Now* telecasts, one reporting the cigarette cancer argument and other presenting the opposing viewpoint. He took on the debate despite the fact that cigarette companies were major sponsors of network programming (Kendrick, 1969).

The *See It Now* telecasts were the first television programs to cover the debate and came out nine years before the Surgeon General Report would say that smoking cigarettes was the major cause of lung cancer (Kendrick, 1969). A chain smoker himself, Murrow stated no definitive conclusions to viewers concerning the connection between cigarettes and cancer, but argued in favor of confronting the topic, saying that it was “the only ground upon which opinion and action can be based” (Kendrick, 1969, p. 381). With this example, Murrow again shows the benefits of tackling controversial topics. For Murrow, it was only through debate and careful consideration of the facts that one could make a wise decision. That was an argument that he expected any reasonable person to accept.

Murrow goes on to cite one more example of how making people aware of controversial topics can lead to positive outcomes. The issue was one that certainly on the minds of many during the Cold War: “The subject of radioactive fall-out and the banning of nuclear tests was, and is, highly controversial. But according to what little evidence there is, viewers were prepared to listen to both sides with reason and restraint” (Murrow, 1965, p. 28). Murrow was referring to the *See It Now* broadcast titled *Atomic Timetable: Radiation and Fallout* from the program’s seventh season (“See It Now”). It was one of the last episodes of *See It Now* to air on television and featured interviews from Dr. Willard F. Libby of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and Dr. Linus Pauling, the chairman of the Anti-Testing Group (The Paley Center for Media). The program explored both the benefits of nuclear energy and its destructive nature, trying to strike a balance between the opposing groups.

These examples cited by Murrow demonstrate how he believed a rational, informative discussion is one that is worthy and effective among audiences. He used these instances from his past to demonstrate, as he states in his RTNDA address, “that timidity in these areas is not warranted by the evidence” (p. 28). He evokes the universal audience with this claim by providing factual evidence through several examples to support his ideas. He has seen for himself that discussion of controversial topics has benefits in a society and he was attempting to convince others of this fundamental truth.

Murrow (1965) goes onto to deter those who might argue against the negative impact of broadcasting reports about provocative topics. He questions those stakeholders who might speak out against his ideas, including network executives and the corporations who support the programs:

> Would the corporate image of their respective sponsors be damaged? Would the stockholders rise up in their wrath and complain? Would anything happen other than that a few million people would have received a little illumination on subjects that may well determine the future of this country, and therefore the future of the corporations? (p. 31)

Murrow is vocalizing some of likely criticisms that some might have against his idea of properly informing the public of controversial topics. In a sense he is carrying out what Nicolas (2011) refers to as the imagined “interlocutor” (p. 52) that offers likely objections so the speaker’s assertions. In this case, Murrow includes those objections in the address itself and answers them accordingly. In doing so, Murrow attempts to prove that there is no rational argument against the idea of informing the public concerning controversial topics that impact their lives. He also extends the impact of not keeping the public properly informed to the corporations themselves, asserting that it is in their own best interests to maintain a healthy democracy. If the nation collapses because it was unaware of the dangers that lie outside its borders, the corporate world falls with it. By providing informative, impactful programming, Murrow contends that corporations would be assuring their own futures.

Greed should not supersede societal responsibility. Murrow further evokes the universal audience with his arguments that the pursuit of money should not get in the way of the industry’s responsibility to the public. Murrow believed the power of the media brought with it a duty to properly inform the citizenry even though that choice might not always be lucrative for the networks and the corporations that sponsored them. His contention was that along with the seemingly endless broadcasts of game shows, comedies, and other profitable programs, the industry had a responsibility to offer informative, thought-provoking fare to its viewers.

Murrow (1965) suggests that like newspapers, broadcasting should also engage its viewers with occasional editorial content, but that the concern over profits often gets in the way:

> Editorials would not be profitable; if they had a cutting edge, they might even offend. It is much easier, much less troublesome, to use the money-making machine of television and radio merely as a conduit through which to channel anything that is not libelous, obscene or defamatory. In that way one has the illusion of power without responsibility. (p. 29)

This suggestion of editorial content certainly was based on Murrow's own experiences when he went beyond the typical goal of objectivity in covering the events of the day and offered his own thoughts to viewers on matters he believed were vitals to their interests. In those instances he risked his personal profits in keeping his job to inform the public about controversial issues he believed were crucial to the future of the nation.

The most striking example of Murrow placing what he believed to be his obligation to society over his own personal gain was the *See It Now* broadcasts that confronted McCarthyism. Even though he was faced with potential negative consequences from network executives, sponsors, and much of the public, Murrow voiced his concerns about what was happening to the nation because of the fear McCarthy was fueling. We see an indication of his belief in the civic duty of broadcasting to confront such issues when towards the end of the McCarthy *See It Now* broadcast he makes the following admonition:

> This is no time for those who oppose Senator McCarthy's methods to keep silent, or for those who approve. We can deny our heritage and our history but we cannot escape

responsibility for the result. There is no way for a citizen of a republic to abdicate his responsibilities. (Kendrick, 1969, p. 53)

In talking about "responsibilities" Murrow was also including himself. He was making a case to viewers to why he was taking an outspoken stance against the senator. With this statement Murrow is also calling on news organizations to confront difficult topics like McCarthyism. He believed there is a responsibility for the outcome that comes with remaining silent on such topics, as was the case with McCarthy's scare tactics.

In his RTNDA address, Murrow certainly would have been considering his confrontation with McCarthy when he talked about putting duty ahead of profit. He was presenting his case that with the "power" that broadcasting wields, it also has the "responsibility" that comes with it (Murrow, 1965, p. 29). He was basing his rational argument on his belief that the nation can potentially be negatively impacted when the broadcasting industry refuses to put its obligations to the public ahead of monetary gains. Murrow saw for himself the need to fulfill that responsibility and accomplished it with his *See It Now* broadcasts. He would expect the same of the industry as a whole.

Murrow continues his appeal that broadcasting must place the public ahead of profits by taking a nostalgic look at the industry's past. He reminds his audience of the early days of radio when he believed broadcasting did a better job of fulfilling its obligation to society.

> In order to progress, it need only go backward. To the time when singing commercials were not allowed on news reports, when there was no middle commercial in a 15-minute news report, when radio was rather proud, alert and fast. I recently asked a network official, "Why this great rash of five-minute news reports (including three commercials) on weekends?" He replied, "Because that seems to be the only thing we can sell." (p. 29)

The implication of this example is that broadcasting as an industry has lost its way. By refusing to provide a sufficient amount of news to listeners for the sole reason that it is not able to being in advertising dollars, Murrow is declaring that radio is shirking it obligations. Instead of improving in its efforts to fulfill its obligations to the public, it has let greed creep in and get in the way of it primary responsibilities.

Murrow drives this point home further by questioning whether what the stations are offering can even be considered to be worthwhile: “If radio news is to be regarded as a commodity, only acceptable when saleable, then I don't care what you call it--I say it isn't news” (p. 29). Murrow draws a distinct line here between what should be a station’s obligation and what is optional depending on whether it can attract a sponsor. If the amount of news available to public is dictated solely by sponsorship, the public has the potential to miss out on crucial information they need to function in society. Murrow believed greed should not get in the way of what was good for the nation. For him this was a fundamental truth he believed any rational and reasonable audience would respond to appropriately.

Murrow argues that three minutes is not enough time for news and that the only person who was able to provide just three minutes of content and make it worthwhile was Elmer Davis. Davis was a radio commentator for CBS News during World War II and drew 12 million listeners a night with his nightly broadcasts (Kendrick, 1969). In bringing up Davis’s name, Murrow is once again looking at broadcasting’s past to make a case that its present and future are both in jeopardy. Murrow admired Elmer’s radio commentaries that were “concise, biting,” and “witheringly accurate” (Sperber, 1986, p. 196). Davis was also one of the earliest commentators to voice his criticism of Sen. Joseph McCarthy and his tactics (Persico, 1988). For Murrow Davis would have been an appropriate example to hold up as someone that would exemplify what radio news should be.

Murrow's argument to the universal audience that greed should not get in the way of radio's social responsibility was also based on his own experiences with radio. Murrow's radio reports helped to define what the medium was capable of accomplishing in covering the events of the world. He had helped transform the concept of radio news into one, as he put it, that was "rather proud, alert and fast" (Murrow, 1965, p. 29). When he uses the word "rather" Murrow incorporates the trope of litotes, which is "understatement that intensifies meaning" (Gross & Dearin, p. 119). Murrow's years with radio created news reports that most other broadcast journalists would describe as very proud, alert, and fast, particularly his reporting during World War II. His understatement is a reminder to the audience that radio, when freed from corporate greed, is capable of serving the public well. It had done so effectively in the past, and it was capable of doing so again.

Murrow continues to point the audiences' eyes towards to the past when he refers to a time when informational programming was treated with a greater sense of respect and importance. He contrasts that with how he sees the networks handling news personnel in the current climate when, despite record network profits, just the "fear of reduction in business" results "in an immediate cutback in bodies in the news and public affairs department" (Murrow, 1965, p. 29). He follows the example with the following conclusion: "We would all agree, I think, that whether on a station or a network, the stapling machine is a poor substitute for a newsroom typewriter" (p. 29). Here Murrow is appealing to all rational beings believing that there is no other logical conclusion than to concur with his assessment that it is better to invest in tools that can provide news rather than to sacrifice them for the sake of profits. Throughout his career, Murrow had been allowed to have state-of-the-art equipment and a staff of talented news reporters. He was given all the necessary tools to produce high quality programming, whether it was broadcasting at various locations during World War II or traveling the globe with his *See It Now* program. For Murrow there was no question that a quality news product required a substantial financial commitment and the networks were obligated to make such an investment, even if it meant cutting into their profit margin.

Murrow then focuses his attention on the problem he sees with how television news is putting profit ahead of its responsibilities. In crafting an argument for a universal audience centered on facts, Murrow (1965) turns to another concrete example to make what he considers an irrefutable point about broadcasting's pursuit of dollars over duty. In doing so, he again alludes to the ongoing threat of Communist nations:

> Not so long ago the President of the United States delivered a television address to the nation. He was discoursing on the possibility or probability of war between this nation and the Soviet Union and Communist China--a reasonably compelling subject. Two networks CBS and NBC, delayed that broadcast for an hour and fifteen minutes. If this decision was dictated by anything other than financial reasons, the networks didn't deign to explain those reasons. That hour-and-fifteen-minute delay, by the way, is about twice the time required for an ICBM to travel from the Soviet Union to major targets in the United States. (pp. 29-30)

With this example Murrow appeals to the universal by describing the subject as "reasonably compelling." He assumes that any rational human being would see that a potential military conflict between two major Communist powers would be a topic that the public needed to know about. The issue is so serious and captivating that it supersedes any other concern, including commercial interests.

Murrow offers a comparison to reinforce his contention that the networks put the public at risk when they let greed get in the way of news judgment. He contrasts the time of their delay of the president's speech with the time it would take for Soviet missiles to reach U.S. targets. This was certainly an extreme illustration, but Murrow offered it as a hyperbolic example of what commercial concerns could cost the U.S. if they got in the way of news that he believed was vital for citizens to know about. He is basically asking the question, "If the topic of war between the Soviets and China is not important enough to interrupt commercial broadcasting, what would be?" He is implying that if the current trends continue, the networks may no longer be willing to answer that question appropriately and that the nation will suffer as a result.

In formulating his idea of what would appeal to the universal, Murrow offered a choice that he believed no reasonable person could counter. The mood of the nation during the early stages of the cold war included a heightened fear of a nuclear exchange. The subject of the prospect of war between super powers was one he believed was the ultimate example of information crucial to the survival of the nation. News that is crucial to the survival of the nation should logically trump any concerns of financial gain.

As part of this example, Murrow (1965) also makes the point that "there is no law which says that dollars will be defeated by duty" (p. 29). He again points to the theme of legal obligations later in his speech in reference to network earnings: "…I can find nothing in the Bill of Rights or the Communications Act which says that they must increase their net profits each year, lest the Republic collapse" (p. 30)." With these statements, Murrow is countering any potential excuse that broadcasters might formulate to defend their position of withholding such important information. By referring to a "law" and the "Communications Act" Murrow is asking the networks to consider what their true legal obligations are to society. If pursuit of profit is not embedded within their legal responsibilities to the public, what is?

Murrow (1965) continues to lay out the facts to support his case by reminding stations of their legal requirements in broadcasting to the public:

> Every licensee who applies for a grant to operate in the public interest, convenience and necessity makes certain promises as to what he will do in terms of program content. Many recipients of licenses have, in blunt language, welshed on those promises. The money-making machine somehow blunts their memories. (p. 30)

Murrow appeals to the universal by stating a given fact–that stations have a legal responsibility to serve the public. As part of their license agreements with the Federal Communications Commission broadcast stations promise to carry out their daily functions working "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" (Barnouw, 1966). He his reminding them that putting the public ahead of their profits is not just something that they should do, but it is a commitment they are legally bound to fulfill.

The requirement to operate in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" was ambiguous even when the FCC first issued the directive (Barkin, 2003). The Commission had no legal mandate that stations include news as part of their programming, but "made it clear that public service broadcasts, news among them, would be a critical factor in deciding among applicants for licenses and in granting licensee renewals" (Mickelson, 1998, p. 8). For Murrow the phrase had clear meaning, however, which was certainly based on his background as an influential newscaster. He had made a career out of broadcasting reports that he believed were in the public's best interest, whether it was telecasts concerning segregation, McCarthyism, or the debate of cigarettes and cancer. He had tried to exemplify what it meant to cover news in the public's best interest and he was now making a case that broadcasting was no longer meeting that obligation by putting profits ahead of that mission. For him there was no question that stations were legally obligated to cover the hard news issues of the day appropriately.

Murrow's RTNDA was based on what he considered to be "real" in the midst of complex and dangerous world. As defined by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) the "real" is composed of "facts, truths and presumptions" (p. 66). While the goal is present an argument that is "self-evident, and possess and absolute and timeless validity" (p. 32), as Frank (1998) asserts, it is still dependent on "the speaker's experience, culture and time-period" (p. 124) since it is a construction in the mind of the speaker. Murrow based his arguments to the universal audience of the dangers of distraction, the benefits of covering controversy, and the need to put social responsibility ahead of profits on his background as a journalist and the state of the world as he observed it. By using several examples and taking his audience through what he believed were logical choices, he formulated an argument to the universal.

Also indicative of the universal audience, Murrow was attempting to unify his audience towards a specific action. As Crosswhite (2010) expounds in relation to the universal, the goal is often to bring groups with different perspectives together by finding commonalities that are based on fact and reason. Murrow crafted much of his argument in this manner, appealing to what he would consider to be rational human beings. In doing so, he was also calling his audience to respond to his message as described by Frank and Bolduc's (2004) concept of "reasoned action." Murrow clearly detailed the problem and how it could impact the nation. He wanted others to see the urgency of the issue and respond by doing what they could to fix the situation and he appealed to reason and rational thought to accomplish that goal.

Murrow's Appeal to the Particular Using Presence

In addition to his appeal to the universal, Murrow also appealed to the particular audience of broadcast journalists, drawing upon their shared devotion for the profession and a belief that it holds a special place in protecting a democratic society. This address to the particular included two major assertions: a) broadcasting is a moral endeavor and b) the moral struggle concerning the profession lies at the top. These points speak to "values" and "hierarchies of values" as described by Ray (1978) in his discussion of the particular audience. Murrow and many others in the profession saw themselves as providing an invaluable service to society that was crucial to its survival. They wanted to believe that they could make a difference if only they could be unshackled by the corporate greed that was corrupting their otherwise moral profession.

In crafting these appeals to the particular, there is also evidence of establishing "presence" as described by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969). This is evident through Murrow's use of metaphors and analogies, which Murphy (1994) and Measell (1989) contend can become important in establishing presence. As detailed by Jenkins (2007), Murrow also worked at connecting his arguments to the particular audience through "timeliness and proximity" so that his fellow broadcasters felt "invested" in the argument (p. 407). In creating presence, however, Murrow also places other facts and lines of argumentation in the background. As described by Gross (2005) this can suppress elements that the speaker might find undesirable. In Murrow's case, he places the responsibility viewers have in embracing informational programming in the background, instead placing the burden solely on the corporate structure. He also downplays his own disagreements with CBS, including the cancelation of his *See It Now* program. Murrow also deemphasized the individual dilemmas and responsibilities related to the broadcasting industry. This is seen in his lack of attention to the compromises individual reporters might face; such as some contend he did when hosting the popular but fluffy *Person to Person* program.

Broadcasting is a moral endeavor. Throughout his RTNDA address, Murrow speaks to the particular audience by picturing broadcast journalism as not just a profession, but a moral pursuit. While laying a rational argument that citizens need to be informed about controversy, he speaks to the particular by contending that broadcasting has the wondrous tools to carry out that mission, and those who work at that task are fulfilling a special calling. In doing so, he is appealing the values that broadcast journalists would hold in high regard. Most would naturally want to see their profession as one that is vital to society.

Murrow (1965) establishes this tone of reverence for broadcast journalism early on in his speech by address the audience in the room as individuals who "labor in this vineyard that produces words and pictures" (p. 27). Here Murrow creates a metaphor where the broadcast journalism is equated to a "vineyard." Following Gross and Dearin's (2003) description of a metaphor, broadcast journalism is the theme of the metaphor while a vineyard becomes the *phoros*, or the "subject-matter to which the theme is being compared" (p. 121). By painting a picture of a vineyard Murrow is alluding to broadcast journalism as a profession that should bear fruit. The expectation is that the toil and effort that broadcast journalists put in on a daily basis should result in reports that feed and nurture society. This illustration of a garden also hints at what Murrow will discuss throughout his speech. Like the Biblical image of the snake in the Garden of Eden, greed has corrupted the productive vineyard of the broadcast journalism. Murrow (1965) continues to set broadcast journalism apart from any other profession by describing the technical wonders of the industry and the obligations it bestows upon those who choose to be a part of the profession:

> You will forgive me for not telling you that instruments with which you work are miraculous, that your responsibility is unprecedented or that your aspirations are frequently frustrated. It is not necessary to remind you that the fact that your voice is amplified to the degree where it reaches from one end of the country to the other does not confer upon you greater wisdom or understanding than you possessed when your voice reached only from one end of the bar to the other. All of these things you know. (p. 27)

Murrow apologizes for not telling the broadcasters in the room what he sees as the values and concerns related to the profession because they should already know them, but obviously by listing these items it does act as a reminder.

Murrow (1965) first describes the two segments of broadcasting–television and radio–as "instruments" (p. 27). Murrow's connection of radio and television as "instruments" is an ongoing theme throughout his address. He describes how "these instruments have been good to me beyond my due," (p. 27), shows concerns for what "these two instruments are doing to our society" (p. 27), and speaks of "the obligation of these instruments" (p. 30). Seven times throughout his address Murrow refers to radio and television as "instruments," implying that they should be more than just a distraction, but they also have a purpose. For Murrow this purpose was to inform the public concerning the important issues of the day.

Immediately after his first reference to radio and television as "instruments" he links them to the duty of broadcasters: "your responsibility is unprecedented" (p. 27). He is connecting the power and purpose of the instruments to the moral obligation of those who accept the challenge to use them in informing the public. The term "unprecedented" implies an obligation like no other. With the power that these instruments wield and the dangers that the nation finds itself in, it is up to broadcast journalists to carry out their duties. Murrow bestows upon those in his profession a special standing– they have a unique task and the instruments to fulfill that mission.

The early reference and the continual repetition of the term “instruments” in describing broadcasting is indicative of establishing presence in an address. As Gross and Dearin (2003) describe, continual use of a stylistic element can formulate patterns that have a “synergistic” effect (p. 137). Murrow continually reminded his audience that radio and television were to be connected to a moral purpose. Broadcasting was not meant to simply be a distraction, but should and must become something more. Murrow continually put that idea to the fore by describing television and radio in such a reverential manner.

Murrow continues reminding his peers about their current situation by asserting that their “aspirations are frequently frustrated” (p. 27). This statement again speaks to what Murrow sees as broadcast journalists’ moral obligations to the audience they serve. The implication is that the “laborers” in the “vineyard” know what the “instruments” should be used for, but that others who have a different agenda often thwart their efforts. This certainly would have been a situation that Murrow felt he understood well. His critically acclaimed *See It Now* documentary program had been canceled in favor of more profitable entertainment programming. Even when it was on the air, he continually struggled with convincing network executives of the benefits of covering controversial programming. He had become frustrated with others constantly obstructing his own aspirations for broadcasting.

Murrow (1965) concludes his opening acknowledgement of his fellow broadcasters by reminding them that just having the instruments that can broadcast their voices across the country does not give them “greater wisdom or understanding” (p. 27). For Murrow is was not enough to wield the instruments of broadcasting and radio, one had to be aware of the obligations that came with them. Murrow had witnessed for himself how those who control the airwaves had been misusing them. For him it was obvious that just having the power radio and television at one's disposal did not provide greater wisdom, otherwise the nation would not be in the situation it found itself in concerning broadcasting.

In relation to presence, this opening address to the particular audience establishes the tone of what is to follow throughout the address. By placing this "non-reminder" early in his address, which actually acts as a reminder, Murrow establishes the instruments of broadcasting as powerful, those who work with them in regards to news as fulfilling a moral obligation, and acknowledges that there are those at work against their best efforts. Murrow is establishing his connection with the audience by recognizing both what they find appealing about the industry and the frustrations they are currently facing. The particular audience of broadcasters becomes immediately invested in Murrow's arguments because they recognize an adherence to his words of reverence to the profession and the frustrations that come with it.

Murrow (1965) continues to tap into the values that his fellow broadcasters have concerning their profession when he begins to describe his solution to the problem of a lack of informational programming:

> But I have said, and I believe, that potentially we have in this country a free enterprise system of radio and television, which is superior to any other. But to achieve its promise, it must be both free and enterprising. (p. 30)

Murrow once again appeals to the particular audience of broadcasters by setting the American system of broadcasting above that of any other nation. This would have certainly been a welcomed reassurance to the broadcasters listening to his speech that they were a part of a unique and worthy profession. Despite the frustrations they faced, Murrow wanted to remind them that when the broadcasting industry is carried out in the way it should, there none better.

In making his appeal to the particular audience, Murrow incorporates the trope of *ploce*, which is the repetition of words where “on its reappearance its meaning is altered” (Gross & Dearin, 2003, p. 124). Murrow (1965) mentions that we have a free enterprise system, but only when it is both “free” and “enterprising” (p. 30). The first reference combining the two words acts as a common positive descriptor of the American broadcasting industry, while separating them on the second reference works as criticism. Murrow is implying that broadcasting is a moral endeavor when it lives up to the promise of the both, but that broadcast journalists are not being allowed to fulfill that obligation. They are not “free” to carry out “enterprising” journalism that could benefit society.

Murrow (1965) further alludes to the moral responsibilities of the broadcasting profession when he poses a question concerning the time it spends informing the public:

> Do we merely stay in our comfortable nests, concluding that the obligation of these instruments has been discharged when we work at the job of informing the public for a minimum of time? Or do we believe that the preservation of the Republic is a seven-day-a-week job, demanding more awareness, better skills and more perseverance than we have yet contemplated. (p. 30)

This is the second time Murrow uses the metaphor of a “comfortable nest” to describe the current state of broadcasting, with the theme being the industry and the *phoros* connected to the “comfortable nest.” The first time is at the very start of his address when he says at the end of his speech “a few people may accuse this reporter of fouling his own comfortable nest” (p. 27). The first reference was referring to his own situation. He implies that he had perhaps been too complacent and benefitted from the situation too long before deciding to make a public stand.

With his second reference Murrow (1965) goes from the singular to the plural, asserting that every broadcaster in the industry has created their own “comfortable nests.” He quickly follows by reminding them of “obligation of these instruments” (p. 30). In doing so, he implies that there is a moral responsibility that accompanies being a part of the broadcast journalism profession and that they have been protecting themselves from it through their complacency. In a similar way the audience has been distracted from the realities of the world, broadcast journalists have often been distracted from their obligations by their daily duties to supply the minimal amount of news that is required of them. Murrow implies that it is their moral obligation to do more.

Just as he began by alluding to the wondrous nature of the technology involved in radio and television and the moral responsibilities connected with that power, Murrow concludes his address by once again reflecting on those ideas. Murrow (1965) puts forth the hypothetical question of what would happen if his conclusions related to the moral obligations related to broadcasting are incorrect:

> Because if they are right, and this instrument is good for nothing but to entertain, amuse and insulate, then the tube is flickering now and we will soon see that the whole struggle is lost. This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, and it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely wires and lights in a box. (p. 32)

With this statement Murrow connects the people involved in broadcasting with their ethical duties. The technology involved with broadcasting brings with it an obligation to serve the public, but that can only happen if those involved with the profession fulfill that mission. Without that moral compass to guide them, the marvelous technology associated with broadcasting is meaningless.

Murrow had a personal connection with the advances in broadcasting technology with the purpose of serving the public. He had been a part of the live innovative multi-city radio broadcast throughout Europe just before World War II when Germany annexed Austria (Sperber, 1986). In doing so, he was able to warn America about the impending menace that Nazi Germany would pose to the rest of the world. With the start of the *See It Now*, he treated viewers to the first connection of images from both coasts of the U.S. (Persico, 1990). Throughout the program's run, Murrow used the power of television to inform the public about the important issues of the day.

It is also understandable that Murrow would connect the powerful capabilities of broadcasting's technology with a moral obligation to use them for good based on his own background. As Sperber (1986) asserts, Murrow's Quaker upbringing taught him "individual responsibility" and a "connection between one's actions and what happened in the world" (p. 16). As a broadcaster with the power of radio and television at his disposal, Murrow felt a moral responsibility to positively impact society. This sense of duty likely also came from his interest in the works of Roman philosopher Marcus Aurelius, who advocated basing one's actions on a strong moral foundation in order to live a happy life (Persico, 1990). This ethical background translated into his message to his fellow broadcasters–your profession is a moral pursuit when carried out properly.

Placing this final appeal concerning the moral obligations of the profession at the end of his address again speaks to Murrow's (1965) use of presence in his speech. At the start of his speech he describes the technology involved with broadcasting as “miraculous” (p. 27), but now at the end he counters that by downplaying the miraculous nature of these instruments if they are not used properly. He entire speech was an indictment of the industry and how greed had impeded its obligations to the public. Without that moral foundation to keep broadcasting on course, the technology was no longer “miraculous,” but merely “wires and lights in a box” (p. 32). By placing this description at the end of his address, Murrow completes the transformation of the industry as one that elicits wonderment to one that is technology with no purpose. Murrow gives presence to this image through placement, only after he has made his case as to why broadcasting is degenerating into a meaningless channel through which to pass along sounds and images.

The particular audience of fellow broadcasters would have also likely responded to such drastic imagery associated with their profession. Part of their choice in becoming broadcast journalists was likely because of the potential they saw in the technology associated with the field of broadcast journalism. They had been a part of the early days of television, witnessing the progression of television news as it brought information into the living rooms of Americans. To hear the technology involved with their profession as “merely wires and lights in a box” (Murrow, 1965, p. 32) must have been a striking image that gave them pause. The television news directors and others in the room certainly did not want their profession to become irrelevant.

Murrow (1965) made a concerted effort to remind the particular audience of broadcast journalists of the moral responsibilities associated with their career choice. Based on his own code of ethics established in his youth and demonstrated through various points in his career, Murrow connected the power that radio and television offer with an obligation to use them to benefit society. For him broadcasting was a moral pursuit that had become corrupted, not by the "journeymen" (p. 27) who hold similar aspirations for the industry, but by powers that were beyond their control.

The moral struggle lies at the top. Murrow's appeal to the particular audience of broadcast journalist continued with the argument that the battle in maintaining the moral standards of the industry can only be resolved at the top of the broadcasting structure. This message would have been appealing to the broadcast journalists he was addressing since it reinforced their own frustrations and placed the blame with the corporate heads and network executives. Murrow gave presence to his argument that the responsibility for demoralizing broadcasting rested with the corporate heads. At the same time he deemphasized the role of the individual in the struggle for maintaining the moral foundation of the industry.

One of Murrow's (1965) main contentions is that the wrong people are in charge of making decision about news content. He argues that the business of news, entertainment, and advertising are by their nature "incompatible" (p. 29) and that the leaders of the networks were trained in sales or entertainment and do not have the proper knowledge concerning news and informational programming. According to Murrow giving these individuals power over news divisions is unwise: "But by the nature of the corporate structure, they also make the final and crucial decisions having to do with news and public affairs. Frequently they have neither the time nor the competence to do this" (p. 29). Murrow goes on to list many of their daily duties related to the business and entertainment aspects of the industry and then contends that it is therefore impossible for them "to give mature, thoughtful consideration to the manifold problems that confront those who are charged with the responsibility for news and public affairs" (p. 29). Murrow believes that because most networks executives were never involved in news themselves, they are oblivious to the responsibilities that come with the profession. Moreover, they are distracted by all of their other duties. They are therefore not prepared to address the moral obligations that come with broadcast journalism.

Murrow illustrates his contention that the current leadership is incapable of making the proper choices concerning news by discussing the delay in a speech by the president concerning a possible war between China and the Soviet Union. After stressing the inherent dangers of keeping such vital information from the public, Murrow (1965) makes it clear he finds the leadership at fault: “It is difficult to believe that this decision was made by men who love, respect and understand news.” (p. 30) Murrow implies that when confronted with this situation network executives had a crucial choice to make: delay the president’s speech for the sake of profits or fulfill the moral obligation that comes with news. For Murrow, this was just one of many ethical decisions related to news where the leadership failed miserably.

An indictment of the network leadership would have been a message welcomed by the particular audience of broadcast journalists. In accepting their charge to serve the public by providing news and informational programming, there was likely the belief that their division should have greater status and support and that decisions related to news should supersede other concerns. Murrow was able to tap into this shared value concerning news content by reinforcing their own beliefs that the leadership of the networks were making the wrong choices and were ill prepared to guide news divisions.

Murrow (1965) also asserts that network executives often look to the wrong source in making their choices, basing them more on political pressure rather than what is best for the public:

> A telephone call or a letter from the proper quarter in Washington is treated rather more seriously than a communication from an irate but not politically potent viewer. It is tempting enough to give away a little air time for frequently irresponsible and unwarranted utterances in an effort to temper the wind of criticism. (p. 29)

Murrow again implies that network executives do not have the proper background or understanding of the values associated with news to make the proper choice in these situations. They would rather succumb to the whims of those in political power than let their consciences be guided by what is best for the viewers.

Murrow's criticism is certainly based on his own experiences with network executives, particularly William Paley and other leaders of CBS. Murrow is addressing an audience full of broadcast journalists just a few months after his own frustrations over CBS granting air time to rebut his *See It Now* program concerning granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, even though Murrow believed he and Fred Friendly had offered a fair and balanced account (Sperber, 1986). While he failed to go into specifics, this statement was his way of voicing his displeasure once again over the decision and asserting that executives like Paley were not taking the moral stance that they should when it concerned decisions concerning news. Murrow realized that the particular audience of broadcast journalists had likely faced similar debates with those in charge of their news divisions. He is reaffirming their belief that those making decisions concerning news do not have the interests of viewers at heart.

While Murrow (1965) derides network executives concerning their news judgment, he does absolve them from the decisions related to programing on the networks:

> Do not be deluded into believing that the titular heads of the networks control what appears on their networks. They all have better taste. All are responsible to stockholders,

> and in my experience all are honorable men. But they must schedule what they can sell in the public market. (p. 30)

Murrow describes these leaders as "titular heads," implying that they have power in name only and that many of the decisions are out of their control. He even describes them as "honorable men," perhaps wanting to soften the blow of his criticism over their poor news judgment. Murrow was implying that the network executives did not knowingly make the wrong ethical decisions concerning news; they were simply ill trained and too busy with other concerns to make better choices. Murrow was likely also thinking of his long-time friend William Paley as he crafted this statement. Despite his disagreements and his frustrations with Paley's lack of support for *See It No*w, Murrow was still fond of Paley and was not willing to place all of the blame on his shoulders.

Murrow (1965) also suggests that the solution to this moral lapse cannot be found in government control. He contends that the "F.C.C. cannot or will not discipline" (p. 30) stations who do not provide worthwhile programming, and even if they did he acknowledges that many are uncomfortable with the government dictating what kind of programming the networks choose to air. Murrow seems to suggest that government agencies should not have to force the networks to air quality programming, even if it is part of their obligation under their license agreements to serve in the "public interest." He would rather that those involved in broadcasting recognize for themselves their moral obligation to serve the public.

That leaves unresolved who is ultimately to blame and who can possibly fix the problem. At this point in his speech Murrow draws attention to what follows by saying: "And this brings us to the nub of the question" (p. 30). Murrow is therefore giving presence to what is to follow. He is effectively telling the audience that what has come before has been building to this moment and he is now offering an answer to the question at hand. He is drawing his listeners to his next words.

Murrow follows by placing the blame related to the constant barrage of entertainment shows at the expense of informational programming on the corporate sponsors. Throughout his speech, he had defined the problem through examples and discussing the negative impact of distracting the public from global concerns. Murrow finally gets to what he sees as a possible solution by connecting the concept of the "corporate image" with a moral obligation to better society. Murrow (1965) seeks to redefine the term "corporate image" to include a responsibility to better serve the public:

> I am not precisely sure what this phrase means, but I would imagine that it reflects a desire on the part of the corporations who pay the advertising bills to have the public image, or believe that they are not merely bodies with no souls, panting in pursuit of elusive dollars. They would like us to believe that they can distinguish between the public good and the private or corporate gain. So the question is this: Are the big corporations who pay the freight for radio and television programs wise to use that time exclusively for the sale of goods and services? (p. 30)

Murrow constructs a metaphor that recognizes that corporations must also be concerned with not just financial, but also ethical concerns. By referring to them as "bodies with no souls," he implies that they currently have no moral compass. They have become entities with no inner conscience to guide them in the proper way to serve society.

Murrow's illustration of corporations needing to acquire a better moral foundation continues with his description of a plan to have the largest corporations give up some air time to make room for informational programming. Murrow (1965) even formulates the words these corporations can use to explain why they are choosing to give up the valuable airtime:

> This is a tiny tithe, just a little bit of our profits. On this particular night we aren't going to try to sell cigarettes or automobiles; this is merely a gesture to indicate our belief in the importance of ideas. (p. 31)

Murrow describes the sacrifice of this airtime using the metaphor "tithe," associating it with an offering to a church. This comparison implies an ongoing commitment. Murrow is suggesting that corporations must continually support the concept of informing the public about the important issues of the day. The use of the word "tithe" also points to a moral obligation. This is again an indication of Murrow's belief that the corporate world has demonstrated an ethical lapse by only supporting programming they know will attract the largest audience, resulting in greater profits for them.

Like he did with network executives, Murrow (1965) displays optimism that the heads of these companies will make the right decision if given the opportunity:

> I refuse to believe that the presidents and chairmen of the boards of these big corporations want their corporate image to consist exclusively of a solemn voice in an echo chamber or a pretty girl opening the door of a refrigerator, or a horse that talks. (p. 31)

Murrow contends that there are too many layers of personnel separating the corporate heads from what he calls the "realities of the mass media," (p. 31) and that if only the leaders of the corporations would be more focused on those concerns, they would be in a better position to make the right moral choices when it concerns programming. With this statement Murrow expresses optimism that corporations can be guided into making the right choices for the benefit of society. They need only to be convinced of the advantages of making the correct moral choice.

Murrow (1965) continues to endow presence to his contention that the moral struggle concerning broadcasting lies with the heads of industry. He accomplishes this by placing it towards the end of speech, reinforcing his position:

> The responsibility can be easily placed, in spite of all the mouthings about giving the public what it wants. It rests on big business, and on big television, and it rests at the top. Responsibility is not something that can be assigned or delegated. And it promises its own reward: good business and good television. (p. 32)

By placing this statement near the conclusion of his speech, it acts as a closing argument in Murrow's case against the industry. He had spent his address laying out examples of broadcasting's deficiencies in their service to the public and discussing the implications of keeping vital information from listeners and viewers. Murrow appeals to the particular audience of broadcast journalists by contending that they are in many respects victims of the corporate structure in which they labor every day. While warning them about the moral lapse within the industry, he asserts that the struggle for reclaiming what he sees as the overriding purpose of broadcasting lies at the top of structure. His fellow broadcast journalists are called to advocate for such changes; they have perhaps benefited from the current structure, but are blameless in its creation and ultimately powerless to make the corrections.

Viewing audience responsibility is diminished. By giving presence to his argument that those at the top of the corporate structure are ultimately to blame for the lack of news and information on the schedule, Murrow downplays the contributions of the public in influencing the lack of such programming. Murrow decries the corporate idea of reaching "for the largest possible audience" which leads to "this process of insulation, of escape from reality" (pp. 30-31), but never dares criticize the public for flocking to such fair. He instead deflects responsibility away from the viewers who choose to watch entertainment programming that distracts them from the realities of the world. In doing so, Murrow presents an idealistic view of the viewing public, who he asserts respond to informational programs in a rational manner.

In laying out his argument aimed at the universal audience, Murrow cited examples of *See It Now* telecasts that he contended illustrated the positive impact of dealing with controversial subjects. He asserted that since there were few complaints from both those involved with the stories and from viewers themselves, it was an indication that the fears networks had in carrying such programs were unwarranted. For Murrow, that lack of negative feedback acted as a rational argument to the benefits of such programs.

Within his argument, however, Murrow makes some broad statements that indicate an optimistic view of the viewing public. Murrow (1965), for example, describes an audience that would be receptive: "I am entirely persuaded that the American public is more reasonable, restrained and more mature than most of our industry's program planners believe. Their fear of controversy is not warranted by the evidence" (p. 28). Murrow reinforces this idea towards the end of his speech, again using the word "evidence" in describing his reasoning: "To those who say people wouldn't look; they wouldn't be interested; they're too complacent, indifferent and insulated, I can only reply: There is, in one reporter's opinion, considerable evidence against that contention" (p. 32). Murrow paints a picture of an audience that would respond positively to programming that includes controversial subjects. According to Murrow they would watch and react in a reasonable manner.

Murrow's evidence that the public would respond rationally to programming that deals with controversial topics was likely based on his own experiences with his *See It Now* program and particularly the telecasts that took on McCarthy. After the *Report on Senator McCarthy* aired, CBS was flooded with messages and letters from viewers, who by a large margin, were in agreement with Murrow's stance against McCarthy (Kendrick, 1969; Persico, 1990). For Murrow, this must have been an indication that all of his efforts to address controversial subjects such as McCarthyism were worthwhile. The public heard the information related to the debate and in his mind responded appropriately.

In evaluating the impact of other *See It Now* telecasts, Murrow suggests that lack of complaint also indicates a positive response from viewers. With the telecasts concerning Egyptian and Israeli relations and the cigarette and lung cancer debate, Murrow (1965) points to the satisfaction of both sides of those controversial topics as an indicator of their success. In the case of the tobacco debate, since both sides were "reasonably content" (p. 28) and therefore the program was successful. There was no mention of audience reaction in either of those examples. When mentioning the *See It Now* telecast concerning nuclear fallout Murrow's proof of audience response is also suspect: "But according to what little evidence there is, viewers were prepared to listen to both sides with reason and restraint" (p. 28). Murrow does not make it clear what "little evidence" there was concerning the audience response, but by using the word "restraint" his contention seems to be that if viewers did not call in and complain about the subject matter, that is an indication that the public responded rationally.

What Murrow fails to mention in his RTNDA address is that despite the critical acclaim *See It Now* garnered, it was never a ratings success among the public. Even when CBS moved the program to a prime time slot, few viewers gravitated towards the program. Even the celebrated *Report on Senator McCarthy*, as Merron (1988) points out, "was viewed in only 2,394,000 homes, a small audience even then for prime-time television." While the McCarthy debate that the program addressed did spark a reaction from the public, that interest did not translate into large numbers tuning into the program. Merron suggests that it was coverage of the broadcasts, not the telecasts themselves that often made the show impactful: "…what the critics thought important and noteworthy did not necessarily correspond to the viewing audience's opinion" (p. 6).

In his address Murrow downplays this lack of viewer support for his program, leading one to question some of the "evidence" that he provides. When Murrow he makes his argument that lack of criticism from viewers means that they responded appropriately to the subject matter, one could also conclude that lack of response simply means that few people were tuning into the telecasts. They did not respond negatively to a program concerning a contentious topic because of apathy towards the program entirely, not because they thought the subject was fairly and appropriately covered.

Murrow (1965) again displays his optimism towards listeners and viewers when he refers to them as "a troubled, apprehensive but receptive public" (p. 31). He elaborates on this description later in the address:

> For if the premise upon which our pluralistic society rests, which as I understand it is that if the people are given sufficient undiluted information, they will then somehow, even after long, sober second thoughts, reach the right decision--if that premise is wrong, then not only the corporate image but the corporations are done for. (p. 31)

With this statement Murrow articulates his concept of an ideal viewing audience, one that is willing to hear two sides a debate, and thoughtfully reach an appropriate conclusion. That was

Murrow's mission with many of his broadcasts, and he contends it is also the foundation of a democratic society.

By asserting that "if that premise wrong" the corporations are "done for," Murrow is implying that he does not believe that to be the case. He does believe in the power of an exchange of ideas and the ability of the public to make the appropriate decisions. He would rather believe the viewing public is wiser and more responsive, that they make the appropriate decisions if given the opportunity. He makes this assertion despite the tepid response among the viewers to his own *See It Now* program, which never attracted a large following. In the case of *See It Now*, viewers were given the opportunity to tune in to thoughtful discussions about important issues on a weekly basis and few chose to do so.

While it is possible, as was the case with the *Report on Senator McCarthy,* that even a low rated telecast can spark a lively debate on a topic, Murrow goes well beyond that single example in his assessment of the public. He implies that the audience will respond appropriately to all informative programming if given the opportunity. By ascribing these idealistic traits to the viewing audience, he diminishes their responsibility in creating a programming lineup full of entertainment offerings. The blame is instead placed solely on the corporate leaders who should fulfill their moral duty to society by providing such programming.

Downplay the responsibility of the public in fostering the state of broadcasting in the 1950's would also appeal to the particular audience of broadcast journalists. The news directors and others in the room certainly wanted to believe that there was an audience of listeners and viewers who were eager to tune into the news content they produced. Murrow's description of a citizenry that is made up individuals who would carefully consider the facts of a report and make appropriate decisions as a result must have been appealing to the broadcast journalists Murrow addressed. Ascribing such idealistic traits to the viewers reinforced the broadcast journalist's sense of purpose. It was a reassurance that their efforts would not be in vain if only they could be freed from the corporate greed that was plaguing the industry.

The struggle of the individual broadcaster is diminished. In putting the burden of maintaining the moral obligations of the broadcasting industry at the upper corporate level, Murrow also places in the background the struggle individuals can have within that structure. This can be found early in his address when he asserts: "These instruments have been good to me beyond my due. There exists in my mind no reasonable grounds for personal complaint. I have no feud, either with my employers, any sponsors, or with the professional critics of radio and television" (p. 27). Murrow gives the impression that his views on broadcasting are removed from any personal grievances that he might have with CBS and its leadership.

Murrow is being disingenuous with the audience when he states that he has no "grounds for personal complaint" and that he has no "feud" with his employer or sponsors. Murrow had seen his award-winning *See It Now* program demoted from a regular prime time to an occasional special (Sperber, 1986). Even worse, CBS decided to cash in on the valuable time slot *See It Now* was occupying, instead replacing it with the quiz show *Beat the Clock* (Persico, 1990). The occasional *See It Now* specials became less frequent, and Murrow and co-producer Fred Friendly became increasingly frustrated with the dwindling support they began to see from CBS. This was particularly apparent with what they perceived as a lack of effort in trying to acquire sponsors for the program (Persico, 1990).

There was also certainly "personal complaint" over the decision by CBS to grant air time to New York Senator John Pillion in response to what Murrow and Friendly believed was a balanced report on the issue of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii (Sperber, 1986). It was this dispute that led to co-producers Murrow and Friendly writing letters to CBS management stating that they could not continue to do the show if they were not consulted about such matters. CBS Chair of the Board William Paley used their ultimatum as the final reason to cancel *See It Now* (Friendly, 1967). Murrow had an ongoing dispute with his employer, but was not forthcoming about it at the start of his speech.

Murrow also had reason to be personally frustrated with the corporate sponsors that he had seen turn away from supporting *See It Now* during its run on CBS. Alcoa had dropped their financial support of the program, presumably over a *See It Now* telecast that criticized the Texas state government during a time when the company was hoping to expand operations there (Persico, 1990). General Motors had withdrawn their sponsorship of the 1955-56 season just before it was to begin over an upcoming episode the company perceived as criticizing Vice President Nixon. This force the CBS to sell the advertising time at dramatically reduced cost, further diminishing the value of *See It Now* to the network (Friendly, 1967). Murrow had seen for himself the fickle nature of corporate sponsors, who often acted out of their own interests rather than that of the public.

Murrow had also been increasingly voicing his concerns to friends and colleagues in the weeks leading up to his RTNDA address. Bernard Eismann, who became the CBS Chicago Bureau chief, recalled a conversation with Murrow a month before the speech at a dinner party during which Murrow told him: “Don’t fool yourself that television is a medium of education and elucidation. It’s an advertising medium and don’t forget it” (Persico, 1990, pp. 432-433). The young reporter was shocked at how openly bitter Murrow had become. During that time colleague Bill Leonard, who later became the head of CBS, recalled getting the impression that Murrow “despised where he was working” (p. 433). Murrow was opening displaying his frustrations to others in the profession, indicating that he had grounds for personal complaint with his employers.

In placing his personal grievances in the background and not making them more prominent in his address, Murrow is strategically giving presence to the larger issues that he sees as the greatest concern in broadcasting. He certainly could have reviewed in detail what happened to *See It Now*, including how the sponsors abandoned the program and the network withdrew its support. Murrow likely knew however, that many would perceive such an argument as simply a personal vendetta against CBS. His arguments would come across as more of a complaint over the status of his own career at the network rather than an expression of true concern about broadcasting. Any valid arguments imbedded within his account of the demise of *See It Now* would be overshadowed by the impression that he was lashing out at CBS over how it treated him and his program. Instead, Murrow decided to diminish his personal struggles with the growing corporate side of broadcast journalism.

By giving presence to the broader, corporate issues related to the industry at the expense of the personal battles, Murrow places the individual conflicts in the background. The battleground for the moral conscience of the industry is to be fought in the executive corporate offices, not in the newsrooms of local television stations. Certainly news directors and others in the RTNDA audience had faced debates with their own management concerning news content versus commercial interests. Murrow (1965) alludes to this when he mentions that their “aspirations are frequently frustrated” (p. 27), but he fails to go into further details. Instead, Murrow’s solution to their frustrations rests on the good will of corporate heads to sponsor occasional quality programming. Broadcast journalists are left applauding the grandiose concept, but are given little encouragement on how to face the moral struggle for broadcasting on an individual level.

Murrow also places in the background of his address what some considered to be his own contributions in creating a prime time schedule of programming that reflected the “escapism” Murrow was speaking out against. Murrow (1965) refers to potentially “fouling his own comfortable nest” (p. 27), but never goes into detail what that entails. For many television critics and colleagues, Murrow’s *Person to Person* was an indication Murrow had been benefiting from viewers’ appetite for programs since by hosting *Person to Person* Murrow earned a large part of his television income (Sperber, 1986). Part of Murrow’s “comfortable nest” that he was about to foul was *Person to Person*.

While others questions his motivations with hosting *Person to Person*, Murrow often justified his involvement by suggesting that he hosted the program in order to earn the right to do *See It Now* (Persico, 1990). Even though it may have started as a favor to two colleagues (Kendrick, 1969), Murrow insisted he continued to host *Person to Person* for the sake of the show he really wanted to produce. This implied that there was some kind of unofficial deal with the network–he would host the program if they would allow him to produce *See It Now*. Whether such an implied agreement ever existed or not, in the end it did not save *See It Now*. CBS cancelled the program and Murrow continued to host *Person to Person*.

In not mentioning his involvement with *Person to Person* as part of his address, Murrow fails to acknowledge that in order to function as part of the broadcasting industry he had to be a willing participant of the corporate structure. He hosted a program that many, including his longtime co-producer Fred Friendly, considered to be beneath him (Persico, 1991). While some may have judged Murrow as surrendering his convictions related to producing informational programming, he saw it as a compromise that allowed him to tackle controversial topics on *See It Now*. Murrow attempted to serve both what he saw as the needs of the network and the needs of the viewers.

By giving presence to the broader corporate struggle for broadcasting's moral direction and failing to mention what some would consider to be his own personal compromises, Murrow deemphasized the struggle the individual broadcaster has in balancing their journalistic obligations with those related to the corporate structure. His actions with hosting *Person to Person* suggest that within a commercial system of broadcasting Murrow realized that there is a give and take that occurs for the individual broadcaster. Like Murrow, television reporters are often confronted with having to make their own compromises because of the commercial nature of the industry. One day a reporter may be asked to cover a story that might have more entertainment than news value with the realization that the next day the subject matter may be more worthwhile. The individual must comply with the corporate requirements in order to perform their journalistic duties. These realities are suppressed in Murrow's speech.

Murrow crafted his RTNDA address in a way that would appeal to multiple audiences. He put forth a rational argument filled with factual examples to convince a universal audience that to continually distract the public is dangerous, that discussing controversial topics can be beneficial, and that greed should not get in the way of broadcasting's duty to society. In speaking to a particular audience of broadcast journalists, he incorporated the strategy of presence to emphasize his assertion that broadcasting is a moral pursuit and the battle for its soul lies at the top.

In endowing presence to his argument concerning the corporate battle for the ethical foundation of broadcasting, Murrow deemphasizes the roles of both the viewers and individual broadcasters. He creates an idealistic vision of the viewing public, asserting that they would respond reasonably to informational programming if only given the chance. His emphasis on the broader corporate struggle also downplays the dilemma individual broadcast journalists face in maintaining their own moral balance between serving the public and their employer.

CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDY OF BROADCASTING TEXTBOOKS

Introduction

In chapter two, I discussed the significance of Murrow to the broadcasting industry and placed his 1958 RTNDA speech in the context of the changes that were occurring both within the industry and in his career. Chapter three analyzed Murrow's address using Perelman's theory of universal audience and presence as a guide. My analysis revealed a speech that spoke to both a universal audience and a particular audience of broadcast journalists. Murrow laid out what he considered to be a rational argument that distracting society from the realities of the world was dangerous, that it can be beneficial to expose citizens to controversial topics, and that the pursuit of profit should never come before broadcasting's obligations to the public. Murrow appealed to the particular audience of broadcast journalists by portraying broadcasting as a moral pursuit and argued that the responsibility for maintaining its integrity rested with top executives.

By giving presence to his argument that the battle for broadcasting's moral balance lied at the top, Murrow diminished the role of the individual. He absolved viewers of any responsibility in contributing to the proliferation of entertainment shows at the expense of informative offerings, instead insisting that they would respond rationally to quality programs. By laying blame at the corporate level and seeking a solution through the generosity of executives, Murrow also places in the background the role of individual broadcast journalists. While he paints broadcast journalism as a moral pursuit that can maintain a democratic society, he fails to address their challenges in fulfilling their obligations to both their audience and their employer. While he had a history of facing those ethical battles himself, those personal struggles are not mentioned in the address.

Modern Implications

While Murrow's speech took place in 1958, the themes that emerged from his argument continue to have relevance today. The concern over the corporate influence on broadcast journalism is as prevalent as it was in Murrow's time, and with the growth of media conglomerates many media critics (Alger, 1998; Hatchen, 2005; Croteau & Hoynes, 2006) have lamented the impact it has on news programming. As a part of this corporate structure, broadcast journalists continue to work at balancing the best way to serve the public obligations of their profession while meeting the demands of a commercialized industry.

Murrow's message is also relevant based on his historical importance to the industry. As broadcasting's "founding father" and "patron saint of American broadcasting" (Edgerton, 1992, p. 75), it is worth considering how his assessment of radio and television is reflected in today's discussions concerning the industry. Is Murrow's view of broadcasting, including his call for a moral foundation and his condemnation of greed over duty, echoed in modern appraisals of the industry? Is the role of the individual as a part of this structure downplayed? These evaluations of broadcasting would likely be found in the textbooks related to broadcast journalism.

It is worthwhile to consider whether Murrow's rhetoric concerning the industry is reflected in the content of textbooks because they also establish the tone for aspiring broadcast journalists. Is broadcast journalism described in similar terms as other professions related to television or radio, or is it given a higher purpose as professed by Murrow? Is the focus of the struggle to maintain the moral obligations at the top of the structure or is attention paid to the individual? Such discussions would help students reflect on the societal responsibilities of journalism in relation to the obligations to their employer and whether or not they sometimes can conflict. A lack of such content might contribute to young journalists who are ill prepared to confront such situations when they arise.

Applied Communication Research

Evaluating the content of broadcasting textbooks also follows in the tradition of applied communication research. Rather than conducting research just for the sake of creating knowledge, applied communication research asks the scholar to consider how that knowledge can be applied to real world situations. Delia (1987) contends that what might be considered applied communication research began when advertisers considered the effects of marketing strategies in the 1930s. Delia argues that there was a stigma connected to this kind of research because of its commercial nature. This began to change, however, when Paul Lazarsfeld created the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia, which “cemented the emerging bridge between academic and commercial interests in communication research and established the theoretical relevance of communication research based on applied problems” (p. 51). Scholars began to see the value of applied theoretical concepts to real world situations. Delia asserts that the growth of applied research expanded when communication research was integrated in journalism and speech departments.

Many researchers recognize the need for communication research to have a pragmatic value. By applying research to real life situations, the findings benefit not only the scholarly community, but also the general public. Kreps, Frey, and O’Hair (1991) endorse this connection between communication research and the greater good: “…applied communication research can help people solve socially relevant problems. Effective applied communication research can make a significant difference in the world by proposing viable solution to difficult problems within important social contexts” (p. 83). As examples, the authors point to intercultural communication research that helps foreigners adjust to new cultures or political communication that analyzes debates so that the electorate can better understand the issues of the campaign. In both cases, the research provides a benefit to society. Cissna (2000) considers the rationale behind such research as a distinguishing factor: “Applied communication researchers are motivated not only to understand with the world, but also to change it in some respect, with luck, in a positive direction” (p. 169-170). Eschenfelder (2011) sees this distinction as setting applied communication apart from typical research: “What makes applied communication research different from other forms of communication research is the focus on social problems and making a difference in people's lives…” (p. 39). According to Eschenfelder, applied communication research has an intrinsic utilitarian value that other studies do not.

Sherry (2010) argues that both basic and applied research can work together to benefit the public, with the applied studies putting into practice what was established by basic research. He uses as an example the long running children’s television program Sesame Street. Sherry describes how its founder, Joan Ganz Cooney, attributes the program’s success to “an emphasis on cooperation between applied and basic researchers” (p. 304). Psychologists, education researchers, and social workers all contributed to the development the program’s content, which was then tested for its effectiveness. With theory being put into practice, the research helped to realize the goals of the Children Television’s workshop in helping young children learn before they enter school.

While the goal is often to work toward broader, societal change, applied communication research can also benefit specific groups or circumstances. Eschenfelder (2011) describes how such studies can focus “on specific communication contexts or situations (such as in organizations, groups, or community settings)” (p. 42) with the goal of encouraging some sort of positive change. Some researchers also advocate the use of applied communication to assist specific groups of practitioners (Milofsky, 2006; Seeger, 2009). In doing so, the "impact may occur through instruction or through direct application" (Seeger, 2009, p. 18). The lessons learned from the study can be applied to the concerns of the practitioners.

Applied communication research also gives credence to the assertion that scholarly studies can have value outside the walls of academia. DeWine (2005) insists that such research can "answer charges of irrelevant academic research by tackling salient issues in faculty member's work and private world" (p. 193). Kreps, Frey, and O'Hair (1991) argue that such studies help the public understand the significance of the discipline: "Effective applied communication research performs an important public relations role for the field of communication by enhancing public perceptions of the legitimacy and importance of communication theory, research, and practice" (p. 84). So while the practitioners can benefit from the findings that can be applied to their situation, communication studies as a field of study also benefits by gaining credibility in the view of the public.

Communication research that is considered as applied can take many forms, but Condit and Bates (2009) highlight the potential of rhetorical studies to assist in such studies. They contend such inquiries can have applied value: "studies that focus on the construction of message about particular topics and address audiences of change agents more closely fit the general notion of 'applied communication research'" (p. 107). For Condit and Bates, the results of a rhetorical study must be in a form that is usable for those who are able to bring about change. As an example, Condit and Bates discusses the work of William Benoit (1995), who incorporated rhetorical criticism to theorize advice to individuals to repair their images after being accused of wrongdoing. They commend his work for being not merely descriptive, but also prescriptive in that it offered practical advice to those seeking to repair their images. Condit and Bates describe how noteworthy individuals such as Kenneth Star, Tonya Harding, and Clarence Thomas later used the strategies offered by Benoit. They were able to benefit from the results of Benoit's work.

In a similar manner, my consideration of how Murrow's rhetoric concerning broadcast journalism manifests itself in modern day textbooks seeks to provide a utilitarian value. In his RTNDA address, Murrow focused his attention on a top-down approach in maintaining journalism's moral compass. For him, the problem lied at the top and only through the generosity of the heads of the corporate world can constructive changes take place. He bestows broadcast journalism with a special status in maintaining an informed society, but he offers no strategies on how to accomplish that goal while balancing the obligations to the employer. He laments the growth of entertainment programming at the expense of news, but places no blame on the audience.

By considering whether his evaluations of broadcasting are still present in modern textbooks, I consider whether broadcasting students are being offered all they need to know to function effectively in today's industry. Is there a condemnation of the heads of industry in seeking profit, but little advice on how to function within that corporate reality? Is broadcast journalism connected with a moral obligation to serve the public or described as any other profession? In considering these questions, I am effectively asking whether students are getting too much Murrow or too little. My study seeks to consider that question and offers some recommendations on how broadcast journalism textbooks might better strike that balance. To accomplish task, I carry out a case study that analyzes the content of textbooks used in some of the top journalism undergraduate programs in the nation.

Qualitative Case Study

My analysis of the textbooks incorporates a qualitative case study approach. Merriam (1988), who specifically addresses case studies as related to educational research, asserts that one of the primary features of a case study is that centers around some sort of *bounded system*, which she describes as "an examination of a specific phenomenon," which "might be selected because it is an instance of some concern, issue, or hypothesis" (p. 9-10). Merriam (2009) argues that a case study must be able to be "fenced in," giving it a unique quality she describes as *particularistic*: "By concentrating on a single phenomenon or entity (the case), the researcher aims to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon" (p. 42-43). In keeping with a description of a specific occurrence, Stake (2006) asserts that "cases are rather special" and more often constitute "a noun, a thing, an entity" (p. 1). He contends that cases are often real items that are easy for someone to picture in their minds, but can be difficult to understand. In the case of qualitative case studies, Stake describes how a case often entails "a collections of events or series of instances" (p. 2), meaning that more than one example may be included in a case study.

Another feature that is indicative of a case study is the type of questions asked by the researcher. Yin (2009) emphasizes how qualitative case studies typically ask "how" or "why" questions rather than "what" or "how many" questions, which are best left to survey research. He argues that asking "how" or "why" becomes more *explanatory* and opens up more opportunities to be descriptive about the subject matter. Stake (2005) asserts that the research question dealing with a case study could be considered as a contract between the researcher and the phenomenon. According to him, the researchers must ask themselves "What can be learned *here* that a reader needs to know?" (emphasis original, p. 110). He emphasizes the word "here" to indicate that the questions are unique to the case. Only by considering that case or cases can those questions be addressed.

Case studies are often associated with lengthy, complex studies that can require years of observation and result in lengthy reports, but Yin (2009) argues that such descriptions are a misconception. He contends that those depictions confuse "the case study method with a specific method of data collection such as ethnography or participant observation" (p. 15) which typically require researchers to invest a long time in a particular setting documenting the data. Instead, he asserts that case studies can take various forms and the methodology is dependent on the topic being studied. The subject matter will often dictate the approach taken by the researcher.

Merriam (1988) also suggests that the methods used in a case study are reliant on the focus of the inquiry: "case study does not claim any particular methods for data collection or data analysis", but that qualitative methods are appropriate when the "researchers are interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation" (p. 10). Whatever methodology is used within a qualitative case study, Merriam stresses the role of the individual conducting the study: "the researcher is the *primary instrument* for data collection and analysis" (emphasis original, p. 19). This connection leads to an interpretive, inductive approach to the data that focuses on "process, understanding, and interpretation" (p. 21). Researchers involved with a case study seek to make connections and conclusions based on the questions being asked and the data before them.

Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg (1991) point to the benefits of using multiple cases for the sake of pointing out differences between each instance. They contend that some of their most effective research "involved a small number of case studies conducted in a comparative framework" (p. 2). Merriam (1988) describes this as a *comparable-case selection* process where "individuals, groups, sites, and so-forth" with "the same relevant characteristics" are chosen in order to compare results (emphasis original, p. 50). Stake (1995) refers to it as a “collective case study” (p. 5). Despite the different terminology, the authors describe a project that may include several examples of the subject matter to be studied for the sake of comparison.

Case studies can include a variety of sources of data for analysis, including interviews and information gleaned from observational techniques (Merriam, 1988; Gillham, 2000), but in some situations written material becomes the primary resource (Yin, 2004). For example, the case study approach has been popular among scholars for considering the content of textbooks. In the studies, the authors often use several textbooks as a way of cross-examining the content or to make broader observations related to what students who read them are learning. These case studies often examine textbooks for one of two reasons: to evaluate the content of what is being taught or to reflect on how the text represents, or perhaps misrepresents, certain groups.

Researchers from multiple disciplines often incorporate case studies of textbooks in order to describe or improve various aspects of the content. Charalambous, Delaney, Hsu, and Mesa, (2010) developed their own framework to examine how textbooks used in Cyprus, Ireland, and Taiwan treated the addition and subtraction of fractions differently and how that could potentially impact student learning. Vincent (1999) analyzed freshman chemistry textbooks for a specific illustration of a spinning electron to track how an error within the illustration has continued to appear over the years. Vanhulle (2009) incorporated a narrative analysis of history textbooks from Belgium in order to track the historical philosophy of history education. In each case, the textbooks acted as “a bounded system” as described by Merriam (1988) that the authors could examine while keeping their research goals in mind.

Other case studies involving textbooks have related more to the field of communication, analyzing the text and how it depicts certain groups. Rifkin (1998), for example, crafted series of criteria for considering the equity of gender representation in foreign language textbooks and applied it to Russian texts. In a study with a similar theme, Thomson and Otsuji (2003) incorporated critical discourse analysis to examine how females are represented in Japanese textbooks. A. Matsuda (2011) and P. K. Matsuda (2011) examined U.S. technical communication textbooks to consider how the text portrays global perspectives, concluding that they often depict non-Americans as the cultural "other" in need of assistance. These types of studies point to the importance of the language within the textbooks and how word selection can influence the way in which certain individuals are portrayed.

The examples above illustrate the effectiveness of incorporating a case study approach to the analysis of textbook content. In each case, the authors tailored their analysis to their research goals, creating a design with a narrow focus. The results illuminated the understanding of the textbook content in relation to their inquiry. They provided new perspectives of understanding related to the content of the textbooks based on their case studies. In a similar fashion, my case study design involving textbooks related to broadcast journalism considers specific content in relation to the themes that emerged from my analysis of Murrow's RTNDA address. In doing so, I also incorporate a comparable-case selection design as described by Merriam (1988) to consider how the different textbooks address the themes that emerged from Murrow's address.

Artifacts

The selection of textbooks for this case study was based on the list on the top journalism schools in the nation as determined by *NewsPro* magazine (Fees, 2011). The magazine, which markets itself as "the magazine for news professionals," surveyed its readers in order to gauge their opinion on what they consider to be the best journalism schools in the United States. The results of the survey showed that Syracuse University's S.I. Newshouse School of Public

Communication “easily claimed the top spot” (Fees, 2011, p. 21) followed by Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism. At number three was the Columbia University School of Journalism, followed by the University of Missouri at Columbia School of Journalism and the University of Southern California’s Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism.

The next step was to find out which textbooks the schools used in their in their broadcast journalism courses. In each case, I was able to look at the schools curriculum online, with special attention paid to the courses that indicated that their goal was to teach aspiring broadcast journalists. For example, Syracuse offered a course titled “Television and Digital News Reporting” and by reading the description I was able to determine that content of the course matched my criteria.

After finding the courses related to broadcast journalism offered by these top schools, the next step was to discover which textbooks were required for each course. In some cases, I was able to visit the bookstore web site of the school and find the textbooks titles. When no textbooks were listed, but the name of the instructor was shown, I emailed the professor of each course to find out which book was being used in the course. Through these methods I was able to find out which textbooks the top schools require of their students. For the sake of this case study, I narrowed my selection to the top four undergraduate schools: Syracuse, Northwestern, the University of Missouri at Columbia, and the University of Southern California. Number three on the list, Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism was therefore not included.

My investigation revealed that both the upper level broadcast journalism courses at Syracuse and at the University of Missouri at Columbia required the same textbook: *Television Field Production and Reporting: A guide to visual storytelling* by Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012). Northwestern University’s upper level broadcasting course required *Advancing the*

Story: Broadcast Journalism in a Multimedia World by Wenger and Potter (2012). The University of Southern California's upper division broadcasting course required *Broadcast News Handbook: Writing, Reporting and Producing in a Converging Media World* by Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007).

It should be noted that some of the courses also required supplementary texts in addition to the textbooks listed here. In order to focus on those designed specifically as a self-contained textbook to teach broadcast journalism they were not included in the case study. For example, the Syracuse course also required Al Tompkins book *Aim for the Heart*, which focuses on storytelling and writing techniques, but is not meant as a comprehensive textbook for teaching broadcast journalism.

Procedure

In keeping with the case study method, my procedures followed the recommendations of Yin (2009) in determining what content to consider for analysis.

> The first and most preferred strategy is to follow the theoretical propositions that led to your case study. The original objectives and design of the case study presumably were based on such propositions, which in turn reflected a set of research questions... (p. 130)

Yin argues that it therefore preferable "to focus attention on certain data and to ignore other data" (p. 130). The idea is to keep the research goals in mind and concentrate on the evidence that is pertinent to study.

Since my case study of the textbooks seeks to consider how the content relates to the ideas that Murrow considered in his RTNDA address, I limited my analysis to the sections of the textbooks that were applicable. Based on my analysis of the Murrow's speech, the portions of the texts that I considered were descriptions of a) the corporate influence on the broadcasting industry, b) the struggle of the individual reporter to balance their responsibilities to their employer and the public, c) broadcast journalism's unique function in society, and d) the audience's role in influencing news content. With those goals in mind, I first examined the table of contents of the books to find chapter headings that might reflect those themes and then consulted the index at the end of the books for keywords that also would lead me to pertinent sections of the books. Special attention was paid the introductory chapters that introduced the students to broadcast journalism and its role in society and the chapters that discussed ethical guidelines.

Analysis

The selected portions of the textbooks were coded following procedures recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994), who advocate the use of a "start list" of codes. As they describe, that start list can be generated from a variety of places: "That list comes from the connectional framework, list of research questions, hypotheses, problems areas, and/or key variables the researcher brings to the study" (p. 58). They also advise however, that the researcher needs to be flexible as the research proceeds: "… the analyst should be ready to redefine or discard codes when they look inapplicable, overbuilt, empirically ill-fitting, or overly abstract" (p. 65). This flexibility allows the researcher to adjust their codes as the analysis progresses.

Miles and Huberman (1994) also recommend having a code structure that relates closely with the research questions. The codes are first given general categories. For example, I used the code "corporate influence" to identify portions of the text that discussed the impact corporations are having on broadcast journalism. Next follows more specific codes that go beyond a descriptive label and become more interpretive. For example, next to some passages dealing with corporate influence I used the code "symbiotic" to describe how the text illustrates a symbiotic relationship between the corporate and business side of journalism. Miles and Huberman also recommend having a third key next to the code on the list that links it back to each research question for interpretation purposes.

Numerous scholars involved in qualitative research have used this coding technique. This includes a qualitative case study analysis of higher education management teams (Gioia & Thomas, 1996), a multi-case study analysis of relationships within small software firms (Coviello & Munro, 1997), a study of how employees in a high-tech corporations balance work and home life (Perlow, 1998), a multi-case study of how new teachers focus on students "mind activity" (Norman & Feiman-Nemser, 2005), and a case study that examined the impact of a community-based participatory research project (Flicker, 2008). In each case the authors utilized the coding methodology developed by Miles and Huberman (1994) to help condense and analyze their data in order to answer their research questions.

Based on the themes that emerged from my analysis of Murrow's RTNDA address, my case study analysis seeks to answer the following research questions:

1) How is the corporate influence on the broadcasting industry described?

2) How are broadcast journalists advised to balance their responsibilities to their employer and the public?

3) How is broadcast journalism's unique function in society portrayed?

4) How is the audience's influence on news content described?

My discussion of each text also ties these themes back to Murrow's description of these issues to compare his viewpoint from that of modern day broadcast journalism textbook authors.

Findings

***Television Field Production and Reporting: A Guide to Visual Storytelling*.** Unlike Murrow's address, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) minimize the impact of the corporate structure that owns and operates television news stations. There is no broader discussion about the impact of media conglomerates or its affect on how stations cover news. There are only fleeting references to how potential cutbacks in news operations might negatively impact the students during the course of their careers. In a section titled "The Future of Video Journalists" the authors describe how the state of the industry will force broadcast journalists to do more, such as reporting, shooting, and editing the stories by themselves:

> In the United States, most broadcast news operations are replacing some two- and three-person crews with video journalists. They do it to save money or to increase the number of journalists gathering and producing stories in the field.
>
> The results have been mixed. When companies use VJs [video journalists] only to cut costs, the product has suffered. Reporters usually can't shoot as well as gifted photographers. Photographers usually can't write and dig for information as well as gifted reporters. When VJs are asked to do the same amount of work each day that once required two or three people, the content usually suffers. (p. 193)

Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) counter this grim assessment by contending that when used properly video journalists can be assets because they allow stations to be at more places at once and provide more stories: "given adequate time, VJ's enjoy a sense of ownership and control over stories the few other journalists can match" (p. 193). What is considered a liability in some situations is not in others. Readers are not told what is considered to be "adequate time" for a video journalist to cover a story. The authors' assessment is that the growing use of video journalists is an indication of the current state of broadcast journalism and that those entering the business need to adjust. The corporate philosophy of cutbacks simply exists and journalist must to learn to accommodate those realities.

This philosophy is apparent when considering research question two about how the authors advise broadcast journalists to balance their responsibilities to their employer and the public. Just a few pages after telling future broadcast journalists that there can be cases where being asked to do too much can negatively impact the coverage they provide, the authors seem to imply that if reporters fail to cover a story properly in such situations the blame lies with the journalists themselves. In a section titled "Excuses" Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) state that there are sometimes legitimate excuses to poor coverage, but that often they "masquerade for indifference and procrastination" (p. 203). Among the excuses they list are "I don't have enough time to do a good job. I have to cover six stories a day" (p. 203). By placing this "excuse" among the list of unacceptable explanations for poor coverage, the authors place the burden on the broadcast journalists to adjust to whatever demands their employers place on them. According to them, time constraints or the number of stories assigned should not be an issue. A good reporter should be able to adjust and meet the demands of the employers while still producing high quality stories.

In the discussion section at the end of the chapter, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) put forth questions for students to consider related to the growing trend of video journalists. These questions are for the purpose of encouraging students to consider these issues before entering the workforce. They include: "How likely is "burnout" among VJ's? How can they avoid burnout? What are an organization's professional and humanitarian obligations to its VJs?" (p. 196). Unfortunately, the authors provide no answers to these questions and leave it up to the students to seek out the answers for these concerns themselves. The problem is stated, but no potential solutions are offered.

One of the few other scenarios where Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) imply that broadcast journalists might face difficulty balancing their responsibilities to the public and their employers is when they are asked to do a live report with few facts to report. In a section titled "Immediacy versus Information," the authors contend that on one hand that "reporters should have the right to postpone a live shot if for any reason they don't trust the information they've been given" (p. 221). This is stated as if it should be the norm at all stations, but no advice is given on how journalists can assure that this is the policy within their news department. Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio seem to counter that ideal with this advice:

> Sometimes uncertainty is the price of instant news. The news business is especially competitive. There can be lots of pressure to be first with a breaking story. That's when you may have to fall back to the adage: "Go with what you have." (p. 220)

The authors do not advocate reporting gossip or rumors, but assert that the responsibility to the employer sometimes must supersede providing the public with the worthwhile information. Being first on the scene is more important than reporting meaningful details. Instead, reporters are advised to give what little information they have and use a lot of qualifiers such as "still unclear," "at this time…" and "unconfirmed reports" and tell the viewers what questions cannot be answered at the time (p. 221).

In a chapter on media ethics, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) acknowledge the connection between the corporate pressures and the possibility of facing ethical dilemmas: "Many ethical problems that reporters encounter come from knowing the competition is in head-to-head combat–and pushing hard. In their zeal to be first with the best story, some reporters overstep their boundaries that define ethical behavior" (p. 264). The authors go on to describe examples where reporters took shortcuts or made poor choices that led to ethical lapses. In addressing these concerns, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio evoke the memory of Murrow, quoting him on the importance of maintaining high ethical standards: "to be believable, [journalists] must be credible" (p. 267). In adjusting the quote to speak directly to journalists, the authors added the "journalists" in brackets. Unfortunately they took the quote out of context. In its original form Murrow was not referring to journalism, but was speaking about the connection between truth and propaganda during his tenure as the U.S. Information Director in the early 1960s (McPhail, 2010, p. 90). In any case, the goal of the authors is to connect the importance of maintaining credibility among the public in order to be believable. To that end, they suggest aspiring journalist review established code of ethics created by news organizations to prepare them for those situations before they arise.

As Murrow's did in his RTNDA address, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) place the struggle of the individual reporter in balancing their obligations to the public and their employer in the background. When they do address those situations where those responsibilities might be somewhat at odds, the authors seem to favor the side of the employer. Broadcast journalists should be willing to do more and not use the added demands being placed on them as an excuse for poor coverage. They should still be willing to do live shots when asked even if the information they have is sketchy, since beating the competitors to the scene is the priority. Broadcast journalists must learn to operate in a way that satisfies the demands of the employer while still doing what they can to perform their journalistic function adequately. They do draw the line at having journalists fall into ethical lapses for the sake of beating the competition, however, and recommend considering those situations before they arise.

In considering question number three, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) description of broadcast journalism distinct role in society focuses on the medium's ability to convey "experiences" to viewers. This is apparent in their introduction to their text:

> Digital media that provide sound and moving images accomplish two things better than most other media. They show people to people, and they can capture and communicate a sense of experience. People have always invested in media that introduce them to interesting people, and give them a sense of "being there." Print- and audio-only media seldom come close. (p. 1)

The authors emphasize the need to give viewers an "experience" throughout the textbook: "visual media help viewers feel they're a part of the action, essentially experiencing the events on the screen" (p. 5); "Anything you can do to enhance viewer's sense of vicarious experience and understanding advances television's mandate" (p. 21); "…good video storytelling shares, or transmits, an experience. It gives views a sense that they are there" (p. 162); "Indeed the promise of a sense of first-person experience is one reason we turn to television and web video even for news" (p. 199); and if reporters do not perform their duties properly, "they deprive their audience the fun of experiencing the story" (p. 164). According to the authors, what makes broadcasting unique compared to other media is its ability to transport viewers to another time and place and allow them to witness for themselves what the people involved in the story are going through. Being immersed in the story is paramount, and the information conveyed rests on that foundation.

If broadcasting transfers a sense of experience better than any other medium, the question then becomes what does conveying this experience mean for society? For Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), the function of broadcast journalism becomes making news more appealing to viewers. They contend that adding storytelling elements to broadcast reports “can make facts more interesting and compelling to watch and build loyalty toward those that offer such content” (p. 207). Such stories “will attract and hold the attention of viewers who patronize tomorrow’s digital screens” (p. xiii). The authors quote *Time* columnist Thomas Griffith who asserts that adding visuals to a story helps in this transformation:

> …whenever audiences don’t know why certain information matters, or find it dull or too complex, the best approach may be to package the information as a visual story. Stories that show how issues and events affect people draw viewers to the screen because they help make information more interesting and accessible. (p. 7)

In *Television Field and Reporting* creating a visual story through the use of broadcasting techniques has a dual function, it makes the information more appealing and in turn attracts viewers to the screen. The information is packaged in way that fulfills the corporate need.

It is noteworthy that in this section of the text Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) highlight a group of quotes from media personalities titled “words vs. images” that includes a line from Murrow. His quote seems to contradict the message of the book that the visuals are needed to make a story more newsworthy: “Most news is made up of what happens in men’s minds, in what comes out of their mouths. And how do you put that in pictures?” (p. 7). While acknowledging the importance of Murrow to the profession by using this quote, they do not expand on its meaning. It is used to accentuate the difficulty in making some news stories visual, but there is no discussion on how to convey the newsworthiness of some stories without the benefit of pictures.

In their discussion concerning the unique qualities of broadcast journalism that allow it to create memorable stories that viewers find appealing, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) do not put to the fore the same moral obligation to the public that Murrow asserted in his address. One of the few mentions of this journalistic responsibility to society comes halfway through the book in the context of a description of using surprises as a story-telling element. The authors advocate that in some situations, it is advantageous to withhold certain bits of information until later in a story:

> Using surprise properly turns one journalism standard on its head. As journalists we know it is essential to our democracy that people be informed. So we work to protect the "public's right to know." However a storyteller changes this a little. (p. 167)

It is during this discussion on storytelling that the broadcast journalist's role in maintaining a democratic society appears, but the authors do not emphasize this obligation early in the text. They do mention how well-trained professionals can "help viewers learn much about the larger world and themselves" (p. 1), but do not connect that to the obligation of the profession. Readers are encouraged to use the information offered in the book to make their stories interesting in order to attract the attention of viewers and keep them coming back. The focus is also on getting ahead of others in their field. Readers are warned that "professionals who have failed to keep up with changing times and job demands now face uncertain futures" (p. 1), but are also assured that mastering the techniques in the book will "help ensure a long, profitable, and rewarding career" (p. xiii).

Murrow connected broadcast journalism with a moral obligation to keep the public informed about issues that had an impact on society, even if they were controversial in nature. While offering many tips on how to make broadcast stories more appealing to viewers, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) place this obligation in the background of their text. They describe broadcasting as unique in that it can offer viewers the "experience" of being where news is happening, which can spark the public's interest in the story. This can encourage them to return the next night to watch that same station, and it can advance the careers of the journalists who produce those stories, but its impact on maintaining a democracy is deemphasized.

The fourth research question asks how the authors describe the audience's role in impacting the news content. Murrow took an optimistic perspective when it related to the audience, convinced that they would respond appropriately to reports that covered controversial issues. He also did not blame them for the lack of informational programming, instead placing the responsibility on corporate executives. In some cases, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) imply that it is the viewers that drive which stories are covered and which are ignored. In describing the duties of an assignment editor, they make this assertion:

> In actuality, only news that is important and interesting to the viewer needs to be covered. Such a simple axiom demands that the assignment editor be a good judge of what is truly newsworthy and interesting and to know the community's pulse. (p. 318)

The question then becomes how does the station know what is "important and interesting" to the viewers? Is it through the ratings? The authors do not go into detail on how to make this decision, but the implication is to give the viewers what they would consider to be newsworthy.

In other cases Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) assert that it is up to the reporter to present the information in such a way that the public understands the importance of the story. In a sense, the station decides what is worthy of coverage and it must convince the viewers that the assignment editors' choices are the right ones through the way the information is presented. According to the authors, this is done in various ways. One is by finding "characters" for the stories that the viewers find engaging: "People who can be seen doing interesting things in your stories help viewers relate to important information or issues they might otherwise ignore" (p.

11). Another tactic is for the reporter to present themselves as credible through their voice inflection, appearance, and body language: “Audiences become interested in the story when they see you think about the story, interpret, and react to it” (p. 305). The authors also point to the power of the medium itself to convince audiences what is newsworthy: “…if your audiences might not realize why crucial stories matter, or would better understand them with more context and perspective, video storytelling can take your work to unparalleled heights” (p. 11). In each strategy, it is incumbent upon the reporters to convince the viewers of the importance of the stories they are covering.

If the reporters are not convincing enough, Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) contend that the technology involved in disseminating news gives the viewers the ultimate power to choose for themselves what they believe is newsworthy:

> But today viewers have gained control of the medium. Viewers with computers, smartphones, tablets, mobile satellite dishes, cable- and wireless-streaming TV and digital video recorders even control the program schedule. They decide whom they will watch, when, where, for how long, and on what platforms. When stories are powerful, compelling, and engaging, viewers may stick around to watch. They seldom watch dull, routine, or predictable stories. (p. 213)

According to the authors, the growing number of options has made it even more difficult for broadcast journalists. Viewers no longer have to sit through an entire newscast. Instead, they can select stories for themselves, giving some precedence over others. This makes it even more crucial on the part of the reporter to use the power of the medium to keep the viewer interested in the story.

Murrow put forth an optimistic tone related to audience, convinced that people will respond to informative programming if it is presented in a rational, well-balanced manner. Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), while acknowledging the need to present news that viewers will be interested in, often suggest that the public must be convinced that a story is newsworthy before they will be engaged. According to them this is accomplished in several ways, but without using those strategies the growing use of computers and other technologies will allow audiences to become more fickle and selective in what they consider to be newsworthy. If the public ignores a story, no matter how important it might be, the blame lies with the reporter for not presenting it in a way that will engage the viewers.

Broadcast News Handbook: Writing, Reporting and Producing in a Converging Media World. In addressing question one concerning how the authors describe the corporate influence on the broadcasting industry, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) take a more upfront approach than Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012). In the preface of the book, the authors review the history of broadcast journalism and acknowledge Murrow as recognizable and trusted voice among listeners of that era. In their assessment of modern broadcasting, however, they describe how future journalists will need to learn a wider array of skills: "Decades later, changes in corporate ownership, the unrelenting need for corporations to generate profits for their shareholders, and a series of corporate mergers have led some news managers to talk about "convergence" in their newsrooms" (pp. xv-xvi). Because of this convergence, journalists are urged to "prepare themselves" by learning skills from other trades. In this reference, convergence is potentially a result of greed and the corporate need requires that journalists become more diverse.

Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) also recognize that the obligation to the corporate structure requires that news be packaged in way that will attract viewers: "those involved in the news business strive to present what's been called infotainment– information presented in an entertaining way" (p. 17). Like Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), the authors accept the necessity of presenting the news in a way that is enjoyable for viewers. The experience of watching or listening to the news must be one that will attract and retain an audience. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) describe this as an inevitable result of the competition from other media choices, such as movies and video games. Giving the news an entertainment value is characterized as "good business" that will help a station "stand out" from others (p. 18).

While conceding the fact that broadcast news must have some sort of entertainment value, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) assert that this need not get in the way of good journalism. For them, the journalist side of broadcasting and the corporate obligations can sustain a symbiotic relationship: "We think well-told stories are informative, interesting, and entertaining, and we hope you'll embrace higher ideals while recognizing that we work in the information *business*" (emphasis original, p. 18). This attitude is expressed repeatedly in a chapter of the book title "Why We Fight," a section of the book placed towards the end of the book to help journalists navigate in the industry. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) encourage journalists not to complain about the corporate structure, but embrace it:

> Yet the two of us–journalists and stockholders–can get along just fine if we remember one key principle: We can't live without one another! The relationship will be mutually profitable if we create value for one another. Good journalism will increase shareholder value. (p. 250)

While they acknowledge the interdependent relationship between broadcast journalism and the corporate structure, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) contend that corporate executives need not influence every aspect of the business:

> Cynics love to decry the death of journalism at the hands of uncaring corporations that seem concerned about nothing but the bottom line. Some companies clearly are better than others, but here's a little secret that applies to almost all of them: The stockholders financed the bus, built the bus, and own the bus. But they're too busy to drive the bus. They gave the busy keys to *us*. *We* get to drive it–and we can take it anywhere we want, within reason. (emphasis original, p. 250)

With statements such as these, the authors seek to empower the individual journalists who must work within the system. Despite the need to fulfill the corporate obligations, they assert that there is still room to perform strong journalism and that it can also work to fulfill the business needs of the station.

This bottom-up approach is in contrast to the message that Murrow delivered in his RTNDA address. While his main concern was prime time space for informational programming and not the daily operations of a broadcast newsroom, he still stressed the need for a solution to come from heads of the corporations. It was the corporate executives that needed to address the industry concerns. With a metaphor of placing journalists behind the wheel of a bus, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) encourage those individuals who are a part of broadcast journalism to work at changing the direction of the industry themselves. They hold the real power to help steer broadcast journalism towards a better future.

This leads into considering research question number two on how broadcast journalists are advised to balance their duties to the public and their employer. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman

(2007) warn future broadcast journalists that a station's pursuit of higher ratings and profits will sometimes lead "broadcasters to take actions that are unethical or, at the very least, tasteless, silly, and counterproductive," and that "journalists need to be on guard" (p. 251). They describe how there are often "competing values" in a newsroom of "integrity, accuracy, responsibility, sensitivity, and accountability" with the corporate needs of "being competitive, being timely, being compelling, being commercially successful in the ratings, being marketable, being profitable" (p. 79). They recognize that a station's eagerness to fulfill its corporate responsibilities may get in the way of its journalistic values.

The authors' recommendation for broadcast journalists is to practice pragmatic idealism. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) suggest that reporters need to realize that they are cogs in the profit-generating machine of broadcasting, and to "not be so idealistic that you can't cope with the reality of the daily grind" (p. 249). At the same time the authors contend that reporters and others in the newsroom can demonstrate a genuine commitment to the journalism profession. They argue that even at stations where the commitment to high journalistic standards may be in question, one reporter who practices and advocates for those ideals can make a difference. To do so the authors suggest that an individual at times must become a "contrarian," who is willing to argue for journalistic ideals when the pursuit of profits might be in opposition. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) describe such an individual and the strategies they can use:

> …someone who makes it a point to be the "loyal opposition" in challenging (diplomatically, if possible) management and co-workers. Network. Let co-workers and managers hear from you. Find ways to express yourself and to nudge people in a different direction. (pp. 248-249)

The authors propose that even the midst of a newsroom that is compromising some of its journalistic standards an individual can still be impactful. A reporter can meet the business needs of the station, but also serve the public while encouraging the rest of the newsroom to do the same.

With this advice to future broadcast journalists, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) again reinforce their belief that changes in broadcast journalism can occur from the bottom-up. This message is in contrast to the theme of Murrow's RTNDA address, but in some ways mirrors what many historians like to highlight when it concerns Murrow's career. He was an advocate for providing viewers with informative programming and repeatedly struggled with his superiors to meet that standard. In many cases it was not always the commercially viable approach to take, such as when sponsors dropped his *See It Now* program, but he continued to lobby for quality programming. While Murrow certainly had a standing within the network that a young broadcast journalist would not, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) content that even beginning reporters can fight for high standards. They can take up Murrow's cause and work towards change. They stress that no matter the situations reporters may find themselves in, that "an obligation to the public" comes first: "Fulfill it. When it comes to your viewers and listeners, never say die, and never give up" (p. 254).

Question number three asks how the authors describe broadcast journalism's unique function in society. Early on, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) establish the importance of the profession by reminding readers of the Communications Act of 1934 that required stations to operate in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" encouraged stations to create newscasts (p. xiv). By doing so, they establish a foundation for broadcast journalism that was formed not for the sake of profit, but for the purpose of serving the public. They also remind readers that journalism performs a special function in a society: “We work in and teach about one of the most important aspects of a democracy–media that are free from government control. Protecting rights as we deal with the public’s right to know is a vital part of journalism” (p. xvii). They stress the need for broadcast journalists to maintain high standards because “stronger journalism should make democracy work even better” (p. 269). They also provide statistical data that indicates that most people get their news from television, particularly during important historical events. Based on that data, they assert that “those of us in broadcast news have a big responsibility to include the most important stories in the limited time available” (p. 25).

Based on all of these assertions about broadcast journalism, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) insist that broadcast journalism is more than a profession, but as they describe it, “a calling”: “Throughout, we acknowledge that radio and TV news is a business, but also stress that it’s more than that. It’s a calling, both work and passion, and a means to document and be a part of history as it’s made” (p. xix). They therefore ascribe a higher purpose to broadcast journalism. According to them it should not just be about earning a paycheck and attracting more viewers to the screen, it first and foremost is a position that carries with it incredible responsibility. In describing it as “one of the most important conduits of information in the information age” (p. 25) and admonishing broadcast journalists to “never lose sight of the power in your hands” (p. 254) they confer on the profession a relevancy that goes beyond the commercial component. It becomes a crucial source of information for society and those that pursue it must be ready to meet that call.

The description of broadcast journalism by Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) is much more in line with Murrow’s contention that broadcasting is a moral endeavor. Like Murrow, they remind readers of the reason broadcast journalism emerged in the form of the local newscast–to fulfill an obligation to serve in the "public interest." They stress the difference that radio and television can have in a society; much in the way Murrow spoke of the "instruments" of broadcasting and the power they can wield. Also as Murrow did in his RTNDA address, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) stress the sense of obligation that comes with having that power. They encourage young broadcasters to not lose sight of that as they work in meeting the corporate requirements of their employers.

In considering question number four concerning the audience's influence over content, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) advocate for a cooperative approach in allowing the public to shape content. They contend that viewers should influence the content, both indirectly and directly, but that it is not a given. Instead it is something broadcasters must actively pursue. They argue that broadcasters "should always keep your viewers or listeners in mind whatever you do" (p. 251). This is to take place in the case of story selection, even when they may be in conflict with the other concerns related to television such as the lack of compelling pictures to accompany the words: "we strongly suggest that decision makers consider all factors when deciding whether to air a story, and not drop it simply because of a lack of video. The most important question to ask it, 'Is this story important to our viewers or listeners?'" (p. 22). Unlike Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), who assert that the visuals can convince the audience of the newsworthiness of the story, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) contend that the interest to viewers should convince the broadcasters of the newsworthiness of the story, regardless of whether there are strong visuals or not.

Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) acknowledge that news stations use research methods to find out what viewers are interested in, but that to best serve the public news directors should go beyond that. News departments should also be open to having the public provide input on how they conduct themselves as journalists. They contend that journalists "owe it to our public to share and explain our methods and motivations" (p. 244). To further make their point, the authors quote from a portion of the Radio-Television News Directors Association code of ethics that stresses accountability:

> But it also encourages journalists to "invited dialogue with the public over journalistic conduct." Television and radio stations are in the position to do this much better than any newspaper is; after all, we're actually capable of the speech the word "dialogue" implies. (p. 244)

With this statement Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) further highlight the unique nature of the medium and how it could potentially assist news stations in being more responsive to the public. Broadcast journalism should not only hold the power to provide viewers with the news of the day, but also allow the public to evaluate and shape how that news is presented. The authors recognize that this would take "a bit of courage" on the part of broadcasters because they would have to "own up to mistakes" (p. 244). They contend, however, that the public would be willing to forgive if news stations are willing to admit to those mistakes.

By proposing that the public have more power in the news gathering process through a more cooperative effort on the part of broadcasters, Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) assume an audience that is more rational than Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) and closer to the one envisioned by Murrow. Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) proposed that audiences often need to be convinced of the newsworthiness of a story. Viewers require visuals, characters, and an effective presentation before recognizing the significance of the report. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) assume an audience that is more astute and should be given the opportunity to influence content not just through ratings and surveys, but also by offering advice on the most ethical way to cover stories. This view of an audience that is more rational and able to distinguish between fair and biased reports is more in line with Murrow's assessment of the viewers. He was convinced that when given the opportunity, viewers would react reasonably to reports that were presented fairly. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) ascribe to the viewers these same characteristics. They encourage stations to look to listeners and viewers for moral guidance when it concerns maintaining journalistic standards.

Advancing the Story: Broadcast Journalism in a Multimedia World. In addressing the corporate influence on broadcast journalism, Wenger and Potter (2012) take an approach that could be described as situational acceptance. They acknowledge that journalists might be worried because of the "gloomy headlines about cutbacks in both print and broadcast newsrooms" (p. 324), but encourage young journalist that learning multimedia skills will allow them to overcome such obstacles. Unlike Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), who ascribe convergence partially to "the unrelenting need for corporations to generate profits for their shareholders" (p. xv), Wenger and Potter (2012) overlook any potential causes and focus instead on the upsides of asking journalists to do more:

> …each platform supplements the others with unique information. These Web extras offer a way for journalists to include compelling content that they had to cut from a broadcast or print story to save time or space or to keep their story tightly focused. (p. 203)

Throughout the text, the authors stress the idea that when broadcast journalists are asked to take the time to tell a story on multiple platforms, it benefits the audience. No matter what the impetus was behind convergence, reporters must accept the change look at the advantages.

In a multimedia world where the corporate demands require journalists to constantly update their stories online in order to beat the competition, Wenger and Potter (2012) recognize as an “important concern” (p. 214) the possibility of reporting misinformation. Their recommendation is that if reporters do not have “enough verified information” (p. 214) to make that clear to their news manager so that they avoid any mistakes. In describing television news live shots they contend that “it is always better to be right than first and wrong” (p. 12). In these instances accuracy should come first.

In another part of the book however, such errors seem to be described as simply a part of the modern journalistic environment when it concerns online news. The authors use portions of an interview with WIBW-TV’s general manager Jim Ogle to make this point: “Constant sharing carries some risks, of course. Information the station puts out early on may turn out to be wrong. ‘That’s all part of the process,’ Ogle says. ‘We acknowledge to people there’s new information that changes things’ (p. 8). So while recognizing the dangers that come with reporting misinformation, the authors imply that in the case of online breaking news the need to be fast and first make it more acceptable for reporters to be wrong.

In a section that focuses more exclusively on broadcast journalism, Wenger and Potter (2012) also discuss the practice of producing a newscast for a specific demographic to attract specific advertisers. They acknowledge the content of a newscast is driven by “the fundamental way that television news makes money” and that is by advertising that is often targeted to “specific types of people” (p. 245). They cite as an example newscasts that are tailored to women between the ages of 25 to 54 because they spend the money in a household: “Producers at stations targeting these women try to include stories that will make them want to watch the newscast. In turn, the hope is that advertisers interested in targeting these women will buy time in the newscast” (p. 246). Wenger and Potter (2012) recognize this practice as controversial “because it can lead to decisions that have less to do with journalism and more to do with making money" (p. 248). They contend however, that a good producer should be able to meet this corporate requirement and still present important stories for the viewers. In making this assertion the authors provide no specifics on how a producer should be able to strike this balance. A controversial practice must simply be carried out because of the need to earn advertising dollars.

In other cases, Wenger and Potter (2012) warn against risking the integrity of a newscast for financial gain. They concede that "good journalism and economic goals can sometimes conflict" and warn against scenarios where news stations "produce or avoid news stories to please sponsors, or solicit or place advertising or PR content in a way that weakens the integrity of their news operation" (p. 297). They decry, for example, the use of video news releases as a substitute for reports produced by news personnel without properly labeling it as such. In such situations, the financial benefit of saving money by airing a pre-produced story is not worth the loss of credibility.

Like Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), Wenger and Potter (2012) focus on the positive aspects of asking journalists to do more. Media convergence and the added requirements it places on reporters is only described in terms of the way it can be used to create better stories. Any potential corporate motivation is downplayed and incoming journalists simply need to adjust. There is also situational acceptance concerning some of the other impacts of corporate influence. In some passages Wenger and Potter (2012) warn against posting erroneous information in online reports in order to beat the competition but imply that such mistakes are "part of the process" when dealing with breaking news. The controversial practice of producing a newscast for a demographic is acceptable if important stories are still covered. Corporate influence over the news becomes acceptable in some cases.

In dealing question number two that considers how broadcast journalists are advised to balance their responsibilities to their employer and the public, Wenger and Potter (2012) offer few recommendations to young journalists other than to look to the same ethical standards that journalists have relied on the in past. They contend that while technology has transformed the delivery of news, it should not affect the ideals of journalism:

> A multimedia journalist faces news challenges in ethical decision making as technology expands both what we're capable of covering and the way we deliver news and information. But journalist's core ethical principles have not changed–our goal is to seek truth and report it, to minimize the harm we do, to act independently of outside influences and to be accountable to the public. (p. 321)

Like Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), Wenger and Potter (2012) encourage young journalists to review the code of ethics from various news organizations, such the Society of Professional Journalists to prepare for those ethical dilemmas. But in contrast to Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007), there is no specific advice on how new reporters can make their voices heard in a newsroom that may be operating in opposition to those standards. They should be ethical, but they are on their own on how to go about it in the face of corporate pressure.

When it concerns the state of the broadcast news due to cutbacks or more demands placed on reporters, Wenger and Potter (2012) seem to suggest that reporters simply need to work harder. In discussing the lack of in depth and investigative reporting, the authors assert that the corporate demands placed on reporters is just an excuse:

> Some journalists say there's not much room for this kind of reporting in today's news media. They point to budget cuts at news organizations and a society that seems to value immediacy over quality. But journalists who bring passion, persistence and skill to work

every day are able to report in depth, even if they have to do it in between other assignments. (p. 121)

For the authors, the blame for the lack of in depth reports does not rest on the corporate pressures, but rather in the attitudes of modern journalists. They need to work around any obstacles that are placed in front of them due to a lack of resources or their workload.

In making a case that reporters need to work harder in the face of corporate pressures, Wenger and Potter (2012) take a stance that is similar to Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012). Journalists should be willing to meet the corporate demands but also perform their job to the highest of standards. If they cannot, it is not because they are being asked to do too much, but that they are lacking in passion or dedication. Just as Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) assert, the added responsibilities or lack of time simply becomes an excuse for a lack of true effort.

Question number three asks how the author's present broadcast journalism's unique function in society. By stressing the positives of media convergence, Wenger and Potter (2012) present broadcast journalism as simply a part of the larger media picture. They do recognize some of broadcasting's strengths, such as its ability to convey emotion, how anchors and reporters are able to "make a personal connection" with viewers (p. 13) and its capacity to present information in "a compelling manner" (p. 14). While they point out the strengths of television and radio, the authors also highlight their deficiencies, such as a lack of depth and detail. Those are weaknesses that can be solved with a converged newsroom: "For every broadcast journalist who wants another minute of time […] multimedia reporting can be an extremely powerful tool" (p. 234).

In reviewing what they consider to be foundational journalistic principles Wenger and Potter (2012) also downplay the unique traits of broadcasting. In listing these core assumptions, they assert that the medium really does not matter when considering the larger goals of journalism:

> One is that story matters more than the medium you tell it in–or, to put it more bluntly, “It’s the content, stupid.” Another is that journalists still have a key role to play in a free society–to provide information that citizens need to govern their lives–a role that matters just as much today as it did when the United States was founded. (p. xxv)

This statement reinforces the authors contention that broadcast journalism is only worthwhile because of the journalism aspect of the profession. The media of radio and television do have their strengths, but it is the content that is carried across those airwaves that truly matters. The medium that carries the information does not confer any special status upon the reports.

Wenger and Potter’s (2012) description of broadcast journalism is in sharp contrast to the lofty depiction of the profession by Tuggle, Car, and Huffman (2007), who referred to broadcasting as “one of the most important conduits of information in the information age” (p. 25) that carries with it power that journalists need to respect. Wenger and Potter (2012) offer no such grandiose superlatives in describing broadcasting. It has its strengths and can be an effective tool in conveying information to listener and viewers, but the real power lies with a multimedia approach.

At times Wenger and Potter’s (2012) description of broadcast journalism also implies that it not only is less powerful than it once was, but that it is becoming antiquated. As such, broadcasting’s salvation can only be found in transforming itself into an online medium:

> Some experts asserted that print would be soon dead, and that traditional over-the-air broadcasts might not be far behind. While that may eventually be true, traditional news

> outlets now expect to ensure their survival by building new audiences and finding news sources of revenue online. (p. 206)

Rather than depicting it as a powerful medium worthy of “a calling” as Tuggle, Car, and Huffman (2007) describe it, broadcast journalism is becoming outdated and must fight to survive. The luster that the medium once held is dulling and to regain its status broadcast journalism must reinvent itself.

Wenger and Potter (2012) expand on this grim assessment of broadcast journalism by quoting portions of an interview with Terry Heaton, the senior vice president for Audience Research and Development, who consults for news organizations. He contends that news stations are not changing fast enough and that “the tradition TV ‘News at 6’ is going away” (p. 254) because news and information now need to be transmitted in real time. Wenger and Potter (2012) also describe how Heaton believes the concept of the broadcast journalist might be becoming outdated: “He suggests that a station might hire people with ‘deep knowledge of important niches in the community’ and train them to be reporters. The stories they produce could be used as content for online businesses” (p. 255). By including such an assessment, the authors diminish the power of the broadcast journalism even further. Not only are the media of radio and television in need of assistance from online resources, the journalists themselves could soon become obsolete. Formal journalistic training is no longer a requirement, just “deep knowledge” of an issue. The future of broadcast journalism is not only in flux, but in jeopardy.

The description of broadcast journalism by Wenger and Potter (2012) is in contrast to Murrow’s (1965) assessment that the “instruments” of broadcasting are “miraculous,” (p. 27), “powerful” (p. 28), and “satisfying and rewarding” (p. 29). Murrow lived at a time when television was still fairly new and a medium like the Internet could only be imagined. It is natural that he would have more respect for the capabilities of radio and television. With an emphasis placed on the superiority of multimedia reporting however, Wenger and Potter (2012) tend to portray broadcast journalism in its current form as outdated. The authors use another quote from consultant Terry Heaton to describe how news stations are still producing newscasts, but trying to figure out how to adapt to the future: “As I hear someone once say, it’s like fixing a car while you’re driving” (p. 256). The implication is that broadcast journalism is broken and is need of restoration. This analogy is also in sharp contrast to Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman’s (2007) description of broadcast journalism as a bus given to them by stockholders. For them the bus did not require repairs, but simply needed to be steered in the right direction. For Wenger and Potter (2012), the model is outdated and needs the help of other forms of media to stay relevant.

Question four considers how the authors describe the audience’s influence on content. Wenger and Potter’s (2012) assessment of the industry is that broadcasters must acquiesce control to the public and conform to their new expectations. This is apparent in their description of the current state of journalism: “Today's news consumers want the news they want when they want it, and that's changing the way journalists gather, package and deliver content” (p. xxvi). This expectation of instantaneous access means news consumers want news operations to work around their schedules, “not on a timetable set by a television station or a newspaper operation” (p. 5). News reporters must offer the public “more ways to access information and more control over how they do it” (p. 8). The result is that news consumers determine the pace of news and as a result place more demands on journalists to meet those expectations.

Wenger and Potter (2012) describe how this not only impacts the speed at which news is disseminated, but also how it is packaged. Filing a television news report is no longer enough; a journalist must “find a way to report information in the medium that works best for each individual news consumer" (p. 11). In some cases, this means making the news experience more interactive and giving the public more control over the content that they wish to see. In pursuing this approach the authors encourage reporters to ask themselves questions related to keeping the audience in mind: "How can I present the information in a way that's most helpful to the user's understanding? How can I make exploring this issue fun for the user?" (p. 18). According to the authors, giving the consumer more control over the flow of content also makes the experience more entertaining for them.

Beyond simply controlling the when and how a report is shaped, in some cases the public is also controlling the content itself. Wenger and Potter (2012) describe how the audience not only expects to dictate when and how news is delivered, but are now being encouraged more to contribute to that content. The multimedia world is allowing the creation of "citizen journalists," which the authors contend "is about inviting the audience to interact with you through the newsgathering process" (p. 226). In such cases, the citizens become the newsgatherers and provide reports for the news outlets. They are given the ultimate control over the newsgathering process because they dictate not only what is newsworthy, but shape the report from beginning to end.

Wenger and Potter (2012) recognize the dangers of such reports "because of a concern whether citizens know enough about journalistic standards" (p. 226). They describe how most newsrooms do not have the resources to fact-check the work of citizen journalists, but insist that "the value of user-generated content is so great that most newsrooms are using it in some way" (p. 227). They point to CNN's iReport website where it posts video reports from citizens who submit stories on various topics. The authors cite how CNN addresses the concern over misinformation on the website by posting this disclaimer: "The stories in this section are not edited, fact-checked or screened before they post. Only ones marked ‘CNN iReport’ have been vetted by CNN” (p. 228). This disclaimer is meant to absolve CNN of the responsibility over any errors that may appear on the website. In this case, the public is given the task of covering the news, but not the responsibility to meet journalistic standards in carrying out the task.

In their text, Wenger and Potter (2012) describe a public that is increasingly having much more control over the production of news. Like Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio, they contend that the audience is driving content, how the news presented, and more increasingly have control over when they get their news. Unlike a cooperative approach as advocated by Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman, (2007), where the audience is asked to guide the reporters in the best way to gather and report the news, Wenger and Potter (2012) go well beyond that, describing how in a multimedia newsroom the public can be given ultimate control by being allowed to gather and report news themselves. In such cases, the public drives all the aspects of the news, even becoming the reporters themselves.

Summary

My case study of three textbooks required in the top broadcast journalism programs in the nation revealed both agreement and disparity in how the authors addressed the themes that emerged from my analysis of Murrow’s RTNDA address. While the issues of corporate influence, the challenge in balancing duties to the public and employer, the function of broadcast journalism in society, and the public’s influence on news content are all relevant issues in today’s broadcasting landscape, the authors often displayed various positions on these concerns. Their descriptions of these topics also often differed from the stance Murrow presented in his RTNDA speech.

In addressing the issue of how corporate demands influence broadcasting, Murrow's stance was clear–he saw the commercial pressures leading to a decline in meaningful programming concerning important issues. He felt that corporate pressures should not get in the way of maintaining an informed public. Each author acknowledges that there is a corporate impact on the broadcasting industry, but to various degrees and with differing opinions on the ramifications. Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) minimize the impact with fleeting references to how cutbacks might require reporters to take on more duties, but engage in no broader discussion of the effects on news coverage. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) take an upfront approach to the corporate side of broadcast journalism, describing a symbiotic relationship between the business and journalistic side of the profession. To them one cannot live without the other, so journalists need to accept the corporate structure while still performing their duties. Wenger and Potter (2012) advocate more a situational acceptance of the corporate influence on broadcasting. The push towards convergence is a given, as is controversial practices such as producing a newscast to only a specific segment of the audience. Other potential impacts of corporate influence, such as having advertisers affect the coverage of news, is unacceptable. The authors seem to agree in theory that there should not be a corporate influence on broadcasting journalism, but the realities of business side of the industry sometimes require catering to those pressures.

There is also disparity in how the authors advise broadcast journalists to balance their corporate and journalistic obligations. Murrow emphasized a top-down approach, looking to corporate executives to help solve broadcasting's ills. Both Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) and Wenger and Potter (2012) downplay the struggles of the individual reporter in maintaining the balance in meeting the journalistic and corporate demands. The answer in both texts seems to be avoid using it as an excuse and simply work harder. Both also recommend maintaining high ethical standards despite the added pressures, but offer no recommendations to young journalists on how to do so in an environment that is not maintaining those standards. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) are more up front concerning the competing values in a newsroom environment. Unlike Murrow, they stress the possibility of changing the culture of a newsroom from the bottom-up, and empower young journalists to work at influencing the industry from within by practicing a pragmatic idealism.

The three textbooks also describe broadcast journalism's unique function in society differently. Murrow (1965) maintained the that the powerful instruments of broadcasting had the potential to "teach," "illuminate," and "inspire" (p. 32) and reminded broadcasters of their duty to do so under their license agreements with the FCC. There was a moral obligation to fulfill that role. Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) do not mention this duty to society until halfway through their text, and instead focus on more of the role of broadcast journalism to provide an "experience" to the viewer that can make news more appealing. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) recognize the role of broadcast journalism to work in the "public interest" at the outset of their text and describe the profession as a responsibility worthy of "a calling" (p. xix). Wenger and Potter (2012) portray broadcast journalism as simply a part of the larger media picture and one that is becoming antiquated and in need of repair. Even the special skills of broadcast journalists are ultimately downplayed. They are at risk of being replaced by people with "deep knowledge of important niches in the community" (p. 255) and there is a growing number of citizen journalists who can also perform their duties.

The impact of the audience on content is also described differently in the textbooks. Murrow's attitude towards the audience was based on an optimism that they would respond to balanced stories about controversial topics. He placed no blame on them for the abundance of entertainment programs at the expense of informational programming. Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) take the approach that the audience may not always know what is newsworthy and that reporters need to convince them through the way the reporter presents the story. If viewers turn away from important stories, the blame lies in the way the reporter put the story together. Like Murrow, Tuggle, Car, and Huffman (2007) also take a more optimistic view of the audience by trusting them to take a cooperative role in deciding what stations cover and how they cover it. Wenger and Potter's (2012) position is that the audience is demanding more control, so that it is up to the industry to cater to their requests. This includes not only what stories are covered, but also at what speed and where they can be found. This relinquishing of control is ultimately leading to citizen journalists, who control the news gathering process from beginning to end.

Based on the results of my qualitative case study, which was informed by my rhetorical analysis of Murrow's 1958 address, the Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) text was the most consistent with Murrow's vision of broadcast journalism and more fully addressed his concerns about the corporate influence within the industry. The author's depiction of broadcasting as "a calling" best reflects the moral obligation Murrow envisioned for broadcast journalists by emphasizing their responsibilities to society. Of the three textbooks, the Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman text also is the most upfront about the potential for journalistic responsibilities to be influenced by the corporate obligations. While the authors acknowledge the need to satisfy the business aspects of broadcast journalism, they offer the best advice on how young reporters can also fulfill their journalistic duties to the public. The Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman textbook was also the one that best laid the historical foundation of broadcast journalism, including Murrow's contribution to the profession and the obligation it has to serve the public.

CHAPTER FIVE: IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In chapter three, I considered Murrow's 1958 address using Perelman's rhetorical theory of universal audience and presence. My analysis revealed a speech in which Murrow crafted a rational argument for corporate entities to place the public ahead of profit and support quality informational programming. Murrow's use of presence in his speech to argue that the solution lies with the corporate heads also placed in the background the struggle of individual journalists to balance their corporate and public obligations, along with the responsibility of the viewers in influencing programming.

This led to chapter four, in which I provided my findings of a qualitative case study of three broadcast journalism textbooks used by the top journalism programs in the country as determined by *NewsPro* magazine. I found there was disparity in how the texts addressed the major themes that emerged from my analysis of Murrow's address. This included how the authors addressed the corporate influence on the broadcasting industry, their recommendations to broadcast journalists on how to balance their responsibilities to their employers and the public, their descriptions of broadcast journalism's function in society, and their depictions of the influence the audience should have on news content. In most cases, their descriptions were quite different than Murrow's views as expressed in his address.

In my final chapter I consider the implications of whether Murrow's views concerning broadcasting are reflected, or not reflected, in modern broadcast journalism textbooks. As I established in chapter two, Murrow is an iconic figure in the field of broadcast journalist and in many ways is considered the moral barometer for the industry. His 1958 RTNDA address was the pinnacle of his moral guidance for broadcast journalism, a profession that he helped to create.

In his address, Murrow took an idealistic view of broadcast journalism. He portrayed the profession as a moral endeavor that was necessary in a democratic society. He also pictured an audience that would respond rationally to reports that addressed controversial topics. While this message was certainly inspirational to broadcast journalists, it also downplayed the commercial realities of the profession. Considering how consistent modern broadcast journalism textbooks are with Murrow's vision for the industry can provide an indication of whether his influence is still present in training young journalists. My analysis revealed that tensions exist between Murrow's assessments of how broadcast journalism can fulfill its duties compared to how the authors of the textbooks describe the profession's obligations and how to meet them.

Implications

Proactive versus reactive journalism. In his address, Murrow stressed the need for broadcast journalism to be proactive in the way it informed society. Murrow believed that the public was often unaware of many of the important issues facing the world, and that broadcasters had an obligation to enlighten citizens about those concerns. In this respect, Murrow envisioned broadcast journalism as often taking the initiative in showing the public what topics they need to be concerned about and presenting them in way that helped citizens make informed decisions related to those issues. In contrast, the broadcast journalism textbooks I analyzed emphasized more of reactive approach. Broadcast journalists are advised to respond to the evolving influences of technology on the broadcasting profession sparked by the corporate pressure for converged newsrooms. Their journalistic practices also must cater to the demands of the public when it comes to the pace of news and what is covered.

Murrow's emphasis on a proactive approach to broadcast journalism was initiated by his belief that the public debate of controversial topics was beneficial to a democracy. This was present in his radio reports on the rooftops of London during World War II when he tried to convince an apathetic America that it needed to be actively involved in confronting Hitler. It was also reflected in the subjects that he and co-producer Fred Friendly covered with *See It Now*, whether it was a program on desegregation of the South, the nuclear debate, or the tension between Israel and Egypt in the Middle East (Kendrick, 1969). He felt that broadcast journalism had the responsibility to be willing to take the initiative in confronting such issues, even if they are topics that are not always popular among viewers or listeners. Murrow's belief was that broadcasting had the obligation to help the public realize what issues are vital to their interests as citizens in a democracy.

Murrow's vision for broadcasting is also reflected in a statement he made to one of his wartime correspondents when the young reporter discussed life after the war. As described by author David Halberstam, the young reporter told Murrow that he would likely go back to Brooklyn to teach French. In response, Murrow asked him: "Kid, how would you like the biggest classroom in the world?" (Steinberg, 2005). For Murrow, broadcast journalism was a classroom for the masses that was meant to teach and enlighten concerning the important issues of the day. Those involved in the profession needed to be proactive in seeking out the issues that the public might be overlooking and make them aware of their importance through informative reporting. That was one of his primary goals with *See It Now* and was also the message he tried to convey in his RTNDA address.

The textbooks I included in my qualitative case study were indicative of a more reactive approach to the broadcast journalism profession. One of the primary ways in which broadcast journalists are asked to be reactive is to adapt to changing journalistic practices brought on by a converged newsroom environment. This was alluded to in Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) and

Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012), but was a primary focus of Wegner and Potter (2012). Since the technology involved with reporting allows reporters to be able to distribute information faster, they must learn to adapt to a more frantic pace. This adjustment may come at a cost, such as information that is incomplete or even incorrect, but journalists are asked to adapt to this new environment.

Broadcast journalists are asked to be reactive to this converged environment for two reasons. While not always overtly mentioned in the textbooks, one is to meet the corporate expectations of a newsroom that is more lean and efficient. A converged newsroom means a single reporter can produce stories for multiple platforms, requiring fewer staff members. The second, which is the reason most stressed in the texts, is to meet the demands of the public who increasingly expect news to be reported faster and in the multiple platforms. Whether it is to meet the corporate or public demands, young broadcast journalists are warned that they must be responsive to these forces when preparing for the profession.

By stressing the need to be reactive to both the corporate pressures and the public demands, there is the danger of moving further away from the type of informational programming envisioned by Murrow. By requiring that reporters cover more stories and disseminate them for multiple platforms, there is the danger that quantity becomes the primary concern at the expense of quality. The daily grind of churning out stories for both the television and online platforms has the potential to limit the time a journalist can devote to more in-depth and substantive reports. This was already the case with the more traditional television newsroom environment, but is potentially exacerbated in the converged newsroom. Wenger and Potter (2012), whose text most fully addresses the converged environment, acknowledge this concern but argue that reporters simply need to work harder. They gloss over the reality of the situation and students are left without meaningful advice. Young journalists simply must adapt to these corporate pressures.

The emphasis placed on reporters being reactive to the public in their approach to reporting news also has the potential to move broadcast journalism further away from Murrow's concept of a medium to that works to enlighten citizens. The textbooks often stress how the public now expects to get the news faster and in multiple platforms. Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) declare that "audiences have gained control of the medium" and that broadcast journalists must work harder than ever to attract and hold audiences (p. 213). In order to meet those demands, broadcast journalists are cautioned they must learn to do more in less time. In addition to the television news reports, they must also spend time writing stories for other platforms. Time that could be spent creating a more in-depth and meaningful report is potentially lost. Stories must also be more compelling to attract those audiences through the use of captivating video. The visuals and other elements can become more of a concern than the content.

The textbooks' emphasis on being completely reactive to the public can also lead to concerns over the topics that are covered in a newscast. This can occur when journalism goes too far in giving the public what it wants rather than what it needs when reporting the news. Wenger and Potter (2012) allude to this concern in discussing tailoring newscasts to a specific demographic. There is a danger of a producer only including stories would be appealing to that specific group. If the target demographic of a newscast, for example, is females between 25-45 years old the tendency might be to include only stories that group would find engaging. They are not exposed to issues that might be outside their realm of interest or concern. There is little enlightenment and certainly not the agitation the Murrow encouraged by exposing the public to controversial issues.

Cogs versus catalysts. While Murrow wanted broadcasting to be more proactive in meeting its obligations to the public, he provided limited options on how it could accomplish that goal. One of the major themes of Murrow's RTNDA address was that the only way to meet the challenge of maintaining a well-informed society was if corporate heads would be willing to support quality programming that confronted the important issues of the day. The influence of both the audience and those involved with broadcast journalism were downplayed and they were essentially cogs within the corporate structure. In contrast, the authors of the textbooks more readily acknowledge the influence of the public in shaping news coverage. They become more of a catalyst that helps in determining the news product, whether it is for the better or worse. In the Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) text, broadcast journalists themselves are also empowered to become catalysts for positive change within the industry. They can impact the corporate machine.

By considering journalists to be cogs in an unstoppable machine, the only solution Murrow saw was relying on the leadership of the corporations to acquire a sense of social responsibility. This would result in them sponsoring airtime solely for the purpose of informing viewers about the critical issues that faced society. The solution Murrow advocated in many ways reflects what later would become the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Through a mix of corporate sponsorship, government funding, and viewer support, the goal of public broadcasting is "to create content that educates, informs, and inspires" (PBS, "Mission Statement," n.d.). The Public Broadcasting Service also bills itself as "America's largest classroom," echoing the words Murrow used to describe what he felt the mission of broadcast journalism should be in serving the public (PBS, "About PBS," n.d.).

In some respects, Murrow's long-time friend and co-producer of *See It Now*, Fred Friendly, took up Murrow's cause in 1966 when he resigned as the president of CBS News after the network aired an episode of *The Lucy Show* instead of carrying live coverage of Senate hearings questioning U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War (Friendly, 1967). Friendly then joined the Ford Foundation, which urged Congress to create the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). When that was accomplished in 1969, Friendly went on to produce public television's first live weekly program (Day, 1995). Like Murrow, Friendly had come to the conclusion that the corporate, commercial structure had too much influence over news content at the networks.

Since its inception, public broadcasting has provided a much-needed alternative to the programming that the networks offer. Over the years, however, some have questioned whether it is actually fulfilling its initial mandate to serve in the public's best interest. Lashely (1992) argues that over the years public television has changed from serving the broader public and "shifted into serving the more narrow interests of viewer checkwriters and industry professionals" (p. xvi). Its reliance on government dollars also makes it vulnerable to political pressures. Former public television producer Roger P. Smith (2002) contends that this pressure has prevented programmers at PBS from confronting the issues that government officials might consider contentious: "Any idea, program or series proposal that might possibly put in question any aspect of the belief system of those holding control of the purse is labeled 'controversial,' and is *ipso facto* simply disallowed" (p. 10). According to Smith, just as Murrow lamented in his RTNDA address about network programming, subject matter that might cause discomfort or controversy at PBS is often overlooked in favor of topics that are more palatable to those in charge.

Such assessments illustrate that Murrow's idea of a top-down solution that relies on corporate generosity to sponsor programming that addresses controversial topics is not without its problems. Murrow had hoped for a system that would require corporations to have a hands-off approach to the programming. In his RTNDA address, Murrow (1965) even dismisses the notion that he is advocating a system where "news and information should be subsidized by foundations or private subscriptions" (p. 30). What Murrow did not want for television is similar to the PBS system of fundraising, which in part relies on the generosity of corporate underwriting and individual donations along with government support. In the PBS structure corporations and government entities do influence content, even if it comes in the form of PBS producers trying to assure a steady stream of support by creating programming that corporate donors and politicians will find agreeable. The influence is not always as overt as commercial sponsorship, but is still present. Murrow perhaps recognized that potential danger.

Unlike Murrow, the authors of the textbooks I considered ascribed more influence to the viewing audience. Murrow portrayed the audience as victims of corporate greed rather than a force that could impact the programming that the networks offered. The authors, however, admit that news consumers are the ones who shape the pace at which news is gathered and how it is delivered. The goal of attracting viewers and listeners becomes the motivation for the decisions related to news coverage. While some of these changes can result in a lower quality news product, there is an acknowledgement that the public wields power in transforming journalism. Journalists are supposed to keep the public in mind when making choices of what to cover and how to cover the news. Listeners and viewers are supposedly able to impact the final product through their preferences and choices when it concerns news.

In addition to the audience becoming a possible source of change, one of the textbooks also empowers young journalists to not simply be a cog, but work towards making a difference. Of the three textbooks, the Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) text was the only one that fully encouraged journalists to become catalysts for positive change within a newsroom to better reflect the ideals Murrow held for the profession. They believe that if the next generation of journalists can hold on to high journalistic standards there is hope that a transformation can occur at the ground level, newsroom by newsroom. No corporate generosity is required.

One area where there was little tension between Murrow's RTNDA address and the textbook authors was the acknowledgement that broadcasting is built around a commercial structure and that journalists must work within it. Murrow's recommendation was not to abandon the commercial system, but use a top-down approach to repair an aspect of it. The authors of the textbooks also do not challenge the legitimacy of the commercial structure of broadcasting. Any changes must occur within it. Transformation is possible through a bottom-up approach spawned by members of the public who shape the journalistic process or by the broadcast journalists who commit themselves to encouraging changes from within.

Recommendations

My rhetorical analysis of Murrow's RTNDA address and my qualitative case study of three broadcasting textbooks used by the top journalism schools in the nation revealed there are tensions that exist between Murrow's view of broadcasting and the perspective of modern day authors. Murrow advocated a more proactive approach to broadcast journalism versus a reactive one. At the same time his solution was based on the idea that the cure to fix broadcast journalism had to come from the top. The audience and the journalists themselves were cogs in the corporate machine, not catalysts for change. In some respects, Murrow's top-down approach is not surprising based on his own frustrations with CBS. By the time of speech, he likely felt there was little hope of broadcast journalists influencing the system.

I believe that positive change can come from within if young broadcasters are prepared to be a positive influence. In order for that to happen broadcasting instructors must take steps to shape the next generations of journalists. Based on my experience as a television news reporter, my many years as a broadcasting instructor, and the findings of this dissertation, I offer some recommendations to other broadcasting educators as they train their students. My hope is that these suggestions can help prepare those entering the profession to fulfill both their obligations to their employer and the public.

Be bold in teaching balance. Broadcasting students must have an equal understanding and appreciation for the dual purpose of their profession. It can be tempting to view the obligations of a reporter who must attract viewers and the role of a journalist who serves the public as an irreconcilable dichotomy. The supposition might be that when a journalist is fulfilling the requirements of their employer to boost ratings, they must somehow be accomplishing that goal by shirking their responsibility to provide meaningful information to the public. This is certainly true in many cases. Each time a prime time news program reverts into a variation of *Entertainment Tonight* or a local newscast runs a sensationalized series during sweeps week, it can weaken the viewers' faith that broadcast journalism is even worthy of having journalism in its name.

Broadcast educators must teach students that their obligations to their employer and the public do not necessarily have to be mutually exclusive. Good journalism can exist hand in hand with strong ratings and the public will often recognize and reward substantive reporting. This revelation is chronicled in the book *We Interrupt This Newscast: How to Improve Local News and Win Ratings, Too* (2007), which seeks to debunk the notion that viewers desire a constant stream of tabloid journalism. The authors base their findings on what they describe as "the most extensive study ever conducted on local TV news" (Rosenstiel et al., 2007, p. 4). This included a content analysis of five years worth of newscasts from 154 stations in large, medium, and small markets and compared the content with the stations' ratings over time. The research also included surveys of news directors and focus groups with actual viewers to gain their perspectives.

Rosenstiel et al. (2007) concluded that a lot of the assumptions that newsrooms have about audience behavior are incorrect. They advise news stations to put aside these myths and instead focus on creating stories that are proven to attract an audience. These myths include the beliefs that "a newscast should emphasize stories that shock or amaze" viewers (p. 56), that "TV is an emotional medium in which pictures are more important that words or ideas" (p. 66), that "viewers care only about local news" (p. 80), and that "viewers will not watch long stories about issues" (p. 85). In each case the authors demonstrated just the opposite. They discovered that viewers were often attracted to stories they felt were important, regardless of whether it had compelling video or was a longer report with more details. They also were attracted to international news they believed had an impact on their lives.

Another conclusion of the study was that immediacy alone was not necessarily attractive to viewers. Rosenstiel et al. (2007) concluded that other factors were equally or more appealing to the audience: "Indeed we found that starting a newscast with an unanticipated everyday crime event made zero difference in ratings" (p. 64). The authors discovered that a late-breaking story that did not concern a topic of importance actually faired worse in the ratings than pre-produced stories that dealt with issues and policy. Such findings reveal that good journalism and strong ratings are possible and students need to know they can serve both the public and their employer.

In addition to stressing the public service aspect of broadcasting, educators should also be upfront about the competitive business side of broadcast journalism. The reality is that broadcast journalism is a profession that requires a specific skill set of strong writing, reporting, and on-air appeal. It is a popular career choice and there are often many more job applicants for the number of jobs available in the field. My own experience in talking with news directors is that even in small market stations they can receive more than a hundred applicants for a single opening in the newsroom. Besides teaching sound journalistic principles, educators are remiss if they do not stress the need for students to develop strong interpersonal and presentation skills, along with refining their appearance for television news. While a strong foundation in the public service obligation that comes with broadcast journalist is a must, it will mean nothing if a young journalist is not prepared for the competitive and often harsh business side of the profession.

One important bit of advice that I stress with my students that I rarely see in broadcasting textbooks is the need for young broadcast journalists to develop a thick skin. Because television is a medium with both pictures and sound students need to be prepared to have all aspects of their reporting scrutinized and in many cases criticized. Writing is a component that often needs improvement, but news directors can be blunt about other aspects of young journalists' reports. News directors may also complain that a reporter has a voice that sounds too nasally or a hairstyle that needs to be changed. They may not like the way a reporter uses their hands during a stand-up, the pace of their delivery, or how they dress. While these concerns may seem trivial to some, news directors often consider every detail of a newscast and presentation plays an important role. If this is not stressed with students before they seek their first job they may not be prepared to enter the competitive job market.

There is also the reality that they may have to do stories that do not always fit the idealistic mold of compelling and substantive news. While the overall goal of a young reporter should be to consistently provide worthwhile and meaningful stories that fulfill the public service aspect of journalism's mandate, the reality is that there will be times a reporter may be asked to do a story that does not fit that mold. Young journalists should not simply refuse to do a story they might consider to be more "fluff" than news. A newscast typically has a variety of stories and hopefully other reporters in the newsroom are producing the more substitutive news of the day. That young reporter will likely get their chance to do more hard-hitting reports in the future. If the newscast consistently avoids reporting worthwhile news that is another matter, but young reporters must realize that they will be called to do a variety of reports and some will likely be on the "lighter" side of news. That does not mean, however, that they are compromising their journalistic ideals.

Young journalists can look to Murrow as an example of this balance. While it may have been deemphasized in his RTNDA address, there was a side of Murrow that was comfortable with contributing programming that focused on the lighter side of broadcast journalism. When Murrow hosted the *Person to Person* program or devoted *See It Now* reports to celebrity profiles he realized that broadcasting, and even the narrower focus of broadcast journalism, is not always about hard-hitting, issue-driven reports. There is room for variety and it is not a moral lapse to offer viewers some lighter, human-interest type of stories. The trouble comes when the balance is skewed and the more controversial substantive issues are avoided altogether.

Broadcast instructors should not just be teachers, but also mentors. Those who educate broadcast journalism students, whether it is in the form of a textbook or instruction in a classroom setting, should not just teach students but also take on the role of a mentor. Because of the many professional skills that are involved with broadcasting, it can be easy to concentrate on the technical instruction at the expense of providing guidance that is going to help them balance their obligations to their employer and the public. Students need more than technical and professional skills; they need a strong ethical and moral foundation that is going to help them navigate in the competitive field of broadcast journalism.

Providing a strong ethical foundation becomes even more important as reporters are being asked to do more with less. The trend towards a converged newsroom environment demands that in many cases young journalists are required to have skills related to online journalism. They must not only master their broadcasting duties, but also transform that story for an online audience. In such a hectic working environment there can easily be corporate pressures that hinder standard journalistic practices, such as taking shortcuts for the sake of speed in the desire to be first with the story. Educators need to make students aware, however, that ethical lapses for the sake of pleasing an employer will likely have negative impacts on their career and the station's reputation.

All of textbooks referred to the codes of ethics of journalism organizations to help guide students in such situations. The Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) and the Radio Television Digital News Association (RTDNA), which was renamed from the RTNDA, both lay out a list of ethical standards students should follow. Broadcast journalism educators need to go beyond simply pointing students to those codes of ethics and telling students to live by them. That is not meant to imply that those organizations' ethical guidelines are without merit.

RTDNA, for example, devotes an entire section of their code of ethics to confronting corporate influences. In a section titled "Guidelines for Balancing Business Pressures and Journalism Values" RTDNA establishes a list of best practices that news stations can follow. These include the following recommendations: "News operations should not show favoritism to advertisers" and "Content should be generated based on journalistic merits and not solely as an advertising vehicle" (RTDNA, n.d.). The organization also addresses the practice of newscasts catering to a specific demographic over serving the public interest as a whole.

While the recommendations in both the SPJ and RTDNA codes of ethics are important and worthy of adoption, they often lack context. In situations where questions concerning ethical journalistic practices arise, students need strategies on how to handle such scenarios. For a young journalist who is trying to make a good impression in a new position, the challenges brought on by corporate pressures can be even greater and having a strong moral compass becomes even more crucial. Students need to recognize the "why" in making an ethical decision when the business side of the profession encroaches on their journalistic obligations. To their credit, the authors of all three textbooks do provide some real world scenarios for students to consider in making ethical decisions. Such examples need to be reinforced through classroom discussions that encourage young journalists to consider the ramifications of letting corporate pressures impact journalistic standards.

In taking on a mentorship role, broadcast educators can provide the context students need by offering their first-hand experiences in properly balancing a reporter's business and journalism duties. They can help students see the value in following those guidelines and prepare them to defend them. For example, when I have discussions with my students about the need to keep the commercial side of the station separate from the news division I often relate it to a story from my own experiences. When I was a television news reporter I was approached by one of the people responsible for selling and producing commercials for our station. He suggested that when I covered a business story that I seek out those that advertise with the station for interviews and video for the report. His thought was that including interviews of their employees and footage of their stores would give the businesses added exposure beyond the commercials that run in the newscast.

I tell my students that I remember refusing his request and that he looked surprised by my response. At the time I could not articulate to him why it was unethical, but today I would have a more thorough answer for him and provide legitimate reasons as to why it also did not make good business sense. If the community discovered, for instance, that news stories could be bought and sold at the station as a form of stealth advertising how would viewers respond? Likely they would not consider the station to be a legitimate source of news and look instead to a competitor. Ratings would go down and advertising dollars with them. The individual in the sales department would be hurting his own efforts. Such a story is an example of placing the ethical balance between the journalistic and corporate side of broadcasting in context. It is also an illustration of showing students that making the right ethical decision also makes the most business sense.

It is also not helpful, as two of the textbooks imply, to tell young journalists to simply work harder so they can provide more in depth and meaningful reports in the midst of a more demanding news environment. Journalists entering the field need to be armed with a commitment to serve the public interest along with a realization that doing so can make good business sense. Rosenstiel et al. (2007) were able to establish that viewers of local television news, where most young broadcast journalists will start their careers, will respond positively to news of substance and importance. Broadcast educators need to provide students with examples of this type of reporting and explain the impact those stories can have on a community.

By mentoring the students in a way that stresses how serving the public can meet both the business and moral obligations that come with a profession in journalism, broadcast educators can better prepare them for the pressures that might tip that balance in the wrong direction. They can help them to become that voice in a newsroom that can make a case for the benefits of more in depth coverage, both for the sake of the community and the station itself. As Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) suggest, they can become the contrarians that try to work towards better coverage. They can help influence stations to shy away from the "if it bleeds, it leads" mentality and instead better serve the public. As mentors, broadcast educators can help in that effort by giving students evidence and examples that good journalism can make good business sense as well.

Balance audience wants and needs. Broadcast educators must also stress the need for those entering the field to appropriately balance an audience's wants and needs. The business side of broadcast journalism requires that a station attract and maintain viewers, but in doing so there may be a tendency for the news staff to base their story selection on what they believe viewers want rather than what the pubic may need. Despite the findings of Rosenstiel et al. (2007), many news stations rely on consultants or their collective intuitions in determining the types of stories viewers want in a newscast. There can be a tendency for stations, for example, to seek an immediate ratings spike during sweeps by airing more titillating stories of little substance. They heavily promote those stories and if they see a jump in ratings it validates their expectations of what the public wants.

There is also the reality, in spite of the research of Rosenstiel et al. (2007), that many viewers do enjoy watching stories with more entertainment value and little substance. Even Murrow realized this and some would argue contributed to viewers' appetites for such programming with *Person to Person*. In his RTNDA address Murrow (1965) stressed, however, that there needs to an appropriate balance and entrainment offerings should not exist at the expense of informational programming. He criticized the continual desire of network executives to cater only to this audience and use the excuse of "letting the public decide" (p. 31). Instead, he advocated also providing the audience with the information they need. His career was one of balancing those two sides of broadcasting and he wanted to assure viewers had a healthy balance as well.

Those who teach broadcasting must guide students on how to distinguish between audience wants and needs in order to help future journalists provide an appropriate balance for the viewers. It can often be challenging to figure out what stories a community might need to know about as opposed to what stories they might simply like to watch. Rachel Mersey, the author of the book *Can Journalism Be Saved?* (2010), believes that the current model of reporting has to change to properly fulfill this function. She advocates moving away for the social responsibility model of journalism and instead adapting what she calls an identity-based or audience-based model. Mersey (2010) describes this model as a bottom-up approach where "the audience determines everything" and that "if there is news that journalists think the audience needs to know, they have to figure out how to cast in the audience's interest" (p. 133). She believes this model would best serve the public because it would give them the control. It would also better serve disadvantaged groups because journalists would have to recognize the needs of all members of the public, not just the ones who would watch the television newscast or read the newspaper.

While I can appreciate Mersey's desire to give the audience more control when it concerns the content of news, I believe that it is possible to accomplish that goal in the current "public interest" model of journalism. Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) offer advise on this matter, stressing the need to "reach out to all segments of the community" and establish a dialogue in order to create stories that will "address community needs" (p. 252). This requires seeking out the underrepresented in the community to help discover what stories are perhaps being ignored. Students must learn to seek out those voices. This can occur through encouraging them to use online forums, but since some underrepresented groups may not have access to computers and social media, it also takes instilling a desire for journalists to create personal dialogues that can uncover some of these stories. They may not always be stories viewers want to see, such as a report that sheds light on homelessness, but are topics viewers need to know about in order to be fully aware about the challenges facing their communities.

While such advice may seem more like a reactive type of journalism because it relies on segments of the public to help shape the news that is covered, it is proactive in the sense that the journalists are actively seeking out that input. It is not reporters simply reacting to a bump in the ratings by providing more of the same, they are instead gaining an understanding of the issues they may need to cover that are currently being ignored. The goal is for journalists to illuminate themselves concerning those topics to they can then pass on what they have learned to the viewers. Such reporting can then contribute to the public dialogue concerning those issues, therefore fulfilling the social responsibility obligation of broadcast journalism.

Teach not only where the profession is going, but where it has come from. Broadcast educators should also help shape the future of broadcast journalism by reminding students of the history of the profession and its foundation. Of the three, only the Tuggle, Carr, and Huffman (2007) text devotes any significant space at the outset of the book to the history of broadcast journalism, which helps to establish that broadcast news was born on the principle of operating in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" (p. xiv). Shook, Larson, and DeTarsio (2012) barely mention this crucial aspect of broadcast journalism and do so only in passing halfway through their textbook. In the preface to their book, Wenger and Potter (2012) do mention that journalists have an important role in a free society and that the function of journalism has not changed, but do not go into details about how this obligation was established for broadcast journalism. It is telling that they include headings in their preface titled "Where we are going" and "How we get there." I would suggest another heading: How we got this far. Only by considering the foundation of broadcast journalism as it relates to its obligation to serve the public can those who work within the industry hope to avoid drifting away from those responsibilities.

This certainly does not mean avoiding the many challenges that face the future of broadcast journalism. Broadcast educators must accept the reality that the industry is changing and that with the advancements in technology the public has more options when watching news. Students must increasingly be prepared to navigate in a converged newsroom environment. This includes providing them with certain skills related to online journalism that were not as necessary a few years ago. Such instruction addresses the realities of the current industry.

In addition to looking to the future, however, broadcast journalists should also be reminded of the past and the foundations that established the profession. This was an argument

Murrow (1965) made in his RTNDA address concerning broadcasting when he contended that "in order to progress, it need only go backward" (p. 29). Again, such a statement does not imply that broadcast journalists should ignore the current challenges facing the industry, but it does acknowledge the need to reflect on the fundamental obligations that broadcast journalism is supposed to fulfill. These core responsibilities are often revealed by how they were carried out in the past. Broadcast educators can establish the desire within their students to fulfill those duties by discussing how individuals who came before them were able to meet their journalistic obligations.

One individual broadcast educators can point to as an example of someone who helped to maintain high journalistic standards within the industry is certainly Murrow himself. Two of the textbooks mention his name in passing but provide little or no context as to what he accomplished in the industry. By considering what he was able to achieve in broadcast journalism, his story can become an inspiration for others entering the profession. They can realize what their profession is capable of accomplishing when it maintains its commitment to the public. Young journalists can also see that the moral dilemma that Murrow faced in broadcast journalism between its corporate and public obligations is still going on today. His struggle has now become their struggle. If not placed in context, students could perceive the end of Murrow's career as discouraging, but broadcast educators need to focus on the foundation he laid and the example he set for others during his career. Included within that is the necessity to balance the business and journalistic sides of the industry.

Murrow is certainly not the only example of a broadcast journalist who strived to fulfill the journalistic obligations of the profession. Whether it was Walter Cronkite, Ted Koppel, or others, broadcast educators can point to those who labored to bring out the best in broadcast journalism. In doing so, educators must caution against making these individuals appear as saints. As Leab (1983) and Edgerton (1992) point out, much of the writings concerning Murrow border on hagiography and he can easily be easily be seen more of a legend rather than a man. Murrow certainly had many flaws and was even accused of betraying his journalistic principles with *Person to Person*. He, and many others like him in broadcast journalism, were simply individuals struggling to make a difference.

In addition to pointing to broadcasters from the distant past who have fulfilled their journalistic obligations, educators can also inspire students by looking to more recent examples. The textbook authors stress how converged journalism, besides becoming more of an economic reality, can also be used to produce strong journalism. Students need to be aware of those examples and see how it is possible to meet the public obligation of strong journalism in the midst of the changing broadcasting environment. Such cases can become an indication to students that despite constant corporate pressures journalism can make a difference in a democratic society. Instilling that belief in the next generation of reporters can help to assure that broadcast journalism will fulfill that role in the future.

Conclusion

This dissertation contributed to our understanding of Edward R. Murrow and his continued impact on broadcast journalism in several ways. First, it revealed the rhetorical strategies that Murrow used in his RTNDA speech and how they produced an address that emphasized a top-down solution to fix broadcasting rather than encouraging change from within. He painted broadcast journalism as a moral endeavor, but felt the real blame lied at the top. This dissertation also provided a practical application of the themes that emerged from Murrow's speech through a qualitative case study to see how closely modern broadcast journalism textbooks reflect his vision for the industry. Finally, based on those findings, it offered recommendations to broadcast educators to better prepare young journalists to face the challenges that are in many ways similar to those that Murrow confronted during his career.

Edward R. Murrow's 1958 RTNDA address pointed out how broadcasting's duty to inform the public was being tainted by growing corporate greed. Many refer to his speech when they criticize today's broadcast journalism and assert that Murrow's dire predictions of an ill-informed, apathetic society have been realized. In some respects that may be true, but the battle that Murrow fought for the integrity of broadcast journalism is ongoing. Like Murrow, there are those currently in the profession fighting to properly serve the public and a future generation of journalists will also soon be confronting those same struggles.

The solution Murrow saw for maintaining an informed society through broadcast journalism was to rely on corporate entities to donate primetime space towards the cause. This placed the obligation at the top. There is certainly merit in the argument that reforms should be made at the highest level, whether it is through the government more aggressively enforcing the requirements of broadcasters to serve in the public interest or the networks deciding they have an obligation to air more informative programming. Unfortunately, as even Murrow lamented in his day, the trend has been for the government to loosen that obligation and for the networks to air fewer programs of substantive news value.

By formulating an address that appealed to a particular audience of broadcast journalists that placed the blame at the top, Murrow missed the chance to encourage broadcast journalists to evaluate their own efforts in fulfilling their journalistic obligations. There was an opportunity to challenge them to assess what kinds of stories they were producing for their viewers. Were they fulfilling their journalistic obligations or simply providing entertainment value? In what ways could broadcast journalists at the local level help viewers develop an appetite for informative programming? Besides his call for changes at the top, Murrow could have helped encourage change from within.

Murrow has become an inspiration for those in broadcast news through his many journalistic accomplishments and the moral standards he set for the profession. Part of that legacy includes his criticism of the broadcasting industry and the growing imbalance between its commercial and journalistic obligations. Those challenges still exist within the industry. Broadcast journalists can easily become frustrated when changes for the better fail to occur from the top. The reality, however, is that they must still operate within that system. Broadcast educators need to prepare students to navigate in that environment so they can fulfill their duties to both their employer and the public. At the same time, educators can help future broadcast journalists realize that while they may not be able to transform the entire industry, they can work towards positive change where they are. They can do their part to fulfill Murrow's vision for broadcast journalism.

REFERENCES

Alger, D. (1998). *Megamedia: How giant corporations dominate mass media, distort competition, and endanger democracy*. Lahnam, MD: Bowman & Littlefield.

Atkinson, N. S., Kaufer, D., & Ishizaki, S. (2008). Presence and global presence in genres of self-presentation: A framework for comparative analysis. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 38*(4), 357-384.

Aurelius, M. (2005). *The meditations of Marcus Aurelius*. (G. Long Trans.). Stilwell, KS: Digireads.com Publishing.

Barkin, S. M. (2003). *American television news: The media marketplace and the public interest.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Barnett, S. (2008). TV news and the echo of Murrow. *British Television Review, 19*(4), 37-44.

Barnouw, E. (1966). *A tower in babel: A history of broadcasting in the United States. Volume I – 1933*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Barnouw, E. (1970). *The image empire. A history of broadcasting in the United States. Volume III – from 1953*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Baughman, J. (1981). *See It Now* and television's golden age. *Journal of Popular Culture, 15*(2), 106-115.

Bayley, E. R. (1981). *Joe McCarthy and the Press.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Beniot, W. L. (1995). *Accounts, excuses, and apologies: a theory of image restoration strategies*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bergreen, L. (1980). *Look now, pay later: The rise of network broadcasting*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Bernstein, M., & Lubertozzi, A. (2005). *World War II on the air: Edward R. Murrow and the broadcasts that riveted a nation.* Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks, Inc.

Birnbaum, B. (Producer). (2005). *The McCarthy Years* [DVD]. New York, NY: New Video Group, Inc.

Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). (2001). *The rhetorical tradition* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Bliss, E., Jr. (Ed.) (1967). *In search of light: The broadcasts of Edward R. Murrow 1938-1961.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Knoff, Inc.

Bliss, E., Jr. (1991). *Now the news : The story of broadcast journalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Campbell, K. K., & Burkholder, T. R. (1997). *Critiques of contemporary rhetoric* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Charalambous, C. Y., Delaney, S., Hsu, H., & Mesa, V. (2010). A comparative analysis of the addition and subtraction of fractions in textbooks from three countries. *Mathematical Thinking & Learning, 12*(2), 117-151.

Cissna, K. N. (2000). Applied communication research in the 21st century. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*(2), 169-173.

Cloud, S., & Olson, L. (1996). *The Murrow boys: Pioneers on the frontlines of broadcast journalism*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Cochran, B. (2008, February). What would Murrow do? *RTNDA Communicator*, 14, 15. Retrieved at http://www.rtnda.org/pages/media_items/presidents-column-what-would-murrow-do917.php

Collins, K. (2012). Murrow and Friendly's Small World: Television conversation at the crossroads. *Journal of Popular Film & Television, 40*(1), 4-13.

Condit, C. M. & Bates, B. R. (2009). Rhetorical methods of applied communication scholarship. In L. R. Frey & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Applied Communication Resaerch* (pp. 106-128). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Coviello, N., & Munro, H. (1997). Network relationships and the internationalisation process of small software firms. *International Business Review, 6*(4), 361-386.

Crosswhite, J. (2010). Universalities. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 43*(4), 430-448.

Culbert, D. H. (1976). *News for everyman: Radio and foreign affairs in thirties America.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Cull, N. (2003). "The man who invented truth": The tenure of Edward R. Murrow as director of the United States Information Agency during the Kennedy years. *Cold War History, 4*(1), 23-48.

Day, J. (1995). *The vanishing vision: The inside story of public television.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Delia, J. G. (1987). Communication research: A history. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 20-98). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

DeWine, S. (2005). Contributions of engaged scholarship to the academic community. In J. L. Simpson & P. Shockley-Zalabak (Eds.), *Engaging Communication, Transforming Organizations: Scholarship of Engagement in Action* (pp. 191-201). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Douglas, G. H. (1987). *The early days of radio broadcasting*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.

Douglas, S. J. (1987). *Inventing American broadcasting, 1899-1922*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Edgerton, G. (1992). The Murrow legend as metaphor: The creation, appropriation and usefulness of Edward R. Murrow's life story. *Journal of American Culture, 15*(1), 75-91.

Edwards, B. (2004). *Edward R. Murrow and the birth of broadcast journalism*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Ehrlich, M. C. (1995). The ethical dilemma of television news sweeps. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 10*(1), 37-47.

Eschenfelder, B. (2011). Lessons about engaged communication scholarship: I heard it through the grapevine. *Florida Communication Journal, 39*(1), 37-54.

Feagin, J. R., Orum, A. M., & Sjoberg, G. (1991). *A case for the case study*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina.

Fees, J. (2011, December). Survey: The top 25 journalism schools. *NewsPro,* 21-23. Retrieved at http://www.tvweek.com/np51_28pg_SinglePg.pdf

Flicker, S. (2008). Who benefits from community-based participatory research? A case study of the Positive Youth Project. *Health Education & Behavior, 35*(1), 70-86.

Frank, D. A. (1998). Dialectical rapprochement in the New Rhetoric. *Argumentation & Advocacy, 34*(3), 111-126.

Frank, D. A., & Bolduc, M. (2004). From *vita contemplativa* to *vita activa*: Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca's rhetorical turn. *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*, 7, 65-86.

Friendly, F. (1967). *Due to circumstances beyond our control*. New York, NY: Random House.

Gates, G. P. (1978). *Air time: The inside story of CBS news*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. London: Continuum.

Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(3), 370-403.

Godfrey, D. G. (1993). Ethics in practice: Analysis of Edward R. Murrow's WWII radio reporting. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 8*(2), 103-118.

Gross, A. (1999). A theory of the rhetorical audience: Reflections on Chaim Perelman. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85*, 203-211.

Gross, G., & Dearin, R. D. (2003). *Chaim Perelman*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Grossman, L. K. (2002). Murrow said it all in 1958. *Columbia Journalism Review, 41*(1), 53.

Hachten, W. A. (2005). *The Troubles of Journalism: A critical look at what's right and wrong with the press (3rd ed.*). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Herrick, J. A. (2009). *The history and theory of rhetoric*. (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hilliard, R. L., & Keith, M. C. (1992). *The broadcast century: A biography of American broadcasting*. Boston: Focal Press.

Jenkins, E. (2007). The presence of Perelman: Selection and attention in a noisy world. In S. Jacobs (Ed.), *Concerning Argument* (pp. 404-413). Washington: National Communication Association.

Journalism class is devoted solely to Murrow's life. (1989, Mar. 12). *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1989/03/12/style/campus-life-fordham-journalism-class-is-devoted-solely-to-murrow-s-life.html

Karon, L. (1976). Presence in the new rhetoric. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 9*(2), 96-111.

Kendrick, A. (1969). *Prime time: The life of Edward R. Murrow*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Kennedy, G. A. (1963). *The art of persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, G. A. (1972). *The art of rhetoric in the Roman world, 300 B.C.-A.D. 300*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Kreps, G. L., Frey, L. R., & O'Hair, D. (1991). Applied communication research: Scholarship that can make a difference. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 19*(1), 71-87.

Lashley, M. (1992). *Public television: Panacea, pork barrel, or public trust?* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Leab, D. J. (1983). See It Now: A legend reassessed. In J. E. O'Connor (Ed.), *American history/American television, interpreting the video past.* New York, NY: Frederick Ungar Publishing.

Leslie, L. Z. (1988). Ethics as communication theory: Ed Murrow's legacy. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 3*(2), 7-19.

Lichty, L. W., & Topping, M. C. (1976). *American broadcasting; a source book on the history of radio and television.* New York: Hastings House.

Matsuda, A., & Matsuda, P. K. (2011). Globalizing writing studies: The case of U.S. technical communication textbooks. *Written Communication, 28*(2), 172-192.

Matusow, B. (1983). *The evening stars: The making of the network news anchor*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

McPhail, T. L. (2010). *Global communication: Theories statkeholders, and trends*. (3rd ed.). West Sussex, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.

Measell, J. S. (1989). Perelman on analogy. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), The new rhetoric of Chaim Perelman: Statement and response (pp. 179-189). New York: University Press of America. (Reprinted from *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, (1984), 65-71)

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative case study research. In S. B. Merriam *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation.* (pp. 39-54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merron, J. (July 1988). Murrow on TV: See It Now, Person to Person, and the making of a 'masscult personality.' *Journalism Monographs, 106*, 1-36.

Mersey, R. D. (2010). *Can journalism be saved?: Rediscovering America's appetite for news.* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Mickelson, S. (1995, September). Watching Paley read Murrow's speech. *RTNDA Communicator*, 53. Retrieved from http://www.rtnda.org/media/pdfs/communicator/classic_communicator/Mickelson.pdf

Mickelson, S. (1998). *The decade that shaped television news: CBS in the 1950s*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994), *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage Publications.

Milofsky, C. (2006). The catalyst process: What academics provide to practitioners. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership. 16*(4), 467-480.

Murphy, J. J. (1972). *A synoptic history of classical rhetoric* (1st ed.). New York: Random House.

Murphy, J. J. (1974). *Rhetoric in the middle ages: A history of rhetorical theory from Saint Augustine to the renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Murphy, J. M. (1994). Presence, analogy, and 'Earth in the Balance.' *Argumentation and Advocacy, 31*(1), 1-16.

Murrow, E. R. (1965). Murrow's indictment of broadcasting. *Columbia Journalism Review, 2*(4), 27-32.

Murrow school to become college. (2008). WSU News Center. Retrieved from http://wsutoday.wsu.edu/pages/Publications.asp?Action=Detail&PublicationID=4643

Nicolas, L. (2011). The function of the "universal audience" in Perelman's rhetoric: Looking back on a theoretical issue. In J. T. Gage (Ed.), *The Promise of Reason: Studies in the New Rhetoric*. (pp. 48-54). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Noe, M. (2005). The real and the preferable: Perelman's structures of reality in Jonson's Bartholomew Fair. *Rhetoric Review, 24*(4), 421–37.

Norman, P. J., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2005). Mind activity in teaching and mentoring. *Teaching and Teaching Education, 21*, 679-698.

Oakley, T. (1997). The new rhetoric and the construction of value: Presence, the universal audience, and Beckett's "three dialogues." *RSQ: Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 27*(1), 47-68.

O'Connor, J. E. (1986). Edward R. Murrow's report on senator McCarthy: Image as artifact. *Film & History*, 16, 55-72.

The Paley Center for Media. (n.d.). *See It Now: Atomic timetable {part 2 of 2}: Fallout*. Retrieved from http://www.paleycenter.org/collection/item/?q=murrow&p=7&item=T77:0151

Paley, W. S. (1979). *As it happened: A memoir*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Paper, L. J. (1987). *Empire: William S. Paley and the making of CBS*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

PBS. (n.d.). *About PBS*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/about/

PBS. (n.d.). *Mission Statement*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/about/corporate-information/

Perelman, C. (1979). *The new rhetoric and the humanities: Essays on rhetoric and its applications.* Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Perelman, C. (1982). *The realm of rhetoric.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Perlow, L. A. (1998). Boundary control: The social ordering of work and family time in a high-tech corporation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43*(2), 328-357.

Persico, J. E. (1990). *Edward R. Murrow: An American original*. New York, NY: Dell Publishing.

Pew Research Center (2005). Public more critical of press, but goodwill persists. Retrieved at http://people-press.org/2005/06/26/public-more-critical-of-press-but-goodwill-persists/

Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. New York, NY: Viking.

Potter, D. (2001, May). From silly to shameless. *American Journalism Review, 23*(4), p. 72.

Potter, D. (2008, October/November). What would Murrow do? *American Journalism Review*. Retrieved from http://www.ajr.org/article.asp?id=4620

Ray, J. (1978). Perelman's universal audience. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64*, 361-375.

Rifkin, B. (1998). Gender representation in foreign language textbooks: A case study of textbooks of Russian. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(2), 217-236.

Roberts, S., & Birnbaum, B. (Producers). (2005). *The best of see it now.* [DVD]. New York, NY: New Video Group, Inc.

Rosenfield, L. W. (2005). The anatomy of critical discourse. In C. R. Burgchardt (Ed.), *Readings in rhetorical criticism*. (3rd ed.). (pp. 67-86). State College, PA: Strata Publishing, Inc. (Reprinted from *Speech Monographs, 35*(1), 1968, 50-69).

Rosenstiel, T., Just, M. R., Belt, T. L., Pertilla, A., Dean, W. C., & Chinni, D. (2007). *We interrupt this newscast: How to improve local news and win ratings, too.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Rosteck, T. (1994). *See it now confronts McCarthyism: Television documentary and the politics of representation.* Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

RTDNA: Radio Television Digital News Association, (n.d.). *Ethics: Guidelines for Balancing Business Pressures and Journalism Values.* Retrieved from http://www.rtdna.org/pages/media_items/guidelines-for-balancing-business-pressures-and-journalism-values145.php

Rudner, L. (1981). Born to a new craft: Edward R. Murrow, 1938-1940. *The Journal of Popular Culture, 15*(2), 97-105.

See It Now (1951-1958). (n.d.) In IMDd.com. Retrieved from http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0211168/

Seeger, M. (2009). Does communication research make a difference: Reconsidering the impact of our work. *Communication Monographs. 76*(1), 12-19.

Seldes, G. (1953, November 7). At home with Edward Murrow. *Saturday Review*, pp. 37-38.

Seib, P. (2006). *Broadcasts from the blitz: How Edward R. Murrow helped lead American into war.* Dulles, VA: Potomac Books, Inc.

Sherry, J. L. (2010). The value of communication science. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 38*(3), 302-306.

Shook, F., Larson, J., & DeTarsio, J. (2012). *Television and field production and reporting: A guide to visual storytelling* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Smith, F. R. (1978). *Edward R. Murrow: The war years*. Kalamazoo, MI: New Issues Press.

Smith, R. P. (2002). *The other side of public television: Censoring the American dream.* New York, NY: Algora Publishing.

Sperber, A. M. (1986). *Murrow: His life and times*. New York, NY: Freundlich Books.

Sperber, A. M. (1995, September). No hope whatever… *RTNDA Communicator*, pp. 50-52, 54, 56. Retrieved from http://www.rtnda.org/media/pdfs/communicator/classic_communicator/about_speech.pdf

Stake, R. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

Steinberg, S. (Producer & Director). (2005). *Edward R. Murrow: This reporter.* [DVD]. New York, NY: New Video Group, Inc.

Stephen, M. (2005). *Broadcast News* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Sterling, C. H., & Kittross, J. M. (2002). *Stay tuned: A history of American broadcasting* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stout, L. N. (2010). The Edward R. Murrow of docudramas and documentary. *Media History Monographs, 12*(1), 1-21. Retrieved from http://facstaff.elon.edu/dcopeland/mhm/mhmjour12-1.pdf

Thomson, C. K. & Otsuji, E. (2003). Evaluation of business Japanese textbooks: Issues of gender. *Japanese Studies, 23*(2), 185-203.

Tompkins. A. (September 16, 2009). RTNDA focus group sounds off on news media, coverage. Retrieved from http://www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=2&aid=170072

Tompkins, P. S. (2003). Truth, trust, and telepresence. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 18*(3&4), 194–212.

Tucker, R. E. (2001) Figure, ground, and presence: A phenomenology of meaning in rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 87*(4), 396-414.

Tuggle, C. A., Carr, F. & Huffman, S. (2007). *Broadcast news handbook: Writing, reporting and producing in a converging media world.* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Upshaw, J., Chernov, G., & Koranda, D. (2007). Telling more than news: Commercial influence in local television stations. *Electronic News, 1*(2), 67-87.

Vanhulle, B. (2009). The path of history: Narrative analysis of history textbooks - a case study of Belgian history textbooks (1945-2004). *History of Education, 38*(2), 263-282.

Vincent, J. B. (1999). Propagation of errors in freshman chemistry textbooks: A case study using the magnetic moment of a spinning electron. *Journal of Chemical Education, 76*(10), 1460-1461.

Yin, R. (2004). *The case study anthology*. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yunling, C., & Delian, L. (2011). The compiling methods for pinyin textbooks of teaching of Chinese as a foreign language: A case study on The Textbook for Interesting Chinese Pinyin. *Studies in Literature and Language, 2*(1) 26-32.

Wenger, D. H., & Potter, D. (2012). *Advancing the story: Broadcast journalism in a multimedia world* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Wheen, F., & Fiddick, P. (1985). *Television : A history*. London: Century Pub.

Wrage, E. J. (2005). Public address: A study in social and intellectual history. In C. R. Burgchardt (Ed.) *Readings in rhetorical criticism*. (3rd ed.). (pp. 28-34). State College, PA: Strata Publishing, Inc. (Reprinted from *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 33*, 1947, 451-457.