THE CAUCUS QUARTERLY

Published by

THE CAUCUS FOR

PRODUCERS, WRITERS & DIRECTORS

February 1989

Editor's Comment:

First, this gives me an opportunity to wish all who receive this journal a Happy New Year from all of us in the Caucus. Second, we hope that you will write to us, give us your thoughts about any of the articles that appear within these pages, criticize us or compliment us, indicate areas you would like us to address. Finally, we invite your attention to the fact that three of the articles in this issue are concerned with language and literacy, and that in presenting them we are taking an initial step that deals with the major aspect of all television: program content. It is a sensitive area, but it is the heart of the matter and we hope to be able to open a dialogue on the subject among ourselves and between the Caucus and its readers. Join us and let us hear your thoughts.

Ted Bergmann

THE CAUCUS QUARTERLY
VOL. VII Number 1

Published by
The Caucus for Producers,
Writers & Directors
760 N. La Cienega Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90069
Telephone: (213) 652-0222

Editor:
TED BERGMANN

In This Issue

LET'S START OVER. THIS ISN'T WORKING.

A Speech to the Producer's Guild

I do this sort of thing a lot. Public speaking is something I enjoy and I invariably get through it with minimum preparation and almost NO ATTACK OF NERVES. I have been known to write speeches for my now estranged spouse and for the stars of my recently demised television series.

As to my qualifications to speak before this particular group —well, I've been a member since the late 60's, am current with my dues, and was raised by two new-deal Roosevelt Democrats.

Why then do I feel so bad? Why am I so nervous? Perhaps it is because I know that public speakers are not supposed to insult their audience and I'm aware that much of what I have to say will be goring somebody's ox ... maybe yours.

To begin, I am no longer convinced of the efficacy of our mission. I have, in fact, come to the place where I am questioning the reasonableness of all guilds in our industry. Secondly, our guild is not homogeneous. There are writers here who endorse their guild's attack in the courts on this body in its infancy. There are directors in our midst who would bar their fellow DGA members from sets — sets that would NOT exist if not for the vision, entrepreneurial, and creative skills of that producer.

We are hyphenated, bifurcated and fractionalized.

We have watched and, often times, participated in allowing the producer credit to become so diminished as to become meaningless. There was a time when the question, "What does a producer do?" was only asked at civilian cocktail parties in the suburbs. Now, we regularly ask ourselves.

Production managers are producers. Writers are producers, so are story editors and directors' secretaries. In the midst of our current labor strike in Hollywood, writers still conjure up the pre-depression days of the 20's when, it is alleged, producers regularly stole their credit. Those writers of letters to the editor don't have to look that far back. It is going on as a regular practice today, although the shoe is on the other foot.

More than once, on "Cagney & Lacey," I was told by much-in-demand writers, that their claim to the producer's credit was a deal-breaker. They weren't producers. They knew it and I knew it. They didn't confront the network, the financier, or the stars on a daily basis. They didn't labor into

the night over editing machines or at spotting and dubbing sessions. Their vision was not reflected in casting or promotion or even the series itself. Still, they insisted they be called producers. They wanted to be "in the club."

At Emmy time I was seated as they trooped to the stage for their writing and directing honors. It would be wrong, of course, for me to take part of that glory. When it was my turn, there *they* were, trudging up to the stage along with me and, only because I am fleet of foot, did I manage to gain access to that microphone to thank my long-suffering family.

I have been embarrassed. Years ago, at a meeting of the Caucus of Producers, Writers and Directors, Lillian Gallo approached and asked, "Barney, how could you, of all people, allow this to happen?" She was referring to the then half-dozen employees of mine who were listed as producers of "Cagney & Lacey" on her Emmy ballot.

Lillian Gallo was right. I was weak. I was tired of fighting and tired of losing. I needed those writers. That they, to some extent, needed me, I will leave to their resumés post "Cagney & Lacey."

I've always understood we had different jobs. Once, we had different titles. I never went after theirs. When I would give them a notion, it was a gift. When I would say, "I don't like this idea you've presented, but here's one I do like," I was not after their story money or their credit.

I could defend their material better than they themselves. Not only because I am glib, but because I have not been trained, as they have, to take notes. I can passionately defend the writing or a line in a scene or a screenplay, and not be accused of egotistically fighting for my own words. They were *their* words.

I am glib. I am a good storyteller. I give great meetings. Does that make me a good writer? Of course not. Are good writers only those who function well in conferences? What about the writer who stutters, who sweats in public, who needs hours or days in his or her lonely room to come up with a line or a rejoinder? What about the writer who looks his or her age? Should they be precluded from doing business?

In this hyphenated era they are suffering almost as much as we.

I say "we," but who are "we"? That's the tough part about speaking to this group. Usually one is invited to speak by people who already agree with what you're going to say or who are so totally ignorant of your subject that the speaker need fear few repercussions.

That's not true here. Many of you have a different vested interest and so might disagree with me violently.

Meanwhile, I've got bad news. *The Wall Street Journal* recently published the names of the world's top twenty-five banks and there is not a U.S. corporation among them. This country no longer produces the best steel in the world, nor the best automobile, nor the finest TV sets. We do still manufacture the greatest motion picture and television product in the world, but not for long. The economic unification of Europe is a reality. This will impact on us all. I'm not talking about the six billion dollar loss to the economy of this community. The Japanese will readily absorb that. The value of Los Angeles real estate will not be negatively affected. I'm not even talking about the hundreds of billions that will be lost to this country via the balance of trade. I'm talking about the American dream. The vision of our culture and our hopes and fears that for so long have influenced the entire world. Doesn't it help world peace that teenagers in Russia wear Levis and know the words to Bruce Springsteen songs? Haven't we, as a nation, all benefitted because of the images of America that have been screened and broadcast throughout the world? Maybe the Europeans or the Japanese or Koreans will do it better, but whether they do it better or not, they are going to do it. And my grandchild will be affected by it.

As usual, Hollywood is a microcosm of our society. We are fat, complacent, and selfish. We shoot ourselves in the foot over miniscule percentages of foreign gross.

This is paradise! Hasn't anyone else noticed?!

People put up tons of capital to finance our dreams. We function in the most creative and exciting environment in the history of the world. If we are good, we find honors and celebrity heaped upon us and, often times, more money that we ever dreamed possible. Still, we can't stop kvetching. When we are not fighting the bosses, or the system, we are fighting each other. It is the Tower of Babel revisited.

Leadership is what is required. Lew Wasserman is seventy-three. He is rightfully enjoying his grandchildren. It's not his problem anymore ... it is ours.

We must unite with our other guilds and talk seriously about major reorganization. We must come up with new thinking for the 21st century. We must stop dealing in terms of greed and look to our survival. We might acknowledge that automatic economic participation, such as residuals, may NOT be a God-given right that should be spelled out as part of every minimum basic agreement. (Note: the operative word here is *minimum.*) This concept, after all, was invented in the 1950's attempting to anticipate the technology of the 60's. It has little to do with the marketplace of the 1990's.

Speaking of out-of-date ideas, what about package fees? What about having our agents return to representing us instead of being our no-risk partners.

A good idea we've lost, but must return to, is getting the networks to announce their Fall schedules in January instead of June. That would put this community back to work on an 11-month-a-year basis instead of the current 8½ month schedule. Not only would we save a fortune in overtime expenses, but consider employee efficiency and loyalty. Are you tired of your grips and sound-men looking for their next job while ostensibly working for you? Are you shocked at the alcoholism and drug-abuse on your sets? These people on our crews have all the drawbacks of being entrepreneurs and few of the rewards. Work toward an eight to ten hour day, instead of the current standard of twelve-plus, and you will see a difference — in your pocketbook, in your product. What we are doing to the quality of the lives of those we work with is morally reprehensible.

Is proliferation of credits your "jones?" The Writers Guild is suffering here, too. Their free-lance members are being squeezed out of the business by too-large writing staffs who incestuously hand out assignments to themselves and defame, by compulsive re-writes, their fellow guild members. There's a possible mutuality of interest here.

What if both our guilds came to an agreement that there would be but one producer per show — no executive producer, no supervising producer, no line producer — ONE producer, and that he be limited in the writing area to providing only "A through H" services.

Television will be infused with newer and fresher ideas where producers — the storytellers — work to encourage writers to do their best efforts ... to be better than their best. Perhaps it doesn't apply to all shows or all formats, but I've never bought the old saw of "Nobody can write this show but me."

How disheartening it must be to that outside writer, assaulted by five or six mavens all shouting "What if ... " How demeaning, that typewriter looming in the so-called producer's office. And the writer knows that whatever he creates will be be run through that machine.

Do you know that a new credit has been born? I haven't seen it on screen yet, but I've heard it in meetings all over town: "show-runner." Someone with a vision. Someone who can handle the network and studio needs, communicate with the cast, hire the writers and the directors, supervise the editorial concept, and turn out a consistent, promotable product, time-after-time, week-after-week. It sure sounds

like a producer to me but, that credit, if it is ever to mean anything again, will have to be retrieved from an awful lot of production managers, staff writers, directors, and assistants.

And what of that elitist corps known as the DGA? This industry is collapsing around their ears and they travel to Washington to complain about colorization! Give me a BREAK!

How about some parity in this industry? In dollars and in credit. Why is a first-time director of an on-going television series paid thousands more per episode than the writer? Why is there no minimum for a producer? What is the logic of this? Why should either a novice writer or director on "Cagney & Lacey" receive, in direct payments and residuals, over half the money of such high-priced stars as Sharon Gless or Tyne Daly? This is insane!

I have made films outside this community and this industry. I know what it is to look for money from wheelers and dealers. I have shlepped Goldberg Boxes across this country until my elbow-sockets ached.

I have profound respect for the people who, as part of their daily activity, sign-off on the financing of motion pictures and television material.

I do not begrudge Michael Eisner his millions. He is drawing from the same talent pool of writers and directors as every other studio head, with obviously better results. He's worth whatever he can get. So are Steven Bochco and Stephen Cannell.

Let's not dwell on the super-stars. Let's talk about the rest of us. Shows are not necessarily hits or misses. There are a lot of us who operate in a gray area somewhere in the middle. Management should find a way to deal with us fairly, too. It is that failure of theirs in the past, that has brought about the labor abuses they rage about today.

We know they keep accurate books for the U.S. government. These men (I say men, because until Barbara Corday's recent appointment, there were few, if any, women to talk about) are not thieves. They are not prepared to go to jail for fraud. They don't need to steal. The contracts and the traditional way of doing business in this town make all that unnecessary. We have to unite to standardize terms, definitions, and collections. We have to stop the infighting. Everyone knows we are in trouble.

What is needed is a very large whistle. Someone has to blow it and say, "LET'S START OVER. This isn't working." For ourselves, for our industry, for our community, for our country, I urge you to forget this fractionalization and hyphenation. Let's get our act together and start something. It always begins with the producer. Somebody has to do it before it's too late. Why not us? Think about it, please.

Point of View
by Barney Rosenzweig
(To the Producers Guild,
August 1, 1988, on the occasion of
the Guild's 20th Anniversary)

Did you know that Caucus member Bob Finkel was a member of Merrill's Marauders in Burma serving as well in India and China, that he was commissioned in the field in his own company (an unusual occurrence in the military) and that he received the Medal of Merit, two bronze battle stars and a meritorious service medal presented to him by Chiang Kai Shek?

Did you know that Caucus member Loreen Arbus discovered Gallagher, and was responsible for David Hartmann serving as host of *GOOD MORNING AMERICA*, that she is a top professional dancer as well as being a writer, producer, and executive?

WE CAN DO MORE TO FIGHT DRUG ABUSE

"For too long some media have glamorized illicit drugs and portrayed their use as socially acceptable. America saw people casually using illicit drugs in the movies and on television. Musicians urged audiences to turn to drugs as a way of life. The gatekeepers of national news were often viewed as unresponsive to attempts to fight drug use.

"For too long, some members of the media have hidden behind a veil of excuses. They have argued that the role of the media is to picture life as it is — an argument that permits them to deny responsibility for the visions of life they present and for their influence in shaping the opinions of millions of Americans."

These two paragraphs are part of the final report sent in June to Congress and the President of the United States by the White House Conference for a Drug-Free America.

I was privileged to have been selected by the President to serve as a conferee to that conference and to represent both my own views and those of the entertainment industry. I was not proud of the words contained in those two paragraphs, and I was shocked to find that much of America perceives the entertainment industry as part of the drug problem, not part of the solution. I have a deep-rooted fear that if we do not change this perception, if we do not take more aggressive steps in changing our image, if we do not employ self-regulation in our industry relative to the drug-abuse issue, we will be faced with government interference and legislation that could have been avoided.

As a result of the meetings I attended and my witnessing the horrendous substance-abuse epidemic affecting all facets of our society, I felt compelled to write this article. I believe there is much more we can do. We in the entertainment industry have the unique opportunity to help our country wage war against drug-abuse.

Chemical dependency is the most devastating problem facing all people — especially young people — in America today. You have read the statistics. To put it bluntly, as long as 20 million Americans are eager to pay the pushers' prices and experiment with mind-altering chemicals, the country faces a major challenge.

You know 20 million American families can help make any one of our television programs a roaring success. You know how hard we work to capture an audience for our programs. We must work equally hard to reach these 20 million American families and change their habits insofar as drug use is concerned.

My White House Conference experience taught me that over $100 billion is spent on substance-abuse annually, both in purchase of untaxed substances and treatment of substance-abuse. This desperate problem lays open the national treasury and causes serious impact on the national debt. The cost of all the "Star Wars," "Ghostbusters," and "Ishtar" movies in the history of the motion picture industry is small compared to these figures.

The chemical addiction problem is not one that concerns some small segment of our population. It is not confined to any one population group or to any specific socio-economic level. Drug use does not discriminate. Drug use affects our entire nation. There is no such thing as safe or responsible use of illegal drugs.

The entertainment industry, for many years, has been subject to criticisms that peg our business as part of the drug problem. Many Hollywood films from the late 60s and 70s glorified drug use and exploited such situations for purposes of humor. Studios catered to what was perceived as a drug-using audience since drug use was considered a mainstream recreational activity. Therefore, certain films of the era found their "drug cult" audiences receptive and demanding a product that legitimized their lifestyles. The success of these films was measured at the box office.

Television also fell into catering to its audiences' demand for entertaining drug-oriented material. The consciousness of America was bent toward decriminalization and legalization. There are many who blame television for whatever ails modern society. I believe the medium is a broad mirror, reflecting both the pleasant and the unpleasant, and it presents a broad and visible target because of its importance in our daily lives.

As I have grown to understand the various elements of the drug problem, it has become clearer to me that there is no magic solution, no silver bullet that is going to eliminate the problem. I do believe, however, that we can turn the next generation of school-age youth, and generations thereafter, away from illicit drug use.

The entertainment media are resources that have been under-utilized in imparting valuable information to the public about the dangers of substance abuse. We can help change behavior and destroy the demand thus eventually causing the supply to disappear. Television has the unique ability to penetrate the very heart of the American home, to enter the living room and touch the emotions and passions of over 100 million persons every single day. The general public forms it perceptions of substance abuse from what it sees, hears or reads in the media. Few

people have access (or the inclination) to read medical journals or the initiative to attend medical seminars. Therefore, most people rely on print and electronic media to help form their opinions.

Today, more writers, directors, producers and performers no longer find drugs humorous, glamorous or the "in thing to do." Network television has cracked down on the depiction of drugs. The majority of our industry has accepted the notion that it can and does influence behavior and perceptions of the audience. The mainstream has begun to use its influence responsibly and has been supporting a variety of initiatives to discourage illicit drug and alcohol abuse. Television movies and feature films have been created to support the anti-drug line. Hardly a prime-time series goes through a season without taking on a storyline that addresses substance-abuse.

Networks, local stations and drug-awareness groups have created hundreds — if not thousands — of public service announcements, and millions of dollars have been contributed by the networks and stations to air them, often during prime-time. Hundreds of celebrities have jumped on the drug-prevention/awareness bandwagon.

Networks' broadcast standards departments monitor every production, from initial script to final rough cut. There are memos and meetings with program producers, script reviews, cuts, rewrites ... the process is endless. There is a concerted effort to prohibit gratuitous drug depiction. We in the creative community should consider this neither network interference nor censorship. It is a positive, voluntary step in the nation's war against drug abuse. There are other voluntary steps we must take if we are to avoid Congressional legislation requiring our compliance.

Historically, our industry has been most aggressive in assuming its leadership role without government pressure or interference. In 1980, the Scott Newman Foundation was formed and was the first industry association to lobby for anti-drug messages from the media. NBC began broadcasting PSAs is conjunction with the National Institute on Drug Abuse. Since 1981, all the television networks have mounted an extensive campaign to point out the perils of drug-abuse.

The networks have creatively involved all facets of television — news, public affairs, sports, children's programming and entertainment programming — to support drug awareness messages. All of this has paid dividends.

In 1982, our own Caucus for Producers, Writers and Directors, reacting to the alcohol-related deaths of several performers, issued a "White paper" to 10,000 producers, writers and directors, suggesting guidelines for sensible alcohol portrayal in television programs. Quite

simply, the paper suggested, "If alcohol is not germane to the plot, why use it?" And the industry responded favorably. If you take a hard look at current prime-time shows, you will see substantially less alcohol use as compared to five years ago.

In 1983, the Entertainment Industries Council (EIC) — of which I am proud to be a founding board member and current chairman — was organized to bring together people who want to combat drug-abuse, especially among young people. EIC has helped create and coordinate over 350 PSAs in partnership with production companies and the networks. It has helped recruit over 500 industry leaders to the ranks of the industry's drug awareness initiatives. This has resulted in industry efforts to assist national and local drug-prevention programs such as the Just Say No Foundation, Federated Parents for Drug Free Use and many others. The EIC also has held industry conferences and workshops for writers, producers, directors, and network standards and practices personnel, and testified in numerous state and national forums on drug abuse.

The EIC's "Stop the Madness" music video is now included on RCA and Columbia home video releases while the prime-time PSA campaigns have enjoyed $20 million in airtime from CBS alone. The EIC has sent its message around the world, working with the United Nations, Sweden, Germany, Italy, Austria, Thailand, Malaysia, Brazil, Canada and Hong Kong.

The Academy of Television Arts and Sciences also has been active in the crusade. The Academy held a substance-abuse conference attended by over 350 people representing the Academy, SAG, AFTRA, the Directors Guild, Writers Guild and Women in Film. Other television-related media, such as basic cable and pay television, should note the contributions of the networks and stations and follow suit.

What about the motion picture industry? The Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA), which regulates the voluntary film rating system, recently adopted a PG-13 rating for films which depict drug abuse. Under the new guidelines, a graphic drug scene could be given an R or an X rating. Unfortunately, depiction of gratuitous alcohol use is not covered in this rating system; alcohol becomes an "illicit drug" only when consumed by minors.

As a result of the rating system, there are fewer motion pictures produced today with gratuitous drug-abuse scenes than there were ten years ago; but just one is too many. The alcohol abuse problem also must be addressed by the MPAA. There is no justification for either gratuitous alcohol or drug abuse scenes in our motion pictures.

More needs to be done. Writers must be educated not to write scripts which depict illicit drugs in glamorous ways. Performers must be encouraged not to act in pictures with gratuitous drug scenes. Motion picture distributors must be made to think twice before distributing films with scenes glamorizing drug use. Theaters across the country must be more responsible in their exhibition of pictures with gratuitous drug scenes.

Other standards must be created and maintained. There has been significant criticism about our industry's link to the alcoholic beverage industry's advertising dollar. I strongly recommend that our industry consider expanding voluntary advertsing standards already adopted by the wine industry to assure that commercials do not encourage alcohol use by minors or abuse by legal drinkers.

Our industry is divided on handling the drug problem. There are those who believe that the poison message is as dangerous as the poison pill and that he who spreads the message bears the same guilt as he who sells the pill. Others have a firm belief that any interference with the creative process would be improper.

I do not want to suggest that we use television or motion pictures as vehicles to carry hidden messages. The writer still must be able to tell his story his way, free and unencumbered by pressure from management. Nor am I suggesting the entertainment industry is a panacea for drug-abuse. But I am suggesting that the media can serve an important function in exposing the dangers of drug abuse.

Illicit drugs endanger all Americans; they affect our labor force and production lines and jeopardize national security. They affect one's ability to work, causing unemployment and often crime. They affect a cross-section of our society, and especially our youth; therefore, drugs jeopardize our very future. We must reach the minds of our youth to educate them about this scourge. We in the entertainment industry hold in our hands an awesome power and an awesome responsibility. We must join together to fight drug-abuse, using all the tools of our trade. Together we can turn the tide and make America drug-free.

For the Caucus
Herman Rush

A PROFUSION OF PUNDITS

The recent political conventions encapsulated a phenomenon which I've been observing for some time, and which seems to be accelerating: the growth of punditry in network journalism.

Years ago, newspapers printed the news, and, besides editorials expressing the beliefs of the publishers, offered very little in the way of commentary or interpretation. *The New York Herald Tribune,* for example, gave us Walter Lippman, and *The New York Times* featured Arthur Krock. Radio had a mere handful of commentators, such as H.V. Kaltenborn and Gabriel Heatter. Television, when it began, presented only the news in fifteen minute chunks, delivered in a straightforward fashion by the likes of John Cameron Swayze and Douglas Edwards.

Today, almost every daily paper includes an op-ed page, with several regular columnist and frequent guest experts expounding their views. Many local radio stations, particularly those that are all-talk, not only have resident commentators, but also devote substantial segments to savants who visit the station in person or by phone.

Televison has followed the same path, in a more alarming degree, and the recent political conventions were a prime illustration.

Nineteen fifty-two saw the first national telecasting of the Republican and Democratic conventions. As producer-director and co-writer of commercials for Philco, which was the sole sponsor of the NBC coverage of both conventions, I was present in Chicago's sweltering July and August heat. Both meetings were held in Chicago to accommodate NBC and CBS, as the networks lacked equipment and manpower to set up in two different locations. It also saved a ton of money.

The conventions and the coverage began at eight in the morning, Chicago time, and ran until midnight, and, although the proceedings were interminable and I was a captive audience, I was spellbound. The process involved unresolved conflicts: Taft versus Eisenhower in the Republican convention, and a field of candidates in the Democratic. With the outcome in doubt, the roll calls were drama-filled, and many issues were hammered out in full view.

The coverage set the basic pattern which is in use today. NBC had Bill Henry as anchor man, Walter Cronkite was at the helm for CBS. Both men functioned as reporters, and as the pivot point for the other reporters on the convention floors. Although there was a modicum of analysis, the basic philosophy of the producers was to tell the story of the event, through reportage and interviews.

The public was fascinated and ratings were huge, as the political process was intimately revealed for the first time. However, it became obvious to the politicians that much of the convention business was tedious and boring, and they realized that when the novelty wore off, viewership would drop away. With each succeeding convention the schedule became more streamlined, so that the highlights came at peak viewing hours.

Gradually, the conventions have become merely media events. The parties have even gone to the length of hiring producers from the entertainment world, such as Dwight Hemion and Gary Smith, to stage the affairs, and they are now, in effect, theatrical shows. For example, demonstrations in favor of each candidate used to run for a half-hour or more. These were patently boring, and they are now allotted a minimum of time.

Thanks to the growth of the primaries as the method of determining the candidates, the outcomes of the contests are known well in advance and suspense is generated artificially by withholding the candidates' choices for the Vice Presidency, and by developing hyped-up arguments over the platforms.

All of this has brought about a tension between the networks and the politicians. The party officials are producing a show and calling it a news event. They expect it to be carried in its entirety, and become enraged when the networks cut away from what is going on in the hall. The networks, on the other hand, are determined to maintain an audience and keep up their ratings, in their own and the sponsors' interest. They maintain that they have the right to exercise editorial judgment, and the oligation to fill the time in what they feel is the most entertaining way.

As a result, the reporters are no longer covering developing stories, but are filling the spaces between introductions, speeches, and roll calls by analyzing and interpreting. They have all become commentators. The epitome was reached this year when we were treated to the curious segments which involved Dan Rather and Walter Cronkite interviewing each other as to their opinions about the meaning and consequences of what was transpiring. They were trying to inject drama and import into a flat and synthetic happening, which was tailored for television and designed to reach the maximum audience in the primest of times.

The reporters and pundits are now reacting as though they, themselves, are the key figures. After Mr. Bush announced his choice of a running mate, the first question I heard discussed by network wisemen was, "How do you think Dan Quayle will play with the media?" And when another panel was discussing the size of the viewing audience, they

declared unequivocally that the number of viewers was not of prime importance—what did matter was what they, the experts, subsequently reported to the public.

I resent the implication that the network people cynically feel that they are entitled, or, indeed, ordained to do our thinking for us.

By contrast, examine *The MacNeil-Lehrer News Hour.* A brief, direct news summary is followed by in-depth coverage of the most significant story, or stories, of the day, using background reports and interviews with key figures. The *News Hour* does present commentary by Roger Rosenblatt, Roger Mudd, and others, but these are brief, and, as in newspapers, clearly labelled. All in all, a shining example of responsible journalism, and one which it would be desirable for the networks to follow.

Guest Piece
by Ira Skutch

****

(Editor's note: Mr. Skutch worked at NBC television as stage manager and director from 1945 to 1948; commercial producer-director for Philco Television Playhouse from 1949 to 1955; producer-director at Lennen & Newell from 1955 to 1957; producer-director for Goodson-Todman from 1957 to 1983; Author of *I Remember Television,* Scarecrow Press, 1988.)

Did you know that Caucus member William Bast's college roommate and longtime friend was actor James Dean, and that after Dean's death in an auto accident Mr. Bast was commissioned by Ballantine Books to write the story of their friendship, *JAMES DEAN: PORTRAIT OF A FRIEND* which he later adapted and produced as an M-O-W, just one of his more than 100 television credits including episodic series, M-O-W's, and mini-series?

WHAT! NO STANDARDS AND PRACTICES?

A major change is taking place in the television industry that will affect all mankind.

NBC and ABC have terminated their Standards and Practices departments and much like the sequential unity displayed by the networks against the Writer's Guild during its strike, it cannot be long before CBS joins them.

In light of the current circumstance in our industry where all creative and non creative decisions of this level are based on business considerations, it may be assumed that General Electric and Capital Cities decided that is not worth any amount of money to keep the public from hearing the filthy, tasteless, pornographic, blasphemous trash that writers and producers, left to their own questionable morality, will disseminate.

Since the world at large believes that all acts of evil portrayed on television are quickly imitated by the masses, without a doubt the acts and language we will be using on the screen now that the barn doors are open will be adopted by everyone, adult and child alike.

Therefore, herewith a warning prepared by the Caucus to all responsible citizens and agencies who wish to be ready for the trouble created by the new television season so that they may do whatever is necessary to protect themselves and those they serve. The Caucus is grateful to the Producers of the shows listed below for submitting copies of their potentially most harmful moments:

On the third episode of "Family Ties," approximately 13 minutes into the show, Alex uses the word Asshole in a heated argument with his mom;

All managers, coaches and players will wear open mikes during Monday Night Football and Baseball this year:

Episode six of the "Golden Girls" titled "Blanche Blows It," deals with a sexual act hitherto considered not suited for the family hour;

In the first five minutes of the second episode of "Miami Vice" the fourth murder is particularly violent;

In the second act of his premier show, Bill Cosby says "damn" once, "hell" twice and tells his kids to "Piss off."

Sybill Shepherd and Bruce Willis will appear topless and bottomless respectively in a "Moonlighting" episode spoofing TV Evangelists;

And the Christmas Specials, "Put That Away, Charlie Brown" and "Here's Your Chimney" may not be appropriate viewing for children.

Personal Point of View
by Saul Turteltaub

Did you know that Caucus member Tony Converse is a Yale graduate and that while he started out as a production assistant at CBS he also worked as an actor, stage manager, and director in the legitimate theatre (interrupted by two years in the Army where he became Program Director of the Armed Forces Radio Network), and that later he produced over 1,000 episodes of the daytime serial *SECRET STORM*, and that he eventually became Vice President of Special Programs for CBS?

THE FIRST (?) RESIDUAL

Way back, about 1947 or thereabouts, while working for the William Morris Agency in what was then referred to as the Legal Department—and subsequently became known as the Business Affairs Department—I was assigned to handle television matters, negotiations and contracts. At that time, television was a non-income producing medium, so the comparatively new guy on the block at William Morris Agency was assigned said non-income producing matters.

My background at that time involved mostly radio deals. My work included personal appearances, legitimate stage, literary properties, music, etc., but mostly radio. In those days, radio deals generally involved the delivery of the program to the radio network with the Network's right to one broadcast, plus the additional right of supplementary coverage purposes within 60 days of the Network broadcast in areas that were not included in the initial network broadcast. One run with such broadcast being spread over 60 days. That was the norm in radio.

Then came television. Among other assignments that I became involved with, was the handling of free-lance motion picture contracts for actors. My recollection is that the first such negotiation and contract was for the employment of an actor or actors to perform their services in a new dramatic half-hour motion picture series designed for telecast over network television, sponsored by Singer Sewing Machine Company, represented and produced by Young and Rubicam as its advertising agency.

The free-lance contract (or contracts) for actors represented by William Morris Agency in connection with such television series was handled by me. My basic approach to such contracts was that television was most like radio.

In my concept of any negotiation, I relied on two basic principles:

(a) Give the other side what they must have; and

(b) Reserve, if at all possible, what they really do not need in order to produce the picture or program for the agreed upon purpose or purposes.

I visualized that the deal(s) for a filmed television program, would involve one telecast in each market (like radio). In view of the fact that television was a new medium, I felt that 60 days for the spread of the one time exhibition throughout the country would be too limiting, so in all fairness, I suggested that the one run in the United States be spread over

120 days (instead of the usual 60 days applicable to radio). My reasoning made sense with the representative of Young and Rubicam in such negotiations. He agreed with me. The appropriate freelance contract enbodied the limitations to one run.

Young and Rubicam and Singer Sewing Machine owned and controlled the series of half hour films, which were available for repeat use on television. The only limitation against such additional use was the free-lance contract or contracts for the actor or actors handled by me. About a year later, they met with me at my office and sought to persuade me that additional rights for unlimited uses should be granted by said actor(s). Jack Dales, who was then the Executive Director of the Screen Actors Guild, marvelously able and respected, joined said meeting. Mr. Dales advised me that I did not understand the motion picture business — in the motion picture business, an actor granted all rights to the Producer, with no reservations or restrictions with respect to the use of such films. He convinced me of the then current practice. In order to grant such additional rights, an additional fee was agreed to be paid as the consideration for the change in said contract(s). I felt that the additional payment was the fair and reasonable approach under the circumstances. I do not recall who the actor was (there may have been more than one actor) but such additional fee was paid — the first residual.

The additional fee so paid was not out of brightness or understanding of industry practices on my part. It possibly indicated the lack of understanding of the then current industry practices and the lack of farsightedness of the future of television. The negotiation did reflect my views, that in any negotiation, one should not give away rights that were not necessary to make the deal. Obviously, the repeat telecast rights should not have been limited. They were limited and it resulted in the additional fee being paid in order to have such limitation rescinded.

Do I need comment about the claims and position of all of the Guilds just a few years later that the talents up front compensation doesn't pay in full for unlimited exhibitions rights? Instead, the additional exhibitions of the film or the program, entitles the talent to the additional residual fees. Such residual fees were initially limited in Guild agreements to the 6th run. Much later, talent became entitled to such residual fees on a much broader and fairer basis.

But I like to think that I was the first to be involved in a deal for an actor or actors which involved a residual fee.

Guest Piece
by Samuel Sacks
Caucus Counsel

TWO VIEWS ON LANGUAGE

Two issues, among many, concern some of us relative to language: 1) the degradation of language on our television screens (and not just on cable and pay-TV programs), and 2) the lack of sufficient and vital information in the motion picture ratings system.

Of all of man's inventions none is more basic to the development of man and his unique place on the planet than the conception of language. The rules of grammar, syntax, spelling, definitions, etc., all have as their major goal a desired end: clarity in our ability to communicate with each other. In the proper use of language we also register fundamental ideas of civility toward each other.

Words, properly used, spell out precision in contracts, beauty in the rhythms and patterns of poetry and prose, enlightenment in abstract concepts of philosophical matters, inspiration in wisdom, entertainment in the creativity behind wit, challenges in the explorations of the atom and the universe. Words, too, can, when used improperly, lead to confusion and disputes, to a degradation of the spirit, and hence to the dimunition of beauty and to the meaning and purpose of life itself.

Which is all by way of saying: how would we react to a television news broadcast that came on as follows:

> "This is the CBS Evening News, Dan Rather reporting: This was a bitch of a day in the political cesspool of Washington when people can rightly ask of Congress, what in the hell goes with those fellows wasting our time and our tax money in another damned filibuster. In the opinion of many observers, the Minority Leader has become the chief obstructionist to the passage of needed legislation, a damnable bastard if one can speak candidly of the opposition party, and a big pain in the ass to millions of ordinary citizens."

None of the above should be surprising or even shocking—although in the context of generally accepted standards of behavior and language on the part of anchor people and the news—we might find it tasteless, even distracting (at first), and offensive.

And yet *all* of the questionable words used in the example have been frequently heard on network entertainment programs this season. Just as we have been desensitized over the years to murder and violence of all kinds on primetime television, to acceptance of adultery, casual sex, and as much nudity as network officials feel will not arouse universal protest in our daytime television, so, too, are we being daily conditioned to

accept an abuse of language which denigrates the human spirit and which makes the lack of ordinary civility acceptable behavior.

Language, which parents and teachers forbid in classrooms and around the dinner table as symbols of what is crude, tasteless, and offensive, is now routine on all three major networks, obviously approved by network so-called departments of standards and practices.

What makes this so-called tolerance of expression border on the obscene is the effort being conducted by one network together with affiliates of all three, to raise the level of literacy in our country. Can senior management engage in that worthy pursuit and at the same time condone other elements of network leadership which work daily at the process of debasing the language? There is a sickening mockery to such contradictory efforts.

It is clear that those responsible for network news—anchors, producers, writers, and executives—have a higher respect for language than their counterparts in the entertainment divisions. Clearly, the leaders in the network standards and practices departments need new practitioners to guide their activities. Elevation should be their goal, not deliberate degradation.

Television is not alone in this debasement of standards. The motion picture industry is not exempt from criticism. In its effort to help parents learn something about the content of its product the ratings body of the MPAA utilizes a simple and primitive nomenclature of a few letters (G, PG, PG-13, R, X) to delineate basic content differences.

Anyone with the slightest awareness of the erratic behavior of the ratings board's judgment knows that what once was an R is now often enough a PG, and what was once an X is now and R, and so on. Recently (on December 23, 1987, in the *L.A. TIMES* to be exact), in response to parental demands that more information be given in classifying films, a case was made for adding additional symbols, specifically S for sex, V for violence, L for language. Jack Valenti, respected and admired by all who know him, was quoted in the article as saying, 'I don't think a parent would be satisfied with a V, S, or L. I don't know what that tells them."

I do. And as a parent I would be satisfied, and so would many others.

For certain, the addition of a V or an S or an L would tell them more than a PG, or an R, or a PG-13. It adds vital specific information *concealed* by the present system. There is nothing so sacred about the present rating system that prohibits change and improvement. If our Constitution can be amended 26 times in the interest of justice and equality, the MPAA code can be amended in the interest not only of clarity, but also in the amount of information the system can carry.

Look at the ads for some motion pictures, often filling an entire page of a newspaper. Look at the titillating illustrations and the tantalizing copy. Then try to find the MPAA classification. It occupies a miniscule portion of the ad space—far less, proportionally, than the Surgeon General's warning of the evils of smoking in cigarette ads. The content of motion pictures can have a devastating impact on young minds, and parents need all the information they can get as to the essential ingredients of the films being offered by production and distribution companies.

More adequate room should be provided for the MPAA classification, perhaps a specific percentage of the ad space. And producers and distributors should be encouraged, or even required, to furnish descriptive material that relates to social values that may or may not be part of the film content—in short, they should provide not only a selling job on the movie-goer, but an informational job to help the film-goer make a better judgment about the picture's real content. That descriptive portion of the ad can then be supplemented by the MPAA's shorthand classification—and shorthand is all it is—so that more information is present in readily absorbable digest form.

A PG-13 V designation will not confuse Americans. Nor an R-S-L. Americans are used to numbers and letters whether it's their social security numbers, zip codes, phone card charge numbers, etc. They'll catch on quickly.

Isn't the chief purpose of the classification system a modest effort to inform caring parents and film-goers in general? The *L.A. TIMES* research on the subject clearly demonstrates that the present system is simply inadequate. Mr. Valenti, instead of making an offhand remark dismissing the findings, and instead of searching for statistics to prove his own a priori position, should ponder over the fact that 72% of those polled by the *TIMES* desired more information.

The ugliness and degradation of language so typical of so many films these days might change if film-goers are warned in advance by an L that socially unacceptable language is part of the film presentation. Who knows, if enough film-goers pass up such films Hollywood might find it profitable to switch their competition to upgrading language to the benefit of all society, rather than to inundate unsuspecting audiences with a vocabulary of verbal garbage.

If artistic necessity demands a breakdown in langage in order to make a singular point, such as Clark Gable's single damn in "Gone With the Wind," how effective would it have been if the picture had been riddled with such expletives simply on the grounds that that's the way people

really talked? Great literature, great plays are remarkably free of such crutches. In America today our writers and producers have abandoned crutches—they've elected to be verbal paraplegics. There is a solution—to paraphrase a Biblical injunction—Writer, Producer, Director, Executive, Distributor—"heal thyself."

The rating board of the MPAA should accept the fact that Americans are quite familiar with a host of abbreviations (which is all that the ratings system itself essentially is in its providing a *minimum* of symbols to denote generalized information) and acronyms. Americans have even managed to absorb a 26 letter alphabet, and to construct and to understand the meanings of thousands of words.

As a useful guide it might be worth noting that on a cigarette ad in *PLAYBOY*, the Surgeon General's warning—designed to prevent pollution of the body—occupies a three inch by half inch block of space. To be in relative proportion, the MPAA classification in a full page newspaper movie would have to measure about nine inches by two inches. That would provide sufficient space to carry useful information that might just, from time to time, protect all of us from involuntary pollution of the mind. Currently, the MPAA classification on a full page ad is contained in tiny blocks of space seldom larger than two inches by a quarter inch including lettering so small as to be virtually indecipherable. It would appear as though the movie distribution companies are determined to make this information as difficult to read as it is difficult to find in the first place!

No, the addition of S for sex, V for violence, and L for language will neither confuse nor addle film-goers, nor will it complicate the ratings system. Those additions will simply edify and clarify film content. Buyers are entitled to know as much about a product as sellers. (Manufacturers of many products—food, drug, etc.—are voluntarily providing more meaningful labels for those who elect to read them.) An S-V- or an L, added to the present mere hint of picture content provided by the present system, will help provide needed information which can help protect our children's minds—not to mention our own.

*****

Point of View
David Levy

TELEVISION THAT SOLVES PROBLEMS

A new concept that is changing lives

**Item:* A made-for-television movie on adult illiteracy moves tens of thousands of viewers to sign up for literacy programs in their communities.

**Item:* A prime time series episode on child abuse ends with an appeal by one of the stars of the program and the televised hotline is flooded with calls.

**Item:* Health and human service agencies report a marked decrease in drunk driving due, in large part, to broadcast public service campaigns.

It's a long-established truth that television's power to reach and involve millions of American viewers at a single moment is unparalleled. But there is evidence of a trend in television today that is taking that power into an exciting new sphere. Networks, broadcasters, and producers are finding that by involving television in social issues and working actively to promote positive change, the medium can reach far beyond the bounds of the living room, helping solve some of the most intractable problems we face as a nation.

The practice of creating television that tackles serious social issues is not new. Made-for-television movies like "Something About Amelia," about incest have a place in television history for their role in shedding light on important social problems. But what is new in today's "issue programming" is the depth of the involvement. We're seeing a new interest in sustained campaigns that join networks, stations, producers, even the entire industry, to help motivate society toward solutions.

The compelling aspect of this type of programming is that when undertaken responsibly, when there is a joining of force among broadcasters and the groups working to solve these problems — educators, social welfare organizations, businesses, even government agencies — the result is more than the sum of its parts: positive change in people's lives on a broad scale.

Three years ago we launched Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS), the joint public service program of Capital Cities/ABC and the Public Broadcasting Service to raise awareness of adult illiteracy in the U.S. Our goal was to create a comprehensive public service campaign, one beyond the scope of anything attempted before on commercial or public television. By using all of the resources of the two broadcasters and

joined by their affiliated stations and radio and print outlets as well, we saw the possibility of a public service campaign that could truly make a difference.

Literacy was a promising topic for a number of reasons: first, it is a huge problem. An estimated 23 million Americans are functionally illiterate, lacking reading and writing skills beyond a fourth grade level. Second, it was a problem that was clearly growing worse; as the U.S. moves from a manufacturing-based economy to a service economy, the need for literacy skills are increasing. Third, illiteracy is a problem that can be solved. A person without literacy skills can be taught those skills with an investment of a couple of hours a week and a willingness to learn. Fourth, it was an area that lent itself to television's focus. Literacy experts made clear the need to let people who couldn't read know that help is available, and that volunteering to tutor an illiterate adult can be a rewarding experience. What was needed was a massive effort to get the word out to the public that, "It's never too late to learn to read."

A key element in creating broad public awareness was evident at the start. As broadcasters, we couldn't expect to teach America to read. Nor could we expect to solve the problem by simply airing well-intentioned messages. Teaching was the job of teachers, and the solution would have to come about on the local level, where people live and work. At ABC and PBS, we saw a clear role for ourselves in simply creating awareness of the problem and the need for action. That, in turn would stimulate and support local efforts.

PLUS was set up as a two-pronged campaign. The first task was to create a network of community literacy task forces, convened by ABC and PBS stations in every major market in the country over the first nine months of 1986. Task forces would assess local literacy services and prepare the community for a massive increase of attention to the issue. The second phase of PLUS was on-air programming on ABC and PBS and their local stations, combined with a long-term commitment of network time to thirty and sixty-second public service announcements to buttress the message of the programming and provide continuity on a daily basis.

Before we went on-air with any programming, we began discussions with our news and entertainment divisions to brief network program executives of our plans and suggest ways of tying in. The discussion was non-intrusive; we were not leaning on producers to cover the illiteracy story or include it in story lines. We did, however, want them to know of our plans and be clear on ways of connecting to PLUS.

In September 1986, we began the on-air phase of PLUS. The kickoff was an hour-long ABC News documentary hosted by Peter Jennings, "At a Loss for Words: Illiterate in America." Following the program, we broadcast a PSA giving a hotline number for viewers who wanted to join a literacy program or who wanted to volunteer to tutor another adult. In following days, all ABC News programs, including "Nightline," "World News Tonight," and "20/20" broadcast features exploring different aspects of the illiteracy problem in America. In following weeks, PBS broadcast a documentary, "A Chance to Learn," and "Good Morning America" contributed a segment on the topic.

Local ABC and PBS stations tied in with local news programs and PSAs, geared to their local community. The network/local aspect was a very special element of PLUS: while national programming covered the illiteracy story on a broad scale, local programs could narrow the focus on the local community, on the problem of English literacy in El Paso, for example, or of displaced steelworkers looking for new jobs requiring new skills in Pittsburgh.

Entertainment programs made a substantial contribution. Nine primetime programs included story lines on illiteracy. The series, "Hotel," for example, included a story on an episode of a hotel employee who had to hide his illiteracy on his job, and was forced to turn down a promotion that would have required reading.

In the first month of PLUS alone, 40,000 viewers called the toll-free hotline to seek help or to volunteer. Hundreds of thousands called local and state hotlines broadcast by local stations on specials and PSAs. Literacy programs around the country were flooded with calls.

"Loving" and "Ryan's Hope" featured continuing characters who were struggling to overcome their illiteracy. Two "ABC Afterschool Specials" carried storylines on illiteracy for younger viewers.

In 1987, PLUS continued with a full schedule of programs and public service announcements. A high point was "A Star-Spangled Celebration of Literacy and Liberty," a three-hour special on July 4th, produced by Pasetta Productions for ABC Entertainment. The program combined entertainment acts with messages from celebrities about the importance of literacy and interviews with "adult learners" about how their lives had been changed.

In September 1987, Nabisco Brands sponsored the Ohlmeyer Communications production of "Bluffing It" on ABC. The two-hour made-for-television movie, starring Dennis Weaver, told the story of a factory worker who, when offered a promotion that involved using a computer and writing, must quit his job rather than reveal his illiteracy. His pride

prevents him from enrolling in a literacy program. Then, his family convinces him that they will not think less of him for learning to read as a 50-year old. The program ended with a message from Weaver about the availability of literacy programs in every community. Weaver's message ran over the toll-free hotline number, and local ABC stations were advised of the PSA's timing, to allow them to cover the message with a local number.

"Bluffing It" outdrew the competition's audience. The next day, the literacy hotline reported nearly 20,000 calls. Local literacy organizations reported a flood of calls, many from older men who, like Dennis Weaver's character in the movie, had lived for years wih the frustration and disappointment of not knowing how to read or write.

Today, PLUS continues as a major public service campaign on ABC and PBS. ABC has committed ten to 15 PSAs a week *on the full network — not* subject to preemption by local stations — to the campaign. PSAs run throughout the broadcast day, from "Good Morning America" through daytime and primetime. Recent PLUS efforts have focused on the educational needs of young people, and how illiteracy is a correlative factor in many problems facing young people today, including drug abuse, teen pregnancy, unemployment, dropping out, and crime.

The hotline receives a steady stream of calls, averaging 25,000 calls a month — compared to barely 2,500 calls a month before PLUS began. The U.S. Department of Education reports a substantial increase in adult basic education classes across the country, over 500,000 new students, which they attribute completely to PLUS. Literacy organizations report annual inreases in student and volunteer enrollment of anywhere from 50 to 250 percent.

PLUS has also set a precedent for reaching out beyond the traditional television community. Educators, business groups, and government agencies have joined efforts with ABC and PBS for literacy related projects. One project, "The Readasaurus Twins," joins PLUS, Reading Is Fundamental, and Mrs. Barbara Bush with Rex and Rita Readasaurus— make-believe baby dinosaurs — to promote reading by children

PLUS is clearly a blueprint for the kind of programming that actively reaches out and makes a difference in people's lives. The contributions of the production community have helped turn PLUS into a comprehensive effort that creates a broad awareness and stimulates a social consensus on an issue of national concern.

Of course, campaigns like PLUS won't replace the traditional fare of television — entertainment and information. But it does go hand in hand with the rest of the broadcast menu, and broadens the range of the medium.

PLUS works because it is good television. It involves all the resources of broadcasting, television's power and reach, the local/national dimensions, and its unique ability to stimulate action.

It is exciting to see interest growing in this type of campaign. Other broadcasters are investigating similar projects, and local stations are beginning to create local campaigns to capitalize on the positive feedback these projects evoke. Advertisers are taking notice: campaigns and "issue" programs not only draw strong audiences for advertising, they provide an opportunity for more thoughtful, issue-related messages. And viewers have demonstrated their interest: "At a Loss for Words" in 1986 won its ratings time period, highly unusual for a news documentary facing entertainment programming.

If interest in television campaigns and programs that help viewers improve their lives continues to grow, it could present a new frontier for the broadcast media. It certainly presents an exciting and dynamic challenge.

Guest Piece
Matthew R. Zucker

(Editor's note: Mr. Zucker is Director, Office of Communication, Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., and is responsible for planning and creative development of Project Literacy U.S., ABC's Public Service Campaign.)

Did you know that Caucus member Norman Felton, both erudite and urbane, currently developing an M-O-W, *WE'RE DANCING IN THE DARK*, and a four hour film, *TO LIVE AND DIE*, was born in London and left school at the age of 13 to work as a laborer, emigrating two years later to the United States where he first worked as a stevedore and truckdriver, still later developing a new method of staging plays which his wife, Aline, named "Arena Theatre", and that he is truly one of the pioneers of television starting out in New York as a director after only two days of indoctrination being assigned by NBC to direct *MUSICAL MINIATURES* and the *JOHN GNAGY SHOW*, followed by assignments some years later as executive producer of such legendary shows as *STUDIO ONE* and *PLAYHOUSE 90*?

Did you know that Caucus member Fern Field — producer, director, writer — who speaks seven languages, was born in Italy of Russian parents and was raised in New York and that by the time she was 21 she had her own business in Rome, called Services Unlimited, an agency designed to provide multi-lingual assistance to the international film business?

Did you know that Caucus member Douglas Heyes is a Shakespearean scholar, that he started out in the business as an artist, is an accomplished sculptor in wood as well, that he wrote and directed 21 pilots that became network series, that he is a successful novelist and feature film writer and director as well, and that he owns John Barrymore's personal set of Shakespeare's plays?

CAUCUS AWARD FOR 1988

Distinguished Service Award—John Mantley

John Mantley, one of the Founding Fathers of the Caucus, a past Chairman, Co-Chairman through most of the decade of the 80s, has contributed yeoman service to the well-being of the Caucus since its inception in 1973. His loyalty is both passionate and intellectual. It is the mark of the man. In high school he was a five letter man, excelling in fencing (later teaching it at the Pasadena Playhouse). This Canadian born artist served as a fighter pilot in the Royal Canadian Air Force in World War II seeing action in India. After receiving a degree Magna Cum Laude from Pasadena Playhouse (prior to that he was a graduate of Victoria College at the University of Toronto). Mr. Mantley became an actor and toured America with Jane Cowl and Dorothy McGuire. Later, he starred in and directed many television dramas, and then began a writing career as a novelist (*THE 27th DAY* and *THE SNOW BIRTH*, both becoming motion pictures). After writing for such memorable shows as *THE UNTOUCHABLES, KRAFT THEATRE, RAWHIDE, DESILU PLAYHOUSE*, etc., Mr. Mantley took over *GUNSMOKE* on which he served as executive producer for 11 years, that assignment followed by 4 years of *HOW THE WEST WAS WON*. Mr. Mantley was drafted on "rescue operations" to set new paths for *THE WILD, WILD WEST, BUCK ROGERS, McGYVER* among other commissions. At the moment he is busily engaged in developing a new two hour Movie-of-the-Week for *GUNSMOKE* which should air in 1989. Winner of numerous awards for production excellence, an authority on western culture, Mr. Mantley has been a member of SAG, and is currently active in the WGA, the PGA, the AFI and the CAUCUS. For exceptional service to the membership of the Caucus Mr. Mantley was the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award for 1988.

CAUCUS AWARD FOR 1988

Member of the Year Award—Garry Marshall

During one week in January of 1979 four out of the top five Neilsen rated shows were the work of one man: the shows, *LAVERNE & SHIRLEY, HAPPY DAYS, MORK & MINDY, ANGIE,* all four created by and executive-produced by Garry Marshall. How did he do it? With training, experience and natural creative talent along with an instinct for wit and humor all honed by writing 25 scripts each for *THE LUCY SHOW* (1963), *THE DICK VAN DYKE SHOW* (1962). Then there are the shows Garry Marshall developed based on the work of another wit, Neil Simon; the shows, *THE ODD COUPLE,* and *BAREFOOT IN THE PARK.* Garry Marshall has put his imprimatur on motion pictures as well, directing and co-writing *THE FLAMINGO KID,* starring Matt Dillon, in 1984, directing *NOTHING IN COMMON,* starring Jackie Gleason and Tom Hanks in 1986, and directing *OVER-BOARD,* starring Goldie Hawn and Kurt Russell in 1987. His 1988 directorial assignment for film is *BEACHES,* starring Bette Midler and Barbara Hershey. When did he start? Back in the early 60s writing for Jack Paar. (Now you know where Paar's ad libs came from.) In his spare time he managed to write scripts for *I SPY, THE DANNY THOMAS SHOW, CHRYSLER THEATRE,* etc. Garry Marshall took time out to serve as production chief of the Armed Forces Radio Network stationed in Seoul, Korea. In 1983, the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce honored him by voting him a "Star" on the famed Hollywood Boulevard "Walk of Fame." (If you'd like to see it visit the Paramount Theatre.) Awards? Enough to fill a couple of walls and bookcases: twelve Emmy Award nominations for *HAPPY DAYS, LAVERNE & SHIRLEY, MORK & MINDY* alone! Famous for his creativity he is also renowned for his charitable work. Ask Northwestern University, The L.A. Music Center, the Westlake School for Girls in L.A.

Garry Marshall: writer, creator, producer, director, actor, philanthropist—honored for his memorable body of work and awarded the *CAUCUS MEMBER OF THE YEAR AWARD for 1988.*

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

We, a concerned group of producers, writers and directors—representing a broad spectrum of the creative community—have organized THE CAUCUS FOR PRODUCERS, WRITERS & DIRECTORS for the purpose of assuming a more direct responsibility to the American viewing public in television programming and related fields, and to protect our integrity as creative artists. THE CAUCUS is concerned with fundamental issues that transcend the specific interests and functions of industry guilds and unions. We stand for the following:

1. THE CAUCUS calls upon the networks, local stations, cable and pay-TV services, advertisers, as well as production companies and the creative community, to recognize their primary responsibility to the viewing public, and to strive to elevate program quality in serving the public.

2. THE CAUCUS stands for the same freedoms of expression for television programming granted to other mass communication media. THE CAUCUS, therefore, is opposed to unreasonable and unwarranted intrusion into any area of television programming by government or by special interest groups.

3. THE CAUCUS believes that the networks should minimize their dependence upon testing as a basis and/or substitute for their decisions. THE CAUCUS believes that over-emphasis on television ratings and testing leads to pandering to the lowest common denominator of the audience and to the inevitable and demonstrated decrease in overall programming innovation, diversity, and quality.

4. THE CAUCUS believes, despite the terms of the present Consent Decrees, that a network, as owner or controller of the means of distribution, should neither produce entertainment programs itself, nor syndicate such programs. THE CAUCUS, in opposing network production of entertainment programs, also opposes network practices and policies which place actors and other performers, producers, directors, writers, and all other creative talent under exclusive network contract.

5. THE CAUCUS believes that the employment of all creative and production personnel should be at the discretion of the program producer and/or supplier. Network approvals of a program's creative elements not only infringe upon the traditional prerogatives of the creative community but also violate the non-delegation terms of the Minimum Basic Agreements of the Writers Guild, Screen Actors Guild, and the Directors Guild. Although creative suggestions by a network are always welcome and should be considered in good faith, a network should view the material which it has licensed, solely to ascertain that a program's content is consistent with its agreed upon format, good taste, and the network's own written code.

6. THE CAUCUS advocates sufficient lead time so that effective and economic production of a program or series can be properly accomplished. THE CAUCUS recommends a March 15 date as the latest date by which Fall network schedules should be announced so that there is a six-month period between the program order and the initial air date. THE CAUCUS advocates that script monies be advanced with adequate lead time for the proper production of a series.

7. THE CAUCUS believes that networks in licensing programs should provide financing more realistically related to the actual costs of the programs. THE CAUCUS believes that the total costs for pilots and development deals should be fully financed by the networks.

8. THE CAUCUS believes that property rights in television programs should be given legal protection commensurate with the protection given any other basic property rights. THE CAUCUS calls upon Congress to amend the Copyright Law and/or enact appropriate legislation in order to achieve that purpose.

9. THE CAUCUS believes that network series contracts should be limited to a maximum period of four consecutive contract years, and that the networks should have only a first negotiation position following such four-year contract—no first refusal. Network rights with respect to miniseries, specials, and television feature programs should be limited to a maximum of two runs within a three-year period.

10. THE CAUCUS believes that network programming should schedule more original programs in every time period throughout a fifty-two week period.

11. THE CAUCUS believes that producers, writers, directors, and actors should receive a minimum fee for every use of the results and proceeds of their services in perpetuity.

12. THE CAUCUS further believes that those who create television programs are not only entitled to a royalty but also to participation on a fair and reasonable basis in the profits thereof.

13. THE CAUCUS believes that producers, writers, directors, and actors should receive fair and equitable residual fees and/or a share of profits resulting from the use of new technologies including Pay Television, Cable Television, Discs, Cassettes, etc.

14. THE CAUCUS believes that the television production industry should adopt minimum, uniform accounting definitions and practices so that minimum, uniform financial standards can be set for the industry which will accord profit participants a fair and reasonable prospect of sharing in such profits.

15. THE CAUCUS generally opposes packaging commissions because they inflate program costs, and urges the networks and production companies against contracting for production under such conditions.

16. THE CAUCUS believes that screen credits should more truly reflect the actual creative contributions made by the creative persons involved. Moreover, credits should not be restricted by arbitrary limitations imposed by studios, networks, or the NAB.

17. THE CAUCUS believes that the production of network public affairs programming should be open to the talents of the entire industry and not restricted to people directly employed by the networks.

18. THE CAUCUS believes that broadcasters should devote at least one hour each day to educational programs for children.

19. THE CAUCUS believes that no Guild should trespass in the internal affairs of any other Guild.

20. THE CAUCUS supports the strengthening of the Inter-Guild Council and recommends renewed and continuing effort by the Council to take positive action on industry problems.

21. THE CAUCUS strongly opposes any industry practices which, directly or indirectly, discriminate against individuals on the basis of sex, race, religion, physical disability, or age.

22. THE CAUCUS, although condemning censorship, believes that all parties involved in shaping program content should be constantly aware of the all-pervasive nature of the television medium and should act responsibly by not giving the appearance of condoning substance abuse, racism, sexism, gratuitous violence, sexual exploitation, or any other antisocial behavior.

CAUCUS MEMBERSHIP LIST — JANUARY 1989

Abrams, Gerald
Ackerman, Harry
Andre, Blue
Arbus, Loreen
Arnold, Danny
Avnet, Jon
Baldwin, Peter
Barry, Philip
Bartlett, Juanita
Bast, William
Bellisario, Donald
Benson, Hugh
Berg, Dick
Bergmann, Ted
Black, John D.F.
Blinn, William
Bogart, Paul
Brademan, William
Braverman, Michael
Brewer, Jameson
Burton, Al
Bush, Warren
Cannell, Stephen
Cardea, Frank
Carsey, Marcy
Cates, Gil
Cherbak, Cynthia
Chermak, Cy
Chomsky, Marvin
Cohen, Eric
Cohen, Harold
Colla, Richard
Collins, Richard
Colman, Henry
Converse, Tony
Cooper, Hal
Cooper, Jackie
Cossette, Pierre
Courtney, Alan
Culver, Carmen
Curtis, Daniel
D'Angelo, Bill
Davis, Jerry
Davis, Luther
Day, Linda
Denoff, Sam
Doniger, Walter
Dortort, David
Eckstein, George
Epstein, Allen
Epstein, Jon
Farr, Gordon
Fehrle, Phil
Felton, Norman
Fenady, Andrew
Field, Fern
Finkel, Robert
Finnegan, William
Freeman, Seth
Friendly, Ed
Fries, Charles
Froug, William
Furia, John
Gallo, Lillian
Garrett, Lila
Gerber, David
Gethers, Steven
Gimbel, Roger
Goldberg, Gary
Goldsmith, Russell
Goodson, Mark
Grant, B. Donald
Grant, Gil
Grauman, Walter
Green, Jim
Greene, David
Gross, Marcy
Grossbart, Jack
Guenette, Robert
Haley, Alex
Haley, Jack Jr.
Hamner, Earl
Hargrove, Dean
Heyes, Douglas
Hill, Leonard
Holloway, Jean
Horn, Alan
Huggins, Roy
Irving, Richard
Isenberg, Gerald
Jaffe, Henry
Jeffries, Georgia
Johnson, Bruce
Kane, Arnold
Kanin, Fay
Karpf, Merrill H.
Katzman, Leonard
Kaufman, Leonard
Komack, James
Lachman, Mort
Lafferty, Perry
Lansbury, Bruce
Larson, Glen
Lear, Norman
Lee, Joanna
Leider, Jerry
Levy, David
Lovenheim, Robert
Mandabach, Caryn
Manings, Allan
Mantley, John
Marcus, Ann
Marcus, Ellis
Margulies, Stan
Markell, Robert
Markowitz, Robert
Marshall, Garry
McNeely, Jerry
Milkis, Edward K.
Miller, Lee
Minoff, Marvin
Monty, Gloria
Morgan, Christopher
Nardino, Gary
Neuman, E. Jack
Orenstein, Bernie
Oringer, Barry
Pasetta, Marty
Petrie, Dorothea
Phillips, Clyde
Rappaport, John
Raskin, Carolyn
Raynor, Milton "Ted"
Rees, Marian
Reisberg, Richard
Reynolds, Gene
Rhodes, Michael
Rich, John
Rich, Lee
Roddenberry, Gene
Rosenberg, Meta
Rosenbloom, Richard
Rosenzweig, Barney
Rothstein, Freyda
Ruben, Aaron
Rubin, Stanley
Rudolph, Louis
Rush, Herman
Sacks, Alan
Saunders, Herman
Schaefer, George
Schenck, George
Scherick, Edgar
Schlatter, George
Schmerer, James
Schultz, Barbara
Shapiro, Esther
Shapiro, Richard
Shea, Jack
Sherman, Harry
Silver, Susan
Silverman, Fred
Simon, Al
Sitowitz, Hal
Sloan, Alan
Spelling, Aaron
Spencer, Alan
Stern, Leonard
Stevens, George, Jr.
Stuart, Malcolm
Tahse, Martin
Thomas, Tony
Tinker, Grant
Turtletaub, Saul
Valente, Renee
Victor, David
Vincent, Edward Duke
Von Zerneck, Frank
Weitz, Barry
Weston, Ann
White, Larry
Wilson, Irv
Winant, Ethel
Winkler, Henry
Witt, Paul Junger
Wolper, David
Yorkin, Bud
Zinberg, Michael

Samuel Sacks (Counsel)