

radio instruction. It is of vital importance, to both education and industry, to determine whether this increasingly diverse approach is educationally sound, desirable and necessary.

Discussion

Arthur H. Wolf (Centron Corp., Inc.): Do the same staffs instruct courses in cinematography and TV filming?

Dr. Goggin: It varies from university to uni-

versity. There is no general rule. In my departments we try to get people who are qualified in television and motion pictures, or radio and television, to teach jointly in these two areas. We don't usually have people teaching radio and motion pictures; there's too wide a gap. For example, the Production Design course is a course for television and motion pictures taught by a man who has been a professional art director and designer for film and for TV. The combination is important. One thing I think should be stressed is that, although a

student may major academically in TV production, the possibilities are that he may later go into theater, radio or motion pictures depending on future conditions or developments. Therefore, it's my contention that the student should have orientation as much as possible in all three media. Particularly if he's interested in television, he should have work in film as well. A curriculum which does this is coming more and more into being. I think the tendency now in American education is to have separate departments of radio, TV and film.

Film and Television Education: A Marriage of Convenience or Necessity?

By RICHARD J. GOGGIN

We can arrive at criteria for future successful curricula initially through a knowledge of past practices in motion-picture and radio education, and particularly through an examination of present intermedia relationships. These relationships have more than the obvious relevancy for teachers. They provide academically sound and professionally necessary guideposts leading to the goal of developing creative and well-rounded students who have been trained within the context of internally integrated curricula in motion pictures and television.

THE TITLE, "Television and Film Education: A Marriage of Convenience or Necessity?" raises many questions. Relative to "marriage," should there be a joining together of teaching and learning in film and television; or should film and television be separate entities, rigorously kept apart? Or, should there be no marriage but rather a kind of illicit liaison; in this case, which one is mistress to the other?

In examining the words "convenience or necessity," if we assume there is a marriage, does it exist merely because it may be administratively easier or operationally better; or is there something beyond mere expediency in teaching film and television together, something that is sound artistically and creatively considering the many similarities of the two media and something that is sound from an industry and business standpoint?

Educational History

Before discussing these factors in some depth a bit of history is in order:

Presented on May 6, 1960, at the Society's Convention in Los Angeles by Richard J. Goggin, Chairman, Dept. of Television, Motion Pictures and Radio, New York University, 43 West 4th St., New York 3, N.Y.
(This paper was received on June 15, 1960.)

the background of the separate development of film and radio education prior to the beginning of television education. The development of film education has already been presented;* let us, therefore, look at radio.

While film education was developing slowly through a few courses appended to other curricula, and then just as slowly in comparatively exceptional situations developing into a fleshed-out curriculum, radio education on the other hand was developing relatively quickly and widely in colleges and universities. Radio education started with a few courses in speech departments or speech and drama departments. Then, as the medium itself grew, the courses multiplied to cover the fields of writing, production-direction, and performance. Thus it began as a major area of emphasis in the context of a larger department, and later branched off into a full-fledged department of radio. There still remain, however, many important radio curricula "housed" in multi-area departments or schools.

Concurrent with this progress was the rise of educational radio stations: AM

* Robert W. Wagner, "The history and future of cinema education in the United States," *Jour. SMPTE*, 71: 643-647, Sept. 1962.

stations in the beginning and later, losing many AM channels due to the purported machinations of some commercial broadcasters, switched over to FM. Radio education was not only classroom teaching but also the use of the station as an on-the-air training ground. Much publicity and promotion for the colleges and universities resulted from this; and radio education, while not fully respectable academically in the eyes of the traditional disciplines, had won a firm position on campus.

What happened when television came on the horizon? The newness and glamor of TV stimulated much student pressure to have course work in the medium. As TV operationally and commercially was another form of broadcasting, the university radio departments or departmental areas drew it to their respective bosoms. As student interest in radio diminished (but is since, by the way, regaining strength), interest in TV soared, and the medium was not merely drawn to the bosom but grasped firmly and nourished. The baby grew up fast from a few introductory courses to a full-scale cluster. TV education was combined with radio education and the departments or areas became hyphenated: radio-television. They continue to be strong and they prosper.

What happened to film education *vis-à-vis* television education as the radio-TV curriculum developed? Film departments, for their part, either ignored the newcomer or else were generally left out in the academic cold. Radio-TV departments, seeing that film was becoming an increasingly important factor in live TV through program inserts or as complete program entities in themselves, spread out to include film.

They began, with some modest editing, camera and lighting gear, to enlarge the scope of live TV production-direction courses. Later many departments (but not, as yet, the majority by any means) gave strong and sometimes equal emphasis to film education as an area in its own right.

Many film educators deplore and inveigh against television education being so allied with radio education. Radio is aural — it is spoken and heard; TV and motion pictures are visual — they are photographed and seen. Radio people have no background in visual presentation, they know nothing of staging, cinematography, sets and lighting, and of the editorial process. Get the rascals out and let us, the visual experts, take over television!

This is a brave stand, but it does not face up to the facts of academic entrenchment. Being based solely on an artistic battlecry it does not face up to the facts of advertising, business and broadcasting industry practices wherein TV — live and films for TV — is firmly bound. And, it does not understand or want to understand that many radio-trained people have made important contributions to all phases of television, including the sacred realm of the artistic and creative.

Necessary Alliance

Let us, for the moment, put aside the fact that Radio-TV departments hold the top spot and, instead, consider the marriage between film and TV education in the light of three main items.

First, artistically, creatively, I believe that film departments and film curricula can be built without any regard to live TV. Film exists as a form of art and communication sufficient unto itself. Essentially, there is nothing in live TV so unique that film as a form suffers if in education live TV is not incorporated with it. Filmed TV, or much more accurately, films for TV, are *films*. Any changes for TV are fundamentally accommodations for specific program length, for the technicalities of television equipment, for program formats, for shooting schedules or for cost. For film, therefore, any liaison with TV is not in the nature of *artistic* necessity.

For television, however, there has to be not a liaison but a marriage, and one not of convenience but of absolute necessity. It is on these grounds that the purists are right: live television has developed artistically largely to the extent that it has incorporated all the knowledge of filmic form and sense handed down to it through the accumulated efforts of filmmakers and critics — and live TV owes much to theater as well.

Second, from a business standpoint, film *could* ignore television; but this

would mean that the film industry overall would be closing itself off from not merely an immensely profitable source of income, but in many cases it would be cutting its own economic throat. Film as an *industry*, therefore, needs something more than a passing liaison: it needs a marriage of necessity with TV.

Television as a program medium and as a business needs film. In spite of all the hullabaloo about video tape, it will not replace film on TV. It may cut down on the amount of film used, and even displace certain kinds of filmed programs, but this is a matter of degree. To provide television operations with program flexibility and sponsors and stations with program variety, film is imperative.

Third, I wholeheartedly concur with the premise set forth by Rudy Bretz: "In training production personnel for television and motion pictures we are unrealistic if we allow a student to limit himself to the study of just one medium."† I would, however, not restrict that injunction to the training of production personnel alone. I would also include students concentrating on writing or business and management. From my own personal experience in the commercial world and from my subsequent experience as a teacher, I do not see any justification for having students make hard and fast lines between motion pictures, television, radio, and also theater.

From the artistic approach, to look at these as nonrelated entities is to overlook the paramount consideration of how similar they are and can be. Educationally, we and our students should understand that in the media, stepping aside from the minor distinctions of equipment or even techniques, a director artistically and philosophically is a director is a director, an actor is an actor is an actor. We can take our clues from theory and from practice: the basic concepts underlying dramatic structure, directing, writing, acting are the same; in practice, we see writers, producers, directors, actors shifting back and forth between the media. To put solely a vertical emphasis on each medium as a separate entity without putting great emphasis on the horizontal ties that bind is to be philosophically, artistically, academically and professionally unsound.

To train students, however, only in the artistic and creative aspects of the several media is still to remain restrictive. Students should know about the essential facts of life in the TV and film market-place. They should know about

†Rudy Bretz, "Training for film and television," presented on May 6, 1960, at the Society's Convention in Los Angeles.

the economic premises of financing, distribution and exhibition as they relate specifically, and interchangeably, to film and TV. As automation increasingly enters into local station operations, the TV academic department which sticks strictly to the artistic and production aspect is ignoring the imperative fact that it is giving a one-sided training to students and materially reducing their chances of obtaining and holding a position. An economic emphasis has to come into the curriculum side-by-side with production, performance and writing. Already a number of radio-TV departments are doing this.

Still another aspect of what I call an *internally integrated* curriculum is that of a communications emphasis. A film or a TV program should be something beyond an exercise in ego-expression: it should be made because *someone* has something to communicate to *someone else*. Students should know about communications as a process and as a technique. They should know of the statistical, sociological, cultural and psychological implications of the faceless and ever-changing composite we call an audience.

Conclusions

First, I think there should be in education — from an artistic, business and operational standpoint — an integrated curriculum in film, radio and television.

Second, students should be made to work back and forth, up and down, in these media so that they can be familiar with, though not necessarily expert in all three. Each medium cross-pollinates the other, and the collective experience enhances the students' background and their chances of employment.

Third, in the smaller departments particularly, I am opposed to any separate administrative Divisions of Television or Film or Radio. This administrative Division (capital "D") results in a (small "d") division of the staff and students, both operationally and psychologically, thus creating divisive barriers or lines of demarcation.

Finally, in an integrated department with an integrated curriculum, I see as part of our goal the turning out of students who not only are knowledgeable about the media but, perhaps even more importantly, who know their reason-for-being as creative communicators; and who have a capacity to find, identify and analyze information; to suggest and weigh alternatives; to make judgments and to describe a path to follow as a solution.

If our Departments can so train and nurture students, it seems to me that we in education can then say to each other that we have taken a long step toward fulfilling our purpose.