

[1953]

The University of Notre Dame has been cited often during the past two years as opposing a large majority who favor restricted television of collegiate football. Our position of opposition is only as strong as the reasons that support it. We are, therefore, presenting a ten-point program which includes the reasoning behind our minority opposition, as well as our concern for the public interest involved.

1. We believe that both football and television can be good elements in American life. Youngsters watching football on television can learn a game available to them and good for them in a way that space ships, range riding, and criminal investigations will never be. Believing this, we are for more, rather than less, football on television.

2. We believe that collegiate football has attained its present popularity and public support because the great mediums of communication, radio, newspapers, and magazines, have stimulated broad interest in the dramatic aspects of the game. Television can further this wide-spread public interest in collegiate football, and, what is more important, can promote greater public interest in the educational institutions of which the teams are but one dramatic aspect.

+ + 3. We believe that the current plans of restrictive television have not been in the public interest. On the contrary, they have attempted to dictate what the public can and cannot see, with little regard for what the public would like to see.

4. We believe that there is one normal restriction that should operate in the selection of what games should be televised and how broadly they should be televised: namely, public interest in the game. If this rule were

followed, and it is followed in everything else communicated by television, our basic principle would be honored. There would be more football on television, and, ultimately we believe, more interest and support for both the teams and the schools they represent.

5. We believe that public interest generally follows the same pattern that obtains regarding other events on television. The public interest is local, regional, and national. If the four networks and local television stations would cooperate with obvious public interest as the season develops each Fall, it would be possible to have football telecasts of as many as fifty schools each Saturday, and hundreds each season. The game of the week might be telecasted nationally, many other games on a regional basis, and a larger number of smaller games could be covered by local stations. With the differential in time, there could even be a double feature Eastern and Western game of the week, and many successive series of regional games across the nation. Many high schools and some small colleges might prefer to telecast locally on Friday night.


6. We believe that this program would meet with wide approval from the now long-suffering public who have generously supported the present growth of football. More general coverage of football games on television might, in the beginning, affect the attendance at some games, although we believe that this loss will eventually be offset by television revenue and by new fans developed through television. For many people, television will never be a substitute for the color and good fellowship associated with a football weekend on a college campus.

7. We believe that this television coverage would give many colleges and universities a wonderful opportunity to present their educational programs to a wide audience of the people whose support they need. This factor

alone would keep collegiate football in focus as merely a part of a much larger and much more significant over-all educational endeavor.

8. We believe that this plan allows for wider participation of the schools and the public in the benefits of both television and football. It is in keeping with the nature of football which dramatizes competition. This plan puts the emphasis on public interest, operating through the networks and local stations, as the selector of many programs each week, rather than allowing a small committee to decide during the Summer, before competition has begun, what few games the general public will be allowed to see all Fall.

9. We believe that this plan places control where it belongs. We advocate the same control for television of football as is applied to all the musical, dramatic, educational, or religious programs currently presented ~~by~~<sup>on</sup> television. They are all controlled by public interest. Without it, they die. This is a natural, rather than an artificial, control. Nor is there any talk of the poorer programs being kept alive by subsidies from the better programs. Applied to football, we believe that there are enough good games throughout the Nation to keep all four networks and hundreds of local stations busy on a local, regional, and national level each Saturday in the Fall. Some schools might appear on more than one Saturday, but so do other good programs. However, in the last analysis, hundreds of schools would meet the public through television, rather than the few that now do.

 10. We believe that any attempt to restrict and boycott what is successful in other television programs would be thought of as un-American and illegal. Any attempt to go further and to share the honest reward for any talent would be looked upon as socialistic, a removal of incentive to excellence and a premium placed on mediocrity. Any attempt of a small committee to legislate

public interest would not be tolerated in any other form of television programming. We believe that all these conclusions are equally true of the televising of football. It is a strange commentary on those who direct athletics, one of whose main values is to teach honest competition, that they alone in the field of television have been afraid to meet competition and have attempted to restrain it through athletic boycott. Follow our path, they say, or you will have no one to play. Nor do we think that there is a valid argument for monopoly and boycott by saying that the majority of those who impose it are in favor of it.

We are not denying that many honest efforts have been made to meet the problem of television and collegiate football. But, we do frankly oppose the philosophy underlying present restricted television plans. We believe that our ten-point program is a more progressive and positive approach to the problem, more in the public interest, better adapted to further the purposes of educational institutions, and, of course, clearly legal and American in facing competition with a will to win, despite the odds inherent in any competitive situation.

These are the reasons for our opposition to the present restrictive television plans. We think they are good reasons to support, even in the face of opposition. We think they touch the heart of many truths that have made sports popular in America. <sup>11</sup>

end

[1953]

University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, Indiana

Office of the Vice-President

Robert A. Hall, Yale University, New Haven, Conn - Chairman  
 Asa S. Bushnell, Biltmore Hotel, New York 17, New York - Director  
 J. Shober Barr, Franklin & Marshall College, Lancaster, Penn.  
 Walter Byers, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago 2, Ill.  
 Jeff Coleman, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama  
 Howard Grubbs, 1343 National City Building, Dallas 1, Tex.  
 Willis O. Hunter, University of So. California, Los Angeles, Cal.  
 Reaves E. Peters, Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City 6, Missouri  
 E. L. Romney, Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah  
 Kenneth L. Wilson, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago 2, Illinois

Sent Fr. Hesburgh's statement on football TV  
annual special 1/3/53

25M

1-3-53