

## 5

## “Regular Television Put to Shame by Negro Production”

PICTURING A BLACK WORLD  
ON *BLACK JOURNAL*

---

DEVORAH HEITNER

In the first episode of *Black Journal*, before the opening credits, comedian Godfrey Cambridge appears dressed in overalls and a painter’s cap with a paint roller in hand and methodically paints the television frame. To the viewer, it appears that his or her television is being painted black from the inside—a potent visual symbol from the first national Black public affairs program. Initially, though, the symbol emphasizes a visual challenge to the absence of Black faces on television—a show that “looks” Black, because of the visibility of its Black hosts and reporters, but where whites still have significant editorial control. Reviewers, who mostly praised the premiere episode of *Black Journal*, tended to see the production as Black produced and something of a novelty. For example, Frank Getlein titled his review “Regular Television Put to Shame by Negro Production,” demonstrating, among other things, how deeply taken for granted, how “regular,” the whiteness of television was to many in 1968.

Studying *Black Journal* today offers a window into the sometimes surprising collisions and intersections of Black Power and media. It gives us a sense of what was possible in this moment in the history of educational television (before there was a “public broadcasting system”—PBS) and when foundations and corporate sponsors seemed eager to respond to social crisis with dollars. The early history of the show illustrates the challenges of finding Black self-determination in a white- owned and -controlled medium. Yet the innovation of *Black Journal*, which was a surprise to NET, was that Black staff members were unafraid to bite the hands that fed them. They were in a position to demand aesthetically and politically radical content that often critiqued the other programming on public television and the rest of the dial as well as the broader situation of Blacks in America. Engaging what Catherine Squires defines as a “counterpublic strategy,” *Black Journal* challenged and provoked white viewers and gratified Black audiences by offering a Black perspective on Black culture and politics.<sup>1</sup>

After the screen is painted black on the first episode, host Lou House appears on-screen and declares, “It is our aim in the next hour and in the coming months to report and review the events, the dreams, the dilemmas of Black America and Black Americans.”<sup>2</sup> Although the style and approach of the show would evolve and the balance of editorial power would soon shift, the categories of content in this first episode—stories on Black communities in the United States, updates on Black activism, coverage of events in Africa, reports on Black politics both mainstream and radical and on Black economic initiatives, and critiques of Black absence from mainstream media—typified the program in its first several years. *Black Journal* was an hour-long newsmagazine with arts coverage, hard news reporting, and interpretive commentary by hosts and guests. Early episodes were structured as a mix of in-studio discussions—often featuring House framed by dramatic black-and-white images from the stories he was reporting—alternating with short- and long-form documentaries shot in the field. The cinematography and editing of these documentaries resembled experimental and documentary cinema more than they resembled other contemporary news programs, though the program’s format was similar in some ways to *60 Minutes*, which premiered the same year.

*Black Journal*, like the many local Black public affairs programs that premiered the same year, originated from the sense of crisis brought about by several years of “long hot summers” and Martin Luther King Jr.’s assassination, which undermined any fantasy that the United States was moving toward racial consensus. The Kerner Commission pointed the finger at media’s culpability for exacerbating rioting and ignoring Black perspectives. After King’s assassination, an experienced white producer at National Educational Television in New York, Al Perlmutter, was working on a series about the urban uprisings.<sup>3</sup> Aware of the lack of Black voices in public television and shaken by the assassination of King, he asked the organization’s program director to start a Black program using the funds from the riot series. *Black Journal*’s initial budget of at least five hundred thousand dollars per season, though small for television, was considerably larger than those of local Black public affairs programs such as Boston’s *Say Brother*, San Francisco’s *Vibrations for a New People*, or Detroit’s *Colored People’s Time* produced by educational stations around the country.

After getting the go-ahead from NET’s administration, Al Perlmutter became the executive producer of *Black Journal*, and he brought on eleven Black and eight white staff members to make the program. Almost immediately, Perlmutter felt some pushback about being a white executive producer for a Black program when he sent a crew to Harlem to investigate the New Breed clothing line. The proprietor there, clearly savvy about how media is made, refused to talk with *Black Journal* unless the sequence was shot, produced, and edited by African Americans. Kent Garrett was promoted to associate producer to produce that segment and has gone on to a distinguished career in media making, as have virtually all of the other Black staff members from the early years of *Black Journal*.

### ***Black Journal on Strike***

After just three episodes, the Black staff met and agreed to strike to demand full editorial control. “NET has deceived the Black Community by advertising the program series as being ‘by, for and of the black community,’” said the strikers to the *New York Times*. Despite appearances, they had “no editorial control over the program’s content or production.” Staff member St. Clair Bourne said to the *New York Times*, “We, not only as black professionals but mainly because we are black people, feel that NET has been hypocritical.” The network’s staffing decisions represented not “tokenism” but “frontism” in that the visibility of the Black on-air staff was used, in the *Times* writer’s words, to perpetuate “the idea that Negroes controlled the program,” though in fact, white NET employees produced the majority of the segments.<sup>4</sup>

Embarrassed, NET soon offered terms, hoping to settle the dispute promptly.<sup>5</sup> NET claimed that it had intended “all along” for the show to have a Black executive producer but was “unable to find anyone qualified.”<sup>6</sup> Eventually William Greaves, who had already appeared as a co-host on the program, was hired for the position, replacing Perlmutter. Greaves, an accomplished and well-regarded experimental filmmaker and theater artist, was, at forty-two, somewhat older than most “young Turks” on the staff at the time.<sup>7</sup> Acknowledging how unusual it was for Black media workers to take action against a powerful media entity, *Variety* reported about the strike: “Even if the series is cancelled and the group dispersed, ‘Black Journal’ has clearly signaled the end of a time when integrationist Negroes accepted the token generousities of white liberals with murmurs of gratitude. Because if NET public service initiative put the show on the air, it took the independent action of black staff members to make ‘Black Journal’ black.”<sup>8</sup>

In 2010, Kent Garrett recalled that one of the most revolutionary things about the strike was that the staff went to the press with their story. “We knew we had them in the corner,” he recalls, as they had been claiming the show was “by, for, and about” Black people. The tenor of the times made the striking staffers feel “almost invincible,” he said: “You didn’t care about losing your job; there is a bigger principle involved. You’re young, you’re talented, you feel that if they’re not going to meet your demands, you’re not going to do the show.”<sup>9</sup> Other activists of color in the broadcast industry around the country successfully used similar tactics in the years that followed.<sup>10</sup>

The transfer of power on *Black Journal* was immediately signaled visually and verbally on the broadcast. At the beginning of *Black Journal*’s fifth episode, which aired in October 1968, host Lou House tells the story of the walkout and subsequent change in control in an understated way. Greaves appears in the studio with him, demonstrating that the program is now under Black direction. The new opening theme featured a red globe with images from the program inside a black space in the shape of the African continent, signifying *Black Journal*’s connection to a Black world. “*Black Journal* surprised itself by making headlines,”

said House of the strike. He smiled as he announced that the show was now truly “by, for and of Black people, and that’s where it’s at.” Speaking with *Variety* after the strike, staff members reported that the show immediately gained “credibility in the black community” due to the strike.

### **Documenting a Black World: Capturing Black Reality**

The installation of Greaves as executive producer seemed to forecast a radical departure from the “rationalist” style of PBS: “Journalistic objectivity is one of the biggest lies in Western culture,” he said.<sup>11</sup> Greaves told his staff: “Always try to make films about Black people with the interior voice. Don’t be like white people and just say, ‘This is what so and so say.’ Try to get *the Black people* to say it.” *Black Journal*’s staff under Greaves, who was at the helm through the twenty-fifth episode at the end of 1969, did “get the Black people to say it” and emphasized an experimental style with documentaries, often shot partially in a cinema verité style with less voice-over and more discussion with the film’s subjects, whether they were Black cops in Harlem or sharecroppers in the Mississippi Delta. These first two years of *Black Journal* emphasized the geographic and ideological diversity of the Black world and Black liberation while also highlighting the importance of unity and connection.

While our historic misremembering of this critical moment in Black liberation history tends to emphasize an adversarial, Martin versus Malcolm or civil



Figure 5.1 William Greaves and *Black Journal* staff. Courtesy of William and Louise Greaves.

rights versus Black Power contest, an examination of *Black Journal* reminds us that this was a chorus of voices, not a contest, and that adherents to a broad spectrum of Black political thought found common ground or at least fruitful dialogue. In January 1969, *Black Journal* brought together an impressive group of Black public figures, including Kathleen Cleaver, Ron Karenga, and Andrew Young, to offer their retrospective views of 1968 and to predict what 1969 might bring. In response to the press release, Memphis-based white critic Larry Williams nervously predicted of this episode, “I’m sure the remarks will be occasionally bitter and even threatening.”

Williams probably quaked when watching Kathleen Cleaver say: “There’s a world of difference between twenty million unarmed people and twenty million people armed to the hilt . . . That’s power.” While some of her colleagues disagree on tactics, they engage with the Black Panther Party positions as she explains them, and she listens to their points of view as well. Each of the guests had proposals and promises for Black America; they spoke to one another with respect, even as they disagreed. *Black Journal* created a forum that brought prominent and ideologically opposed individuals into the same room—not an everyday occurrence. From a cultural nationalist perspective, Ron Karenga of the organization U.S. (United Slaves) points out the problems of alliances with white groups: “We can only do that [build alliances] with people of color as opposed to the colorless—we cannot make alliance when they have all the power. The white people are slick enough to understand that people are not going for nonviolence anymore.” In contrast to Cleaver and Karenga, Andrew Young says he can imagine 1969 as a year when Black people, poor people and white people “of goodwill” can get together. Cleaver, with her brisk Black Panther rhetoric, distinctive Afro, and yellow miniskirt suit, is both aurally and visually striking in this room full of men, and she becomes the focal point of the conversation, though all get to air their perspectives in a wide-ranging conversation.

The forum offers no easy answers to these differences in strategy, but it does remind us that these leaders sat down together—and that *Black Journal* gave them a space to do it, implicitly encouraging such a dialogue. Furthermore, this was not a media circus to entertain, titillate, terrify, or reassure white folks but a serious grappling with varied strategies for Black liberation. *Black Journal*, along with some of the local Black public affairs programs, gave voice to a mix of Black liberation ideologies, representing a Black political spectrum that was far more diverse than mainstream television news’ obsession with binaristic liberal and conservative points of view. Furthermore, once the program was under Black editorial control, one never saw white “experts” discussing Black issues on the program, a sight all too common on both public and commercial broadcasts in this era.

In a striking departure from public television’s practice of having white professors and government officials speak as “experts” on Black conditions or on “race relations,” in one 1969 episode we hear from a national panel of Black high

school organizers working toward school reform and adding an African American Studies component to high school curricula. Using TV as a metaphor for some white teachers' cluelessness about the life experiences of urban Black students, one high school organizer from Chicago says: "Most white teachers come from the *Leave it to Beaver* suburbs." He describes how "the school curriculum is imposed on the students—we want to have a say in why we learn . . . Everything we learn is from the system." Another young man quietly points out the similarities between schools and prisons, a prescient observation in 1968, long before the critique of a school-to-prison-pipeline for Black kids was in wide circulation.

While the student activists' analysis is the explicit reason for their presence on the show, their performance and representation of the "new Black look" as an alternative image of Black youth put their appearance in implicit contrast with the few other Black images on television.<sup>12</sup> On *Black Journal*, the new Black look is a constant reminder of changing times and new ideas, whether it is House in his dashiki or Kathleen Cleaver in her Afro. In his striking green dashiki and wire-rimmed glasses, the young man speaking about the "system" looks poised beyond his years, reminding us how mature and astute young activists can be. A young woman on the panel sports a generous Afro and wears a gray and white minidress, again communicating both by her words and her appearance that these students are part of a new generation of Black young people. She asks urgently, "How can a white teacher communicate with me if he hasn't gone through what I've gone through?" Her question demands an answer, and the program, by not offering resolution, implicitly encourages viewers to act in their own communities. Each of these young people models both intelligence and the height of Black fashion to a national audience eager to consider questions of Black identity in curricula and in personal aesthetics. By positioning these young, intelligent, and outspoken students as experts on school reform and bringing young people from across the country to be on the program, *Black Journal* advanced the national discussion on school reform while also highlighting the possibilities of a national Black program. Significantly, the program also offered role models for its youth audience, not an image of victimized youth such as had come out of the news documentation of the southern movement, but of youth in a position of strength, expertise, and beauty at a time when Black youth were either maligned or ignored by mass media.<sup>13</sup>

*Black Journal* was frequently pedagogical—for Blacks and whites. Unlike the local Black public affairs programs, which sometimes had a more "enclave approach" (though they too were educational for non-Black viewers), *Black Journal* always was aware that because it was the national Black program on educational television, white viewers and critics were watching. So the program, while explicitly addressing itself to Black people, also offered history lessons and made political connections explicit for everyone.<sup>14</sup> The program implied that Black viewers should consider themselves part of a national and international

Black community, assert themselves politically and culturally, know and take pride in their history, and seek out and demand alternative sources of news. By situating the topics it explored as common to Black people in many regions and nations, the program proposed that Black viewers should consider themselves part of an emerging Black world wherein all regions of Black America as well as Africa and the Black Diaspora were vitally relevant.

On the home front, the program’s national inclusiveness was most pointed when it covered the American South. Whenever House spoke of southern Black people, he used the words *we* and *us*, as in “We are having trouble with voter registration in the South.” Early episodes focused on business development, health care, and educational initiatives in the South, from basic literacy initiatives to the student activism at Duke University that led to the formation of Malcolm X University. One story features an innovative fishermen’s collective that shares a boat among a number of poor Black fishermen who had previously been unable to purchase their boats and had to work for white, boat-owning fishermen.

While covering dynamic new initiatives in the South, *Black Journal* also insisted on giving airtime to the brutality and privation that many African Americans continued to face even after the southern civil rights movement, along with a focus on the ingenuity of various individuals and organizations in addressing southern injustices. In one episode, the privations of tenant farmers and their families in the Mississippi Delta and their brutal effects on the health and life chances of poor sharecropping families are exposed. Through interviews and in wide images that situate the people in harsh landscapes reminiscent of the Dust Bowl photographs taken by Dorothea Lange and Walker Evans, we see people literally starving before our eyes. A scene features a long conversation with a woman with thirteen children whose husband makes sixty-five dollars in a “good month” tending a local farmer’s cattle. Another segment focuses on the continued challenge of Black disenfranchisement in the South even after the Voting Rights Act, including scare tactics, turning elected posts into “appointed” posts, and “redistricting to dilute our vote.” Images of clothes drying on the line in front of shacks demonstrate that people are living in desperate conditions, conditions that *Black Journal* explicitly compares to the third world. The next scene shows Representative Robert Clark, who, in 1967, became the first African American elected to the Mississippi State Legislature since the Reconstruction era. The scene features Clark in his office helping people whose food assistance has been inexplicably cut. House angrily narrates: “The outrageous violation of our rights is an everyday occurrence in the Delta, and Representative Clark spends much of his time dealing with the criminal and discriminatory practices of most state agencies.”

Far from the disinterested voice-over of an “objective narrator,” House’s voice bristles with anger as he describes the situation, emphasizing the first-person plural. At a time when other media tended to separate the southern civil rights struggle from the experiences of northern and urban Blacks, emphasizing

dichotomies such as rural versus urban and southern versus northern, *Black Journal* purposely sought to resist those divisions, framing the national civil rights struggle as one struggle of unified African American people—despite acknowledged differences in priorities and approaches.

*Black Journal* also continually defined and redefined its commitment to a “Black world” as including not merely the United States but also Africa and the Caribbean. At the beginning of its second season, House enthusiastically introduced an “exclusive” film of the 1969 Pan African Cultural Festival. *Black Journal* began to produce African coverage, bringing Black Americans into dialogue with African liberation struggles. By August 1970, the program had attained the resources to open a bureau in Addis Ababa—an extraordinarily ambitious move that defined the show as cutting-edge and peerless and underscored the importance of Africa to African American thinking and politics.<sup>15</sup> Reflecting in 2010 on the program’s emphasis on African coverage when other media were all but ignoring Africa, Wali Siddiq (formerly Lou House) said resolutely: “We wanted to do more on Africa. We should do more on Africa. There should be more done on Africa. Africa is your whole soul land.”<sup>16</sup>

In an episode on apartheid, *Black Journal* hosted a number of South African intellectuals and artists living in the United States. It also showed a film made by South Africans in 1965, which was smuggled out of Africa, and offered its own commentary on the footage. In August 1970, *Black Journal* opened with a direct interrogation by William Greaves of audience members’ ideas and/or lack of knowledge about Africa: “One thinks of Africa and thinks of . . . what? Rhythms . . . Black people in the jungle dancing, naked and perhaps scarred with body marks.” Setting aside “such clichés, such Western myths about Africa,” he announced, *Black Journal* had “examined the current situation in Kenya and Tanzania” for its viewers.

Following this opening, Tony Batten, who ran the newly created African bureau, interviews the brother of President Jomo Kenyatta, James Muigai, as well as President Julius K. Nyerere of Tanzania, individuals not frequently seen on U.S. television. In a long and heady discussion, Nyerere theorizes about socialism and capitalism, explains how a communal society in agrarian Tanzania offers an indigenous base for socialism, and discusses the need for manpower to modernize his country, directly soliciting African American engineers, doctors, and architects to consider how they could contribute to Tanzania’s emergence. The episode also offers an interview with a field commander from the Mozambique Liberation Front who speaks of the challenging conditions faced by decolonizing forces in Mozambique. The content of the discussion, especially with Nyerere, was undoubtedly long-winded for some viewers. However, by refusing to simplify the complex issues of decolonizing nations, minds, and economies, it demonstrates the respect that *Black Journal* had for its audience. Furthermore, one gets the sense that the African leaders interviewed saw *Black Journal* as a vital opportunity to reach out to African Americans.



In the next episode, the program made more explicit connections between *Black Journal's* American viewers and Black Africans—connections that *Black Journal's* audience eagerly sought as well. David Sibeko, head of missions from the Pan Africanist Congress, offers a message for *Black Journal's* viewers, saying it moves him that his “brothers” are wearing their hair “natural.” While in the previous episode Nyerere had effectively invited skilled African Americans and Black Europeans to join the struggle for modernization in Tanzania, Sibeko asks for and acknowledges a more symbolic form of connection and support, suggesting that Black Americans were doing their part by decolonizing their minds—two vital messages to Black Americans about Africa’s role in their lives. Reports such as *Black Journal's* segments on African nations provided a much needed and much appreciated context for redefining Blackness in art, culture, and politics to American audiences.

When *Black Journal* premiered in June 1968, educational television was a prominent example of what *Black Journalist* and historian Lerone Bennett designated as “white-oriented media,” and the context for public television’s emergence seemed to offer little hope for substantive change.<sup>17</sup> As educational television (ETV) was consolidating forces and funding to become what we now recognize as public television,<sup>18</sup> the public broadcasting system, (created from the previously loosely connected ETV stations around the country), provided a new space for Black programming, in part to counter charges of “elitism” that were being used by conservatives to argue against public television’s government funding. Yet educational television had an overwhelmingly white staff and an overwhelmingly white audience—so *Black Journal* emerged within a great chasm.

*Black Journal* had to deal with a special kind of censorship, as some educational stations did not want to air the program and NET could not impose programming on stations. Ultimately, Alabama ETV lost its broadcast license because of the station’s repeated refusal to air Black programs. *Black Journal* was one of the key points of contention. Alabama ETV was reluctant to show *Black Journal* (or *Soul!* or *Sesame Street*), ostensibly because its leaders theoretically objected to the language in specific episodes. A representative of Alabama ETV claimed to the FCC that *Black Journal* contained “lewd vulgar obscene profane and repulsive materials.” In a rare victory for antiracist broadcast reformers, in a case similar to the better-known WLBT case, Alabama ETV lost its broadcast license in 1973.<sup>19</sup>

In 1970, after Greaves left, NET hired Tony Brown from *Colored People's Time* in Detroit as the executive producer. While Brown brought a vital energy to the program right away when he took the helm, the changes he made were not without their detractors. Critics argued that the new format sacrificed the shows’ usual acute and clear assertions. “He is trying for a slicker and faster-moving fusion of assorted reports and occasional bridges of song,” stated the *New York Times* in a review of the show.

*Black Journal's* status as the premiere Black public affairs program continued to erode in 1973, when *Black Perspective on the News*, which had started out as a local program in Philadelphia, surpassed it in national public television distribution. Many more stations chose to air *Black Perspective*, in part because Tony Brown had become a controversial figure in public television. One industry memo noted that “many members of the black communications community” felt that Brown arbitrarily kept “all viewpoints but his own from *Black Journal*.”<sup>20</sup> Yet Brown also had ardent supporters and was able to rally them to continue to keep the pressure on public broadcasting for several more years.

The Black perspective of shows like *Black Journal* had begun to seem too radical to PBS decision makers by the mid-1970s. Many Black public affairs programs were canceled in this period; some of their replacements (when they were replaced) were more “interracial” in their address. In the first half of the 1970s, a number of articles in the Black press made the argument that Black viewers’ taxes paid for PBS and that these vital programs should not be cut. One 1974 article in *Black Enterprise* characterized the Corporation for Public Broadcasting as “a tax-supported institution operated as a white-male-dominated plantation with a shocking lack of concern and sensitivity about racial matters.”<sup>21</sup> Despite such protests—and despite *Black Journal's* support from the FCC’s first African American commissioner, Benjamin Hooks, and sponsorship of two hundred



Figure 5.2 *Black Journal*: Percy Sutton, Adam Wade, and Tony Brown. Courtesy of PhotoFest.

thousand dollars from the Pepsi Corporation—PBS elected not to continue airing *Black Journal* in 1976. The show migrated to commercial television in 1977 as *Tony Brown’s Journal* with funding from Pepsi-Cola that allowed Brown to offer the program free in syndication.<sup>22</sup> Eventually, the program returned to public television but remained, in both title and focus, *Tony Brown’s Journal*.

Looking back at *Black Journal* offers a conspicuous reminder of the ways innovative Black media makers did the work of redefining the meaning of integration toward pluralism and recognition of Black politics, arts, and culture. In its early years especially, *Black Journal* called attention to the diversity and the common interest of Black people in all regions of the United States and the world. By asserting themselves with the strike, the staff “ended an era of thanks for tokenism” for good and provided an example of the possibilities of this kind of action. With its innovations in content and style, *Black Journal* offered a Black interpretation of Black experiences and envisioned a Black world documenting Black life, liberation, and struggle throughout the United States and the world. In all of these efforts, *Black Journal* considerably exceeded its mandate from NET—ultimately doing much more than simply painting the television screen Black.

#### NOTES

1. Catherine Squires, “Rethinking the Black Public Sphere: An Alternative Vocabulary for Multiple Public Spheres,” *Communication Theory* 12, no. 4 (November 2002): 446–468.

2. House is now known as Wali Siddiq.

3. NET was an influential New York-based producing organization that sent programs to most educational stations around the country. The programs were literally sent through the mail in this era. They did not have technology to do a live feed to most other cities.

4. Robert E. Dallo, “11 Negro Staff Members Quit N.E.T.’s ‘Black Journal’ Program,” *New York Times*, August 23, 1968.

5. George De Pue, “NET ‘Black Journal’ Ended Era of ‘Thanks for Tokenism,’ Producers Say,” *Variety*, September 18, 1968

6. Ibid.

7. Charles Hobson, interview with author, August 14, 2004.

8. Ibid.

9. Kent Garrett, interview with author, September 3, 2010.

10. See, for example, Chon Noriega, *Shot in America: Television, the State and the Rise of Chicano Cinema* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).

11. George De Pue, “NET ‘Black Journal’ Ended Era of ‘Thanks for Tokenism,’ Producers Say,” *Variety*, September 18, 1968.

12. See Maxine Leeds Craig, *Ain’t I a Beauty Queen? Black Women, Beauty, and the Politics of Race* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

13. [Editor’s note: The connections between what *Black Journal* does and what Bill Cosby attempts to do in his 1970s children’s program *Fat Albert and the Cosby Kids* strike home here. See TreaAndrea Russworm’s chapter on *Fat Albert* and play in this volume.]

14. Squires (“Rethinking the Black Public Sphere”) proposes that Black publics use the enclave as a strategy of speaking primarily within Black communities when conditions are

too threatening to employ a counterpublic strategy of speaking both to Black and other publics.

15. Lawrence Laurent, "'Black Journal' in Ethiopia," *Washington Post*, August 1, 1970.

16. Wali Siddiq, interview with author, August 4, 2010.

17. Lerone Bennett, "Media White," in *The Challenge of Blackness* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing, 1972).

18. For accounts of this history, see Laurie Ouellette, *Viewers Like You? How Public TV Failed the People* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002) and James Day, *The Vanishing Vision: The Inside Story of Public Television* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

19. [Editor's note: See Steven D. Classen, *Watching Jim Crow: The Struggles over Mississippi TV, 1955–1969* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), for more on the WLBT case.]

20. Bill Duke to John W. Macy, personal memorandum, NPBA, March 24, 1972.

21. James D. Williams, "Blacks and Public TV," *Black Enterprise*, January 1974, 31–33.

22. "Hooks, FCC Commissioner: Keep *Black Journal* on the Air," *New York Amsterdam News*, January 20, 1973; Gerald Fraser, "'Black Journal' Is Syndicated," *New York Times*, November 10, 1977.