

**Part 1**  
**BROADCAST LICENSE RENEWAL**

---

4 - OCT 3 0  
Copy ..... 1973

**HEARINGS**

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON  
INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS**

**FIRST SESSION**

ON

**H.R. 5546, H.R. 3854, H.R. 370, H.R. 565, H.R. 1066,  
H.R. 1864, H.R. 2001, H.R. 2349, H.R. 2355,  
H.R. 3551, H.R. 6319, H.R. 6320, and all  
similar and identical bills**

**BILLS TO AMEND THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934  
WITH REGARD TO RENEWAL OF BROADCAST LICENSES**

---

**MARCH 14, 15, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29; APRIL 3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 19;  
MAY 8, 9, 10; AND SEPTEMBER 18, 1973**

---

**Serial No. 93-35**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce



[Whereupon, the subcommittee recessed at 12:15 p.m., to reconvene at 2:30 p.m., the same day.]

AFTER RECESS

[The subcommittee reconvened at 2:30 p.m., Hon. Torbert H. Macdonald, chairman, presiding.]

Mr. MACDONALD. The hearing will be in order.

Our witness is Ms. Jan Crawford, National Organization for Women, New York City chapter, and other women's groups.

**STATEMENT OF JAN CRAWFORD, REPRESENTING WOMEN'S MEDIA ALLIANCE OF NEW YORK CITY, ABC WOMEN'S ACTION COMMITTEE, RKO RADIO & TELEVISION WOMEN'S COALITION (NEW YORK), MANHATTAN WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE, NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN (NEW YORK CHAPTER), NBC WOMEN'S COMMITTEE FOR EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY, AND AMERICAN WOMEN IN RADIO & TELEVISION, BOARD OF NEW YORK CITY CHAPTER; ACCOMPANIED BY MARY HELEN BLUME, NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN; AND CYNTHIA A. GOULDER, NBC WOMEN'S COMMITTEE FOR EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY**

Ms. CRAWFORD. Yes; the other women's groups are: ABC Women's Action Group, Women's Media Alliance, RKO Radio and Television, Manhattan Women's Political Caucus Employment Committee. In addition, our position has been endorsed in principle by NBC Women's Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity and by the board of directors of New York chapter of American Women in Radio and Television.

We submit that if the broadcast license period is extended from 3 to 5 years, and if the present employment and programing requirements are relaxed, we, women employed in broadcasting and women of the general public, stand to be deprived of our rights in the interest of a small privileged group. It is our contention that even under the present law, broadcasters are operating illegally. With regard to women, employment is discriminatory, programing is unbalanced, and ascertainment is inadequate. Deregulation would only make the situation worse. We propose instead that the present regulations be strengthened and enforced.

Gentlemen, as you are aware, there is a national policy favoring the advancement of women in employment. Since 1964, with the passage of title VII of the Civil Rights Act, employment discrimination against women has been unlawful. The Federal Communications Commission has adopted rules requiring broadcasters to submit affirmative action plans for women. [See Report and Order, Docket No. 19269, released Dec. 28, 1971.] Nevertheless, broadcasters are egregiously discriminatory against women. In New York City, women make up more than 40 percent of the labor force, but less than 25 percent of television station employees in New York City are women. Thus, women are significantly underrepresented in New York broadcasting employment.

In addition, women are restricted almost entirely to low-paying, dead-end clerical and office jobs. More than 70 percent of women employed in New York City broadcasting are in office and clerical jobs;

less than 10 percent of men are employed in these jobs. On the other hand, men make up 83 percent of the officials and managers in New York City television stations, 83 percent of the professionals, 99 percent of the technicians, 78 percent of the sales workers, and 100 percent of the craftworkers. In all New York industry, women hold 35 percent of the jobs in the top four employment categories, but in television stations we number only 11 percent. Furthermore, despite the FCC requirement for equal employment opportunity and affirmative action toward it, there were fewer women employed in television stations in New York City in 1972 than in 1971. During that period the percentage of women in full time professional jobs decreased from 19 percent to 17 percent. These data are based on information supplied to the FCC by the broadcasters themselves.

As bad as these figures are, the true employment situation is even worse, especially in the top four categories. What these statistics fail to reveal is that women in these categories are almost invariably at the bottom levels of them. The figures are inflated. In the sales category, for instance, a salesperson—invariably male, and a salesclerk—invariably female, are listed together, even though the salary differential can range from \$7,000 to \$40,000 or more, and the female clerk has no decisionmaking power. Technically, she shouldn't be listed as management at all. Furthermore, unlike their male counterparts, women do not with any frequency get promoted to the top levels.

Women have proven to be equally as qualified as men in both the level of educational attainment and the years of service we are willing to provide. And, contrary to the prevailing myth, our turnover rate is lower than that of men. However, we are started in lower jobs with lower salaries and less advancement potential. If we do advance, we remain nevertheless in secondary jobs—for example, assistant producer, administrative assistant, and office manager; and when the men we work for leave their jobs, we are seldom considered as possible replacements. Because we are held in lower jobs at lower salaries, our benefits, such as life insurance and pensions, are also low, and we have no share in stock options or management incentives. We rarely have an opportunity to participate in company training programs or management development programs. And our companies are less willing to pay for our educations than they are for the education of our male coworkers. All these things systematically work against us as we try to advance ourselves.

Broadcasters have not, of their own accord, made any significant attempts to meet standards of equal employment opportunity. The only improvements that have been made so far are the result of concerted, positive efforts by women's groups, backed by the power of legal challenge.

At NBC corporate headquarters in New York, women employees organized the Women's Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity. For more than a year the group repeatedly approached the company's top management and personnel department to make them aware of sex discrimination in employment and to urge compliance with Federal laws. The women's grievances were many; some women were being paid less than men for comparable work; some were refused jobs given to men even though they had more education or more

experience or both; in general, women were prohibited from interviews for higher, so-called men's jobs. The list goes on. The women's committee made many appeals to management to correct the employment situation and supplied many suggestions for what could be done. With great hesitation, NBC agreed to implement some of the minor changes the women suggested. However, after more than a year of procrastination NBC said no to all of the major changes. At this point—February 1973—the women filed complaints of across-the-board discrimination with the EEOC.

The NBC women wanted to believe they could rely on the good faith of management, and therefore allowed their opportunity for license challenge to go by. Unfortunately, this good faith was not justified. If the license period is extended, these women will have to go through another 5 years of sex discrimination before they can use the challenge mechanism. If broadcasting is deregulated, they may not even be able to use it.

At ABC in New York, management did not begin to make changes until pressured by an outside group. In May 1972, the New York chapter of the National Organization for Women filed a petition to deny the license of WABC-TV, the New York station owned and operated by ABC Inc. The petition was filed on grounds of discriminatory programming and employment. For over a year and a half prior to the filing of this petition, the station had been well aware that women were not satisfied with its performance. New York NOW's many requests for fairer coverage and better treatment were rejected. Only once was such a request even acknowledged. The station's refusal to be responsive to women is documented in the petition on file at the FCC.

ABC corporate management, aware of the women's activities, suggested a meeting with the Women's Action Committee, the organization of women employed at ABC, in August 1972. At this meeting the women made several proposals, including the establishment of an employee relations committee, through which representatives of management and the Women's Action Committee would discuss on a regular basis the prospects of improving employment opportunity for women. This committee was set up, and, since that time, ABC has implemented some positive procedures; job openings are now posted, so that all, and not just a chosen few employees may apply. A computerized skills bank is being instituted, to make possible the notification of all employees qualified for open positions. And a woman has been appointed associate director of employee relations to give job counseling to all employees and to recruit women actively into the top four job categories.

At CBS corporate headquarters in New York, the situation is somewhat different. Aware of what has been happening in other places, company management has taken some positive action of its own accord. The company has appointed five of its women to take on the duties of representing women employees and working with management to redress their grievances. And they have hired a consulting firm, made up of women, to study the problem. Whether the company's gestures will accomplish meaningful changes for the women and bring the company into compliance with the law, or whether they are only token

diversionary tactics, remains to be seen. At any rate, it is clear that one of the reasons for this apparent positive action was CBS's desire to avoid litigation.

At RKO General, New York [WOR-TV, WOR-AM, WXLO-FM, RKO Television representatives, and RKO Radio representatives], women have just begun to organize. Already management has indicated a desire to talk with the new women's organization. Thus, they too wish to avoid a challenge.

As the above has shown, it has been only through the pressure of women's groups that any constructive change has occurred. Despite the FCC requirements, stations have not acted, but only reacted. And this only because of the threat of litigation. Most of the changes to date have, however, been token changes.

The employment status of women must be improved. Unless women are represented on all levels of the broadcast industry, including ownership and management, women's views, interests and needs will not be fully represented on television and radio.

At present there is an enormous gap between the reality of women's lives and broadcasting's image of women. Except where sex discrimination prohibits us, more and more women are taking on new responsibilities; participating in the world of work and the life of society. Women are doctors, lawyers, corporate officers; we are jockeys and racing car drivers; we run for political office, and we sit in Congress.

However, television programs and advertising continue to depict us in traditional stereotyped roles of housewife-mother, secretary, nurse, or assistant, leaving the distinct impression on our culture that women can't do anything else. And even within these limited roles, which one would have thought we'd have mastered by now, we are demeaned by being shown as childlike, subservient idiots, incapable of assuming full responsibility for ourselves. No employer in his or her right mind would be anxious to hire the kind of brainless incompetent woman who is ubiquitous on the airwaves. Indeed, it is because broadcasters have this biased image of women that they do not hire and promote us. Thus, they perpetuate a vicious cycle of discrimination.

So, we come to you, gentlemen. To get broadcasters to take just a few small steps toward ending discrimination has taken thousands of hours of volunteer work and many personal sacrifices by thousands of women; by community activists, by women in broadcasting, by lawyers, and by homemakers who could no longer digest the distorted images of themselves they are daily being force fed. These sacrifices should not have been necessary to begin to get laws enforced. Broadcasters have proven by their actions that the public interest cannot be left up to their good faith. It is now your job to see that the broadcasters carry on their responsibilities to the public. Women inside and outside of broadcasting in New York City oppose any of the proposed legislation that provides for deregulation.

This concludes my statement. I will be glad to answer your questions.

Mr. MACDONALD. Ms. Crawford, I see you have joined with other women. Would you care to have then identified for the record?

Ms. BLUME. My name is Mary Helen Blume with the National Organization for Women, FCC task force.

Ms. GOULDER. My name is Cynthia A. Goulder with the NBC Women's Committee.

Mr. MACDONALD. Thank you, Ms. Crawford. All through your testimony, which was very clear, you keep saying that deregulation would only make the situation worse, et cetera. You keep referring to the bills being considered by the subcommittee as deregulation. I was wondering what you had in mind when you say broadcasting is deregulated, et ceteras. I haven't seen any bills that deregulated them.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I think by extending the license period to 5 years, the effectiveness of challenge is weakened.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is the 5-year extension the thing that you object to most in the bill?

Ms. CRAWFORD. Most prominently.

Mr. MACDONALD. If you don't mind my asking, what do you do now?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I am employed now as placement coordinator for the National Organization for Women's Public Service ad campaign on women's rights. I have been consulting with different women's groups, and I am a member of the steering committee of the Women's Media Alliance.

Mr. MACDONALD. Have you ever worked with a broadcaster?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I have worked with many broadcasters while in a media sales position and have spent several years discussing with them the status of women within their companies.

Mr. MACDONALD. Did you sell advertising space or something like that?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I negotiated the sale of advertising time.

Mr. MACDONALD. In that activity, was it ever brought up to you the stereotype that you point out on page 6, of women being shown as childlike, subservient, idiots, incapable of assuming full responsibilities for yourselves?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I can give you one example that quickly comes to mind. In my previous position I was a senior associate media director, which is several steps above a media buyer. It is from the media buyers ranks that broadcast sales people are often hired. Upon the suggestion of a sales person at ABC, I called ABC a year ago to say that I would be interested in one of the sales positions open at that time. The person I spoke with said, "I am not interested in a woman" and showed no interest in discussing my qualifications.

I think he had a derogatory image in his mind because he dismissed me although my qualifications were obviously acceptable and even interesting.

Mr. MACDONALD. I don't disagree. That is one interpretation.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I would prefer not to dwell on my background.

Mr. MACDONALD. No, I am not talking about your background. I am talking about the background of the ABC official who said he was not interested in having a woman. You say he automatically thought all women were childlike, subservient idiots, and incapable of assuming full responsibility. That is possible. But it is also possible he may have had a bad marriage.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I don't think employment standards should be based on his personal experience in his marriage.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not saying that it should. I am saying that is another possibility. You jump at that conclusion that you were being put down just because this man did not think a woman would fit the job.

Ms. CRAWFORD. That is sex discrimination, I believe.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, yes, I guess it is on his part.

Ms. CRAWFORD. He did not review my qualifications. I told him that one of his people suggested that I discuss with him the possibility of a sales opening, and his statement was: "I am not interested in hiring a woman," but I prefer not to dwell on that.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, I am not dwelling on it. You used it as an illustration.

Ms. CRAWFORD. He obviously had some stereotype of what a woman would do in that job and I think he probably gained much of it from his culture. He did not ask me for any other qualification except my sex.

Mr. MACDONALD. But really you are talking about television programming and advertising that leads to this image of childlike, subservient idiots. My only demurer is that it seems to me that these are men who could make the same statement about media advertising. A concrete example, I am not very flattered by seeing an image, I am not being chauvinistic, but of two or three men discussing in especially tough terms, because they want it made perfectly clear that these are tough guys talking, and they are discussing what bleach to use in their wash. I don't really think that advertiser thinks that all men are like the person they put on that ad.

Ms. CRAWFORD. It is true that men are often shown in demeaning roles in advertising also, but you are shown in unlimited roles. Men are doctors and lawyers and crazy people at washing machines—but very rarely at washing machines—according to the ABC challenge they represent 89.3 of voice overs, telling women how to use those bleaches. We are saying that by fuller representation of women in broadcasting and in decisionmaking posts, you will have a broader, unbiased spectrum of what women's roles in society are.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not arguing the point with you. I am saying that some of what you say could be used as knocking the media and especially the advertising media as just being out of touch with reality both as far as women go, I will agree, but also as far as men are concerned.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I will grant you that.

Mr. MACDONALD. You would think that every man in the country wants to use Brut or whatever it is because if he drives a fast car and uses Brut, then he is a sex symbol or something. I don't know where the transference is but it is clear to the advertising media. I don't necessarily think that puts men in any great shape as being bright adults.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I think you have to see the weighting of it. A WABC study monitors the roles of men in television and the roles of women. It is clear that the women's roles are confined to the kind of characterizations I have suggested in this testimony. Men occasionally are shown in roles that would be demeaning to me if I were a man, but it is the weight of the stereotype roles of women in society that disturbs us.

Mr. MACDONALD. I understand your point. I am saying that maybe it isn't quite as clear cut as you make out. That is all I am trying to point out. I am trying to think of programs that I have seen that don't show women in a very demeaning role. Just the opposite. I was thinking of one made in England, the Avengers. There is a female karate expert and a crime detector and a rough and tumble fighter and she is also throwing men all over the place. She has yet to be pinned.

Ms. CRAWFORD. As you suggested, that was produced in England. And, by the way, there is a new female lead on that who isn't quite as rough and tumble. There are few examples of programing which show women in roles that we really occupy in society. For the most part, it is very unrepresentative, as studies confirm. Another factor that very much supports that is that Red Book, a magazine for "conventional young women," or "young mommies," as they describe themselves. A recent poll showed that 75 percent of the women deplored the way the communication media represents women. They said it was demeaning. They clearly were angered by their images on the media. There were 120,000 respondents.

Mr. MACDONALD. We have shaken this tree quite a lot and I don't intend to keep shaking the limbs, but would you think a Julia Child show, the cook, is that showing women in a demeaning role?

Ms. CRAWFORD. No, and I don't think "The Galloping Gourmet"—

Mr. MACDONALD. You anticipated my question.

Ms. CRAWFORD [continuing]. Is a demeaning role. We want programing to show all interests of the woman, and cooking, should be of interest to both men and women.

Mr. MACDONALD. What do you think of the women's shows themselves: Barbara Walters, Virginia Graham, Dinah Shore, and a couple of others that escape me at the moment? And luckily in Boston they have very good women shows which I don't find demeaning or they just show women as being quite bright questioners of people on subjects that are very valid parts of life in metropolitan Boston.

Ms. CRAWFORD. Yes, I understand the Boston show is very good, and we are very pleased by some of this programing. However, if you talk about total daytime programing—where 80 percent of the viewers are women, you have very little news programing, very little documentary programing or instructional or educational programing. Women are pretty much fed the soap operas and prime time reruns. There is little regard for the intelligence of woman in the daytime besides these few programs you can name one one hand.

Mr. MACDONALD. I understand your point. I am just saying the fault is of the media, not the man versus woman thing, because some of those men, and I am no devotee of the soaps, but some of those men who play in those roles, you would not tell your son, "Why don't you imitate that person?"

Ms. CRAWFORD. I have an interesting antidote to this. When NBC women finally had an opportunity to meet with their management, Don Durgin, who is president of the NBC-TV network, he said he was programing for women's interests in the daytime. He was programing things that had to deal with abortion and extramarital affairs

and incest. And this shows a clear misunderstanding of what women's issues are.

Mr. MACDONALD. What was his job?

Ms. CRAWFORD. President of the TV network of NBC.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Goodman said that?

Ms. CRAWFORD. Don Durgin.

Mr. MACDONALD. I thought Mr. Goodman was president of NBC.

Ms. CRAWFORD. This may be network. Durgin is under Goodman.

Mr. MACDONALD. I see. But in any event, it was not a very illuminating remark.

Mr. Van Deerlin?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I think Mr. Chairman that maybe I will stay out of this one. Thank you.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to point out that you have established a new world record for Mr. Van Deerlin. This is the only subject that I haven't heard him discourse on for a period of 8, or 9, or maybe 10 years.

Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to Mr. Collins and then reclaim my time.

Mr. COLLINS. I am sure this will be a very informative session, for all of us, Mr. Chairman. I would like, if I could, for you to broaden me on two subjects. One of them is the subject of what is demeaning employment.

Ms. CRAWFORD. It is not demeaning to be a secretary and it is not demeaning to be a homemaker or assistant or anything else, but when those are the only roles for women in about 99 percent of TV dramas—that is demeaning. And when occasionally women are given professional status, it is made clear that they are unhappy. I remember a program a few weeks ago, there was a woman who was an adviser or campaigner for a politician who was trying to be elected to Congress. She was in a professional role, and it was exciting. But her professional role caused her tremendous difficulties in her home and in the end she was guilty for taking time away from her home. So again, we are told that the real place for us is in the home.

Mr. COLLINS. You then do not feel that a woman in any way is handicapped as a mother when she is in a career function?

Ms. CRAWFORD. Of course not, if that is her choice. The women's movement is about offering women choices. We are talking quite a bit about programing. The basis of our testimony is employment.

Mr. COLLINS. Let's go into programing. How many women go to engineering school nowadays? Maybe more of them around here than at home, but I am amazed at how few are in engineering school. Do any of you happen to be in engineering graduate? How many of your members are engineering graduates?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I don't feel that is pertinent? Are any of you engineering graduates?

Mr. COLLINS. No, but I went to Harvard Business School. How many of you went to Harvard Business School? What I want to know is what technical training did you have that qualifies you for these executive positions in which you have been denied the right to achieve?

Ms. BURME. A good number of the schools that you would make

reference to have discriminated against women for years, some denying women admittance and some admitting women on a quota system. Also, you would find that major universities have an increasing proportion of women in their technical programs. The only statistics that come to mind are the number of women in law school and it is booming. I know for a fact that the number of women is increasing in engineering as well. At the University of California at Los Angeles, the engineering students' association on campus is headed by a woman.

Mr. COLLINS. What you are saying is that today women are going and taking technical training in advanced management fields?

Ms. BLUME. Yes, I am saying they are taking it.

Mr. COLLINS. You say in the past they have not had this type of training?

Ms. BLUME. They have been discriminated against by not being allowed in the schools.

Mr. COLLINS. For whatever reason, they did not have it, but if they did not have the training, it looks to me as though the thing that comes first is to train them as we are now doing. We are talking about a matter that ought to come up 5 and 10 years from now. How can women be discriminated against today as far as industry is concerned if these women do not have the training?

Ms. BLUME. One point is that many women do have training and continue to be discriminated against. The other point is that the broadcasting industry does a great deal of in-house training and people are brought in at lower positions. The high school graduate is eventually made the technician and the college graduate is eventually made a president and there is an upgrading procedure.

Mr. COLLINS. Your spokesman said first that she thought engineering was irrelevant so I assume you have not considered or you have no interest in going into engineering positions.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I meant that whether any of the three of us had a degree in engineering was an unfair question because if you took a cross section of men or women sitting here probably—

Mr. COLLINS. No, none of us would want to go into engineering.

Ms. CRAWFORD. Also when you mention engineering, you are encapsulating broadcasting as totally technical. In New York there is a tremendous pool of women graduates in many other areas that qualify them for programing positions, sales, et cetera.

Mr. COLLINS. Let's talk about business. I know more about business than engineering. I know a little bit about business and I found women were reluctant to go into sales, and sales is important in this field. Do you find women are anxious to go into sales on a commission basis? I would like to know of an instance where the commission schedule for women is different than the commission schedule for men. Would you give me specific cases in television where women do not earn the same commission as men?

Ms. BLUME. I can give one in a major shoestore chain.

Mr. COLLINS. We are talking about broadcasting.

Ms. BLUME. It is selling. If you want me to have to dig for examples, that—

Mr. COLLINS. My goodness, you have the entire broadcasting industry that is tremendous and you are being discriminated against.

You mean you can't think of one single example in the broadcasting industry that is discriminating in selling?

Ms. BLUME. I know many.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I know many women from the media area who until recently had no opportunity in broadcast sales until recent months. Because of the ABC-TV license challenge stations are under more pressure to upgrade women. I personally spoke with about six different companies about sales positions. One of the answers was hysterical because it was the only negative reply that the person interviewing me could come up with—that they could not tell as many jokes at their sales meetings if women were present. This is “subtle” discrimination. There are women interested in sales. I can guarantee you that. I have spoken with many, and in New York they are beginning—they are beginning to interview these women. Before the license challenge women were not being interviewed for these positions or they weren't described as positions women could fill. There are women within the network and stations who are very capable of going from clerical positions in sales to selling outside and who, until recently, were not being considered—and are still having a difficult time being considered.

Mr. COLLINS. On a commission schedule, men and women are paid exactly the same across the board. If you are on a commission, you make \$50,000 if a man makes \$50,000. I would recommend sales as a great field for women. Second, if you want to measure your achievement, you can absolutely measure it because you are either selling or not selling. You would be paid on a basis of sales results. Let me encourage you to use selling as one means of expanding in the industry.

Ms. BLUME. I am sorry it does not relate to the broadcasting industry but I do know of a specific example in a major shoe chain in the country where men and women were selling at a different commission and the women were only allowed to stand behind the counter and sell purses and write up tickets and they got one commission for what they did and the men got an entirely different commission for selling shoes.

Mr. COLLINS. That is unfortunate.

Ms. BLUME. It has gone into litigation and the women won.

Mr. COLLINS. The three of you here, who represent an industry that has tremendous employment, could not think of one instance in the broadcasting industry where there has been discrimination against women in commissions for selling.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I am not disagreeing with you on the commission basis. I am saying we are not allowed in the jobs in the first place. It is only because of the license challenge mechanism that stations are beginning to respond by hiring women in those areas. It looks good on their FCC and EEOC forms—that's why we now have this opportunity. I totally agree with you that it is a place you can show initiative. I have tried to get there for a long time and others have. I think it looks better now, but only because of the challenge mechanism.

Mr. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Byron?

Mr. BYRON. You say on the last page of your testimony, “Women inside and outside of broadcasting in New York City opposed the proposed legislation.” What about the rest of the country, the smaller areas

throughout the entire United States with just hundreds of radio and medium market television?

Ms. CRAWFORD. The reason I speak for New York City is because that is where our coalition was formed. The only national organization represented by us is American Women in Radio and Television. They did not have the opportunity to poll their entire membership who are professional women in radio and television. They aren't meeting for 2 weeks. I can't say what their decision would be, but the New York board is very much in favor in principle of not extending the license period to 5 years.

Mr. BYRON. How many members are in your organization?

Ms. CRAWFORD. Our combined organizations?

Mr. BYRON. Combined.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I would say over 3,000.

Mr. BYRON. And NOW?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I am only representing NOW in New York City chapter.

Mr. BYRON. What about nationally?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I think it is about 35,000 for NOW nationally.

Mr. BYRON. Thank you.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. I would like to pursue the questioning out in the country. I am getting sort of this unpleasant picture of New York I hear from you, and the woman who testified this morning gave me the impression that we are somewhat more alert out in the sticks to the matter of equal opportunity than people are who live in the bastion of liberalism that seems to be dominating advice to the rest of the world. The American women in radio and television, have you done any study of that group to find out whether they do better outside New York City than they do inside the city?

Ms. CRAWFORD. The United Church of Christ's computerized figures, based on the broadcasters' own reports, indicate that New York is better than the rest of the country but not very much. I gave you about 22 percent total industrywide representation, 11 percent in the professional category. That is a couple of percentage points higher than the national average. Also, I can tell you that in the National Organization for Women, there are many women across the country who very much object to the employment practices of their local stations. It is not just New York City that needs the challenge mechanism, it is women across the country who need it. Whitney Adams, who is our coordinator, will be testifying tomorrow on the national picture of women employed in broadcasting. I think she can better clarify the national picture. We are here for New York City only.

Mr. BROWN. The reason I asked the question is because in my part of the country we have a chain operation which I understand has a woman vice president and 30 years ago their head program originating locally was a program that was built around a woman personality on the station. Are you aware of that? I am talking about WLWC and Ruth Lyons. For radio and television. She was involved in radio before television.

Ms. CRAWFORD. There is always a number of spectacular women who are very sparsely represented in broadcasting.

Mr. BROWN. Thank God for that.

Ms. CRAWFORD. Super spectacular. That is the point of it. For a woman to have attained this position in broadcasting, her effort had to be to triple the effort of many men. It is an extra expenditure of energy that she should not have had to give. She should be judged as men are judged. Some women have worked harder, and there have been some women who made it in broadcasting, thank heavens. But not enough women have made it through the gauntlet.

Mr. BROWN. Again, do you have any statistics which break down across the country the position of the women who served in radio and television? Are they just on-the-air personalities or are they supporters and executives, and so forth?

Ms. CRAWFORD. We can submit the United Church of Christ figures. They are broken down nationally into all categories of employment.

Mr. BROWN. You are confusing me with the United Church of Christ. I am speaking of membership in American Women in Radio and Television. Are they one and the same?

Ms. CRAWFORD. They are undertaking studies now of their membership. They are not available yet or they would be submitted by us today.

Mr. BROWN. When will they be available?

Ms. CRAWFORD. There is no date set for their availability. I would be happy to have them submitted to you.

Mr. BROWN. I cannot resist one other observation as a male chauvinist, and that is that it seems to me we have got to catch up for all of those years when broadcasting was devoted—at least during the daytime almost exclusively—to the soap opera, which I guess was aimed at women. It had to be aimed at women because men were not able to listen to it and we had to put up with an awful lot of programming for lack of a better word during that period of time. I guess programming that was aimed pretty much at a women's audience because it was the women's audience that was supposed to be the household daytime audience, isn't that the case?

Ms. CRAWFORD. It is. But the fact that 45 percent of women work full time influences that and also the fact that women are not finding this programming as credible. I do not have statistics to support it. I did not have adequate time to research this figure. But I believe that Advertising Age several months ago reported a major decline in daytime television watching, particularly of the soaps, but there is not yet much alternative for women during those hours of the day.

Mr. BROWN. I find some difficulty in the identification of what ought to qualify as "women's programming" when the objective is to set up a life style in which women and men are not distinguished by their interests. This morning we had the suggestion that there ought to be more "women's programming." If men and women are to have similar responsibilities and opportunities and interests, how do you draw the line between men and women programming?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I agree with the ultimate goal. I am in total agreement. However, we have not yet achieved that goal and the kind of things I refer to are programs and news of current interest to women. For instance, in the news, when ERA passed the Congress, ABC gave

it 10 seconds and the Burt Reynolds foldout 2 minutes. Women would have liked to be——

Mr. BROWN. I have to think about which was oriented to which here. But go ahead.

Ms. CRAWFORD. When women won seven of the eight gold medals in the Olympics, they were given 20 seconds, and a women's pancake eating contest, 1½ minutes. These are issues that make important history. The information on ERA is very important for both men and women. And young women need role models. The fact that so many of the gold medals were won by women athletes is important to establish these models.

Mr. BROWN. I have run over my time, but it seems to me there is an elitest position here that you are taking, and that is that we ought not to portray women as they are in terms of the 40-percent part of the employment picture and the fact that currently they are not in executive positions, but we should portray women in the role of women as they should be and that I find a little difficulty with. Go ahead and comment on it.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I think we would be quite satisfied if women were portrayed as we are. I can think of television commercials in which 85 percent of women are shown in the home and in that role only. They are not usually coming in from work. They are in the home. There is a statistical study showing in programing what women are doing. For instance, 45 percent of them are not shown as working women though that is statistically accurate. There are women of achievement in this society. We are not being represented at any professional levels.

Mr. BROWN. But the point is that you feel you are not being portrayed as you are and that there should be much more portrayal of women in a different role or a role which sees them in a more advanced state?

Ms. CRAWFORD. As adult human beings, yes.

Mr. BROWN. But you talked about this second role and women in the home should not be portrayed as much as women at work?

Ms. CRAWFORD. Women at work are not really portrayed now. And that gets back to the fact that there are not women working in decision-making jobs in broadcasting. So the viewpoint of the program director, or the people who make the films and sell them to the stations, is very biased. They are not sensitive to the changing roles of women in this society.

Mr. BROWN. Finally, you feel that such ought to be accomplished through a licensing procedure as opposed to the equal employment opportunity legislation and some other methods which have been specifically set up to accomplish that goal?

Ms. BLUME. At the moment, the license renewal and petition to deny device has been used because we feel it is the most effective one. EEOC now has a 2- to 3-year backlog of complaints, so a petition to deny is the strongest and most effective means of approaching the employment problems. In theory if employment discrimination or antidiscrimination law was being enforced, then it would not be necessary to use a petition to deny as a means of dealing with the problems of employment discrimination. Now the petition to deny is just about the most valuable tool we have to approach the employment situation.

Ms. CRAWFORD. The additional effective necessity to the petition to deny would also lie in ascertaining, another direction toward getting women's and community interests reflected. I believe Whitney Adams will deal with that tomorrow. It is not only the employment aspects of the petition to deny we are interested in.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. CRAWFORD, your organization is a nationwide organization?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I am representing several organizations here.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Are they nationwide?

Ms. CRAWFORD. Two are nationwide. The American Women in Radio and Television and the National Organization for Women, but I am representing only their New York chapters.

Mr. GOLDWATER. So you aren't speaking for Los Angeles?

Ms. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Do you happen to have an opinion on how they are doing out there as far as women are concerned?

Ms. CRAWFORD. The national figures are not as good as New York, which, as we have seen, are poor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is interesting. I got the impression without digging into it, that as far as women represented in the broadcast media, they had marked improvement over 5 years ago, but you are saying it is not even as good as New York City?

Ms. CRAWFORD. The national figure of women in the work force in broadcasting stayed exactly the same in 1971 and 1972. There were no percentage increases of women. As we said, in New York there was a 1-percent decrease.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Through observation I have noticed more and more women appearing on news programs and talk shows and things of this type, but maybe that is just camouflage. Is that what you are saying?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I think visibility should always be scrutinized. Does it represent the total employment practices of the station toward women or is the station putting women in visible positions only?

Mr. GOLDWATER. You feel that using the privilege of challenging a broadcasting station where there is in fact millions of dollars in most cases involved, is the rightful way to attack this problem of equal employment?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I will say that for several years in New York, we took the normal steps toward attempting meeting with management. My testimony describes these steps. We were not taken at all seriously by management. This was pursued with a number of stations. It was not until the challenge mechanism that we could begin to set up any kind of dialog toward progressive practices in the employment of women.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What do other people do in other industries who have the same problem? What do they do? Suppose there is discrimination in the banks?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Banks are not Federal licensees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But they still have a similar problem of discrimination as far as employment, pay, and responsibility.

Ms. BLUME. They can try the same negotiation efforts that we tried but when it comes to appealing to a Federal authority, they must go through the EEOC complaint system. A bank employee or applicant who feels he or she has been discriminated against can also complain to the Department of the Treasury. However, because the Treasury now—

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am wondering if that is the rightful role of the FCC—to administer civil rights.

Ms. CRAWFORD. There may be 50,000 banks in the country or any number in each city. You have a choice. We are talking about the public airways here and broadcasters' responsibility to the public. Their responsibility is much clearer and more direct than employee at a bank having some difficulty. The employee at a bank is not effecting the communication system of this country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Isn't there a direct equation or relation between the people who are behind the scenes and what is put over the airways? Is that not what we are considering, what is put over the airways, is not put over in a responsible way? You seem to relate the two and thus that is one of the qualifications for a license and that is to adhere to the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Ms. CRAWFORD. Is that a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a question.

Ms. CRAWFORD. I think we should use every possible mechanism. I feel that is why guidelines were made by the FCC to give citizens an opportunity—

Mr. GOLDWATER. I don't see anywhere in the Communications Act, or the authority the FCC has, that was given to it by Congress, to talk about employment. That came out in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The FCC did put out directives that they should have some sort of progressive action program.

Ms. CRAWFORD. Are you saying broadcasters should be released from their responsibility for fair employment standards?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think it is a good question and we are assigned the task of trying to clarify what guidelines the FCC should use in determining licensing of broadcasters. Some people say we should consider multimedia ownership and here we are talking about employment practices. I am wondering if that is really a valid argument to be used in determining whether a broadcaster has misused the public airways.

Ms. BLUME. There is a theory of government now being practiced now by the Federal Government, and which is endorsed very strongly by the Civil Rights Commission, that all Federal agencies are trustees of Federal laws. When the FCC is reviewing the practices of broadcasters which are being granted access to the public airways, they should also be, reviewing the employment practices of that broadcaster. Since the FCC is the regulator of the broadcast industry, it should be looking at employment practices as well as the other broadcast practices because all broadcasters are bound to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. So you are raising the question who does the monitoring and who does the enforcing. The theory that we are following, and that is now being practiced, is that because the FCC has the most im-

mediate access and the greatest responsibility to this segment of employment, that they should be the agency to enforce the law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But a broadcaster is not employed by the Federal Government. This is a free-enterprise organization. The only thing we are concerned about is that license, that permit to use those airways. How far do you take this? Is not perhaps the correct avenue the Justice Department or the Equal Employment Commission?

Ms. BLUME. That might be more correct if it were effective, but at the moment it is not. The greatest help that we as public petitioners looking at the broadcast industry have is through FCC. An EEOC complaint can be a 2- to 3-year process. Also, EEOC has not been given any of the roles of an educator or an adviser, an assistant in developing affirmative action or carrying out continuous monitoring. They respond to complaints or initiate investigations and court proceedings. We are talking also about a different kind of role that is broader than just what EEOC would do.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think it is a legislative question that perhaps we should examine very closely. I have to say that I do agree with the problem that you are expounding upon and I think it is unfortunate that women are discriminated against in certain areas of hiring practices. I am not so totally convinced that this should be an area that the FCC should get involved in.

Mr. BROWN. If you will yield, I find some problem with what you just said about FCC having responsibility to enforce EEOC laws. Now by the same logic one could conclude that FCC ought to enforce the OSHA laws, Occupational Safety and Health Act, which is the responsibility of the Labor Department to assure that the location where one works is safe and healthful. It seems to me the problem here is separable. That is one discrimination in employment, which has remedy in law and agencies for dealing with that, and discrimination in broadcasting generally in terms of whether or not a balanced job is done in broadcasting, that is that too many National Football League games are all male oriented and soap operas are all female oriented. I don't know whether one can follow that logic through necessarily or not. But that is a problem that relates to the responsibility of the FCC. If it is employment that is a problem and I recognize the argument you are making that there is a connection between the two, but that ought to be pursued through EEOC and then if the station is violating EEOC laws, the occupational safety and health laws, and so forth, that becomes part of the record of the employer, the station, and has an impact on its license renewal by FCC. But for the FCC to be the appellant agency for discrimination in hiring, and so forth, I find a good deal of difficulty with that as a matter of administrative good sense, frankly.

Ms. BLUME. But in the examples you gave of enforcing the safety laws, if I am correct, that agency acts as an enforcement agency. Does it not do some examination and then enforce the laws? EEOC has not been able to play that role with the broadcast industry. If you want to argue about an office of Federal contract compliance equivalent that could review employment of broadcasters, then I could see the comparison. EEOC is only at the moment able to respond to appeals. In some cases it initiates but those are very few and I am talking about

an ongoing enforcement responsibility that would not be just a response to complaints, but the kind of role that the Federal equal employment offices are playing in guaranteeing that there is not discrimination among Federal contractors or among recipients of Federal funds. That is not just an appeal. It is an enforcement. I think there is a difference.

Mr. BROWN. I think that is a worthy point. I am not sure that I agree that it makes for pushing the EEOC into FCC thing, however.

Mr. MACDONALD. Any further questions?

Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I assume that the procedure that you take in your efforts is that you have grievances, you attempt to sit down with management and, as I understand it, you have not been all that successful as far as getting management to speak with you. What do you do if in fact you can't get results this way?

Ms. CRAWFORD. File a petition to deny.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Have you done this?

Ms. CRAWFORD. The petition to deny WABC-TV was an outgrowth of lack of interest by the management of ABC in dealing with any of the requests for negotiations or meetings at that time with women in the community who were representing women interests.

Mr. GOLDWATER. So the petition for WABC was filed by your organization?

Ms. CRAWFORD. By the National Organization for Women, New York chapter.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What is the status of that?

Ms. CRAWFORD. WABC has just answered the NOW complaint and NOW is reanswering. This a year later—after the petition.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the only station that has been filed against by your organization?

Ms. CRAWFORD. By the New York City chapter. Whitney Adams will talk tomorrow about other cases.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I see. Thank you very much.

Mr. MACDONALD. Thank you all for a very fine presentation. I think in the main you are very understated, which I think works to your benefit in the long run because I know it is easy to get wrapped up in something very close to your heart and sort of overstate, but I think you did overstate one point, and this is a very small point, but still it is an overstatement when you were using an example of network bias toward women and you said, I think, some woman who won a baking contest or flapjack thing got 4 minutes, whereas the fact that gold medals won by our Olympic women's team went virtually unnoticed. I don't believe that is true. I hate to say this to you. I think that is absolutely wrong.

Ms. CRAWFORD. The exact figures are in—

Mr. MACDONALD. I don't know what you are quoting, but what you are quoting is like the Bible. What I am quoting is my own eyes, which disagree with your document. But isn't it your memory that as a concrete fact that one of the heroes of our Olympics was that cute little girl from the Midwest some place who did the same thing as the Russian cute little girl?

Ms. CRAWFORD. I am referring to monitoring studies over a several week period of over a hundred women monitoring WABC-TV. These

are the exact statistics on how many seconds were devoted on WABC-TV to those subjects. This isn't subjective.

Mr. MACDONALD. Most Americans never saw gymnastics until ABC focused on these gymnasts.

Ms. CRAWFORD. We are talking about the news events. Not everyone saw the gymnastics.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am talking about the most heavily advertised and most expensive for the network so someone must have watched it. I think you overstep when you say the networks have paid no attention or demeaned women in the role of athletics and built up their role in flapjacks. I think you do your cause a disservice because I don't think that is true.

Ms. CRAWFORD. We are saying there is a bias in the media which does exactly that.

Mr. MACDONALD. The guy who was putting on the Olympics was not biased because before ABC brought acrobatics, body control and grace, and all of the rest, I bet you could count on the fingers of everybody in this room how many people had watched gymnastics. Yet after the Olympics, in the Maryland Field House there were 15,000 people watching the Russian counterpart to the girl from the Midwest who was cute and just got married to a former Redskin. I know everything but her name.

Ms. CRAWFORD. You are talking about network coverage of the Olympics. We are talking about local ABC news reporting of the Olympics and what was weighted how. ABC network, of course, covered exciting events at the Olympics performed by women. They also covered Chris Evert's tennis because it is very good news. But when it is reported in the context of the whole report, of all the time devoted to sports news this year you would see that the time devoted to women is a bare minimum. And this is so at a time when women are beginning to play very strong roles consistently in sports. So this is another area where we are having difficulty getting full representation.

I will give you one last example. The Manhattan Women's Political Caucus had a fundraising event or major scope a few weeks ago. It featured Maria Casals, Billie Jean King, and other major women tennis players—it was their only fundraising event held in Madison Square Garden.

The coverage on ABC was an interview with Alan King, who said because women played tennis slower, one could learn technique better. They had no description of what was happening. It was a 2- to 3-minute interview with Alan King, one of the comedians who was there, and did not cover the fact that this was a women's event—by women for a women's cause. So this is an appropriate example of what broadcasters are picking up on. Not always but enough news reporting is biased.

Mr. MACDONALD. I've heard the news assaulted by any number of different groups, but you are the first women's group that has ever said the news is biased against the women. Is it just network news or local news?

Ms. CRAWFORD. All news. I am talking about a national pattern. I am not talking about each station every day doing something negative about women. But until women are represented fully in station man-

agement and can make their real feelings known about what is being broadcast, there will continue to be biased reportage of what women do in society.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On that point, do you feel that the FCC should control the content of broadcasts?

Ms. CRAWFORD. We feel it should be a tripartite thing, broadcasters, FCC, and the public having a full voice to make sure that the community is represented, that the broadcasters, of course, have their rights under the law and their rights as free enterprise people, and that the Government is regulatory. But this will be developed more tomorrow. I wanted to represent the New York City case today.

Mr. MACDONALD. Before we get to tomorrow, we are running out of time today. I would like to point out to you and ask your opinion—it seems to me that running throughout subcommittee questioning of you and your panelists the thought, although not expressed and the committee will correct me if I am wrong, that many of us feel that perhaps you are using an elephant gun to kill a squirrel. What I am saying is that you are challenging a license or you are putting in jeopardy, say. You challenged the flagship of NBC in New York. In so doing, it is such a big gesture and now you take it along and I am saying that your problems are little.

I am not saying that they are, but it would seem there are more direct and feasible ways than to challenge an entire operation of a station. Would you point out where I am wrong?

Ms. BLUME. I think your analogy of the elephant gun and the squirrel is good, but if we don't use that elephant gun, I think our only choice is to use our bare hands. If I really want to get that squirrel, I will at least pick up the elephant gun and take aim. I think that is what we are talking about. The petition to deny is extreme. If we ended up with someone's license in our hands, and the FCC said, "Here, you can have their license," I would not know what to do with it. That is not the point. We are trying to emphasize that the petition to deny is the only effective tool available at this time.

If you would like to come up with intermediary kinds of things, such as a complaint process that is handled through the FCC that would be responsive, I think that would be a very good alternative.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to point out one reverse discrimination which we had pointed out to us by a very gracious lady who is general manager of a station here at Havre de Grace, Md., and her license got held up by the FCC because at one time she had nine employees and had two females. She is the general manager and she is a female. I guess she doesn't count because she is the manager.

FCC held up her license because when one of the girls told her that she was going to leave and gave her ample notice to fill the job, she looked all over the place for another one but, according to her story, which I believe, the time of notice ran out, which was ample at the beginning. She then divided up the job between other personnel at the station, still looking for a woman, could not find a woman, and the renewal of her license was held up because the chart showed that

there was one less woman employed at her station than the year before or two years before. Do you think that is a reasonable procedure?

Ms. BLUME. No, it is not. NOW has written up alternative procedures and presented them to the FCC. We feel that the current procedure of comparing two years of employment data and only reviewing the employment practices of stations that have no women or minorities or a decrease of women or minorities is really quite absurd because it does not look at either the problems or causes. So we have presented alternative proposals.

Mr. MACDONALD. You would agree with the woman in that case.

Ms. BLUME. Yes, I would agree that the FCC should have responded in a timely fashion. By talking to her, by reviewing employment practices of her station, in probably one afternoon of investigation the FCC could have established whether or not there was any evidence of discrimination.

If she did all of the things she said, if she did try to find a woman, then she obviously tried to take affirmative action, and that is all that can be reasonably expected.

Mr. MACDONALD. In conclusion, I think you put down what you call clerical people and their preponderance of employees being women. As a concrete example, don't you feel that many women who theoretically are on the secretarial level carry an awful lot of clout? For example, in my judgment, I don't know how radio or TV stations are, but I would rather know the personal secretary, say, to the President of the United States than I would the leading figure in his Cabinet.

Ms. CRAWFORD. They do carry a lot of clout, we agree. They often have management responsibility, but they are not paid for performing management functions.

Mr. MACDONALD. You think that they aren't given responsible positions? I can't think of a more responsible job than to be a personal secretary or an executive secretary to, say, the head of a network or to any one of the operational positions. If you get her ear, you have a direct pipeline.

Ms. BLUME. Compare the number of executive secretaries with the number of clerk-typists. Compare the number of people that are in this position out of choice and those that are in it because other alternatives have been closed to them. I don't think we ever want to put down women that are in secretarial positions because that is where a great number of our working sisters are. But what we are criticizing is their lack of opportunity. Also the fact that they are often underpaid. There are many executives that will have a male assistant and a female executive secretary who are basically doing the same thing and their salaries will be extremely different.

Mr. MACDONALD. I don't think we can quarrel with equal pay. It has been pointed out by every member of the committee that that is illegal under the law. It is illegal.

Ms. CRAWFORD. But it happens. I believe it was a New York Times article recently that said pay variance between men and women has widened in the last 5 years. So the issue of equal pay for equal work may exist in a liberal sense, but as a practical reality it does not exist. This is what we are trying to make clear through these mechanisms.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is very clear to me.

Ms. CRAWFORD. Can you excuse me? We were delayed on the docket this morning because of our difficulty in getting our testimony reprinted, and I must now make a 4 o'clock train back to New York.

Mr. MACDONALD. You certainly may be excused any time you wish. Are there further questions?

Mr. BROWN. Please go ahead. I don't want to hold you up. I want to make one observation on the athletic events, and that is that the support in public interest in dollar revenues for events in which women are involved where they play a game comparable to men, tennis or golf, just does not seem to be there currently.

I don't know whether that is because the men are the ones who go watch the events and if you put on more women athletes that you would have more women watch the events or what the psychology of all of that is, but I do think one has to be careful here to think in terms of what the market really is interested in in terms of an audience because that is what this is all about and you have got a problem in that regard. The other thing that I am equally concerned about, and I think that you should be concerned about also, is in dealing with discrimination, if you go after the licensing only and don't make the case for what it is, and that is discrimination in employment, you have kind of lost the point someplace because you get the license changed or challenged and you may not have the impact on employment that you would like to have.

Finally, if you can get the women organized, I am under the impression that the women own most of the stocks in the country and other economic power, and that once focused in on this problem, they could hire and fire the male leadership of these stations and the people who own the stations if they wanted to do it.

Apparently there is some difference of opinion or at least a dichotomy of judgment here on the part of women who have the economic power as to whether it should be used in a different way than it is being used now. Is that a fair comment or not?

Ms. BLUME. It is fair and if I were to rebut it, I think I would be going over years of history and functions of society.

Mr. BROWN. So those women who own that stock believe in the woman's role as something different than what you think it is.

Ms. BLUME. Or some people may be paid off with stock to maintain a domestic role. But I think one of the points we are making between the connection between decisionmaking and programing is that there are a lot of assumptions being made about what the public wants and I don't think that the summer Olympics is nearly as good an example as the winter Olympics were where women took all of the medals and got very little coverage.

The assumption was we wanted to see the men skiing down the hill and not getting the medals rather than women skiing down the hill and getting the medals.

Also petitions to deny and employment complaints with EEOC are often filed simultaneously.

Mr. MACDONALD. Thank you very much. The hearing is adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. in this room.

[Whereupon, at 3:50 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., March 28, 1973.]