VJD

Interviewee: Lloyd N. Morrisett Session #1 {video}

Interviewer: Sharon Zane New York, New York

Date: April 13, 1999

Q: Just to do a little background and biographical stuff leading up to when you got to Carnegie [Carnegie Corporation of New York], first maybe you could tell me where and when you were born and something about your family background, if you would.

Morrisett: I was born in 1929 in Oklahoma City where my father was at that time a high school principal. We moved in 1933 to New York where he got his PhD at Columbia Teachers College. And after that he was an assistant superintendent of schools in Cranfield, NJ, then an assistant superintendent of schools in Yonkers, NY from the period of about 1936 to 1940. He went out to UCLA to teach in summer session and was invited to come out as a professor of education. We moved to Los Angeles then in 1941 where I grew up through junior high school and high school. Subsequently I went to Oberlin College where I graduated in 1951. Then back to UCLA because I'd majored in philosophy in college and I'd decided that I wanted to become a psychologist and had to make up a psychology major. So I spent two years at UCLA doing that and then off to Yale from 1953 to 1956 where I got my PhD in Psychology.

Q: Psychology at that time was how evolved as a science, would you say?

Morrisett: To answer that question slightly more generally, the Second World War had an enormous influence on the social sciences in the United States, because, as part of the war effort, a large number of the very best social scientists were drawn together in the OSS [Office of Strategic Services] and other federal departments in Washington. They got to know each other, and the stimulus given by the research they did for the war effort, plus the relationships that were established during that period, meant that after the war there was quite a flowering of psychology and other social sciences, generally. That was certainly true of psychology.

Clark [L.] Hull was the primary behaviorist in the United States, after the Second World War. He was at Yale [University], where I went, partially because he had been there, although he had died before I got there, but his influence was very strong. But the other people who were part of that effort -- Carl Hovland was my major professor. He was a principal researcher in communication and attitude change. He came out of that period with those relationships, and was very important. So psychology was evolving very rapidly, and it was evolving, in the United States, at least, in the model of a hard science, that is, where it was possible to make predictions based on data that you obtained, and really establish laws of human behavior. That program went on, probably through the late 1950s and early '60s before other influences began to be felt in psychology, particularly cognitive psychology began to become important in the '60s, and later, as biology and neuroscience evolved, they had a very strong influence on psychology. So psychology, now, is really quite different than it was in the 1950s, but there was a flowering of all social sciences in the United States in the '50s, after the Second World War.

Q: And for you, what was the appeal? The draw of psychology, at that time, in terms of your own interests, and -- ?

Morrisett: Well, when I went to college I thought I was going to become a chemist, and the idea of a science was very influential with me. Chemistry did not prove to be my thing, and psychology, particularly because of a professor I encountered in probably my junior year in college who was part of the tradition I've told you about was very influential. Then I went to UCLA [University or California at Los Angeles], and at UCLA I had the great good fortune to become associated with Irving [M.] Maltzman, who had been a graduate of a psychology program at Iowa, under Kenneth [W.] Spence. He was another person of the kind I'm talking about, very important, very influential in psychology, and Irv was at UCLA, a young, assistant professor. He needed an assistant and for some reason he picked out me. So for two years I had the enormous privilege, really, of working with him, and in those two years, together we authored ten papers and studies. So for someone who had not gotten a graduate degree, that was an enormous start in what I hoped would be my profession.

Q: And his basic area of interest was -- ?

Morrisett: His basic area was human learning, creativity and human thinking, which, essentially, was the area that I pursued after I left UCLA and went to Yale.

Q: Well, just tell me a little bit more about your experience at Yale. Your dissertation was on what?

Morrisett: My dissertation was on whether or not it was possible to improve performance by thinking about it. The question is, in a physical activity -- and I used three physical activities. One was dart throwing, one was a two-hand coordination task, and one was -- what was the third task? It doesn't make any difference right now -- but the question was, with a little experience, a little practice, could you simply, by thinking about it, improve your performance? And the answer was in dart throwing, you could not. The dart throwing that I did was very difficult. It was about, oh, I suppose ten yards to the dart board, and it was a full arm motion. It wasn't just a little toss. People could not improve. On the other hand, with the two-hand coordination task, where symbolic learning was also involved, people could improve. As it turned out -- I didn't realize it then -- that kind of idea, what you can do physically by thinking about it mentally -- was a sort of forerunner of some sports psychology. I didn't know it at the time, of course.

Q: And once you got your degree -- ?

Morrisett: Well, as I said, my father was a professor at UCLA, and I had always thought that I would become a professor. He thought -- and for him, being a professor at UCLA was the best job in the entire world -- that was the way I was brought up. So academic life was part of our dinner table conversation during my formative, junior high school and high school years, and after Yale I assumed I would go ahead and get a teaching and research job at an institution, and that would be my career -- much like my father's, although in a different field. His was in education, and I was in psychology.

My first job was at [University of California at] Berkeley, where I was formally in the School of Education, but teaching educational psychology and statistics. I found that I didn't enjoy it as much as I expected to. There were probably several reasons. One was

that there was no mystery in it. That was what I had known most of my life. So, in comparison to my friends, to whom academic life was a novelty -- to me it was no novelty. The sort of politics I heard about were the politics I heard about at home. There were no differences. Secondly, I found that among the students, probably five percent, I would say, were really seriously interested in working and learning, and that seemed to me a very low ratio. Also, it could have been that my perception was wrong, but at that time, at least, it seemed to me that Berkeley was a highly self-satisfied institution. I remember sitting around a lunch table one day with a group of colleagues, somebody started talking about what Berkeley was going to be like in ten years. I said, "Well, not all of us may be here ten years from now." He looked at me and said, "Lloyd, when somebody comes to Berkeley, they never leave voluntarily."

All those things were working. At the end of two years I really was very uncertain of what I wanted to do: whether the institution was wrong -- and that's what I principally thought -- and, therefore, I should transfer to another institution and a different job, and that would make it better, whether I needed a full-time research job, or whether I needed to do something to sort of give myself a little more time to look around. As it turned out, I probably had the opportunity to go to Bell Laboratories and do full-time research at that time. I was interviewed for a couple of other teaching jobs, but I was offered a job at the Social Science Research Council in New York, and that appealed to me, because the Social Science Research Council dealt with many institutions, and I felt that in two or three years I would get a chance, really, to understand better the idiosyncrasies of particular institutions, and whether I would feel more comfortable at one rather than another, so that's the job I took, in 1958. I had been at Berkeley two years.

Q: Which meant moving to New York?

Morrisett: Which meant moving to New York. My wife and I drove back, and the morning I went to work she started looking for a place to live. It was a different time, and very exciting. The Social Science Research Council -- [E.] Pendleton Herring was the president at the time -- was a very useful experience for me, because I was involved in their committees. They worked through committees. The committees are composed of social scientists in particular areas that deal with special problems. I was involved, probably, with two or three committees as a junior staff member there, but I got to know a number of absolutely first-rate social scientists, some of whom have been lifelong friends since then. I was quite happy there.

Well, I went there in the fall of 1958, and in the spring of 1958 I got a call from Carnegie --

Q: 1959.

Morrisett: Spring of '59? Yes. Spring of '59. I got a call from Carnegie, and John [W.] Gardner invited me to come over and have lunch. I had never met him, but because the Social Science Research Council was importantly supported by Carnegie, obviously it was the thing to do and I was interested to know more about foundations, about which I knew nothing. So I did go over and have lunch with him, and he offered me a job. I was absolutely dumbstruck. I had been at one or two conferences, as I said, where Carnegie staff members had been present, and that's the only association I had had with it before, whether through Carl Hovland, at Yale, or through other of my mentors and friends, he had decided that I might be a worthwhile addition to the staff, I don't know. I really don't know the background to that lunch, aside from what I've said.

But I was highly intrigued. I was highly intrigued because this was a place that had mystery and novelty, in contrast to what I had been doing. The Social Science Research Council didn't have mystery and novelty, it just dealt in a broader range of things that I was quite familiar with. So somewhat reluctantly, because I had at least mentally committed myself to the Social Science Research Council for two or three years at least, I somewhat reluctantly but gladly accepted that job and went to work there in, I guess, probably September of 1959.

Q: And what was the position that John Gardner had offered you?

Morrisett: I was -- Hmmm. I'm not sure what the title was, even, at that point.

Q: I can tell you the title. I think it was executive assistant, but it was under whom and to do what, really?

Morrisett: Carnegie was a very useful experience, because John and Jim [James A.] Perkins, who was then vice-president -- You figured out a title to work, so what the title meant internally might be very different than what it looked like externally -- sort of like a bank vice-president. Executive assistant -- I essentially was the junior staff person handling certain aspects of the program. Because I had a background in psychology, naturally the things that were closest to that fell to me. In those days, those areas were the things that we did concerning creativity -- which was a fairly lively program at Carnegie for several years -- things to do with early education, and the relatively few things that we did that were directly in psychology. Carnegie was focused very strongly on

higher education, and these other areas were minor themes in the total program. So that's what I dealt with.

Q: Maybe before we talk a little bit about that, tell me what -- was it the exciting place you thought it would be, and what was the atmosphere? What was the culture, as you perceived it, at that time?

Morrisett: At that time Carnegie was a wonderful place to work, and I'm certainly not alone in thinking that because I've talked to other people who were there at that time, and I think everybody saw those as golden years at Carnegie. Part of it was, certainly, the leadership, and John Gardner and Jim [James A.] Perkins, who formed a team, in my view as a very junior staff member, they were an almost ideal team because they complemented each other in extremely useful ways -- John, extremely thoughtful, creative; Jim, much more garrulous, much more outgoing than John -- so that it was sort of a yin and yang in terms of the personalities that you dealt with. John Gardner's leadership manner, as I saw it, was essentially that he, or other members of the staff, but principally John, would have ideas about areas we might look into, so that he might say, for example, "Well, why don't we take a look at this early reading problem?" Or he might say, "There's a problem in preparing people for public service. Let's look at public administration, and how it prepares people for public service." That would then fall to a staff member. He would talk to me about the early reading problem. He would talk to somebody else about public service, and in the course of a year he probably would throw out, I'm making up a figure, ten ideas like that, some of which took root, others of which didn't. But he was never, apparently, concerned as to whether they took root or not. He tried to foster them, and help you dig in and find out if there was something there, but there was never any prejudgment about how it should turn out. So you were quite free to develop it as best you

could, together with his help and Jim's help, from time to time. So his method was sort of planting a garden with a lot of seeds, some grew and some didn't, and he was always happy with the ones that grew. The ones that didn't, he was not reluctant to give up. So that sort of leadership style was, I thought, extremely productive. It always allowed practically everybody on the staff to be involved in something that really worked, as well as having a few things they would dig into that probably didn't work.

It was a happy place to work. I think during those years I was always excited to go into the office, always glad to be there. There was a lot of humor in terms of talking to people, a lot of good, personal interaction with the staff. Everybody got along quite well.

Q: And then, in terms of your own career there, how did it change? Because I know it did, in terms of what you were doing over those ten years.

Morrisett: Ten years. Well, the first big change was when Jim Perkins left Carnegie. I suppose that would have been probably two or three years after I had arrived. From my viewpoint, as being a junior member of the staff, I saw that as a big loss. It was a big loss because, as I've tried to indicate, Jim's ebullient personality was a very good factor in the office. Alan [J.] Pifer became vice-president after Jim left. Alan had many talents but he didn't have that same ability to sort of infuse people with enthusiasm and humor that Jim did. At the same time, my own role was changing, because I had some more experience and, therefore, I had more responsibility. I began to be involved, for whatever reason, in the administration of the office. Then when Alan became president, after John left -- which was five years after I'd been there -- I became vice-president. Then my role changed quite considerably, because as vice-president, as opposed to what I had been doing formerly, in terms of being directly involved with specific programs, I was essentially the production

manager in the office. I dealt with all the staff members and all the ideas funneled through me. That in itself was a significant change in the way the office worked, from what I previously described. Because in those early years, I described John's method as sort of seeding a garden with lots of plants and seeing how they grew, when Alan became president it was much more up to the staff members themselves to generate those things. Alan was much more distant from the content of the program than John had been -- which meant that my job as production manager in the office was quite different than what I had been used to in those first five years.

Q: Because you had to then take these grant ideas and in some way try to organize them in terms of a structure? Is that what you mean?

Morrisett: Well, I had to work with each individual staff member and try to guide them on whether or not something was worth pursuing, and the degree to which it was worth pursuing. Secondly, I had to be concerned about the total flow of ideas and whether or not we would be able to finance what seemed to be in the pipeline at the time, so I was concerned with both the process and the content.

Q: You were talking about how you really assumed many more administrative duties --

Morrisett: Yes. It's been, of course, a very long time, thirty years, since I was at Carnegie. So what I say now may not represent accurately what was the reality then, nor may it represent accurately what I believed at that time, but as I saw it, certainly in the latter period I was there and the first few years after, it seemed to me that Alan -- in comparison to John -- Alan was more interested in the philanthropic process and structure than John had been. John -- and it's not black and white -- was more interested in content, so that --

it changed gradually, however. The processes within the organization, that had been built up during my first five years there, for me, essentially carried over into the last five years, because we were sort of doing things the same way, only I was in a different set of responsibilities than I'd had before. But I think that the overall style of the organization had begun to change, even though it was very gradual and I didn't see much of it. Certainly, I think much more -- from what I've heard, although I can't attest to it directly -- happened after I left than when I was there.

Q: I'd like to go back to something you said about Gardner's style of sort of throwing out ideas and some seeds would take root and some wouldn't, and in terms of your early work there, perhaps you could give an example of one of those seeds that did take root, the content of it for you, just as sort of a descriptive thing of what was happening there at the time.

Morrisett: John Gardner had been trained as a psychologist, as I had, and so perhaps there was some particular affinity between our areas of interest, but one of the first things that he suggested, after I'd been at Carnegie awhile, was to take a look at the area of creativity and "Could creativity be taught?" was the way the question developed. We did pursue that for several years, and the person that I best remember working with outside Carnegie was Richard [S.] Crutchfield at the University of California at Berkeley, who really did, I thought, quite brilliant work in the area of creativity and, at least for me, proved conclusively, that if you decided to teach it directly you could. He produced a test that was a good indicator of creative thought, and he produced at least an outline of a curriculum as to how to go about it. For some reason, beyond that, what I've said, it really never took root in education or teaching very much, but that was one of the kinds of areas

that John and I discussed that was essentially him saying, "Well, why don't you take a look at this?" and that was one of the things that developed.

Another area like that, that was somewhat related to creativity, but also related generally to human learning, where I was also involved, we began to look very early, in the probably 1961, '62 period, at how computers might be related to the study of thinking and thought. That was the time that I first attended part of a seminar at RAND [Research and Development Corporation] in California, and met Herb [Herbert A.] Simon and Al [Allen] Newell. Herb, of course, later got the Nobel Prize in Economics because they couldn't figure out how to give him a prize for what he had done in psychology, where his real work had been done, but in 1961 and '62, they, along with a few other people concerned with artificial intelligence, simulation, the development of list languages for computers, that was the ferment, really, that led to the flowering of cognitive psychology in the 1980s and 1990s. So, we were right there at the beginning, and we did participate in funding some of that work, and Herb was one of those people and became one of my lifelong friends.

Q: As I presume also was sort of the beginning of your lifelong interest in --

Morrisett: Oh yes, that traced it right there. That was the beginning.

Q: The beginning of -- ?

Morrisett: The beginning of my interest in computers and communications and how modern technology could be used both to study human thought and also to model human thought, and, the way I would put it now, amplify human thought, because computers,

properly used, are really a way of making us more intelligent. They are essentially a prosthesis, if you will, to our thinking process, if used properly.

Q: That's an incredible thing to me. You said to me before that -- well, I'll ask you the question. When you went to work at Carnegie, what did you know about American philanthropy at that time?

Morrisett: I knew practically nothing about American philanthropy when I went to work at Carnegie. All I knew, really, was that the Social Science Research Council had been supported by Carnegie and Ford [Foundation] and a few other organizations and I hadn't thought much about it and I knew very little.

Q: Did you get any training when you got there, in terms of how to look at a grant proposal, or how to think about what would make a good grantee?

Morrisett: The sort of training that was done was done with specific issues. So, if you had a -- if I had a person or an idea or a project that seemed promising to me, I would first discuss it, particularly in the first couple of years, with Jim Perkins, because he was the person who was essentially the production manager at that time, although not in the sense that I was later. And also discuss it with John, and they would criticize it, and ask questions about it, and suggest things to do with it, and in that process of going back and forth, certainly I received training. But not training in a formal sense, training, sort of on-the-job training, if you will.

Q: And then I presume what you were saying, is that you did less and less of that, in that particular way, as you assumed more and more administrative responsibilities.

Morrisett: That's correct.

Q: One last thing on this. Some of the things you mentioned that you worked on early on was the whole issue of creativity, and the other was early childhood education.

Morrisett: Yes.

Q: So, could I have an example or two of what that kind of work was then?

Morrisett: Well, we've talked about creativity, and I mentioned Richard Crutchfield and the kind of thing that he did. The early childhood education was an area that began to develop probably in the last two years that John was at Carnegie. So it was really just getting started then, it really carried over then, into the period after that. Well, we were concerned with the issue of why children from educationally disadvantaged families, or poor families, entered school, typically first grade, perhaps six months behind in reading level and other testable attributes, than children from normal middle class families or well-to-do families, and by third grade maybe a year or two behind. What to do about that? That was the way the issue was being framed for us internally at the time. That also fit in with a beginning national concern with this issue: the loss of talent that the nation was suffering because children were not being educated to achieve their potential. We tried to attack that by financing experiments to see whether you could, let's say, inoculate children before they went to school so that when they entered school they would not suffer the deficit that they seemed to be suffering otherwise.

The inoculation theory was sort of one theory. Another theory was, perhaps by enriching the curriculum for these children in school, and keeping it enriched, that would help them overcome the deficit. It wasn't a problem of inoculation, it was a problem of not having the right kind of stimulation and education. We financed, in those years, now we're leaving -- now I'm really in the period of 1964 to '69, I would say -- my guess is five to ten reasonable sized experiments in those areas, and indeed found, in most cases, that you could substantially affect children's performance if you did this and helped them in school.

The issue was that at Carnegie, spending -- I really don't remember what our budget was then, I'm going to say that it was perhaps six or seven million dollars a year, my guess, could be a little more than that -- we were spending perhaps a million or a million and a half on those experiments a year. That meant we were spending a substantial amount of our budget on it. We were reaching, at best, a few hundred children, so that there was an enormous discrepancy between the problem we were dealing with and what we were able to do. How to overcome that was, in my mind, a continuing issue. This then, begins to get to the background of what led to "Sesame Street." This was the practical problem that I was dealing with as a person at Carnegie.

Now there were other things that were involved here. Our first daughter, Sarah, was born in 1962. And by 1965, beginning the period we're talking about, she was three years old. And my wife and I would sometimes sleep a little later than usual on Sunday morning and we would come out and find Sarah having turned on the television set and watching the station identification signal. It certainly suggested that television had some power to attract, one; and two, that children of very young ages would watch, even though what they were watching didn't change, it was just an unchanging picture on the television set. So that's a little other background on this.

The third thing that led up to "Sesame Street" was that Julian Ganz was one of my oldest friends. I met him in 1941 or 2, when we first moved to Los Angeles, and he still is one of my oldest and best friends. When we moved to New York in 1958, Julian said that he thought it would be fun for me to get together, for Mary and myself, my wife and myself, to get together with his cousin Joan, who was then Joan Ganz, and get to know her. Time went by and I didn't do anything about that until around 1961, I suppose, when I first called up Joan, and I don't know whether we had lunch or what happened, but anyway, we became friendly, and she came, we had dinner together, and we went to her house for dinner, and that then leads up to 1966, when, with the background I've described as what Carnegie was doing, and our daughter Sarah watching the television signal, we were attending a dinner at Joan's apartment, she was then -- she'd married Tim [Timothy J.] Cooney by then, and we were having a conversation afterward, after dinner, Lewis Freedman, who was the program director at Channel 13 at that time and Joan's boss, was also part of the group we were talking with, and I said, "Do you think television could be used to teach children?" Joan said she didn't know, but she'd like to talk about it. And so a short time thereafter, Joan and Lewis came over to Carnegie to talk about this idea, and it seemed to me that we needed somebody to do a feasibility study of this, because we didn't know whether it was possible, or how television could be used that way.

[END TAPE ONE, SIDE ONE; BEGIN TAPE ONE, SIDE TWO]

Morrisett: As I remember it, it was in the early spring of 1966, when Mary and I went to a dinner party at Joan [Ganz] Cooney's house -- I think by then she had been married to Tim Cooney, and afterward we got into conversation, I think a group of three or four of us. Joan was there, Lewis Freedman was there -- Lewis Freedman was then in charge of

programming at Channel 13, and Joan's boss. I asked, I think, a general question: Do you think television could be used to teach young children? -- this coming out of the problems I was dealing with at Carnegie. Joan answered she didn't know, but she'd like to talk about it. So within a couple of weeks after that, Joan and Lewis came over to Carnegie to talk about that idea, and it seemed to me that we needed a feasibility study done -- where I had come in my mind, how to pursue this if we were going to go further. They agreed that yes, that was the logical next step, but Lewis said, "-- but Joan wouldn't be interested in doing that," and Joan spoke up and said, "Wait just a minute." She said she might be. So I did talk to her further, and she agreed. On leave from Channel 13 she began the feasibility study of whether television could be used to teach young children. She interviewed a large number of people, many of whom she knew because of her television background -- having worked at Channel 13 -- others of which we put her in touch with because of the people in psychology and early childhood education we were dealing with. And as time went on it became clear that her result was going to be that yes, it was feasible, and, indeed, there were certain programmatic elements she had begun to identify, based upon the television culture of the time. For example, "Laugh-In" was a very popular program at that time, using quick, in-and-out movements. She also identified the commercials as being very effective teaching mechanisms at one level -- although not used to teach the kinds of things we wanted to teach young children. And I'm not quite sure when that feasibility study was finished -- probably in the early summer of 1966. At that point the issue became what to do about it.

Now the culture at Carnegie was not particularly conducive to financing television ventures. In particular, there were two or three people -- one of them Florence Anderson, who was then secretary of the Corporation -- who believed that television was far too expensive for us to get into, not of proven effectiveness, and generally something in which

we had little confidence and certainly no background. So there was significant opposition to the idea of going ahead with this. And I, by that time, had become very partisan about doing something with this, and worked with the staff to talk about it, how we might proceed, and, of course, the issue quickly became, "Well, how much is this going to cost, and where will the money come from?"

We didn't know. In the fall of 1966 -- I hope I've got the right date here -- I began working seriously on trying to put together some funding for this. Later, Joan came over, as a full-time employee, working both on helping put this project together, and she was working on the Citizens Group for the Support of Public Broadcasting. I haven't quite got the right title, but that's what it was about. Those were her two main activities.

We didn't know where this money was coming from, but now I think I'm to the spring of 1967. Carnegie finally agreed to put a million dollars, conditionally, into the project; conditionally, if we could raise the rest of it. The money was actually there, but we had to raise the rest, because by then we had a budget, as I recall it, of about four to five million dollars, as being required, and Carnegie was never going to finance the whole thing. I talked to a wide variety of people and organizations, trying to figure out how to support it -- Ford being among them, Ford being one of the first and most obvious cases, and they turned it down. We really were --

Q: They turned it down, reasoning being --? If you can recall?

Morrisett: It just didn't fit their program. The formal reasons why foundations turn things down, typically, are, "They don't fit our program," or, "They don't fit our guidelines." The actual reasons they turn them down are seldom revealed. So we have to say that

there's a difference between what's publicly announced and what's actually the case. In any case, one of the people I'd gotten to know at Carnegie, because of my work there, was Harold Howe, who was then Commissioner of Education. He had been superintendent of schools in Scarsdale, New York -- a friend of John Gardner's. That's where I first became acquainted with him. And I called Doc -- his nickname -- up and suggested we had something that might be worthwhile talking about. I don't really remember specifically, but I suspect that Joan and I went down and talked to Doc about this. Subsequently, he called together a meeting of people within the Office of Education who might have budgets that could support such a project, as well as certain other people, in other parts of the government, that had possibly related budgets.

We presented the project to this group. I would say that it was a chilly reception. Doc looked around the room and said, "Well, I think the ayes have it." So he put his assistant, Lou [Louis] Hausman, as the chief relationship with us, the person most closely related, to help us get this funded. Lou was to coordinate the government response here. Lou had had a background in commercial television, and he quickly examined our budget and decided that we had not put up nearly enough. He raised the budget to eight million dollars, and shortly thereafter he was able to tell us that the Office of Education and the other government agencies with which he was dealing could provide up to four million dollars. So by then we had the promise of the federal money of four million dollars, the Carnegie money of one million -- a total of five million dollars, and we then were able to say much more confidently, to other possible funding sources, that we were going to be able to do this. Doc also, I believe, called up the Ford Foundation, they reversed their decision and came in with the next amount of support, which I'm not going to remember specifically. It was probably on the order of two million dollars.

So we were getting very close to the total amount, and with that start -- the initial Carnegie million, the four million from the federal government, the additional money from Ford -- we were able to raise eight million dollars.

Q: Before you go, was there any reluctance at the time to take government money? Was there any thought of what that might entail, in terms of creative independence?

Morrisett: This was a very different period in terms of the way things were thought to work. Typically, foundations believed that if they were able to start projects, the ongoing support for successful projects would be the federal government. So there was no particular reluctance to take federal money for these purposes. There was no real -- I don't remember any discussion of the possible interference in the creative process of having federal money or federal guidelines to follow. I think that we saw this at the time as a natural thing, and a very fortunate thing because we, obviously, could not have done this project without it. With the promise of money -- or the money in hand -- we next, obviously, had to find a way to broadcast a television program. Lou Hausman, coming out of commercial television, was always convinced that what became "Sesame Street" -- we didn't have a name by then. This was the "Early Childhood Television Program" -- should be on commercial television. That was our first effort. I talked to people at NBC, ABC, Westinghouse Group. We had a very cordial meeting at NBC with the top people, who professed interest and said they would be glad to cooperate, but no promise of air time. Although we had fully financed the project and we were coming, essentially -- when I started doing this I suppose we only had it half financed. But anyway, in terms of a television production, we had covered a very substantial amount of the cost. We got really nowhere with any of the commercial sources. At the same time, now we're getting toward

1968, the ideas for public broadcasting were being developed. Carnegie was importantly involved in that. The chief staff person involved was Arthur Singer, although I was tangentially involved. But because Doug Cater, Douglass Cater was a special assistant for education in the White House, and also because Carnegie had had very good relationships with the [Lyndon B.] Johnson Administration, the idea for public broadcasting seemed to be taking root, and we began to think that public broadcasting might be a way to have this early childhood education program broadcast, and, indeed, that's the way it turned out. That was a highly fortuitous coming together of two developments: our work on the project, and the national development of public broadcasting. It was also fortuitous for public broadcasting, because at that time they didn't have -- they had very little special content that would prove their national appeal.

Once the money was there, or the promise of the money was there, and we began to see that there was the possibility of broadcast, Joan, particularly, got to work trying to put the organization together. We were heavily influenced -- she was particularly heavily influenced by the experience of the Public Broadcasting Laboratory that had been started by the Ford Foundation. Stuart Sucherman had been the Ford Foundation officer involved. It had been a very mixed success, partially because they had set up a board of advisors that was involved in the determination of content, and that didn't work well in the creative process. So very early on, partially on Stuart Sucherman's recommendation and partially because of Joan's conversations with other people involved, she decided that's not the way we were going to do it; that the creative people, really, had to be the final arbiters of what went on the air. We also were quite convinced, however, that we had to find a way to meld sound content, sound curriculum, and research, which, coming out of my work at Carnegie, we believed to be very important with the program. So there were always three elements.

There was always the creative element, the content element, and the research element. The genius of Joan's organization was to put those together in an effective way.

We had significant help along the line. I ought to backtrack here. Before we got to that point, we had to find a project manager, and we had three principal funders at that point: Carnegie, because we were the ones in first, and we also were the ones that were supervising the development of the project; Ford, because they had come in with a significant amount of money -- Ed [Edward] Meade was the program officer at the Ford Foundation with whom we interacted; and Lou Hausman, representing the Office of Education and four million dollars. So there were three principal sources of funding, and we had to agree on a project director. Joan was always my candidate, but we put together a list, I think probably five candidates, that various people had suggested, and we began to go over the list. There was always something wrong with somebody. It also became quite clear, in one of the final discussions that we had that, very gingerly, I would say, both Lou Hausman and Ed Meade sort of suggested that, under the right circumstances, they might be drafted for this job. They were obviously in a conflict of interest situation, so I say gingerly was suggested. I was reluctant to promote Joan too vigorously, because I was also in a conflict of interest situation. But, as it turned out, the objections to everybody else meant that, at the end of the day, there was no other really good candidate who was ready to do it, than Joan.

So she became the project director. I was absolutely delighted, and then the work began on putting the organization together.

Q: Before we go to that -- Joan as the project director -- what qualities did she have that you recognized, and made you feel that she would be right for the job?

Morrisett: She had the background in television. She knew television, she knew the creative process. Two, she had gone through the feasibility study and in that, had talked to a wide variety of content and research people, and really, in her own person, embodied the kind of marriage of these three elements that were important. And, three, energy, the thoughtfulness that she had shown in taking the lessons of the Public Broadcasting Laboratory and translating them. And it was an unproven project, it was not something that you could go to someone who was successfully involved in a commercial television career and say, "Do this." It was completely unproven. The question that was constantly raised, still, was, "All right, you think this can be done. But will it really teach anything? Can you do it?" We didn't know. We had to prove that. And Joan was willing to take that risk, when many other people might not have been. So there were all those qualities involved.

Q: The other question I had was, you know, working with the Ford Foundation, together, did that -- what kinds of issues did that bring up along the way? Or didn't it? That kind of collaborative --

Morrisett: Working with the Ford Foundation and the Office of Education, as I remember it, only brought up two issues. One was the one I've already touched on, that was commercial television as the home for the project, and we really tried to do that. Secondly was the choice of the project director. Theoretically, this group of three funders -- myself, Ed Meade and Lou Hausman -- were supposed to be a sort of controlling committee, if issues came up. They never came up. So that was never really an issue. Theoretically, it could have been; practically speaking, it was not.

One of the early considerations in trying to find a home for this was should we build an organization? That was going to be expensive. How do you -- where do you get people to do the financial work? Where do you get the support? The fiscal? The administrative support that you needed. And Joan early on decided that if we could find a home for this, with another organization where we would be sort of a sub-unit of it, that would be a great advantage. And Jack [John] White, who was then president of NET [National Educational Television], was extremely cooperative and helpful in providing that for us, without any interference. He provided the fiscal and administrative support for what became the Children's Television Workshop after it was incorporated, he was one of the initial incorporators, if I remember, and from that point we had a few key jobs that we knew we had to fill. One, we had to find an executive producer. Second, we had to find someone who could be chairman of what we called our board of advisors -- not in the public broadcast sense, public broadcast laboratory sense, but in the sense we needed a group of advisors we could call on individually and from time to time have meet and use their expertise. And third, we needed somebody to handle the research process within the organization.

The executive producer was, from the creative point of view, obviously key. We put together a list of candidates and George Dessart was our first candidate and the one we really went after. We tried to recruit him very strongly. George thought about it, and finally he told us that he just wasn't right for it. We were really despondent over that decision. He was exactly right. He probably would have been terrible. He was a fine producer, but for this job, he was not right for it although we thought he was. Subsequently, Mike [Michael H.] Dann, who was then at CBS, and an important advisor to the Workshop over a very long period of time, suggested that we might consider Dave

[David D.] Connell, who had been working with "Captain Kangaroo." Dave was exactly right. So we were saved from ourselves by someone who knew better than we did what was right. We were also saved, essentially, in the same way by our choice of the chairman of our board of advisors. Our first choice was Roger [W.] Brown, who was then a professor of linguistics at MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology] -- a brilliant student of linguistics and child psychology. He also said he wasn't right. Our second choice, as it turned out, was Gerry [Gerald S.] Lesser, who was an old friend of mine from Yale -- perfectly right. Again, we were saved from ourselves and we got someone that, in both cases, who should have been our first choice. But we didn't know as well as they did. So that was very helpful.

The third person, Ed [Edward L.] Palmer, had been, I think, an assistant professor at the University of Oregon in education, and had done research on how you tested people's attention to television programming, and we were fortunate enough to recruit him. A number of people had been suggested, and we looked into them and he decided that he would come. So he was our first choice. He was also exactly right. With those four key jobs filled -- the project director, Joan; Dave Connell, executive producer; Gerry Lesser, chairman of the board of advisors; and Ed Palmer as our director of research, we had the kernel of what became the Children's Television Workshop, and the organization that produced "Sesame Street."

Q: And that was your team.

Morrisett: That was the team.

Q: And in terms of the creative work that went into getting that first show on the air? Anything -- ?

Morrisett: One of the things that we did -- and I'm not quite sure how the idea came about -- but we all recognized that in order to have research and content effectively integrated in the creative process, there needed to be a period of development and learning, because these people talk different languages. The research and content people typically feel that television people -- felt then and probably still do feel -- that television people are superficial and don't really know what they're doing. The television people feel, on the other hand, that academics don't understand the creative process, can't make decisions, and what use is research anyway? So to overcome that we put together a series of seminars, where we brought together content, research and our production people -- by then who were on board. For over six months we met around particular content areas, and we really worked through -- under Gerry Lesser's guidance, who was key in moderating those seminars and putting them together. We worked through how this could be done, how these people could work with each other, what research could mean to television production, how it could be used, what kind of content should we have, in an early childhood education program? Joan had provided the framework in her feasibility study, but, okay, you say you want to teach the precursors to reading. What are those, specifically? Specifically, what should you do, when, in a program? Particularly when you can't guarantee that children will watch everyday -- as opposed to school, when they're presumably in class every day you can build sequentially in content. We knew we couldn't do that in the same way. If you had a child only watch two or three times a week, and maybe miss a week -- how do you handle that with a television program? All those questions had to be really worked through in the seminars, and, substantially, they were, to the point when, in the beginning program design -- and I was not involved in those

beginning program design sessions. Those were largely conducted by the production staff, under Dave Connell. I think by that time Jon Stone was part of that production staff, as well as Sam Gibbon. And whether or not we had recruited Joe Raposo as our director of music, I don't know. He could have been involved at that point. The connection with the Henson Organization, or Jim [James M.] Henson, I think had been also made by then. Whether he participated in those particular meetings I don't know. But they went away. After they had a sort of outline in their mind of what needed to be done, and had a concept and a name -- and the name they came back with was "Sesame Street." Then my recollection is that we produced, initially, five trial shows and tried them out, tried them out both in terms of their audience -- in real production -- in terms of their audience appeal, and we probably conducted some research around them, although not the kinds of research we did when the program was actually in full production later on. There were some modifications made in those initial shows, but then we went into production of the full show -- 130 of them. I think that was the first number.

Q: Do you remember your own reaction, the first time you saw something real coming from all this work, and the ideas?

Morrisett: The first thing I say -- it was a lot of fun to do. Everybody was committed, excited, we worked well together. The team worked well together. We were involved in something new, and it was really fun. I think it was fun as well as hard work for everybody.

Now my role, at that point, was somewhat peripheral; that is, I had been involved in developing the funding and the organization and I was one of the incorporators and subsequently became the chairman of the board of the organization, but the real work was

being done by the production team, under Joan's guidance as project director. Even, I think, when we saw things that had been produced, they looked good, but none of us were ready to say, on the basis of our own reaction, what this would mean in terms of an audience reaction -- which was obviously the key. The initial critical response from that first group that I remember, where probably we had twenty or thirty people looking at it, was very favorable. So that was highly satisfying.

Q: I guess I was really wondering from the point of view of you as the social scientist who was interested in seeing whether television could teach young children.

Morrisett: We didn't know. We still didn't know after the program went on the air. We only knew after the research was done later that it really taught something. We believed that it could, and we had partial evidence from the kind of research that Ed Palmer and his group were doing, but only with the ETS [Educational Testing Service] study, the follow-up study that was done later, did we really know that. I think the thing that stands out in my mind -- in answer to your question -- we went on the air in the fall of 1969? November 1969, I believe. At that time the bank that I used in New York was the branch of -- was it the Morgan Guaranty Bank by then? I guess it was Morgan Guaranty at the time, on Fifth Avenue at 44th Street. The reason -- by then I had gone to the [John and Mary R.] Markle Foundation, in September of 1969, and that bank branch was right below me. So that was the reason I was doing my banking in that particular branch. I was standing in line for a teller one day, in, oh, probably December or January, and somebody in line in front of me started talking about "Sesame Street." I couldn't believe it.

So we were all delighted by the reaction. None of us expected it. But the most thing was the fun in doing it.

Q: Of course, you've been with it now for thirty years?

Morrisett: That's right.

Q: Your perspective on that?

Morrisett: That's a long story. The world has changed since 1969. In 1969, effectively, there were only three and, let's say a half television networks, if you counted public broadcasting as a half. So that the competition we were dealing with in terms of audience fragmentation was very much less. "Captain Kangaroo" went off the air, so we were essentially the only daily program for a long time, for children. That world is gone. Now, in the world that has evolved through cable television, now satellite television, the subsequent fragmentation of audience, the development of competitive programming -- because commercial broadcasters began to see that children, or children and their parents, were an audience they should pursue -- has meant that what we have to do now is very different than what we had to do then. We have to be much more interested in public relations and advertising than we were then. And, of course, one thing that we're not talking about, at least not yet, is that we saw, from the very beginning, that we were not going to be able -- In the first year we saw that, in the long run, we could not count on either federal support or foundation support to sustain the program. And we had to find ways to do that.

[END TAPE ONE, SIDE TWO; BEGIN TAPE TWO, SIDE ONE]

Q: Lloyd, could you describe a little bit the first broadcast of the first show -- what it was like, where it was, what the atmosphere was like, and how you felt?

Morrisett: To tell the truth about that first show, it was at the Essex House. I remember that. Most of it is a blur now, because we had so much -- both work had gone into this, as well as so much hope, that I think, looking back, that, you know, I was much more emotionally attuned to the event than dispassionately attuned, so my memory of what actually went on is pretty limited at this stage. I know that --

Q: Well, emotionally -- ?

Morrisett: Well, it seems to me that at one point people began to sing along with the show, and that was a powerful suggestion that we had done something good.

Q: And I guess the real data came in as part of the ETS assessment?

Morrisett: Yes. Ed Palmer was doing his kind of work in terms of audience attention, all along the line, but the sort of research proof that we needed was based on the ETS study. That's right. And that -- the results from that were not in until probably well into the second year of the show. But on that basis, then we could really say that yes, it does teach something.

I should say that one of the -- there were two reasons that we oriented the program cognitively, as we did, and with such an important emphasis on letters and numbers. One was that those were things that children really did need to know in order to learn to read and do beginning arithmetic. We knew that, on the basis of the research that I talked

about previously that Carnegie had done, that many of the children who were not doing well in school did not do those things well when they entered school. So they were at a real deficit. The second reason for focusing on those was we had to have things that could really be measured. It couldn't be something ephemeral that we could say; we had to be able to point and say, "Yes, these are things that children really learned." So those were the two reasons we focused on those, and, obviously, those were the things that were highlighted in the ETS research.

Q: I know that over the years there have been follow-up assessments, all along the way -- various things -- and some of the criticisms?

Morrisett: There have been two sorts of criticisms, I think. One was based upon the idea that what we were really trying to do was close the gap between educationally deprived, or culturally disadvantaged children and children who were not so disadvantaged and the work -- we, I think, never said that that was our intent, but implicit in what we were doing was the idea that maybe you should be closing the gap. Clearly, the research suggested that we didn't. Children that watched the program more learned more. If disadvantaged children watched it more, they learned more. But if you had advantaged children and disadvantaged children watching equal amounts, the advantaged children learned as much as the disadvantaged children, and the gap -- if you want to refer to it, in educational attainment -- tended to remain the same. The problem with that kind of criticism is that any generally distributed social good has that same characteristic; that is to say, Social Security, which is a generally distributed social good -- everybody over sixty-five who has worked a certain amount of time gets Social Security. The people who don't need it get the same amount, proportionately, as the people who do, and you could say you haven't diminished the gap, because one income has gone up, the other income has gone up, but

that gap still remains. The only way to get around something like that is to target the social benefit, provide a means test or something like that -- which you can do, to some extent, in something like social security, because people above a certain level of income are taxed on their social security earnings. People below a certain income level are not taxed. So there's some targeting. Broadcast television cannot be used that way. It's available to everybody. So we knew from the beginning that we were trying to help all children, we hoped disadvantaged children would be helped significantly -- if they watched -- and that turned out to be true. But that is one kind of criticism.

Other kinds of criticisms that have come and gone over the years have been that the pace of the show would create hyperactivity. That didn't ever show -- seem to be true. Another criticism was that if children learn these things before they go to school, then what will teachers have to do in school? There was some resistance on the part of teachers, because of that kind of thought. As it turned out, a variety of research has shown that if children are better prepared, they do fine and teachers love it. But there was some concern of that kind. There have been other criticisms like that. There have been criticisms on both sides that we were too multi-cultural, or, that we didn't have enough multi-culturalism. All those things are involved. But I think that the educational criticism that was the most serious was the one I talked about, the issue of the gap.

Q: Now CTW [Children's Television Workshop] incorporated in 1970?

Morrisett: In '69, I believe.

Q: In any event, you served as chairman for how many years?

Morrisett: Ever since we started, so I suppose it's been about thirty years now.

Q: I wanted to just go back to one earlier thing, just as a pickup. You said initially there was resistance at Carnegie to fund this. I was wondering how you managed to overcome that resistance.

Morrisett: Talking about the early resistance at Carnegie, I suggested, was partly because there was resistance to doing anything in television -- a distrust of the medium, one; the expense of the medium, two; no precedent for us, three. There were a variety of reasonable objections to be raised. With a staff of -- I suppose we had people involved in the final decision-making process. It was a fairly democratic process. The staff typically voted on projects. My job and Alan's job was not to let anything get to the voting point that we weren't satisfied was of quality. We always had more things to vote on than were voted on, but once it got to the point where we agreed that any of these things are sufficient quality that Carnegie could do it, typically, the staff would vote on it and we would rank those things, based upon the staff's votes. And, depending on the amount of money we would have, then we would go down on the list until we had used that amount of money -- if I'm being clear about how the process worked. So in overcoming the resistance, the issue came down to being able to convince enough people on the staff that this was worthwhile, so it would get sufficiently high in the voting process and could get through this roadblock. That was two things. One, you had to have enough people involved, and, also, you had to be able to convince them that the project was important enough to give up other things, because if you're using a million dollars for this, there are things down there on the list that you may care a lot about that aren't going to get funded. There was just a lot of talk, a lot of discussion about the potential. Joan's feasibility study was very compelling. It was beautifully done and put together. That was extremely helpful. The other thing is that it

takes time for people to adapt to new ideas, and perhaps change their minds. So yes, there was initial resistance. Over time there was -- at the end there was still some resistance, no doubt about that, but much less. Because people had adapted to it, they had thought about it, and six months, eight months, ten months -- Joan had been there maybe a year when that was done. They had gotten to know her. So there were all those things involved, and people feeling more comfortable at the end of that process and being willing to provide the million dollars than at the beginning.

Q: The great irony of this, of course, is that "Sesame Street" turned out to be one of Carnegie's greatest successes.

Morrisett: But you couldn't have predicted that. We didn't know it would work. We didn't know we could attract an audience. We weren't sure that we could prove the teaching effectiveness of the program. All those things.

Q: Now Lloyd, you left Carnegie in 1969. Would you just say something about why you left and where you left to go to?

Morrisett: By 1969 I had been vice-president at Carnegie for five years. As I've said, I was essentially their production manager in the office. I was then thirty-nine years old, and I think a variety of things contributed to my leaving. One certainly was in the stage of lifecycle or career, I was to the point of thinking of something else. Could I ever become president of Carnegie? Alan Pifer was a fairly young man. He might do something else, but on the other hand, as it turned out, he didn't, so it would have been a very long wait if I had had that as my objective. Secondly, as production manager I didn't enjoy it quite as much as when I was closer to the projects we were actually dealing with. That was

certainly extremely true with the development of "Sesame Street" as a project, because I was very much involved. But it was also true of other projects that I had been involved with, where I was much closer to the people who were doing the research, much more involved in what was going on. As production manager I'm dealing with ideas second-hand, and sort of funneling through the process -- which is a very useful function, but to me it was not as satisfying as the former. I'd become, because of that, convinced that -- And one other thing I should say about this. I had done a little study to examine the relationship between a foundation's resources and the size of grants it made. I looked at the time at the Ford Foundation, at Carnegie and a few others, and it turned out that typically the foundation, regardless of its size or resources, made grants on the order of fifty to two hundred fifty thousand dollars. That being, then, the amount of money that you could think could be effectively spent in a year by a project or a person. So if you had more resources you could do more of them, but people didn't do bigger things on the whole. This was certainly true at Carnegie. That million dollar grant that we talked about for "Sesame Street" was perhaps the largest grant up to that point that Carnegie had ever made. That line of thought, then, suggests, "Well, if you go to a different foundation, a smaller foundation, where you're more involved, you're going to be able to do as many things personally as you would at a large foundation." That was a theoretical idea.

So all those things were combined, and the excitement that I felt, when I was first there with John Gardner and Jim Perkins, had diminished over the years. All those things were involved, so when I was invited to think about the Markle Foundation as a possibility, I was psychologically prepared, if it looked like a good opportunity, to say yes.

Q: And it obviously did.

Morrisett: And it obviously turned out to be a good opportunity. But that's by hindsight.

Q: Maybe I'll just ask you -- because it's interesting in light of your interest in how it developed -- just the direction in which you took Markle, in terms of your interests. And then I'll ask you the big question.

Morrisett: That's fine. [Interruption] I obviously skirted around the answer to your last question a little bit.

Q: That's fine. Lloyd, I thought you just might, in terms of Markle, talk just a tiny bit about the direction in which you took it, because it really relates to the development of your own interests over the years, and the way life has turned out to be, now. So --

Morrisett: Obviously, the experience of working on the development of "Sesame Street" was extremely important, and it conditioned me to think that it was possible for a foundation to do something important in the area of communications. When the Markle idea was advanced, Markle had been in the field of medical education. The program, running for -- between 1947 and 1969, was called Markle Scholars in Academic Medicine, and it had been very successful. But I knew nothing about academic medicine, or medicine, medical education, and that certainly was not my interest -- which I told the two trustees of the foundation, in our initial conversation. But I said that if they wanted to examine other ideas I would be glad to suggest something. It turned out that, because of the history of the Markle Foundation, the trustees at that point were ready to consider something else. They felt -- at least some of them felt -- the majority of the board felt -- that the original program had served its purpose and they needed a program change. They said they would be glad to think of something else, and as I recall it I prepared a

memorandum around the issue of mass communications, as I thought of it then, because I was coming out of the television experience, and what a foundation might do. Somewhat to my surprise, they accepted that, and said they would like me to become president of the foundation and go in that direction. The issue was twofold, as it turned out. It was really -- although I had had a great deal of help from John [M.] Russell, who tried to terminate the preceding program and leave me a clean slate, there were still 500 and some odd doctors out there who believed that was their program and their life. So there was a several-year period where we were transitioning out of that program, as we were developing the new program in communications. It became later Communications & Information Technology, but concentrated generally upon how communications in our society can be made a more effective and more purposive educational mechanism. And the belief behind that is that public education -- or, indeed, any education, given the way our society works and the importance of the media in it -- cannot work effectively unless it's supported effectively in the communications media. And that's been -- although I would point to some successes, it's an uphill battle, because the values of our society are not that. The values in commercial television, clearly, are not educational values on the whole, with some notable exceptions.

Q: Well, Lloyd, the question is what do you see as the place in American life of private philanthropy today?

Morrisett: Private philanthropy in American life today has a variety of roles, and all of them are important. One role, obviously, and the one that is most predominant, is philanthropy supports worthwhile causes and provides an underlying basis of support that does not come from the federal government, and does not come from state government. So all sorts of causes, issues, religious movements are philanthropically supported. That's

where most of the philanthropic money goes. The other kinds of importance in philanthropy depend very heavily on the creative ability of people in philanthropy to define areas in which they can work, and work in effectively. This is not a subject with which I've steeped myself. In fact, during my years at Markle we had very little interaction with philanthropy, generally, partially because that area -- communications, information technology -- is not a typical philanthropic area. On the other hand, if you look around, I would say that the [George] Soros foundations have been creative in a different kind of way than just providing the base support of ongoing things. And I'm sure, if you looked and studied the philanthropic area, you would find others like that. But there are all gradations in between. There are creative, highly creative and effective foundations. There are those that generally support things at a subsistence level, that are important to keep supported. And, obviously, there are things that have little relevance, that are not very effective. So there's a broad spectrum. The way our society works, however, having that broad spectrum in addition to the federal government is very important to make things go as they do.

Q: Well, you get an A. And that's it.

Morrisett: Okay. We're done.

Q2: There's one other area. One additional area.

Q1: You get an A plus but I get a B plus.

Morrisett: That last question --

Q1: So maybe you could start with the statement --

Morrisett: In 1969 I became chairman of the Children's Television Workshop board of trustees. I've been chairman ever since, so the partnership that Joan and I started when we created "Sesame Street" has continued. As you know, she is currently chairman of our executive committee, and was president until seven years ago. We knew, as I've said initially, that we had to find ways to sustain the organization. Once we found that the program was a success and deserved to be continued, and could not count on political, governmental support or foundation support. That meant we had to begin developing methods of self-support, initially licensing books and records, later toys, and now we're involved in a wide variety of things, including our most recent partnership with Nickelodeon to produce a digital television educational channel called Noggin.

The Children's Television Workshop was an experiment in the beginning, and I think it has to be looked at in that way now. In the beginning, when the workshop was formed, before the program went on the air we did not think of continuity, because we didn't know that continuity was going to be useful or deserved. And we certainly never thought -- no one, that I remember, voiced any thought -- that the workshop, as it formed, should be anything other than a non-profit organization. Today, if we were able to develop "Sesame Street" anew, if we were doing it now -- of course, it would cost much more -- but the idea of it being a non-profit organization would be examined very carefully. The non-profit form has, for us, had many advantages. It shielded us from taxes and enabled us to retain more income to support our programs than we could otherwise.

On the other hand, it's also insulated us from certain kinds of creative market forces, and the urgency of commercial activity that, probably, has been disadvantageous to us. I don't

know where I would come out on that particular issue, at this point in time. The reason for putting it that way is that, to survive as an organization now, in the kind of environment we're now in, without government support, without significant philanthropic support, you essentially have to engage in things that are often labeled as commercial activities. This is what we're doing. We're trying to do it in the context of the values which we have retained from the beginning as an organization, and also do it in the context of a non-profit form, which is our heritage. There are contradictions in that. There are uncertainties that we have to deal with all the time. And as we think of the future, it's very hard, in 1999, to think that we will ever get back to the time in the United States where you can look at the federal government as the central source of support for activities like "Sesame Street," or where you can ever think of aggregating, on a continuing basis, foundation support for such programs. New projects, yes. But programs that are going to extend over ten, twenty, or thirty years -- this is not what foundations do. It will not be, as far as I see, what foundations ever do.

So in that kind of environment, how the organization will have to evolve -- as it certainly will -- beyond the time that Joan and I are going to be involved in it, which will probably be only a few more years -- we don't know. This is exactly the set of issues we're wrestling with, and ten years from now we'll see if we do it successfully.

Q: Thank you.

[END OF SESSION]