

ENDNOTES

CHAPTER ONE (pages 1-33)

1. Unless otherwise indicated, the information in this section will be from Garson (1977).
2. At the turn of the century Moody (1904), Brandeis (1914) and the Pujo Committee (US Congress 1913) saw that the economy was dominated by a coalition of families and corporations of great wealth and power, particularly the Rockefellers and Morgans. Berle and Means (1932) estimated that 2,000 people controlled one-half of U.S. industry. The New Deal's Temporary National Economic Committee (TNEC) Monograph No. 29 (Thorp and Crowder (1914) considered that the top thirteen most affluent families, particularly the duPonts, Mellons and Rockefellers, shared economic primacy in the country. Sweezy said in 1939 that there were eight or more financial interest groups with their own satellite corporations which dominated the American economy. Other speculations as to how many people control the country have been made by Baran and Sweezy (1966)--10,000, Dye (1976)--4,100, Gordon (1945)--4,000. (Other guesses are covered later in this chapter.) The conservative Hayek recognized

in 1944 that monopoly capitalism was leading to a totalitarian, corporative state which would be controlled and operated by and for the monopolists.

3. One of Rose's students told the author that Rose said to her, before he died, that the Power Elite perspective was correct after all. Dahl made a similar statement in a visit to the University of Texas at Austin. This also is the rather plaintive theme of Dahl's After the Revolution (1970): political scientists--the pluralists--had been ignoring the economic realities of the system; true pluralism was therefore a goal for which we should strive.
4. Unless otherwise indicated, the information comes from Gold, Lo and Wright (1975).
5. Marxists frequently point to contradictions inherent in the capitalist system which produce instability in the system with which the capitalists are constantly trying to deal and which also form areas of focus on class exploitation, discontent and struggle. Marx pointed out two main contradictions, the most basic being the arbitrary and unnatural division between capital and labor, the result being that, because the capitalist wants production only for profit and because he appropriates this profit (or surplus) from

the wealth produced by the workers, the capitalist actually fetters the productive mechanism which could produce much more of a socially beneficial nature than just to provide accumulation for the capitalist. The other main contradiction is that production is a social process, whereas the means of production are privately owned, and the greatest benefits also are appropriated privately: profits are not socialized. Another contradiction is that, in this process of accumulation, the spending power of the workers is reduced below that which can be used to purchase everything that is produced. If this occurs, recession results. Also, because corporations are in almost constant debt, they must make continually rising profits to pay their creditors. Therefore, capitalism must expand continuously. On this point even the capitalists agree. Hence, to grow, the system must accumulate. Without such growth, economic and social disintegration occurs, people see the system more clearly, discontent is rampant, and struggle is heightened. As O'Connor points out, under monopoly capitalism even the costs and results of production (such as pollution) are increasingly socialized (born by the government, hence taxpayers);

but the profits go to the corporations. Now, even the risks are being socialized: gas consumers are paying higher rates to finance an Alaskan pipeline; defense industries are guaranteed profits; the government reimbursed the big banks for the latter's loan losses to Poland. Still, the corporations collect the profits.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO (pages 34-150)

1. Some of these large corporations and their stock held by the top institutionals include AT&T (4.1%), Western Union (30.4%), Burlington Northern (28.3%), Southern Railway (35%), Caterpillar Tractor (26.9%), Chrysler (22.5%), General Electric (18.6%), Mobil Oil (23.8%), Monsanto (25.8%), Union Carbide (18.9%), Northwest Airlines (45.5%), United Airlines (39.4%), United Aircraft (36.6%), Virginia Electric and Power (23.3%), Safeway Stores (24.3%), Travelers Insurance (29.5%).
2. For example, General Motors has two interlocks with Ford, four with Chrysler, and five with International Harvester. Exxon has interlocks with Mobil (6), Standard of California (6), Atlantic Richfield (4), Texaco (2), Standard of Indiana (2) and Shell (1). These are basically indirect interlocks which are not

prohibited by the Clayton Act, but which might be in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, according to Metcalf.

3. Unless otherwise indicated, CFR information is from Shoup and Minter.
4. Unless otherwise indicated, Bilderberg material is from Liberty Lobby [1975].
5. Some of these policies are as follows: decrease restrictions to free trade; let the dollar float; revise the National Security Council; strengthen the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and Asian Development Bank with U.S. tax money to guarantee the loans of U.S. transnational banks to other countries; lower the standard of living of American citizens; and support the lesser developed countries by creating a common support fund for their commodity prices. "Interdependent" is a favorite buzzword of the TLC. When it appears in a political or economic speech or article, chances are there is TLC influence somewhere.
6. Whittaker has an outstanding chart on pages 158 and 159 which show the direct and indirect connections of various foundations with the CIA.
7. Unless otherwise indicated, the information in the

- section on universities comes from D.N. Smith (1974).
8. The three TV networks are no longer listed in the Fortune 500 for industrial corporations.
 9. Unless otherwise indicated the information in this section comes from Network Project 1973a.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE (pages 151-253)

1. Unless otherwise indicated, all statistics are from Compaine (1979, 312-315).

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR (pages 254-349)

1. Unless otherwise indicated, the information for the News Budgets section is from Epstein (1973).
2. Unless otherwise indicated, the information for the section on rating services is from Kellner (1976).
3. The network positional information is based on Epstein (1973).
4. Schorr remarked on the Dick Cavett Show on PBS that CBS executives would stop him in the hallways and give him informal feedback.
5. Unless otherwise indicated, the information for this section is from Epstein (1973).
6. Unless otherwise indicated, the information in this section comes from a Liberty Lobby publication,

particularly the Spotlight. See Allen and Ehre 1980; Bartel 1978; Foner 1979; Grey 1980; Liberty Lobby [1975]; Lincoln 1979; Nicholas 1978a, 1978b, 1978c; Potts 1978; Shaw 1980; Spotlight 1979a, 1979b, 1980a, 1980b; Waits 1979. See also Fund to Restore an Educated Electorate 1980, another right wing source.

7. Compared with the right wing, which first started talking about the Bilderbergers in the 1950s, the left wing did not begin covering the organization until late. See Mayo 1980; Shoup and Minter 1977; Eringer 1980; Weissman and Eringer 1977; Judis 1978; Sklar 1980.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE (pages 350-388)

1. In *United States v. Paramount Pictures, Inc.*, 334 US 131 (1948) the Supreme Court ruled that radio as well as newspapers are considered to be the "press."
2. To see the change in court thinking, compare *Hammer v. Degenhart*, 247 US 251 (1918) and *US v. E.C. Knight*, 156 US 1 (1895) with *US v. Darby*, 312 US 100 (1941); *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 US 111 (1942); and *Heart of Atlanta Motel v. US*, 379 US 241 (1964).
3. See bibliography for other significant works by Barron. For a comprehensive listing of articles see

Lange (1973). Lange has a list of anti-access writers on page five. Authors not listed by Lange are (for access): Maeder (1974); University of Pennsylvania Law Review (1974); Myers (1974); Barrow (1975); Cornish (1974). Anti-access authors are Boyer (1975); Loper (1974). For an extremely comprehensive review of access and cable television as of 1973 see Fordham Law Review (1973).

4. There was an isolated Ohio case in 1919 mentioned in Pearce (1972, 59) in which it was held that if the newspaper was the only one in town, all people should be given equal opportunity to purchase space (22 Ohio N.P. 225, 31 Ohio Dec. 54 (C.P. 1919)).
5. See Pierce (1972, 68-80) for a discussion of the following cases.
6. Jaffee says that the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ was helping more than 100 community groups.
7. BEM/DNC (1973, 123). Nicholas Johnson says this is exactly the situation now--the wealthy dominate the media (Johnson and Weston 1971, 625).
8. See endnote 3 and Pierce (1972, 94, 95, and her footnotes 22-27).
9. Justice Douglas concurred only with the result of

BEM/DNC, but said that if broadcasters did perform as government agencies, access would inexorably follow (148-170).

10. In addition to its pro-access views in the previously mentioned cases, the Court of Appeals said in the 1971 case of Citizen Communication Center v. FCC, 447 F.2nd 1202 (D.C.C.A. 1971) that "new interest groups and hitherto silent minorities . . . should be given . . . the chance to broadcast on our radio and television frequencies."
11. In Broadcasting during the first four months of 1974 there were several issues which referred to Justice Department activity urging the FCC to take a stronger hand on the subject of concentration.
12. For information on local access usage and struggles see the following: Access 1981k, 1981q, 1982f, 1982g, 1983b; Access, Austin Community Television (ACTV) 1983b; Anderson 1983; Applebaum 1981; Austin American-Statesman 1984; Barbaro, 1983; Bark 1980; Barton 1983a, 1983b, 1983c; Behre 1983; Bell 1983; Buetler 1978; Bilello 1980; Blow 1980; Bond 1979; Botein 1972; Brown, B., 1981; Brown, Ben, 1983; Brown, L., 1979b; Buckley, T., 1973; Burchell 1980; Bushnell 1982; CableVision 1983d, 1983a; Calloway 1979; Cerra 1982;

Clines 1977; Collins 1980; Cone 1979; Crook 1983; Cullum 1978; Cumming 1983; Davis 1982; Dillard-Rosen 1982; Divoky 1979; Dobbs 1983; Durkin 1983; Enstad 1983a, 1983b; Feinstein 1984; Ferretti 1971, 1972; Fisher, S., 1979; Gent 1971a, 1971b; Getlein 1976; Glover 1979; Goetze 1982; Gould 1971a; Grand Rapids Press 1979; Greene 1982; Greyson 1983; Harrington 1973; Halvorsen 1974; Hanks and Longini 1974; Hudson 1977; Hylton 1983; Independent 1983a, 1983c; Indianapolis Star 1974; Jacklin 1975; Jacobs 1981, 1982; Jaynes 1978; Kasler 1979; Kerr 1983; Kirmser 1973; Kreiger 1980; Lane 1983; Laurence 1982a, 1982b; Lydon 1971; Manley and Harzog 1983; Marriotti 1982; Maxon and Swanson 1984; Meislin 1981; Melvin 1982; Minneapolis Tribune 1975; Montgomery 1974; Myers 1981; National Federation of Local Cable Programmers 1983a; New York Times 1971, 1980a, 1980b, 1981b, 1981c; Noam 1981; O'Connor, J.J., (all); Omaha World Herald 1980; Oppenheim 1972; Dresman 1982; Owens [1978], 1980; Passell 1981; Perking 1979; Phillips 1971; Portland Oregonian 1982; Powell 1982; Rice 1984; Rosen 1980; Salganik 1982, 1983; San Jose Mercury 1977; San Diego Union 1978; Schomisch 1981; Schwartz, T., 1980, 1981a, 1981b; Self-Reliance 1981; Sima 1981; Sorenson 1983;

Stier 1982; Stoney 1981; Strickler 1983; Taylor 1982; Third Coast 1983; Thomas 1980; Tucci 1983a, 1983b, 1983c; Van der Veer 1979; Wadler 1974; Whitehouse 1981; Williams 1980; Wisser (all); Wittek 1973; Wyoming State Tribune 1975.

13. Atheist Madalyn Murray O'Hair has a network of about 30 channels. Various religious groups have regional and national distribution. A conservative veterans group distributes nationally. See the section on Alternative Views for information on growing national distribution of this alternative news magazine program. Also, people trade tapes on an individual basis to show on their respective access channels.
14. Many of these attacks at the local level can be found in endnote 12 above. Good examples are Access 1982g; Barbaro 1983; Behre 1983; Bond 1979; Durkin 1983; Feinstein 1984; Owens 1980; Sorenson 1983; Tucci 1983c.
15. Unless otherwise indicated, information in this section will come from Townsend (1981).