



Race, Media and the Crisis of Civil Society

From Watts to
Rodney King

Ronald N. Jacobs

Race, Media, and the Crisis of Civil Society

From Watts to Rodney King

Ronald N. Jacobs



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK <http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Ronald N. Jacobs 2000

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions
of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may
take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2000

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in 10/12.5 pt Times New Roman in QuarkXPress™ [SE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloging in publication data

Jacobs, Ronald N.

Race, media, and the Crisis of Civil Society : from Watts to Rodney King /
Ronald N. Jacobs.

p. cm. – (Cambridge cultural social studies)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 62360 X (hardback) – ISBN 0 521 62578 5 (paperback)

1. Afro-Americans and mass media – United States. 2. Mass
media and race relations – United States. 3. Afro-Americans in
mass media. 4. Afro-American press. 5. Mass Media – Social
aspects – United States. 6. United States – Race relations. I. Title.

II. Series.

P94.5.A372 U557 2000

302.23'089'96073–dc21 00–047914

ISBN 0 521 62360 X hardback

ISBN 0 521 62578 5 paperback

Since the early nineteenth century, African-Americans have turned to black newspapers to monitor the mainstream media and to develop alternative interpretations of public events. Ronald Jacobs tells the stories of these newspapers, showing how they increased black visibility within white civil society and helped to form separate black public spheres in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. Comparing African-American and "mainstream" media coverage of some of the most memorable racial crises of the last forty years such as the Watts riot, the beating of Rodney King, the Los Angeles uprising and the O. J. Simpson Trial, Jacobs shows why a strong African-American press is still needed today. *Race, Media, and the Crisis of Civil Society* challenges us to rethink our common understandings of communication, solidarity and democracy. Its engaging style and thorough scholarship will ensure its appeal to students, academics and the general reader interested in the mass media, race and politics.

RONALD N. JACOBS is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University at Albany, State University of New York. Before moving to Albany he was an Annenberg Scholar at the Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania. He has published extensively on the relationship between news media, culture, and democracy in *American Journal of Sociology*, *International Sociology*, *Sociological Theory*, *Media, Culture & Society*, *Real Civil Societies* and *Media, Ritual and Identity*.

Race, Media, and the Crisis of Civil Society

Cambridge Cultural Social Studies

Series editors: JEFFREY C. ALEXANDER, *Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles*, and STEVEN SEIDMAN, *Department of Sociology, University at Albany, State University of New York*.

Titles in the series

ILANA FRIEDRICH SILBER, *Virtuosity, Charisma, and Social Order*
0 521 41397 4 Hardback

LINDA NICHOLSON AND STEVEN SEIDMAN (eds.), *Social Postmodernism* 0 521 47516 3 Hardback 0 521 47571 6 Paperback

WILLIAM BOGARD, *The Simulation of Surveillance*
0 521 55081 5 Hardback 0 521 55561 2 Paperback

SUZANNE R. KIRSCHNER, *The Religious and Romantic Origins of Psychoanalysis* 0 521 44401 2 Hardback 0 521 55560 4 Paperback

PAUL LICHTERMAN, *The Search for Political Community*
0 521 48286 0 Hardback 0 521 48343 3 Paperback

ROGER FRIEDLAND AND RICHARD HECHT, *To Rule Jerusalem*
0 521 44046 7 Hardback

KENNETH H. TUCKER, JR., *French Revolutionary Syndicalism and the Public Sphere* 0 521 56359 3 Hardback

ERIK RINGMAR, *Identity, Interest and Action* 0 521 56314 3 Hardback

ALBERTO MELUCCI, *The Playing Self* 0 521 56401 8 Hardback
0 521 56482 4 Paperback

ALBERTO MELUCCI, *Challenging Codes* 0 521 57051 4 Hardback
0 521 57843 4 Paperback

SARAH M. CORSE, *Nationalism and Literature* 0 521 57002 6 Hardback
0 521 57912 0 Paperback

DARNELL M. HUNT, *Screening the Los Angeles 'Riots'*
0 521 57087 5 Hardback 0 521 57814 0 Paperback

LYNETTE P. SPILLMAN, *Nation and Commemoration*
0 521 57404 8 Hardback 0 521 57432 3 Paperback

MICHAEL MULKAY, *The Embryo Research Debate*
0 521 57180 4 Hardback 0 521 57683 0 Paperback

LYNN RAPAPORT, *Jews in Germany after the Holocaust*
0 521 58219 9 Hardback 0 521 58809 X Paperback

- CHANDRA MUKERJI, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles*
0 521 49675 6 Hardback 0 521 59959 8 Paperback
- LEON H. MAYHEW, *The New Public* 0 521 48146 5 Hardback
0 521 48493 6 Paperback
- VERA L. ZOLBERG AND JONI M. CHERBO (eds.), *Outsider Art*
0 521 58111 7 Hardback 0 521 58921 5 Paperback
- SCOTT BRAVMANN, *Queer Fictions of the Past* 0 521 59101 5 Hardback
0 521 59907 5 Paperback
- STEVEN SEIDMAN, *Difference Troubles* 0 521 59043 4 Hardback
0 521 59970 9 Paperback
- RON EYERMAN AND ANDREW JAMISON, *Music and Social Movements*
0 521 62045 7 Hardback 0 521 62966 7 Paperback
- MEYDA YEGENOGLU, *Colonial Fantasies* 0 521 48233 X Hardback
0 521 62658 7 Paperback
- LAURA DESFOR EDLES, *Symbol and Ritual in the New Spain*
0 521 62140 2 Hardback 0 521 62885 7 Paperback
- NINA ELIASOPH, *Avoiding Politics* 0 521 58293 8 Hardback
0 521 58759 X Paperback
- BERNHARD GIESEN, *Intellectuals and the German Nation*
0 521 62161 5 Hardback 0 521 63996 4 Paperback
- PHILIP SMITH (ed.), *The New American Cultural Sociology*
0 521 58415 9 Hardback 0 521 58634 8 Paperback
- S. N. EISENSTADT, *Fundamentalism, Sectarianism and Revolution*
0 521 64184 5 Hardback 0 521 64586 7 Paperback
- MARIAM FRASER, *Identity without Selfhood* 0 521 62357 X Hardback
0 521 62579 3 Paperback
- LUC BOLTANSKI, *Distant Suffering* 0 521 57389 0 Hardback
0 521 65953 1 Paperback
- PYOTR SZTOMPKA, *Trust* 0 521 59144 9 Hardback
0 521 59850 8 Paperback
- SIMON J. CHARLESWORTH, *A Phenomenology of Working Class Culture* 0 521 65066 6 Hardback 0 521 65915 9 Paperback
- ROBIN WAGNER-PACIFICI, *Theorizing the Standoff* (2)
0 521 65244 8 Hardback 0 521 65915 9 Paperback

Acknowledgments

I have been fortunate to have enjoyed an unusual amount of academic support and advice throughout this project. I began working on the book during my years as a graduate student at UCLA, continued it as a visiting scholar at Rice University and University of Pennsylvania, and finished it at the University at Albany, State University of New York. To all of my colleagues, I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude.

During my years at UCLA, Jeff Alexander was extraordinary as my teacher, mentor, and dissertation chair. He gave me thousands of hours of his time, discussing ideas and offering useful advice. He read every word of every draft from this project as well as others, always providing penetrating commentary and luminous critique. His exemplary embodiment of intellectual scholarship continues to serve as a model of practice for me today, as I interact with my own graduate students. Other UCLA faculty also helped me during the early stages of this project, the most important of whom were Walter Allen, Steve Clayman, and Rogers Brubaker. Finally, members of the “Culture Club” reading group at UCLA offered a supportive forum and a critical audience for thinking through new ideas and refining old ones; particular thanks are owed to Phil Smith, Steve Sherwood, Anne Kane, and Andy Roth.

My colleagues at Rice University offered a wonderfully supportive environment while I finished my dissertation. Elizabeth Long, Chandler Davidson, Steve Klineberg, and Chad Gordon made special efforts to make me feel like a member of their Sociology Department, and made funds available for travel and research.

I was most fortunate to have had the opportunity to spend a year as an Annenberg Scholar at the Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania. Special thanks are due to Elihu Katz, the director of the program, for creating a climate of intellectual dialogue and

critique. Ravina Aggarwal, Hannah Kliger, Tali Mendelberg, Jeffrey Strange, and Itzhak Roeh, the other Annenberg scholars, were stimulating colleagues who contributed mightily to the creative intellectual climate. I also thank Barbie Zelizer and Carolyn Marvin, at the Annenberg School, and Diana Crane in the Sociology Department, for helping to make Penn such a welcoming and engaging place.

My colleagues at the University at Albany have been extremely generous with their time and advice. Richard Alba, Nancy Denton, Hayward Horton, Richard Lachmann, John Logan, and Steve Messner have all discussed some of the ideas in the book with me. Steve Seidman read several chapters of the book, offering sage advice and helping me to work through some theoretical uncertainties I had been struggling with for far too long. Students who took my graduate course in Civil Society and the Public Sphere asked sharp and stimulating questions, helping me to develop a clearer sense of the project as a whole. Dan Glass and Dalia Abdel-Hady provided crucial research assistance, allowing me to complete Chapter 5 much more quickly than would have otherwise been possible.

Other colleagues have also been very generous with their time. Craig Calhoun, Margaret Cerullo, Patricia Clough, Bruce Haynes, Jim McKay, Steven Pfohl, Vincent Price, Lyn Spillman, Ken Tucker, Michael Traugott, Robin Wagner-Pacifici, and Craig Watkins have all spent time reading or discussing my analysis of race, media, and civil society. Susan Douglas and Charles Lemert read the entire book manuscript during a crucial stage in its development, offering important and valuable suggestions.

Financial assistance for this project came from a UCLA Communication Studies Fellowship, the Walter Hall Fund at Rice University, the Annenberg Scholars Program at the University of Pennsylvania, and the Faculty Research Awards Program at the University at Albany, State University of New York.

Finally, I thank Eleanor Townsley, whose contributions to this project are surpassed only by her more general impact on my happiness and well-being. Interrupting her own research more often than I deserved, she provided thoughtful criticisms at every stage of the project, coaxed me off the floor during moments of depression and frustration, and kept my life in balance.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page xi</i>
Introduction	1
1 Race, media, and multiple publics	19
2 Historicizing the public spheres: New York, Los Angeles, Chicago	31
3 The Watts uprisings of 1965	54
4 The Rodney King beating	81
5 Rodney King 1992	113
Conclusion	140
<i>Notes</i>	152
<i>Bibliography</i>	175
<i>Index</i>	186

Introduction

Los Angeles is wonderful. Nowhere in the United States is the Negro so well and beautifully housed. Out here in this matchless Southern California there would seem to be no limit to your opportunities.

(W. E. B. DuBois, 1913)

Stop your protest or we will use Los Angeles measures against you.

(Tadzhikistan police, 1992)

This book is about three disturbing events in the history of Los Angeles, and the ways in which those events were made meaningful in African-American and mainstream news media. The 1965 uprisings in Watts, the 1991 videotaped police beating of Rodney King, and the post-verdict events of 1992 have transformed the image of racial Los Angeles from one of a Utopian Oz,¹ extolled by DuBois in 1913 and named by the Urban League in 1964 as the best city for blacks to live; to a dystopian *Blade Runner*, with Los Angeles the setting for a tale of moral decay, despair, and the loss of authenticity.² Images of racial violence and police brutality hang heavily, casting a dark shadow over glitzy images produced in the dream factories of the City of Angels. Tourists no longer have to wonder what lies on the other side of the Hollywood sign; it is the haunting specter of racial fragmentation.

While most research on Los Angeles has focused on economic change, population shifts, and public space, this book focuses on civil society, culture, and the spaces of representation. The Watts and Rodney King crises were certainly indicative of significant structural strains which heightened racial tensions in Los Angeles and the nation. But they also provided key moments of public debate and public reflection about such heady matters as the meaning of the American dream, the promise of the civil rights movement, and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. These

crises offered social drama of the highest order to the American public. Would they end with unity or fragmentation? Trust or suspicion? An opening of social boundaries, or an increase in tribalism and other hyper-active forms of social closure? People who were otherwise disengaged from public life turned on their television sets and opened their newspapers, in the process having often heated arguments about what each crisis meant, and what should be done to resolve it. By exposing racial representations in their rawest form, the Watts and Rodney King crises changed public discussions about matters of common concern in ways which were far from trivial.

Mass media and civil society

In the social sciences, the study of public communication and democracy is coming increasingly to be framed through the twin concepts of *civil society* and *public sphere*. Civil society refers to the entire web of associational and public spaces in which citizens can have conversations with one another, discover common interests, act in concert, assert new rights, and try to influence public opinion and public policy.³ This rather expansive definition includes the activities of social movements, voluntary associations, public relations specialists, media personalities, reading groups, and any other individuals or groups who gather together to discuss matters of common concern. It includes the pursuit of common political agendas as well as common cultural identities and solidarities. It understands that a vibrant civil society is supposed to prevent the state from dominating and atomizing the rest of society, allowing groups and communities simultaneously to resist subordination and to demand inclusion.⁴ Finally, and most importantly, it binds the normative ideals of democracy to the arena of the public sphere.

The concept of the public sphere refers to a particular type of practice which takes place in civil society: the practice of open discussion about matters of common public concern. The concept owes much of its academic popularity to Habermas, and the publication of his now-classic *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Habermas wanted to explain why the normative model of politics changed, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (particularly in the Anglo-American world), so that the principle of open public discussion came to replace that of parliamentary secrecy.⁵ He explained this change in politics as being caused by the development of a bourgeois public sphere, which he defined as the sphere of private people come together as a public, who claimed the space of public discourse from state regulation, and demanded that the

state engage them in debate about matters of political legitimacy and common concern. Envisioning the public sphere primarily as a political space that could help challenge, engage, and regulate public authorities, Habermas emphasized face-to-face communication, rational-critical discourse, and a single public arena.

More recent scholars, however, have begun to question the historical, empirical, and normative validity of a single public sphere grounded in rational-critical discourse. Instead, contemporary theorists argue that civil society consists of multiple, frequently nonrational, and often contestatory public spheres, which are oriented just as often to cultural issues as to political ones.⁶ Established and maintained by communication media, these public spheres support many different (but overlapping) communities of discourse.⁷ The new model of civil society that is emerging is one of a multiplicity of public spheres, communities, and associations nested within one another, most of which are also oriented (in differing degrees) to a putative larger “national sphere”.⁸

In this portrait of overlapping, interconnected, and competing public spheres, which are likely to remain always fractured and disconnected in some degree or another, the mass media – and in particular, the news media – take on an ever increasing significance.⁹ News media provide a common stock of information and culture, which private citizens rely on in their everyday conversations with others. Indeed, sixty-eight percent of the American public watches at least one television news program in a typical day, for an average duration of fifty-eight minutes.¹⁰ Fifty-four percent of adults read a newspaper every day, and eighty-eight percent read the paper at least once a week.¹¹ This common stock of information makes intersubjectivity possible, even among those who may never come into contact with one another. By creating an open-ended space where ideas can be expressed and received by a potentially limitless and universal audience of present and non-present others, modern communications media – contrary to theories of “mass society” – have actually expanded the public sphere.¹²

If mass media have expanded the public sphere, however, they have done so in rather unexpected ways. On the one hand, they have expanded the spatial and temporal limits of public communication, creating a “global civil society” that has the potential to impact any public discussion about matters of common concern. International media events today are addressed to a fictional world audience that is believed to be an important source of international public opinion.¹³ On the other hand, mass media have multiplied the number of publics immeasurably, stretching the beliefs about shared communication, so important to democracies, to the limit. Mass media serve simultaneously as forces of inclusion and exclusion, universalism and

particularism, globalization and localization, integration and fragmentation, freedom and constraint. To understand their impact, they need to be located within a communicative geography of civil society.

In Chapter 1, I offer a theory about the role of news media in a civil society consisting of multiple public spheres. Recognizing that news media do not offer perfect public forums for open dialogue about matters of common concern, I argue that there are, nevertheless, many instances where news media do act as public spheres: during press conferences, interview shows, call-in shows, live broadcasts of public events, and the like. In addition, news media shape most other publics in significant ways, by defining the public agenda – a fact which leaders of social movements, voluntary associations, and other civil society organizations ignore at their peril. In order to gain a voice in the larger, more politically-consequential public spheres, these leaders must develop successful strategies for gaining media access.

In a civil society consisting of multiple publics, the media strategies of citizens, associations, and communities can be accommodated most effectively when there are both large and small news organizations. Access to large news media such as *ABC News*, the *New York Times*, and the *Los Angeles Times* is crucial for those who want to try to influence public opinion and public policy. Indeed, the lure of this kind of publicity leads many people to adapt their media strategies to the preferences and practical routines of mainstream journalism. But there are risks involved when people try to participate in large public spheres over which they have little or no control. There is no guarantee of gaining a larger public voice, and there is a danger of too much accommodation and too little cultural autonomy. Because of these risks, there is still a powerful need for smaller, more local spaces of discussion and news which offer greater autonomy and more control. This suggests that alternative media such as the African-American press have an important role to play in the creation of a more open and inclusive civil society.

If Chapter 1 provides a theoretical justification for multiple publics and multiple news media, Chapter 2 offers a more historical one, by describing the development of the African-American and mainstream press and public spheres over the last 200 years. Separate public spaces and communicative institutions formed among Northern free blacks in the 1700s; the black press was established in 1827. At least forty different black newspapers were published before the Civil War, and the establishment of a national black press was generally agreed upon as the second most pressing issue among African-American leaders. The historical need for a strong black press was three-fold: (1) to provide a forum for debate and self-improvement; (2) to monitor the mainstream press; and (3) to increase

black visibility in white civil society. African-Americans could not count on the mainstream press of the time to publicize black voices or to represent black issues in a non-patronizing manner. By establishing an independent black press, African-Americans were able to secure a space of self-representation: not only to craft common identities and solidarities, but also to develop arguments which might effectively engage white civil society.

The African-American press was never intended to substitute for participation in the majority media. Rather, it was designed to encourage continuous discussion about matters of common concern, to develop arguments for later engagement in the majority public spheres, and to correct the prejudices and misrepresentations which resulted from engagement in those other public spheres. The point was to continue discussion and conversation, and to keep open the possibility of expanding the conversation to include new participants and new venues. This, after all, is the ultimate value of civil society, regardless of how many different publics compose it: to keep a conversation going, to open up ongoing dialogue to new narratives and new points of difference, and to expand the substantive content of existing solidarities.

The normative vision of the black public sphere does not map perfectly, however, onto its history. The African-American press was strongest between 1900 and 1950, during the period of forced residential segregation and mainstream press neglect. During this time the black press provided an important and powerful space for forming arguments about integration and civil rights which would later find their way into the public spaces of communication in white civil society. Thurgood Marshall summed up the power of the black press in 1954, when he remarked that “without the Negro press, the NAACP would get nowhere.”¹⁴ In a certain sense, though, it was easier for African-Americans to prioritize the black press during the first half of the twentieth century, given their near-total exclusion from the mainstream press and public spheres. Before the 1960s, fewer than one percent of journalists were African-American, and it was rare for race news to account for more than one percent of total news space in the mainstream press.¹⁵ Quite simply, the only publicity African-American leaders could count on was that which came from the black press.

Since 1960, however, most black newspapers have seen their circulation decrease rapidly, by some fifty to seventy-five percent. This decline has a number of reasons: a more general decline in newspaper use resulting from the rise of television news; an inability of black newspapers to publish a successful daily edition (with the notable exception of the *Chicago Defender*), which became more of a problem with the fast pace of life characteristic of the modern media age; and the increased distribution costs

arising from a more residentially dispersed black middle class. But in addition to these structural factors, there was another, more subjective one. Between 1950 and 1970, the attention to African-Americans and African-American issues increased dramatically in the mainstream press, as a result of the civil rights movement and the 1960s urban uprisings. With this increased visibility came an increase in participation and voice for African-American leaders desiring to speak in the mainstream media. This increased participation was limited and, as Chapter 2 shows, it has stagnated or declined ever since the early 1970s. Regardless, however, a significant minority of African-American intellectuals during the 1950s and early 1960s were beginning to believe that racial integration would remove the need for a separate black newspaper, and began arguing that the black press should fight for its own disappearance.¹⁶

There are new forms of black media, of course – such as talk radio, Black Entertainment Television, and Internet discussion groups – just as there are more black journalists and more black voices in the mainstream news media. But even if these new public forums were able to support a vibrant black public sphere without African-American newspapers, the loss of a vital black press would still constitute a crisis, just as the disappearance of multi-newspaper cities has been interpreted as a crisis for the mainstream press and mainstream civil society. A diversity of news media helps to guarantee a diversity of public voices, and increases the likelihood that there will be vital public debate about matters of common concern. The crisis of the black press, then, is a crisis for American civil society.

While the current crisis of the black press is largely the result of declining circulation, the actual power of the black press is not only tied directly to the number of people who read it. In addition to circulation, the potential power of the African-American press resides in the fact that people know it is there, available to be read should the need be perceived. Indeed, during periods of racial crisis, such as the Watts and Rodney King uprisings, sales of black newspapers surged, as African-Americans sought out the “black perspective,” compared it with the news stories in the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, or *ABC News*, and then proceeded to have conversations. Put simply, the existence of the black press adds diversity to civil society, and offers the possibility of new forms of discussion to emerge. Alternative news media provide public forums for subordinate groups to develop arguments free of the hegemonic gaze of the dominant group. They also provide public spaces for repairing the symbolic damage which inevitably occurs with participation in the larger, mainstream media. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 support this claim about symbolic repair conclusively,

as would any empirical analysis comparing African-American and mainstream media coverage of racial crises.

Comparing racial discourses in the news

Because news media are plural, the study of media discourse is best accomplished through comparative research. How does news coverage of racial crisis differ in Chicago, Los Angeles, or New York? How is race news in the mainstream press different from the African-American press? How has it changed over time? Does it matter if the events being reported took place in the geographic “home” of a newspaper and its readers? These are some of the empirical questions this book addresses, by comparing news accounts of the Watts and Rodney King crises in the African-American and mainstream news media of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Three goals motivated my selection of news sources: (1) to use the same news sources for all three racial crises; (2) to compare news coverage in different cities; and (3) to compare African-American and mainstream news coverage. Ultimately, these goals led to the selection of six newspapers as primary source material. The *Chicago Tribune*, *Los Angeles Times*, and *New York Times*, as the largest daily newspapers in their respective cities, were obvious choices to represent the mainstream news media. For the African-American press the choices were slightly more difficult, because circulation sizes for many African-American papers are not audited. In addition, there are very few black newspapers which are published daily. Only the *Chicago Defender*, in fact, has published a daily edition continuously between 1965 and 1992.¹⁷ To try to equalize the comparisons of the African-American newspapers, I chose the weekly edition of the *Chicago Defender* (published Thursdays), as well as the two African-American papers regarded as the most important in New York and Los Angeles: the *New York Amsterdam News* and *Los Angeles Sentinel*, respectively. Data collection involved extensive microfilm research, as well as the use of electronic databases such as Lexis-Nexis and Ethnic Newswatch, and included the collection and analysis of every news article from the first twelve weeks of each crisis. All told, there were a total of 2269 news articles in the six newspapers.

News reports from *ABC News* were also collected, but only for the two Rodney King crises. Because transcripts of its news broadcasts are stored on the Lexis-Nexis news database, *ABC News* was the obvious choice among the television news organizations. Unfortunately, this collection of transcripts dates back only to 1990. In fact, systematic collection of television news broadcasts did not begin until 1968, with the establishment of the