Nelu's ukochana,

15 lipca 1962

Dziękuję za kochaną kartkę i życzenia. Taka ładna kartka i Arturka apisz! Ciągle dostajemy różne wycinki o Arturze. Czasto syn przysyła z NY. lub różni przyjaciele. Świetny był niedawno w Herald Tribune. A świetny był ten ogromny interview w Nytimes

With best wishes
for
many happy returns
of the day

i pilnuj się. Co z tą?
Pisz jak możesz, zawsze
radość od ciebie mieć
słowo. My oboje zdy-
cieni, sierpień odpoczy-
wamy bez lekcji, ale w
domu. Wygodnie i dobrze.
Mam nalong klasę na jesień,
nie wiem jak wy dotam.
Całujemy was najdroższych
i kochanych Alinę i Johny
Kochający Wa Iowik.

✻HAPPY✻ BIRTHDAY

w lutym z Henry Brandon. Takie rzeczy pożyczam do czytania zainteresowanym przyjaciołom, b. mi są w drodze. W oddzielnej kopercie posyłam Wam b. ciekawe mowy syna Bronka, które robiły furorę w radiowych operach. Ten Sponsor to Radio TV Magazine i to są kopje z tego przysłane na nasz prośbę. Dużo rozesłałam; b. dumni jesteśmy z syna. Graf-Bron był zachwycony i napisał do niego. Staś znalezie pracuje w dodatku do jobu moc extra godzin lata, odbywa reserve duty. Ale przynosi mu extra zarobek, wyc rad, ale wcale go nie widzimy. Dzieci słodkie i Susie b. kochana. — Martusiu ż ty takie kłopoty miałaś domowe, czy teraz lepiej, czy Alina-córka u nie ci być pomocną w domu? Aha, niech mi Alina i Johny przyślą taką swoją gazetkę o rodzinie Rubinsteinów. Kiedyś przysłali Mateusce i b. wszyscy cieszyliśmy. Nie zamęczaj się bel,

AIR PAR AVION MAIL

KANSAS CITY 16 MO. JUL 15 11 00 AM 1962

Mr. Arthur Rubinstein
22 square de l'avenue Foch
Paris 16me France

W. Kabunski
5801 Grand ave.
Kansas City 13,
Missouri
U.S.A.

SOUND OFF

by STEVE LABUNSKI

Vice Pres. and Gen. Manager, WMCA, N.Y.C.

If, by a freak of nature, newsprint were limited—like broadcasting frequencies—the FCC might be charged with licensing and regulating newspapers. Newton Minow would call newspapers a "vast treshland" with too many comics, horoscopes, and crossword puzzles; too much space devoted to lovelorn advice, horse racing, and circulation contests. The FCC staff would analyze renewal forms dealing with percentages of ad space to editorial content, count "interruptions" (starts on page 1, runs for four column inches, interrupted by 14 pages of ads and diverse matter, etc.), measure "equal space" for candidates, and puzzle over whether a dispatch by The New York Times' Buenos Aires correspondent (not written in New York) should be classified as "live original" or "overseas boilerplate."

STEVE LABUNSKI

Newspapers would have at least one advantage — nobody would seriously consider licensing and regulating a paper he had never read. Clairvoyance, you see, only works in the case of radio stations.

The radio station is a local institution, and at last count almost 4500 AM's and FM's were scattered from Maine to California. So in order to understand how each one serves its particular community, the FCC staff in Washington takes two vital steps:

1. They spend their days reading about "0.8 agriculture," "2.3 discussion," and "13.6 wire commercial";

and

2. They go home evenings and secretly watch television.

This, of course, qualifies them as experts to pass judgment on the job an operator is doing at a station in Mitchell, South Dakota.

What would happen, do you suppose, if the FCC junked all the paper charades, bought several hundred transistor radios, and sent their people into the bright, shiny world outside of Washington to listen to some radio stations? Revolutionary, you say, impossible? Dangerous? But wait—

The FCC would find out, for example, what some radio preachers really say about the Lord and money (not necessarily in that order) in fulfillment of "0.9 religious." They might also discover what a tremendous amount of choice the listener has in markets served by 10, 15, or even 30 radio stations; and unless his hand is broken, how easy it is for him to twist the dial and exercise his free choice. (That might help the FCC understand the regulating role of competition and the nature of popular taste.) And wouldn't it cause some hurried revising of official scorecards if FCC monitors happened upon some small, unpublicized stations performing vigorously and creatively in the public interest — while finding some widely-heralded giants comfortably ensconced on their Peabodys?

A word of reassurance here to those who are ready to protest: "But they'll hear the music we play, and that will be the end! Don't we have enough program directors among wives, clients, and country club friends without letting Ken Cox and Ted Meyers find out about Chubby Checker, too?"

We just have to be philosophical. Many cherished illusions are shattered as we grow up and make progress. We all have to face life's realities sooner or later. Like it or not, one day soon Frank Sinatra will be somebody's grandfather; Mighty Mouse is a fake; and Zsa Zsa Gabor was voted Miss Hungary 11 years before Pearl Harbor! So, too, the FCC will some day have to hear what the music ratings are made of. So be brave and have faith. Besides, once the FCC boys have gotten used to the sunlight, they may even grow to love radio—you know, just like people.

JUST RELEASED

Pictured are the great new DOLTON-LIBERTY LP's, "Twist With The Ventures" (BLP 2010/LST 00101) and "Take Good Care of My Baby" (LRP 3211/LST 7211), featuring Bobby Vee with three smashes as well as nine other sensitive hits. And just picture the fabulous Ventures in a "Twist session."

Turning The Tables

(Editor's Note: Liberty Records is aware of the fact that trade paper editors and music personnel rarely receive personal publicity. Therefore, although uncelebrated by these honorable members of the fourth estate, we will "turn the tables" on them each edition).

THE MUSIC REPORTER of which Charlie Lamb is publisher and managing editor, has its own story to tell. It observed its fifth anniversary in August. What's happened in those five years is best summarized by recognizing that THE MUSIC REPORTER is today one of the most important visas to the music trade. This has taken a lot of doing.

Charlie Lamb says the credit should be divided with two others . . . Anita McInturff is assistant to the publisher and an inferno of ideas and energy. Ray Brooks who has been with the magazine since its start is executive editor who views every news story as an A&R man going into a recording session intent on making the work a masterpiece.

CHARLIE LAMB

Charlie Lamb says it has taken blood, sweat and tears —not as in a war time crisis when the danger is faced and overcome and everybody celebrates afterward, but with new emergencies conquered every day of every week.

Liberty Receives Vatican Communique

Alvin S. Bennett, president of Liberty Records, recently received word from Vatican City from the Pope's secretary of state on behalf of His Holiness. Bennett had dispatched the first copy of "Season's Greetings," forthcoming Liberty premier album, featuring the Felix Slatkin 90 piece orchestra, as a gift to the Holy Father. The letter from Rome received by Bennett at the label's Hollywood offices, expressed the "Pontiff's cordial thankfulness for this gesture of deferential homage."

QUINTET

With the Grand-
hefty consumer accep
lads Of The King," "

BIG BAND PLAYS THE B
Si Zentner And His O
3197/7197

Calcutta; African Waltz;
Don't Run; Apache; Up
River; etc.

Si Zentner's "Big Band Pla
Hits" LP is definitely headed
status. It has already exce
action in L. A., San Fran
Seattle with the news spread
where. Hefty response wa
about by the heavy air play
Lazy River," single from the

BOBBY VEE SINGS H
OF THE ROCKIN' '50
3205/7205

Liberty's youthful pop
Bobby Vee, seems to have hi
gest seller to date in "Rock
Dealer re-orders have been
est.

Shades Of "Route 66"

From left, Dolton Records topper Bob Reisdorff, vocalist Vic Dana and Dick Glasser, head of Metric Publishing Company, Liberty's publishing firm. Dick saw Bob and Vic off on a month's trek along Route 66 in Reisdorff's Corvette, ala the popular TV show. The pair will visit D.J.'s, distributors, etc., on behalf of Dana's single, "Little Altar Boy."

MAY WE BE THE FIRST TO
WISH YOU AND YOURS THE
HAPPIEST OF HOLIDAY SEASONS

THE STAFF AND ARTISTS OF
LIBERTY and DOLTON RECORDS

35 Cents

31

BROADCASTING

THE BUSINESSWEEKLY OF TELEVISION AND RADIO

MAY 7, 1962

Tv network 'spot carrier' shows jeopardized by rep fire, available substitutes 29

Justice Dept., FCC probe racing newscasts as possible aids to gamblers 46

CBS officials attack proposals to screen tv programming 68

WMCA's Labunski offers strong rebuttal to Minow's radio charges 74

Labunski gives Minow sandpaper test

WMCA MANAGER CHARGES FCC CHAIRMAN

WITH LOOSE TALK ABOUT RADIO

Labunski gives Minow sandpaper test

WMCA MANAGER CHARGES FCC CHAIRMAN WITH LOOSE TALK ABOUT RADIO

In the strongest attack yet made on FCC Chairman Newton Minow by a broadcaster, Stephen B. Labunski of WMCA New York charged last week that the chairman not only had "learned very little" about radio but had let his "initial innocence" become "contaminated by a few questionable facts which have led him to numerous improbable conclusions."

Mr. Labunski said Chairman Minow in his NAB convention speech last month misrepresented radio's audience, criticized radio for the same features he advocates for television, underestimated the motives of broadcasters and the services of many small stations, appeared inclined to discriminate in favor of radio networks and while disavowing censorship seemed to urge "unofficial censorship" through the NAB.

Mr. Labunski said he knows some broadcasters "who might really contribute something" to the forthcoming "shirtsleeves session" on radio, advocated by Mr. Minow and supported by NAB, but who "may not attend until Newton Minow starts to talk their language a little better than he has to date."

"I have a terrible feeling," Mr. Labunski said, "that I am on an airplane and Mr. Minow is the pilot. I see him walking up the aisle carrying a book under his arm with the title, 'How to Fly in Ten Easy Lessons.' The book looks as though it hasn't been opened. I wish us all a happy landing."

Mr. Labunski spoke at a luncheon meeting of the Advertising Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., last Wednesday. His speech was broadcast by WBRE and WILK, both Wilkes-Barre, and other stations in the area.

Distorted ▪ The WMCA vice president and general manager said that Mr. Minow "greatly distorted the true picture of radio listening" when he reported that sets in use average 9% or 4.5 million homes in the daytime and 6% or 3 million homes at night.

He said "nobody seems to know" where Mr. Minow got these figures but that "most likely" they are Nielsen per-minute average and in any event they represent a fraction of radio's true dimensions: That Nielsen shows radio reaches more than 47.5 million different homes a week, or almost 39 million homes per day during daytime hours and 24.5 million each night.

"The one place radio, with its undeniably universal accessibility, has not reached is the hallowed halls of the FCC, judging by things which FCC spokesmen have periodically said about the medium," he asserted.

Mr. Labunski challenged the chairman's conclusions regarding the growth of radio from 996 stations in 1946 to 3,451 in 1960:

"Instead of concluding from this that the American people are currently being served by a great variety of radio programs and that the listener might therefore be richer in choice than he had ever been, Mr. Minow immediately went . . . to the conclusion that the quality of radio services had been seriously impaired by the over-abundance of radio stations.

"This is a strange conclusion for Mr. Minow, who has been a prime advocate of greatly expanding the number of television stations in this country for the express purpose of broadening viewer choices and improving programming through the pressure of competition.

"The situation he is advocating for television exists with a vengeance in radio; yet his conclusions about radio are largely couched in negative terms and critical stereotypes with hardly a reference to the industry's ability to flourish during the years of television's greatest expansion and without recognizing those qualities of the radio business which provide a seemingly endless supply of men and women who would like to get into radio despite the known economic hazards which cause one-third of the industry to swallow red ink every year."

Mystified ▪ Mr. Labunski said the FCC chairman was "mystified" because "radio stations do not fade away; they just multiply." This, he said, "simply means that there are a large number of ambitious and enterprising people in our country who are anxious to undertake one of the most exciting and potentially rewarding careers open to them —the radio broadcasting business— combining as it does the satisfactions of communicating with an audience, playing a vital role in one's community and engaging in a highly competitive business enterprise in which the financial rewards for success can be substantial."

Mr. Labunski

He quoted Mr. Minow as referring to radio as "dull, dreary . . . wild . . . raunchy records . . . tasteless chatter . . . rip-snorting, unaccurate news reports." If this is Mr. Minow's total impression of radio, he said, then the chairman "has not done very much representative listening; instead, he has been content to let a well-known critic of radio supply him with his philosophy and, indeed, his choice of words."

The least Mr. Minow could do, he suggested, is invent his "own cliches."

He cited Mr. Minow's commendation of variety in programming, and said: "The fact is that in many major cities variety already exists when you take the radio service as a whole. If this is what the chairman meant, he didn't say so. Instead, he made broadcasters recall the discussion of some time ago about the need for 'program balance' on a station-per-station basis.

"I hope this doesn't mean that every station playing popular music must play some symphonies because, in all fairness, it will also mean that all stations playing symphonies will have to schedule some rhythm-and-blues every now and again. Or does 'program balance' really work only one way—as an instrument to force FCC tastes and preferences on the American people?"

Mr. Labunski agreed that children's programs would be desirable, "provided we find any evidence" that children will listen to this fare. But he cautioned against confusing "children" with "teenagers," whose musical tastes are often criticized. "Perhaps," he suggested, "Mr. Minow could be helpful by suggesting a cut-off age—11, perhaps 12— when 'children's programs' (a worthwhile project) become 'teenage' programs (a not-so-worthwhile project)."

First brush ▪ He found it hard to reconcile Mr. Minow's "conception of low radio usage" with his observation that more people are apt to hear of a news event from radio than from any

other medium. "But let's be charitable," he said, "and assume that he has had his first brush with ratings and that he may learn to interpret them better in the future."

The WMCA vice president found it "inconceivable" that Mr. Minow would suggest that the station-ownership limits might be raised for networks to encourage them to stay in the news and programming business.

He called the idea "patently discriminating" and possibly beyond FCC's jurisdiction—although, he said, it obviously would entitle his own company, the Straus Broadcasting Group, to "a subsidy" for its Radio Press International, a voiced news service.

"In effect," he said, "Mr. Minow is proposing that the FCC bolster the radio networks, which it does not regulate, through the device of expanding their ownership of stations, which the FCC does regulate. Why not suggest that newspapers be allowed to own more radio stations? Many of them are in deep financial trouble and some profitable radio stations might keep *them* in business as well. I am afraid that Mr. Minow is a dreamer—he hopes that by increasing the size of the library reading room he is going to get more people to read the right books."

Of Chairman Minow's belief that there are too many commercials and that stations should join NAB and subscribe to its Code, he said: "Does this mean that no station which does not subscribe to the Code has standards which are at least as good—or better? . . . The NAB already has urged television networks to allow them to prescreen upcoming programs, and from this point it's but a short step to suggesting something similar for radio stations.

"Mr. Minow keeps insisting that he is opposed to FCC censorship, yet he seems to be toying with a form of unofficial censorship through the NAB."

Mr. Labunski said that some broadcasters already have high standards and that "others, under pressure of increasing competition, will sooner or later recognize the need for them." He said "Mr. Minow can add his encouragement to this trend if he will but first come to know and understand the radio business as it really is and talk to radio broadcasters in radio terms. . . . This would be a perfectly proper role for the chairman of the FCC to play, but he must first establish an understanding and a rapport with broadcasters which are now so obviously lacking."

Reason for Being ▪ He said the FCC chairman "may be right" in questioning whether tiny radio stations "with a staff of a combo man and the owner" can serve as a communications medium in the public interest. But, he added, "I remind him that in 900 American communities served by radio stations, there is no daily newspaper service. Maybe the radio station is all that community has to keep in touch with the rest of the world. Some of these tiny am stations with a combo man and the owner, struggling to survive every new day, do an outstanding job in serving their communities. . . .

"Does Mr. Minow propose that we obliterate small, struggling stations and depend on the networks and other industry giants to spread the word? Is it the purpose of a regulatory agency to encourage monopoly, permit mergers under which the strong gobble up the weak, all the while proclaiming undying dedication to private enterprise and the need for varied, diverse, community-oriented programming and news services?"

Mr. Labunski also challenged Chairman Minow's assertion that broadcasters are reluctant to face members of their audiences in local hearings:

"Alas, Mr. Minow is confusing *audience* with *spokesmen* . . . Broadcasters are understandably leery about being put on the carpet by special-interest groups with their self-appointed and self-righteous spokesmen who, often without benefit of popular election or recognizable mandate, purport to speak for audience groups. It is at best a very superficial view of life, as any elected public official will tell you."

BROADCASTING

THE BUSINESSWEEKLY OF TELEVISION AND RADIO

Executive and Publication Headquarters
1735 DeSales Street, Washington 6, D. C.
Bureaus: New York, Chicago, Hollywood

Published every Monday for broadcasters, advertisers and their agencies, and the allied services of the business and art of broadcasting. Founded in 1931, it is the recognized source of news, ideas and information in the burgeoning tv/radio field.

Whether, as a reader, you want to keep current with the broadcast media . . . or, as an advertiser, you have something to tell or sell, you'll get more of what you need, faster, through BROADCASTING. It's THE Businessweekly of Television and Radio. Annual domestic subscription $7.00—with Yearbook $11.00.

SPONSOR

THE WEEKLY MAGAZINE RADIO/TV ADVERTISERS USE

YOU'RE WRONG, MR. MINOW, SAYS A RADIO BROADCASTER

A broadcaster speaks out

In this issue we are printing in full the remarkably forthright and vigorous speech delivered last week in Wilkes-Barre by Stephen B. Labunski, executive v.p. and general manager, WMCA New York.

We urge every one of our readers to read and study Steve's remarks carefully. They are the courageous, hard-hitting, but thoughtful and analytical opinions of a man who thoroughly understands radio and is completely dedicated to the medium.

Even more important, they represents one of the few occassions in the history of the industry when a licensed broadcaster has stood up and expressed himself, publicly and at length, in opposition to the views of an FCC Chairman.

For this reason alone, it is an historic speech. We need many more of such forthright expressions.

YOU'RE WRONG, MR. MINOW,

Stephen Labunski, WMCA, New York, offers vigorous refutation of FCC Chairman's NAB radio speech

Veteran broadcaster challenges both Minow's facts and ideas on radio in address to Wilkes-Barre ad club

Last week, on 2 May, the Advertising Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., heard one of the most outspoken attacks ever delivered by a broadcaster against an FCC Chairman. The speaker was Stephen Labunski, executive vice president and general manager, WMCA, New York. The attack was on Chairman Newton Minow's NAB radio speech given at the convention in Chicago, 1-4 April. Here is Labunski's address in full.

REBUTTAL to FCC given by Stephen Labunski, exec. v.p. and gen. mgr., WMCA, N.Y.

You can take the same set of facts and put different interpretations on them. There was a story doing the rounds during the last Olympic Games about the two-man foot race between the Russian and the American, which the American won. The Soviet press, however, acclaimed their athlete as a great hero, explaining that while he had come in second, the American had run next to last.

I am afraid that the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission suffers a little from the same malady, although obviously not for the same reasons. He does, however, take a set of facts about radio and, in a speech before the National Association of Broadcasters on 3 April, draws some mighty peculiar conclusions. Mr. Minow quoted some figures on radio homes and radio usage which people in the industry found hard to understand. He said, among other things, that in 1961 we had 50 million radio homes, but that sets in use during the day averaged 9 per cent, thereby reaching 4,500,000 homes; and during the evening sets in use averaged only 6 per cent, reaching 3 million homes. I have asked a number of people since then, including experts in the research business, where he might have gotten such a set of figures. Nobody seems to know. Most likely, these are Nielsen figures on per-minute averages, but whatever the case, they greatly distort the true picture of radio listening today. Assuming that the source is Nielsen, this same source says that radio reaches more than 47½ million different U. S. homes each week—almost 39 million homes every day during the daytime, and 24½ million homes every evening. At any given moment a typist is using only one finger with which to hit a key, but no one measures a typist's performance by anything except the use of all ten fingers. In effect, the Chairman views radio in about 1/10th of its true dimensions, and it is not surprising, therefore, that this has led him to some strange conclusions.

The FCC Chairman, however, did concede that some outside listening took place and that, in fact, radio had spread to the kitchen, the bedroom, the workbench, the office, the automobile, the fishing camp, and the mountain trail. The one place radio, with its undeniably universal accessibility, has not reached is the hallowed halls of the Federal Communications Commission — judging by things which FCC spokesmen have periodically said about the medium.

In comparing the use of television to the use of radio, Mr. Minow spoke of the "massive section of the mass audience (which had) deserted radio for television." Here he made the old mistake of assuming that every viewer acquired by television was necessarily a listener lost to radio. Perhaps Mr. Minow himself has stopped listening to the radio and has become a television viewer only, but there is a great deal of evidence that this is not the case with other people. Many of the same people do some television viewing, some radio listening, some newspaper reading—attending one communications medium does not preclude some overlap in viewing-listening-reading habits.

Mr. Minow spent a good deal of time lamenting the prolific growth of radio stations in the last 15 or 16 years. His figures are doubtless correct when he says that in 1946 there were 996 am stations excluding those owned and operated by the networks, and that in 1960 there were 3,451 such am stations. But instead of concluding from this that the American people were currently being served by a great variety of radio programs and that the listener might

SAYS A RADIO BROADCASTER

Labunski sees danger if radio men follow Minow

"If radio broadcasters are in as much trouble as Mr. Minow says they are, and if they now follow his implied program suggestions and stay away from the things he apparently doesn't like, they are almost guaranteed to have more trouble than before. You may consider it unfortunate or not, but the American people simply do not listen to a radio station for program 'categories' which look good on paper in Washington, D. C., headquarters of the FCC. The people who listen to radio, far more than Mr. Minow imagines—and probably for different reasons—have various choices, among which is the ever-present one of being able to turn their radios off completely."

therefore be richer in choices than he had ever been, Mr. Minow immediately went from this statement to the conclusion that the quality of radio services had been seriously impaired by the over-abundance of radio stations. This is a strange conclusion for Mr. Minow, who has been a prime advocate of greatly expanding the number of television stations in this country for the express purpose of broadening viewer choices and improve programing through the pressure of competition.

The situation he is advocating for television exists with a vengeance in radio; yet, his conclusions about radio are largely couched in negative terms and critical stereotypes with hardly a reference to the industry's ability to flourish during the years of television's greatest expansion and without recognizing those qualities of the radio business which provide a seemingly endless supply of men and women who would like to get into radio despite the known economic hazards which cause one-third of the industry to swallow red ink every year. The FCC Chairman is mystified by this phenomenon: ". . . but we are finding that in our competitive system radio stations seem to have no mortality rate," he says. ". . . few radio stations ever decide —voluntarily—to leave the air. Radio stations do not fade away; they just multiply." I have known this a long time but find it not at all puzzling. It simply means that there are a large number of ambitious and enterprising people in our country who are anxious to undertake one of the most exciting and potentially rewarding careers open to them—the radio broadcasting business—combining, as it does, the satisfactions of communicating with an audience, playing a vital role in one's community, and engaging in a highly competitive business enterprise in which the financial rewards for success can be substantial.

Furthermore, if you truly believe in private enterprise, you welcome the competition of new ideas and of an ever-widening market. The fruits of private enterprise, as they apply to radio, make Mr. Minow cringe as he describes his reaction to radio stations: "dull, dreary, full of decay and desolation . . . wild as a hurricane—blasting off continually with an insane symphony of sound and fury—signifying *what?* . . . plagued by too many bills, too few accounts, and too little audience? . . . destined to sink into a rut of raunchy records, tasteless chatter by adolescent disc jockeys, and rip-snorting, inaccurate news reports?" If this is his total impression of radio, Mr. Minow has not done very much representative listening; instead, he has been content to let a well-known critic of radio supply him with his philosophy and, indeed, his choice of words.

What is an "insane symphony of sound and fury," Mr. Chairman?

What is a "rip-snorting, inaccurate news report," Mr. Chairman?

Do you mean that well-chosen sound effects designed to interest and attract the listener so offend you that you call it "an insane symphony"? Is it wrong for a broadcaster trying to get his listeners to pay closer attention to news broadcasts to use the ordinary devices of showmanship on the air?

Is "rip-snorting, inaccurate news" the same as "rip and read"? Do you mean that the wire services transmit "inaccurate news" and that stations, by not editing it, are compounding the felony?

Have mercy, Mr. Chairman; this industry has enough stereotypes and well-worn cliches as it is without having you prolong their life. You are a better phrase-maker than most critics of popular media—at least try to invent your own cliches.

What little good Mr. Minow finds in radio he describes thus: "Sometimes a listener is treated to exceptionally varied fare of well-prepared newscasts, imaginative entertainment, a drama, a children's program, enlightening commentary, breathtaking variety."

Let us interpret this a bit. Out of the items Mr. Minow names, two of them point to variety as an absolute virtue. The assumption here is that every station must offer variety for its own sake. While we agree that every station is wise to vary its appeals in order to improve its services and strengthen itself competitively, the problem is not as simple as it may seem. The fact is that in many major cities variety already exists when you take the radio service as a whole. If this is what the Chairman meant, he didn't say so. Instead, he made broadcasters recall the discussion of some time ago about the need for "program balance" on a station-per-station basis. I hope this doesn't mean that every station playing popular music must play some symphonies because, in all fairness, it will also mean that all stations playing symphonies will have to schedule some rhythm and blues every now and again. Or does "program balance" really work only one way—as an instrument to force FCC tastes and preferences on the American people? I don't know where Mr. Minow heard a drama on radio, but in case he hadn't been told, drama is a bit more exciting on television, and most radio broadcasters recognized this a long time ago. As for children's programs, I am all in favor of them, being associated with a company which was one of the first to experiment in this field, provided we find any evidence that children can be attracted to radio for this kind of fare. It is certainly worth thinking about.

children's programs

One word of caution here—prudent radio broadcasters must not confuse so-called "children's programs" with entertainment programs which might appeal, among other people, to teenagers. Anybody who has programed music considered to have such an appeal knows that this is an unfashionable course to follow. So perhaps Mr. Minow could be helpful by suggesting a cut-off age—11, perhaps 12—when "children's programs" (a worth-while project) become "teenage" programs (a not-so-worth-while project).

If radio broadcasters are in as much trouble as Mr. Minow says they are, and if they now follow his implied program suggestions and stay away from the things he apparently doesn't like, they are almost guaranteed to have more trouble than before. You may consider it unfortunate or not, but the American people simply do not listen to a radio station for program "categories" which look good on paper in Washington, D. C., headquarters of the FCC. The people who listen to radio far more than Mr. Minow imagines—and probably for different reasons—have various choices, among which is the ever-present one of being able to turn their radios off completely.

Here and there Mr. Minow came close to some important realizations. He did say "Radio's function as a news medium is of essential value to this country. More people are apt to hear of a major news event from radio than from any other medium of communication."

(This fact is hard to reconcile with Mr. Minow's conception of low radio usage, but let's be charitable and assume that he has had his first brush with ratings and that he may learn to interpret them better in the future.)

His only conclusion from this recognition of radio's unique ability to disseminate news was that the radio networks ought to be allowed to own more radio stations than any other licensees so that they would be better able to stay in the news-gathering business. Now Mr. Minow is a lawyer and I am not, but it is inconceivable to me that such a proposition could stand up in court when it is patently discriminatory in treating one licensee differently from another on such a basic matter as ownership limitation. This idea may even be outside the jurisdiction of the FCC. In effect, Mr. Minow is proposing that the FCC bolster the radio networks, which it does not regulate, through the device of expanding their ownership of stations, which the FCC does regulate. Why not suggest that newspapers be allowed to own more radio stations? Many of them are in deep financial trouble and some profitable radio stations might keep *them* in business as well. I am afraid that Mr. Minow is a dreamer—he hopes that by increasing the size of the library reading room he is going to get more people to read the right books.

I must say truthfully that this suggestion—while distressing in what it reveals about Mr. Minow's thinking—would be very attractive to our company, the Straus Broadcasting Group. We own and operate Radio Press International, a voice news service with over 100 station subscribers on the North American continent. RPI furnishes the same kind of news to its independent subscribers as the networks do to their affiliates. Despite the fact that RPI would obviously be in line for a subsidy under Mr. Minow's plan, we still view it as a discriminatory proposal.

The most publicity was given to Mr. Minow's complaints about commercials. He thought there were too many. His suggestion was that everybody join the NAB and follow the Code. Governor LeRoy Collins of the NAB didn't let any grass grow under his feet. He was quick to propose that advertisers in effect blacklist stations which do not subscribe to the NAB Code.

another code

Does this mean that no station which does not subscribe to the Code has standards which are at least as good—or better? Aren't there any competent doctors who don't belong

to the AMA? I don't know if anyone has explained this to Mr. Minow, but the NAB is only one of several private industry organizations. While industry organizations perform certain useful functions—whether in broadcasting, medicine, or steel—we seriously question whether among these useful functions is playing the role of arbiter of moral standards or censor of programing content. The NAB has already urged television networks to allow them to pre-screen upcoming programs, and from this point it's but a short step to suggesting something similar for radio stations. Mr. Minow keeps insisting that he is opposed to FCC censorship, yet he seems to be toying with a form of unofficial censorship.

But as I said—I too am concerned about commercials and the real problem of over-commercialization in radio. As a matter of fact, last Sunday I was listening to a radio station which carried too many commercials, and I wanted to twist the dial. Unfortunately, I had picked up the *New York Times* that morning and had sprained my wrist lifting its hundreds of pages of ads off the front steps—so I couldn't exercise the free choice which all other listeners had at that moment.

But to be serious again, I am keenly aware of the dangers of over-commercialization in radio. The simple solution seems to be to establish a numerical limit on commercial units and hope for the best—that the programing which carries this commercial content will magically improve with the change. A more positive solution—albeit far more complicated—might be to begin thinking in terms of certain minimum program standards: if a radio station plays a certain amount of music in order to entertain and to compete; if a radio station schedules a certain number of news broadcasts throughout the day; if in addition a radio station makes sure that community needs are met on a regularly-scheduled, non-preemptible basis, the major part of the commercial limitation problem would take care of itself. How, you might reasonably ask, can we be assured that broadcasters will develop such a broadcast philosophy and maintain such operating principles? Some broadcasters already have such standards; others, under pressure of increasing competition, will sooner or later recognize the need for them. Mr. Minow can add his encouragement to this trend if he will but first come to know and understand the radio business as it really is and talk to radio broadcasters in radio terms. Only then will he be in a position to exert the kind of influence he would like to see applied to the improvement of radio broadcasting services everywhere. This would be a perfectly proper role for the Chairman of the FCC to play, but he must first establish an understanding and a rapport with broadcasters which are now so obviously lacking.

In discussing financial qualifications of marginal radio stations Mr. Minow suggests that we are kidding ourselves when we expect "a tiny am station with a staff of a combo man and the owner to serve as a communications medium serving the public interest." He may be right, but I reminded him that in 900 American communities served by radio stations, there is no daily newspaper service. Maybe the radio station is all that community has to keep in touch with the rest of the world. Some of these tiny am stations with a combo man and the owner, struggling to survive every new day, do an outstanding job in serving their communities. Their size may have little to do with their ability to entertain, to inform, to broadcast news, and to be the watchdog in the community—exposing the town's scandals, keeping score on the promises of elected officials, and protecting the public from isolation, ignorance, and darkness.

Does Mr. Minow propose that we obliterate small, struggling stations and depend on the networks and other industry giants to spread the word? Is it the purpose of a regulatory agency to encourage monopoly, permit mergers under which the strong gobble up the weak, all the while proclaiming undying dedication to private enterprise and the need for varied, community-oriented programing and news services?

community hearings

On the matter of community hearings such as the ones recently held in Chicago, Mr. Minow warned the broadcasters that they had better prepare themselves for more of the same. He chided broadcasters for being afraid to face their listeners and to hear their comments and opinions. Unfortunately, he concluded this portion of his talk with the following admonition: "If some broadcasters regard these citizens [church, civic, business, educational, labor and charitable leaders] as fanatics and loud-mouths, if this is their view of their audience, I suggest that they may be in the wrong business." Alas, Mr. Minow is confusing *audience* with *spokesmen*. The broadcaster deals with his audience every day in hundreds of ways. That is not the issue. Broadcasters are understandably leery about being put on the carpet by special-interest groups with their self-appointed and self-righteous spokesmen who, often without benefit of popular election or recognizable mandate, purport to speak for audience groups. It is at best a very superficial view of life, as any elected public will tell you. It is the individual mail from home and barbecues back in the home district which keeps a congressman in touch with his constituency. He soon learns not to pay too much attention to the visiting delegations with petitions all signed with similar handwriting.

At this stage in the speech the radio broadcasters must have felt that they had had enough for one afternoon, especially after the kind of lunch you get in a big Chicago hotel during a convention. But Mr. Minow fed them a little dessert. He referred to his speech last fall before the Radio and Television Executives Society in New York, in which he had urged television broadcasters to sit and watch their stations for 24 hours as a test of their endurance and in order to cause them to revolt against the programing which they were furnishing the American people. Mr. Minow had further suggested to broadcasters on that occasion that they break out of the enslavement of ratings and try their own private tastes for a change.

To suggest seriously that broadcasters impose their private tastes on the American people is a prime example of the abuse of any mass medium. A mass medium doesn't exist for the entertainment of the station operator and his family. It exists and is licensed as a public communications vehicle. How on the one

hand you can argue for knowing and serving the tastes, needs, and interests of your listening area and on the other hand propose that you abandon these efforts and make your radio or television station a mirror of your private notions, is beyond comprehension.

Nobody would reasonably argue that popular taste alone is the standard for all programs on radio and television. Every responsible broadcaster recognizes that he has an affirmative duty to try to broaden tastes and expose people to new ideas —and, in so doing, to seek and weigh the views and opinions of community leaders and representative individuals. In evaluating such views and opinions, however, he must recognize two important considerations. One is that popular tastes will not change at the wave of a magic wand. They change slowly. You can keep moving the train forward and urge citizens to jump aboard, but you can't drive it so fast that only a few manage to get on. Having said this, let me add that the realities of popular taste do not absolve broadcasters from exercising leadership, and this is the second consideration. From time to time we must move ahead of our listeners—as effective political leaders must move ahead of the electorate—even though it might be easier in either case to let the public govern the pace and to be content merely to reflect existing tastes or preferences. Those who kid themselves about popular taste are destined for the boneyard—those who use popular taste as a permanent excuse never to pioneer, never to experiment, and never to progress are not filling their responsibilities as licensees.

You must admit that this is a more complicated approach than doing what Mr. Minow suggests—limiting commercials, programing to your own tastes and assuming the public will respond.

The problem of popular taste and broadcasters' leadership is one that we live with every day. You must know and understand popular taste, and you must recognize it as a force which, as a practical matter, governs the speed with which you can change or "uplift" people's standards.

It seems as though there is going to be some "shirtsleeve session" involving representative broadcasters and the FCC. I don't know who is going to attend, but I do know that some broadcasters who might really contribute something may not attend until Newton Minow starts to talk their language a little better than he has to date. Mr. Minow has been Chairman of the FCC long enough to have acquired some knowledge of the radio business, but sadly, he has learned very little and, if anything, his initial innocence has been contaminated by a few questionable facts which have led him to numerous improbable conclusions. I have a terrible feeling that I am on an airplane and Mr. Minow is the pilot. I see him walking up the aisle carrying a book under his arm with the title, "How to Fly in Ten Easy Lessons." The book looks as though it hasn't been opened. I wish us all a happy landing.