Minow's Viewers: Understanding the Response to the "Vast Wasteland" Address

James L. Baughman*

On May 9, 1961, Newton N. Minow, the new chairman of the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC" or "Commission"), gave what is probably the most famous speech ever delivered by the head of an American regulatory agency. It remains the single most searing indictment of television. Before the National Association of Broadcasters ("NAB"), Minow challenged his listeners to watch television all day, something he had made himself do one Saturday before coming to Washington. "I can assure you that you will observe a vast wasteland."[1]

More than a harsh criticism of television programming, the speech carried the promise of change. Minow reminded his listeners, most of whom operated broadcast stations, that the FCC had the authority to make them alter their programming practices. "[T]he people own the air," he remarked. "For every hour that the people give you, you owe them something. I intend to see that your debt is paid with service."[2] This would

* James L. Baughman is professor of journalism and mass communication at the University of Wisconsin—Madison. He is the author of *Television's Guardians: The Federal Communications Commission and the Politics of Programming, 1958-67* (1985).

1. Newton N. Minow, Television and the Public Interest, Speech Before the National Association of Broadcasters (May 9, 1961) [hereinafter Vast Wasteland Speech]; Letter from Albert P. Weisman, Public Relations Director, Foote, Cone & Belding, to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (Apr. 12, 1961) (Minow Papers, box 26, on file with the Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, Wis.). Subsequent references within this Essay to the "Minow Papers" will refer to papers on file with the Wisconsin Historical Society. References to the "FCC Papers" will refer to FCC archives on file with the General Services Administration, Invoice 63A83, Washington, D.C.

2. Vast Wasteland Speech, *supra* note 1.

not involve censoring specific programs. Minow pledged "no suppression of programming which does not meet with bureaucratic tastes."[3] Rather, the chairman cited the Commission's traditional, if listlessly enforced, policy that stations, when seeking the renewal of their licenses, document their record of public-service programming. "[M]any people feel that in the past licenses were often renewed *pro forma*. I say to you now: renewal will not be *pro forma* in the future. There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license."[4]

Minow's address created a sensation. "Your speech is still reverberating," wrote his political mentor, Adlai E. Stevenson, on May 25, 1961, "and your fame growing more rapidly than your troubles!"[5] Indeed, the Chairman's remarks did generate extensive news coverage, far more than the press normally had allotted a regulatory agency the previous eight years. More stories, columns, editorials, and broadcast interviews followed. In fact, in 1961, no other member of the new Kennedy administration, except the president himself, made more television and radio appearances than Minow. The Associated Press's survey of editors chose him as the year's top newsmaker.[6] Such reportage introduced him (and his agency) to millions of Americans, and some 4000 wrote the chairman, most in support of his position. A Commission analysis of the first 2542 communications received indicated that 2049, or 80.6% of those writing, completely agreed with the chairman's sentiments. Only fifty-five dissented.[7]

The speech itself had much to do with its impact. FCC Chairmen routinely spoke at the NAB's annual convention. They were bland, forgettable exercises delivered by bland career bureaucrats. James Lawrence Fly, who had chaired the Commission from 1939-44, had attacked broadcasters and radio programming, including soap operas.[8] But Fly had been the great exception. "A bold scout for the New Frontier," wrote a *Washington Star* columnist, "has broken with a thunderclap

3. *Id.*

4. *Id.*

5. Letter from Adlai E. Stevenson to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 25, 1961) (Stevenson Papers, box 833, on file with Princeton University).

6. Timothy J. Gilfoyle, *Corporate Consciences: Interviews with John H. Bryan and Newton N. Minow*, 29 CHICAGO HIST. 58, 62 (Summer 2000).

7. Jack D. Warren, Analysis of Letters Received in Response to Chairman Minow's Address to the NAB (n.d.) (Minow Papers, box 29).

8. Michael J. Socolow, To Network a Nation: N.B.C., C.B.S. and the Development of National Network Radio in the United States, 1925-1950, chs. 3-4 (2001) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University) (on file with Georgetown University). A year before Minow's May 9, 1961, speech, his immediate predecessor had addressed the NAB and had made some of the same points, but much more mildly. Frederick W. Ford, Address Before the National Association of Broadcasters (Apr. 5, 1960) (on file with Journal).

through the barriers of do-nothingness which time and official timidity have erected around the independent agencies of the Government."[9] As a political scientist told Minow, "[Y]ou are just about the only Commissioner in years who has openly told the truth in the plain language about the quality of American TV programming."[10]

Like Stevenson, the Democratic party's 1952 and 1956 presidential nominee, Minow took public address seriously.[11] Many Americans admired Stevenson for his rhetorical skills more than any other aspect of his candidacy. His speech accepting the Democratic nomination in 1952 was widely praised. Even more noteworthy, however, and relevant to an analysis of Minow's NAB speech, was Stevenson's August 1952 address to the American Legion's national convention. In one of his first major appearances after being nominated, Stevenson faced and chose to challenge a hostile crowd. Most Legionnaires were expected to support Stevenson's Republican opponent. And most even more keenly practiced a fervent anti-communism. Two years earlier, the Legion had recommended that all members of the Communist Party be tried for treason. On the local level, Legionnaires had monitored the patriotism of public school teachers and librarians.[12] Rather than cultivate the Legionnaires' good will by, for example, emphasizing his support for veterans benefits, Stevenson attacked their strident anti-communism. "The tragedy of our day is the climate of fear in which we live, and fear breeds repression," he remarked. "Too often sinister threats to the Bill of Rights, to freedom of the mind, are concealed under the patriotic cloak of anti-communism."[13]

9. Doris Fleeson, *A Call for Improved Television*, WASH. STAR, May 11, 1961, at A15.

10. Letter from Bruce Lannes Smith, Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (June 20, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 242).

11. He recruited a former Stevenson speechwriter, John Bartlow Martin, to help write his NAB address; Martin coined the "vast wasteland" line. Draft 1 (JBM) of Speech to National Association of Broadcasters, May, 1961, at 5 (Minow Papers, box 28) (copy on file with Journal). An aide, Tedson Meyers, another Stevenson supporter, also worked on the speech; at the same time, Stanley Frankel, a Minow friend, drafted yet another version, portions of which appear to have been used. Interview with Tedson J. Meyers in Washington, D.C. (June 30, 1981); Letter from Stanley A. Frankel, Vice President, McCall Corp., to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (Mar. 23, 1961) (Minow Papers, box 28); John Bartlow Martin, draft of speech written by Martin for Newton N. Minow's May 9, 1961, speech to the National Association of Broadcasters (Minow Papers, box 28).

12. M.J. HEALE, AMERICAN ANTICOMMUNISM: COMBATING THE ENEMY WITHIN, 1830-1970, 173-74, 177, 187 (1990).

13. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, MAJOR CAMPAIGN SPEECHES OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON 20-21 (1952). *See* JOHN BARTLOW MARTIN, ADLAI STEVENSON OF ILLINOIS: THE LIFE OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON 653-56 (1976) (containing material on the speech's drafting and Legionnaires' response). Minow had just joined Stevenson's gubernatorial staff and was not directly involved in preparing the Legion address. *Id*. at 525, 629.

Minow was similarly confrontational. The same speech, delivered to a national parents group for "better" television, would not have possessed the same news value. The FCC Chairman would have been preaching to the choir. At the same time, several journalists covering the meeting proved to be powerful publicists. Val Adams's account of the speech appeared on page 1 of the May 10 *The New York Times*. Jack Gould, *The Times*'s respected television columnist, wrote an admiring analysis of the address.[14] *The Washington Post*, *Detroit Free Press*, *The Miami Herald*, and *New York Herald Tribune* gave Minow's speech similar treatment. Within days, other large newspapers followed.[15]

Such editorial judgments conveyed the extent to which television had become a part of the national culture. In early 1961, nearly nine out of ten households had one or more televisions. Television viewing had eclipsed every other form of mass entertainment. The public, Minow remarked later in the year, "spends more time now with television than it does on anything else except working and sleeping."[16]

Television had triumphed over the older mass media despite offering relatively few choices. In most viewing areas, consumers could select from three channels, each of which was affiliated with a network. In 1961, 95% of all stations were affiliated with one of the three networks.[17] The largest markets, including New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, had independent stations—ones without network affiliation. These channels telecast sporting events, old feature films, and reruns of network series.[18] Educational stations operated in some communities. But in January 1961, less than 10% of the nation's 579 television channels were non-commercial.[19] Many large cities, including New York, Los Angeles, Cleveland, and Washington, D.C., lacked non-commercial channels. Along the East Coast, one

14. Val Adams, *F.C.C. Head Bids TV Men Reform 'Vast Wasteland': Minow Charges Failure in Public Duty—Threatens to Use License Power*, N.Y. TIMES, MAY 10, 1961, at 1, 91, Jack Gould, *TV: Withering Critique: Minow's Condemnation of Imbalance in Programing Stuns Many Broadcasters*, N.Y. TIMES, May 10, 1961, at 91. *See also* JACK GOULD, WATCHING TELEVISION COME OF AGE (Lewis L. Gould ed., 2002) (containing material on Gould).

15. JAMES L. BAUGHMAN, TELEVISION'S GUARDIANS: THE FCC AND THE POLITICS OF PROGRAMMING 1958-1967, 65-68 (1985).

16. Saul Carson, *Television and Your Place in the Picture*, THEATRE ARTS, Dec. 1961, at 78. On the distribution of television in 1961, see CHRISTOPHER H. STERLING AND TIMOTHY R. HAIGHT, THE MASS MEDIA: ASPEN INSTITUTE GUIDE TO COMMUNICATION INDUSTRY TRENDS 372 (1978).

17. STERLING AND HAIGHT, *supra* note 16, at 53.

18. Earl C. Gottschalk Jr., *TV Station in Oakland Does Fine with Shows Networks Had Before*, WALL ST. J., Mar. 4, 1982, at 1; George Maksian, *Forty Candles for WPIX*, N.Y. DAILY NEWS, June 13, 1988, at 38.

19. STERLING AND HAIGHT, *supra* note 16, at 49.

educational television ("ETV") station, located in Philadelphia, operated between Boston and Chapel Hill, North Carolina. ETV stations, usually closely tied to a university or public school system, had limited schedules of pedantic programs. They drew few viewers. One supporter confessed: "Educational television today is like oatmeal: vaguely good for you, but a little hard to take."[20]

The commercial networks' hegemony prompted many of those who cheered Minow's critique. Applauding Minow's efforts in August 1961, the national board of the American Civil Liberties Union concluded that "the monopolistic nature of the [broadcasting] industry necessitates government supervision."[21] "The network leadership takes millions from the public air space," wrote former FCC Chairman Fly. "This is only an added reason why any indolence and arrogance on their part toward the public's vital interest are not to be tolerated."[22]

An examination of the letters Minow received after his NAB talk, however, suggests that most of those writing worried less about the structure of the TV industry than its performance. Although Minow himself had expected most of his correspondents to be mothers concerned about television's effects on children, more men than women wrote the chairman.[23] And they expressed a broader discontent.

The Chairman's supporters had concluded, not altogether wrongly, that the television networks and stations had become obsessed with reaching the largest possible number of viewers during the broadcast day. In the process, they had essentially disenfranchised those who preferred other types of shows. Until the mid-1950s, each network had self-consciously dedicated portions of its schedule to cultural and news programming. In most instances, such efforts had not commanded high ratings. Yet they had appealed to what insiders dubbed "light viewers." Frequently better educated and more well-to-do than the average viewer,

20. Louis Cowan, *Excellence and the Good Life: A Proposal on Educational Television* (Jan. 1963) (Minow Papers, box 10). Echoing Cowan was Hartford N. Gunn, Jr., General Manager of Boston's ETV station. Hartford N. Gunn, Jr., *The Future of Educational Television: Analysis and Recommendations*, 28-30 (Dec. 20, 1962) (Minow Papers, box 45). On ETV in the early 1960s, see JOHN WALKER POWELL, CHANNELS OF LEARNING: THE STORY OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION 155 (1962) and Ithiel de Sola Pool & Barbara Adler, *Educational Television: Is Anyone Watching?*, 18 J. SOC. ISSUES, no. 2, 1962, at 50.

21. *FCC Crop Control for TV "Wasteland" Sprouts Debate*, 8 THE BRIEF, Jan. 1962, at 1.

22. James Lawrence Fly, *The Network Bluff*, THE NATION, Mar. 10, 1962, at 210, 212.

23. Jack Warren's analysis of the first 2542 letters received indicated that 63.2% of Minow's correspondents whose gender were known were male. Warren, *supra* note 7. *See also ABC's Issues and Answers* (ABC television broadcast, June 18, 1961) (transcript of interview with Newton N. Minow, located in Minow Papers, box 46).

they consumed relatively little television. By 1961, however, they reported watching even less. Increasing competition among the networks, as well as pressure from national advertisers, caused reductions in telecasts for light viewers. Three programming fads—the big-money quiz shows, the "adult" western, then the detective series—had displaced many culturally ambitious programs. The most notable casualties were hours dedicated to original dramas, virtually all of which left the air, and CBS's news program, *See It Now*.[24] Not all programming for light viewers was canceled. In fact, the networks increased their news telecasts partly in response to criticisms that followed revelations, late in 1959, that many of the big-money quiz shows had been rigged.[25] Yet some correspondents were doubtful. "The alleged 'sweeping reforms' which were to follow the quiz program scandals never materialized," wrote a New York City woman.[26] Others still longed for an earlier period in TV's short history. "Ten years ago when T.V. was just beginning, before the advertizers [sic] had come into such complete control, the medium was a delight with programs like 'Studio 1' and the 'G.E. Theater' in its hour long version," wrote a Pennsylvania woman. "Now, with the exception of a few newscasts, which are excellent, television has become just the American version of the Roman games; blood, gore, sadism and all!"[27]

Many of Minow's correspondents shared the perception that television had become too much of a mass medium. "We've owned a TV set only since 1956," a Baltimore man wrote, "but in that time we've seen [the] so-called balance of programs become a rat race to see who can make the most money off of more and more categorized items in the same narrow list."[28] A young Ohio journalist observed a difference after two years in the Navy: "I've noticed a definite change for the worst since my return."[29] The flood of western series angered a Fresno State College student. "I am sick

24. Gilbert Seldes, *Indignation Is Not Enough*, SATURDAY REV., Aug. 16, 1958, at 25; BAUGHMAN, *supra* note 15, at 21-29. Hubbell Robinson, Executive Vice President of CBS, admitted such complaints had some validity. *See* Hubbell Robinson, *TV's Myopia of the Wide Screen*, 50 ESQUIRE, Jul. 1958, at 21, 23-24.

25. BAUGHMAN, *supra* note 15, at 49-51.

26. Letter from Mrs. L.L. Robinson to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 13, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239).

27. Letter from Barbara Raphael to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 22, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 241).

28. Letter from Floyd A. Spencer to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 12, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239).

29. Letter from John A. Stratton to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (June 21, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 242).

of the cow country," he informed the Chairman.[30] Nor did the daytime schedule provide any relief to some correspondents. A Virginia homemaker asked him to do something for "the poor housewife who would like to watch television during daytime while doing dull housework with the children at school. The only choice we have is between asinine give-away programs and soap operas, all shows made for half wits."[31]

Although angry, most of Minow's viewers had modest demands, that the networks offer *some* programs appealing to them. "It isn't too difficult to understand the fact that many people enjoy rather mediocre programs such as the westerns, for the purpose of pure relaxation from stress," a California woman wrote, "but do we have to be deluged every evening, every hour with such mediocrity?"[32] Terming Minow's speech "manna from heaven," a Long Island man asked only for "freedom of choice on T.V. during prime evening time. Let the cowboy and adventure programs remain, *but not on every channel at the same time*."[33]

Affiliated stations often added to the frustration. Some failed to carry less popular news and public affairs programming. Although eventually a leading champion of deregulation, Cornell economist Alfred E. Kahn complained that the five stations in his viewing area frequently refrained from airing the networks' public-service programs.[34] A South Bend, Indiana, schoolteacher claimed that her ABC station carried no news broadcasts the previous year.[35] Cincinnati's CBS affiliate, a physician wrote, dropped two news programs, *CBS Reports* and *Face the Nation*, in favor of the adventure series *Sea Hunt* and *Gray Ghost*. "We were told quite frankly," he reported, "that the station was in business to make money, and since the public service programs are not sponsored and the ratings are not as high, the station derives less benefit from them."[36]

30. Letter from Roger F. Graham to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 23, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 241).

31. Letter from Lilian Eisenberg to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 18, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 240).

32. Letter from Mrs. Elevyn L. Meyer to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (June 5, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 242). *See also* Letter from Gerald Gale to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (June 30, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 243).

33. Letter from Nathan Trokie to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 13, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239) (emphasis added).

34. Letter from Alfred E. Kahn, Chairman, Department of Economics, Cornell University, to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 12, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 240).

35. Letter from Mrs. Joseph Weeks to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 22, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 241).

36. Letter from Carl G. Thompson to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 15, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 240). The week of the NAB meeting, the president of CBS

As Minow had anticipated, some of his correspondents decried the violence in many TV westerns and detective series. Too many TV shows, they averred, were too violent for the younger viewer. One mother told of her son's week-long hospitalization with an eye injury after he and his friends tried to re-create a scene from ABC's gangster series, *The Untouchables*.[37] "[T]here is too much violence, sex and murder on television," an Ohio accountant wrote. "A parent cannot constantly 'police' the programs."[38]

Such viewers took solace in Minow's promise to increase the FCC's role in supervising television. Through the 1950s, most of his predecessors, notably John C. Doerfer, had self-consciously refrained from criticizing television. This approach conveyed both an aversion to anything approaching censorship as well as a market-driven approach to business oversight. But several conflict-of-interest scandals in 1958 and 1960, including one that forced Doerfer's resignation, had greatly discredited such a hands-off approach to regulation.[39] Minow's speech promised a regulatory revival. "The F.C.C. had come under a cloud in the past few years," one man observed. "With you as its chief, there is some reason to believe that the body will serve the purpose for which it was established."[40] "It's about time that someone in *authority* . . . spoke up," a Connecticut woman wrote.[41] An Indiana minister agreed: "We have felt so helpless in the past."[42]

Most of the nation's TV critics and columnists belonged to Minow's legion. These included Jack Gould of *The New York Times*, John Crosby of

reported, 57% of his network's affiliates carried *CBS Reports*. Letters from Frank Stanton, President, CBS, to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 26, 1961, and June 1, 1961) (Minow Papers, box 41).

37. Letter from Mrs. A.J. Selig to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 23, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 241).

38. Letter from Harry T. Thomas to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 12, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239). *See also* Letter from Mrs. Toivo Sober to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (June 24, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 243).

39. *See Investigation of Television Quiz Shows*: *Hearing before the House Comm. on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*, 86th Cong. (1959) pt. 1, 512, 521-22 (comments of John C. Doerfer). S*ee generally On the Fortieth Anniversary of the FCC*, 27 FED. COMM. B.J. 141, 142-44 (1974) (containing remarks made by Comm'r John C. Doerfer). *See also* WALTER GOODMAN, ALL HONORABLE MEN: CORRUPTION AND COMPROMISE IN AMERICAN LIFE 192-93, 314 (1963).

40. Letter from Harry Starfield to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 11, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239).

41. Letter from Vilma C. Haynes to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 12, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239).

42. Letter from Charles G. McCallister to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 10, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239) (emphasis omitted). *See also* Letter from John B. Kelly to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 10, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239).

the *New York Herald Tribune*, Robert Lewis Shayon of *Saturday Review*, and Lawrence Laurent of *The Washington Post*. They had witnessed the rise and fall of television's "Golden Age." The more standardized fare of the late 1950s and early 1960s had left most disheartened. With few exceptions, they cheered Minow on.[43]

So did other opinion leaders, often regardless of party or ideology. Two pillars of the Republican temple, *The Chicago Tribune* and *The Wall Street Journal*, attacked Minow, as did the conservative columnist David Lawrence. Minow, they feared, would play the censor.[44] Not all readers, however, accepted such logic. *The Wall Street Journal*'s critical editorial failed to move a Los Angeles businessman "[I]f your views are censorship [as *The Journal* charged] lets [sic] have it," he wrote. "Unless the thing is soon cleaned up, the Nation will not have to worry over the threat of Communism, it will rot and decay from the inside."[45] Some Republicans complimented the new FCC Chairman. Old Guard Republican Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire told Minow he was "very much impressed" by his NAB speech.[46] *The American Legion Magazine* in September 1961 included an article favoring the FCC chairman's crusade.[47]

No amount of favorable publicity or bipartisan support, however, allowed Minow to meet his admirers' expectations. In that regard, his speech may have been *too powerful*, too newsworthy. His authority as chairman proved limited. He had to invest much of his time persuading skeptical colleagues on the Commission as well as members of Congress to support a more modest agenda for change. This ultimately involved increasing viewer choice by fostering expanded commercial and non-commercial competition. Minow fought hard for policies that aided

43. Letter from Robert Lewis Shayon, TV-Radio Editor, *Saturday Review*, to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 22, 1961) (Minow Papers, box 4); James L. Baughman, *The National Purpose and the Newest Medium: Liberal Critics of Television*, *1958-60*, 64 MID-AMERICA: AN HISTORICAL REVIEW 41-55 (Apr.-July 1982). Janet Kern of the *Chicago American*, a Minow acquaintance, was among the few TV critics to regard his crusade as a threat to freedom of expression. *See* Letter from Janet Kern to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (Aug. 29, 1961) (Minow Papers, box 24).

44. Editorial, *The TV Wasteland*, WALL ST. J., May 11, 1961, at 14; Editorial, *A School of Minows*, CHI. DAILY TRIB., May 24, 1961, at 14; David Lawrence, *Federal Dictation of Broadcasting*, WASH. STAR, May 18, 1961, at A9. Several correspondents sent Minow editorials attacking his speech, including ones appearing in *The Richmond (Va.) News Leader* on May 11, 1961, and the *Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star* on May 17, 1961.

45. J. Lincoln Ritchie to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 12, 1961) (FCC Papers, box 239).

46. Letter of Norris Cotton, U.S. Senator, to Newton N. Minow, Chairman, FCC (May 10, 1961) (Minow Papers, box 10).

47. Lester C. Grady, *What's Ahead in TV*, AM. LEGION MAG., Sept. 1961, at 20-21, 37.

educational television and the struggling UHF stations.[48] In the long run, such an approach might provide more viewers with more choices—and television just might begin to realize its potential. His correspondents had hoped for more immediate relief.

48. Minow and his allies on the Commission failed to promote cable television as the best means of increasing viewer choice. Fearing that cable would harm newer UHF and ETV outlets, they supported regulations that actually inhibited its diffusion. *See* BAUGHMAN, *supra* note 15, at 93, 156-57. *See generally* DON R. LEDUC, CABLE TELEVISION AND THE FCC: A CRISIS IN MEDIA CONTROL (1973); Thomas R. Eisenmann, *The U.S. Cable Television Industry, 1948-1995: Managerial Capitalism in Eclipse*, 74 BUS. HIST. REV. 6-7 (Spring 2000). Thirty years after his NAB address, Minow expressed doubts about cable, in part because not all viewers could afford it. *See Minow Looks at "Wasteland" 30 Years Later*, BRDCST., May 13, 1991, at 34; Newton N. Minow, *How Vast the Wasteland Now?*, 45 BULLETIN (American Academy of Arts & Sciences, Cambridge, Mass.), Feb. 1992, at 16, 21-22.