

## **An Interview with Edward Miller By Sarah Lippek**

*Edward Miller is the chair of the Media Culture Department at CUNY Staten Island, and author of Emergency Broadcasting. This interview took place on May 20th, 2005.*

### **The Early Days**

*Sarah Lippek: Sketch the broader developments of how radio has changed technologically, socially, and also in a regulatory sense, over the course of the century.*

Edward Miller: Early inventors, Marconi being the most famous, and also, some would argue, [Nikola] Tesla, did not view it as a medium for broadcasting, but as a point-to-point communications device, narrowcasting, if you will. Similar to the telegraph. Radio's popular usage allowed it to be envisioned as broadcasting. People took on the technology and learned it, definitely by the early 1900's, but probably even earlier than that, and started using it for talking to each other, by creating their own radio sets using any materials that were around. Those were the people that really thought up broadcasting. It's really much more of a popular movement. They were hobbyists, called Radio Boys. Radio Detectives.

*Is there a particular class or social stratum that was particularly involved with radio?*

It was thought to be middle class boys. White middle class boys. Michelle Hilmes<sup>1</sup> has discovered that there were at least a few women, and there were at least some women who pretended to be men. So, similar perhaps to the early internet, when people would sort of shift genders because they could, or even novelists, although among novelists, I don't think there are any boys who pretend to be girls!

*So, in those early days, people were creating their own broadcasts, and there wasn't really any regulation yet. So people were just broadcasting wherever they could?*

There was regulation, regulation that followed the sinking of the Titanic. It was thought that if the people on the Titanic had their radios on, and if other ships had their radios operating, that the Titanic disaster could have been avoided, or at least helped. Also there were thought to be mischievous people who were using radio waves for subversive purposes, or just hoaxes and other mischievous purposes. So that was

the beginning of radio legislation, which began with the sinking of the Titanic. Then there were other, subsequent regulations, as well, that were trying to partition off and distribute the rights to the radio waves.

*Would you say that was the beginning of the commercialization of radio? Were there licenses being sold at that point? Was it expensive?*

No, I think that what actually happened was, in World War I, the U.S. Navy took over all the radio frequencies, because they realized they needed radio to fight this war. They didn't want anyone using the radio waves in the U.S. for any other purposes. Interestingly enough, I think that they didn't allow anyone who was of German descent to be a radio person. But they needed to hire these, let's call them 'radio renegades,' because no one else had the knowledge. So they hired these people who had once been considered a sort of enemy or pest, right? Like hackers being hired as security consultants for big firms. So radio became a state monopoly, at that point. Then that state monopoly was sold off to...think of it as a sort of an RCA monopoly. But it was also at that time, after the end of the war, which was the beginning of what we could call the official Broadcasting Era, in 1920, at the end of WWI. It happened through this moment of centralization, and also of professionalization of these renegade types within the navy. So, again, the correlation, the similarities with the internet are really major, because the internet, too, had a military upbringing. It started as ARPAnet<sup>2</sup>, and the military didn't really realize what it could be used for.

*So, at that point, in the 1920s, we had the advent of commercial radio stations, music radio stations...what kind of things were on the air?*

KDKA was the first licensed commercial station, and the first thing they broadcast was election night results in Pittsburgh. That was in 1920. The station was owned by Westinghouse. They didn't sell ads, but the station was used promotionally to sell Westinghouse brand radios. It was in Queens that there was the first example of commercial broadcasting. The first-ever ad is thought to have been broadcasted by WEAf, which was owned by AT&T. In 1922, the President of the Queensboro Corporation bought 15 minutes of airtime to talk about his properties in Jackson Heights, and the advertisements were very successful. So it was a local station that hit upon this notion that you could sell airtime. Please note that some historians insist that Seattle's radio station KFC was first by a few months—they aired a show sponsored by a local music company that sold sheet music.

Also, in the early 20s, and before The Radio Act of 1927 which further regulated the dial, everyone seemed to have a radio station.

Department stores, churches, and all sorts of civic organizations. Everyone had one. The dial was crowded with low-power stations, broadcasting church services, specials at the store, things like that. What began in the mid to late 1920s, for example, was WEVD, which is now a sports radio station with the same call letters, but started off as the Eugene V. Debs<sup>3</sup> station, the socialist station. Now it's mostly known for having broadcast in Yiddish, but they also broadcast in Chinese, they broadcast in Macedonian, and they sought out advertising from local ethnic neighborhoods. Some of it was comedy, a lot of it was music, but it was geared to the new multi-ethnic urban environment. A lot of what was going on happened in the cities, in this new environment. In sum, radio was local.

*Radio is no longer totally local. The stations are owned, largely, by giant companies like Clear Channel, and even the 'local' weather reports are recorded and sold in centralized locations. So how did that develop? What happened to radio?*

Those are immense changes that happened gradually, and also, through legislation, sometimes happened more quickly. Just think of FM, which you can think of as the settlement of a new Oklahoma, happened very recently, as recently as 1960. That happened through an FCC<sup>4</sup> regulation that said that AM broadcasters could not duplicate their broadcasts of FM. So all of a sudden, there was a whole new area that all kinds of people jumped into. A lot of 'alternative' types settled into the FM dial. At least initially, until it became corporatized in the 1970s.

*So we think of the 1960s as the heyday of the DJ as a personality?*

The DJ as a personality, the DJ that would play all sorts of different music, the DJ that didn't have a playlist that was imposed upon him or her. I say 'her' because there were certainly a number of prominent female DJs. Also, the DJ would be his or her own personality, and create what he or she would say, in a way that we would now think of as a performance, almost like an audio poet. They didn't necessarily think of themselves in those terms, because they didn't have those terms available to them at the time. They were real radio pioneers, much in the way that some of the people in the 1920s were. So, speaking of the FCC, some people, I think, are quick to say that it always worked in favor of, or in league with, the large corporations. I don't think that's always been the case. I think that there were people in the congress who have tried to make the FCC work in the public interest. I also don't believe that the public interest and the corporate interest always necessarily have to clash...well, maybe I do! But, in an ideal world, maybe they wouldn't! So there have been times when the radio dial has

reopened itself up, to adventure, to experimentation, and clearly with internet radio, which is going on now, and with low-power FM, there has been some effort in that direction too. Which came through legislation. So there have been moments when radio has been more community-oriented.

### **The Changing Face of Radio**

*I have this Norman Rockwell<sup>5</sup> picture in my head of everyone in the family gathering around to listen to the radio together, and now, I think, when people listen to the radio, it's often driving alone in their cars, or on walkmen, and it's definitely waning as a communal event.*

*Radio listening is becoming a more solitary event, or becoming more in the sonic background of your life; because you have it on in your home, your apartment, while you're doing something else, rather than sitting there paying close attention. It's become an alarm clock, or just a sound. What changes happened to lead to that transformation?*

There are a lot of cultural factors at work here; one is that this country has become much more visually obsessed, in the postwar era. Maybe with the rise of cinema and television, we've become much more comfortable with watching the world on a screen. You can put the world on a television, with some sound, and we're OK with it. Rather than having what you see dispersed all around you, you want to see it encapsulated, framed.

I also think that, as you note in your question, radio moved into the car. People began using it as a companion while driving alone, which changes the way it gets used at home. People don't use it at home in the same way anymore. There's that funny show on VH-1, where people are singing along to the radio in their cars. It's a *Candid Camera* type of show, where they watch people while they sing along, alone or with their friends, and it's cool because that music encourages people to act like jerks, to have fun. But they wouldn't do the same thing at home. They do it in their car. Also, we live now in a time, since the Walkman, where people want to listen to their own music.

And people are classified as belonging to all these different market splinters by the funders of radio, the advertisers, so that there are smaller and smaller groups being catered to. It's actually hard to imagine *The War of the Worlds* happening now, because there wouldn't be enough people listening to the same station at the same time to cause a huge panic.

*No, it would have to happen on TV.*

And maybe not even then, because of cable. It'd have to be on all the channels, interrupting all the reruns of *Law and Order*<sup>6</sup> at the same time!

But, yes, radio became affiliated with the mobilization of our culture, the fact that we are traveling around a lot, and radio is the companion to that movement. It's been taken out of the home, where it existed before as a very domesticated animal, if you will. It's because of other things we've adopted that radio had to move out, television, in particular. You can't watch TV while you're driving. You shouldn't, anyway!

On a more personal note on the uses of the medium, I don't really like Walkmen or iPods. Particularly as an urban dweller, I need to know what sounds are around me, and where they're coming from. And I like noises. I don't necessarily want to eliminate them. And I think that part of the rise of the Walkman and part of the rise of the iPod has to do with noise. People want to block it out. They want to live—and I don't mean to disparage the masses of iPod users, they're fine!—but it's almost like people want to live in their own videos and the iPod becomes the soundtrack for that imaginary video. You become your own DJ because you create your own playlist.

*I've been seeing ads for a new store opening in SoHo, and there's this huge billboard that has a picture of an iPod, and it says "Do Not Disturb signs---coming to SoHo!" I was reading also in The New York Times that there has been a rash of thefts of iPods because they have these distinctive white cords, they're highly portable and they cost five hundred dollars! And people are tuned in to their music; they're not alert.*

Totally not alert. I remember in the days of the Walkman that I got mugged using one. I don't blame it on the Walkman, but I was in my own little world. I don't need a Walkman. I'm already self-involved enough!

*That leads to something kind of interesting. As you brought up, the rise of television has brought on a great proliferation of these small screens all around us, and with these small screens, the way people get their news is changing a lot. It's shifted away from radio broadcasts, but also away from newsreels where people would watch the news in public, in a movie theater before the movie. They would go once a week and watch the news together in the theater. I was living in Spain, and I was struck by the level of political education there. Everyone talks about politics.*

*They know the news, the events, the personalities involved, and discuss them in a very informed way. They know more about American politics that most Americans do. I wonder if the national conversation, or the public conversation, does it shrink when you take it out of the public realm and into the living room, onto the small screen?*

I think you make a good point. I also think that if you look at the television screen, it's hard to watch. When you look at CNN, and you're trying to focus on everything on the screen, there's the newsreel on the bottom, there's an inset here, there's this, there's that. It's hard to focus. Even if they were trying to have a really in-depth discussion about something important that's going on, like the war in Iraq, I don't think I'd even notice it.

*It's interesting to think about the limitations of a format. Even time limits are very influential. Noam Chomsky<sup>7</sup> talks about that. He says he'll never be allowed on television; his ideas won't come across on television, because of the time limits. If you're getting received information that already fits into your worldview, it can be fit into 15 seconds, into a soundbite on television, because that information is already familiar to you. However, if someone is trying to change your mind, persuade you, introduce new evidence of something that's harder to swallow, it takes much more time. It can't exist in the world of television where nothing lasts longer than three minutes.*

I think that's true, and not just Chomsky's point, but Marshall McLuhan's<sup>8</sup> point should be considered as well. He said that television is a 'cool' medium and a certain type of person will be more successful on it. Someone like Al Gore<sup>9</sup>, who's kind of intense, will never be our president. Someone like our current president [George Bush] is a good ol' boy, and a 'cool' figure, he works the cool medium, and does it well. I don't think he does it all that well, but he certainly seems to do it well enough. Television is not made for that kind of intensity, whereas radio, because it focuses on a single sense, the sense of sound, is a 'hot' medium, and does require more attention from the audience to absorb.

### **Public Radio**

*So, to totally shift gears, what about public radio? How did it start, why was it introduced, what's happened to it since then?*

It started through the mandates of the FCC, who were displeased with commercial radio. That's why it's there. It's there because Newton Minow<sup>10</sup> said, "Television and radio is a wasteland." Under his leadership, the national public radio was created, under Kennedy.

Really recently. There have been other examples of listener-supported radio, before that, and government stations as well, but the idea of a national public radio is really quite recent, and came through the displeasure of people in the FCC. They said, "Something is missing here. We're missing out."

When I was driving through France, I was amazed at the number of really quiet talk radio shows. No one was incensed. They were passionate, but not yelling, and they were talking about politics. It was almost hard to find music. In the United States, I do think it would be possible to have a more informed debate, a better public discussion of politics. Here in New York, we don't talk about politics; we talk about relationships. Our television is filled with relationships and relationship talk. I'm guilty of it myself. I love talking about other people's relationships. To gossip is human, right? So I do think that---this is all hypothetical---radio requires intimacy. The voice, the broadcasted voice, can reach an interior landscape so much more easily than a television image. You make your own imagery. It's very personal.

### Experiencing Sound

*They say that, in the centers of your brain, there's a sort of hierarchy of what's the most connected to memory, the most personal, and they say that scent has the most evocative power. But the sense of hearing is next---sound. It's far more deeply ingrained as an evocative experience than sight is, closer to the 'animal brain.'*

Yes, and I think it's true that one hears before one sees, and the relationship to your mother is based on sound before it's based upon sight. So, yes, not only does radio come before TV, but when you think of the human development and the human psyche, sound comes before sight. Again, we've become such a screen-oriented culture that radio, and the intimacy of radio, has lost its centrality in our lives. Which is not to say that it won't remain a really important part of the media landscape.

### The Media Landscape Today

*So let's talk about where we are now, what the landscape looks like from where we stand. There are some places, mostly in rural areas, where there was deemed sufficient space on the dial and some low-power FM licenses were given out in 2000. So there have been some small triumphs for local, low-power, community radio movements. But, also, larger and larger numbers of stations are owned by a few enormous conglomerates, and the songs you hear are the same*

*regardless of whether you're in Philadelphia or Denver or Flint. What are the currents that you see now as far as what's happening with the future of radio? There are some interesting prospects on the horizon with satellite radio---Howard Stern just moved to satellite radio. Is this stuff important?*

I'm not sure how relevant the term 'radio' is going to be for referring to the various types of media that foreground sound. Sound is going to satellite, it's going to internet radio, it's coming though all these disparate activities that we call 'radio,' and maybe the term provides some kind of cohesion, but it's not very accurate anymore. However, I'm pretty optimistic. The way that I listen to sound and convey sound has become much more interesting to me. I no longer rely upon WBAI<sup>11</sup>, which I tend to rely upon in times of war. I don't have to run to that one station just to get access to different points of view. Now there's more room for alternative views, they're more spread out. Radio artists like, in my department, Valerie Tevere, who is a member of neuroTransmitter [a transmission arts collective] are making radio packs [portable transmitters], and there are people who are experimenting with new ways of utilizing radio in immediate situations. They're using radio to interact with people who are actually present at the broadcast site. I'm hopeful. Of course, one worries! I worry about what's going on with NPR right now. I can't imagine that it's going to get even more corporatized and more right wing!

*You're referring to pressure from within the Bush administration to present more right-wing views.*

Yes. There are times when I can't listen to NPR because it's too cutesy, with that *All Things Considered*<sup>12</sup> music, I just can't hear it anymore! But there are other times when I want to hear the lefty liberal people talk about their latest books. And you can get BBC, and there are other points of view. I think it provides something for people who are interested in intellectual pursuits, people who are a little more progressive. It gives us something we can share. Of course, NPR is no longer dependent on the government for much of its funding, but it is dependent as far as its license. The airwaves are meant to be public, and the FCC is meant to ensure that, but it's getting more restrictive. That's the scary thing, the licensing conditions that the FCC could exert, which would really put NPR and all of public radio in a vice hold. Very scary.

To go back to WEVD, which was sometimes listener supported and sometimes reliant on advertising, I do think that there is a third way in American broadcasting, combining public and private funding. It would

allow the stations to go past just announcing their underwriters on the show and allow actual advertising. And I think that the American advertising industry is an ingenious industry. I'm not against having advertising. Even Air America<sup>13</sup>, which has commercials, shows a potential third way. You don't have to be reliant on the government in any way; you can be reliant upon supporters and advertising at the same time, in order to insure your independence. I don't want to say that alternative voices have to be dependent on non-commercial radio. I don't think that's true. I think there are important examples that show that you can combine listener involvement and advertising, and I think these options should be further examined.

Subscriber-based services, however, don't have commercials. It will be interesting to see what happens with Howard Stern on satellite radio. I hear the guy from the New York Dolls has a show. Eminem has a station. It's going to be interesting, too, to hear other people's playlists. Knowing what stations they use will be like having access to their iPod. It's a way to get a musical education from someone who knows more about music than I do. I sometimes listen to radio on the way to school, and there are just so many goddamned commercials. And they're not good commercials! I like a good commercial. It can be like a little playlet. They seem to go on and on and on. And when they do have an hour for real music, they interrupt all the time to tell you, "We're having an hour's worth of music!" You just want them to shut up. There are some clear advantages to subscriber stations. I think radio is about playing music. At least in America, that's what it's been about. It's been an outlet for the recording industry. Maybe the recording industry could do something to help radio, too. Although the recording industry is in dire straits, too.

*It seems like there used to be there was a clear trajectory for music to be released. You would release an album, you would release a single, you'd engage in whatever graft was necessary to get the single played, it would go on the radio, and you'd be selling albums in direct correlation to the number of times your single was on the radio. Now it seems like things come from all different directions. Some artists are in favor of filesharing because they get more attention from downloaders, especially mid-level artists who don't get a lot of money spent on publicity by their labels. Instead of listening to something on the radio and then going to buy it, people are maybe downloading a few songs, then buying a different album by the same musician, and then burning the album for a friend, who plays it on her internet radio station. How does all this direct sharing fit in with radio? There has been so much decentralization of cultural communication, but radio remains, in most of its guises, a central point from which signals are sent out to pretty*

*passive audiences.*

What you say is true. It's become very centralized; it's fallen under the control of a very few corporations who exert a lot of power, and really control the airwaves, at least the most powerful part of the airwaves, and they control everything. It's just true; they do. And on AM, most of the talk radio shows you hear are very, very conservative, and they're about people yelling at each other, basically. One of the interesting things about Howard Stern<sup>14</sup>, who I was listening to today, and one of the reasons why he continues to be successful, is that it's a kind of male soap opera that revolves around this cast of characters. It is a little bit too much tits and ass, but it's this drama, this ongoing story, and really it's also about interviewing people. Interviewing has always been an interesting format. That's what all the late-night television shows are about; stars come on, and they are interviewed. I think radio is an excellent format for that.

Also, increasingly, rather than broadcasting, there is a lot of narrowcasting going on. In your life, as in mine, you probably get e-mails from people telling you about a great song. You may download something and tell someone else about it. You have a lot of point-to-point or narrowcasting communications going on at the same time. The corporation is always there. But this type of communication doesn't have to happen via the corporation anymore. I get my fast internet from Time Warner, so the corporation is always there. Maybe I have a corporate e-mail account. So the corporation is always there and the transmission of information may be empowered by the corporation, but the information itself that is being downloaded or emailed does not have to go through some approval process, which is good.

*Music, it seems like that's true. Seems like there is less exchange of talk, so maybe that's where radio still has a ton of potential: there's so much room for discussion. There are a couple of anecdotes that are popular with low-power, local radio folks. True stories. One happened somewhere in the Midwest, storm country. The local radio station was broadcasting pre-recorded, canned content from New York or somewhere, and so when a tornado warning came up, there was no one who could access the radio station to get the warning on the air. There was a lot of damage because there was no warning broadcast locally on the station.*

There's a danger of that happening elsewhere, too, everywhere, because of course a lot of the content get recorded elsewhere.

*The other thing that comes to mind is the infamous 'no-play' list that*

*Clear Channel sent to all its stations immediately following 9/11. Stations all over the country were commanded to stop playing certain songs. This memo was leaked, and it was things like "Imagine" and "Times They Are A-Changing" and other classic anti-war songs from the Vietnam War era, and other songs that just seemed ridiculous. They just had the word 'fire' in their titles, like "Burning Down The House" and "Fire Woman" by the Cult. All these songs were forbidden because Clear Channel felt that they might be offensive or disturbing or politically subversive, presenting a different stance than the dominant one.*

It goes to an important conflict that we have in American culture right now. American popular culture includes and allows subversiveness and experimentation. American corporate culture does not. It does not accept these things at all.

*Except to adopt a rebellious pose to sell shoes and cars! Rebellious advertising.*

But these things are not fundamentally acceptable. And it's an argument that's been going on a long time. I think it was in 1934, when the FCC was being formed, and the FCC was saying that all broadcasting had to be educational. NBC put out a series of publications called "broadcasting To All Homes," and they said that entertainment is, by essence, educational. They argued from an essentially anti-intellectual, classic American response: you can't let these people in Washington and New York decide what's best for you. However, NBC can decide! You can't let the legislators that you actually vote for speak in your name. But NBC, which was full of horrible, racist programming like *Amos 'n Andy*<sup>15</sup>, was supposed to be presenting educational fare. Entertainment was, ipso facto, educational. So that's been the policy ever since, and we've got all this lowbrow programming, some of which I like---I don't have to always listen to NPR---but the corporate ideology has remained intact for a long time. "We provide something for everyone." And if you're not the everyone we're interested in, please be quiet! Please go to the periphery of the country: Seattle, New York, San Francisco. So, you can read NBC's book, *Broadcasting to All Homes*, and you can see that they've consistently maintained that they are educational because entertainment is the real American way. The definition of what's best for Americans hasn't been seriously re-examined since the 1960s, when Newton Minow said the airwaves were a wasteland. I don't think that the educational imperative on broadcasting is even considered anymore.

*What do you think about the recent FCC crackdowns on 'obscenity'? The FCC is basically saying that commercial forces can decide what*

*will go on the airwaves, but now those forces are catering to the national appetite for smut and sleaze, and there's this recent tightening of the restrictions on what's acceptable content.*

If I had to think of one reason why this is happening, it has to do with kowtowing to the religious right wing. It's part of the whole backlash that's been going on in this country for a number of years. I don't necessarily think it's great that Janet Jackson did or didn't want to expose her breast<sup>16</sup> on TV, or that there are really racy, ass-shaking videos on MTV, but I don't think the government should be able to legislate it. I absolutely don't think so. Sexual minorities and women always lose out whenever that happens. When sex can't be talked about, and when issues of gender can't be talked about, then people become oppressed. And I think that's clearly what's going on right now. It's all part of the same thing. I was reading this article about New York in the 1970s, about prostitution, and gay male bath houses, and pornography. At this point, in the 1970s, the city was depressed. There was no other industry, so porno moved in, in a big way. It allowed for a lot of sexual and political freedom for a lot of people. And creative and generative energies around what others might think of as sleaze. But for sexual and other minorities it was a place where they gained new routes of expression. It was a really good time to be in New York. Maybe not too safe, but very, very creative. I think it's important that at least cable, and Howard Stern, and everyone who wants to, gets to say naughty words. It trickles down, and it benefits people who otherwise are marginal. They need that space for expression. For every naughty word, there is a person who clings to that word, who needs it to form their identity.

#### **And Tomorrow...**

*What should people do to influence the future of radio? People are making waves already, by making their own stations, both FM and internet, they're voting with their feet by subscribing to satellite channels, they're distributing their own music....*

Beyond that, I think people should think about what kind of programming they can do that is innovative. There are some great people working with radio drama right now, like Gregory Whitehead, and others, but I still think that radio drama is something that can be expanded and explored, in both popular and more experimental manifestations. It could reach more people, or just more particular people. I think radio drama is popular, and experimental radio drama should be encouraged. I would encourage dramatists to think of radio as their medium. Radio has a rich history of drama, and a bright future as well. I also think the interview

format is a fascinating format. It doesn't need to rely on celebrities or even academics. There's something that energizes a conversation that is being recorded or broadcast. It's important to think in terms of format, not just technologically but creatively. There is so much left to do.

---

<sup>1</sup> Michelle Hilmes

Hilmes is a professor in the Communication Arts department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the author of *Hollywood Broadcasting*, *Radio Voices*, and other works.

<sup>2</sup> ARPAnet

The earliest incarnation of what we now call the internet was Advanced Research Projects Agency Network, a project of the US Department of Defense.

<sup>3</sup> Eugene V. Debs, 1825-1926

Five-time presidential candidate and lifelong Socialist activist Eugene V. Debs was a labor organizer and American rabble-rouser.

<sup>4</sup> FCC

The Federal Communications Commission is an agency of the US federal government, established in 1934 to regulate broadcast communications.

<sup>5</sup> Norman Rockwell

American painter known for his nostalgic, heartwarming scenes.

<sup>6</sup> *Law and Order*

An incredibly popular TV drama revolving around police investigations and court proceedings in New York City, which was in its fifteenth season at the time of this writing (2005.)

<sup>7</sup> Noam Chomsky

An American linguist and scholar, one of the most erudite and convincing anarchist thinkers of the 20th century.

<sup>8</sup> Marshall McLuhan, hot and cold media

A cultural scholar and media theorist, McLuhan introduced the theory of hot and cool media. 'Hot' media, such as radio, appeal to a single sense and provide high amounts of data. 'Cool' media, such as television, loosely engage multiple senses, and convey little information.

<sup>9</sup> Al Gore

Vice President of the United States under Bill Clinton, and unsuccessful presidential candidate during the 2000 race.

<sup>10</sup> Newton Minow

Former chairman of the FCC, who also served as the chairman of PBS, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. He is best known for his "Vast Wasteland" speech attacking the dearth of quality programming on the public airwaves.

<sup>11</sup> WBAI

A left-leaning, non-commercial New York radio station

<sup>12</sup> *All Things Considered*

A daily radio show produced by NPR, on which commentators focus on current cultural and political events, often viewing them from a liberal, humanistic perspective.

<sup>13</sup> Air America

Billed as the first liberal radio network, Air America broadcasts talk radio shows with a left-leaning slant.

<sup>14</sup> Howard Stern

One of radio's famous 'shock jocks,' Howard Stern made his name through potty humor, sexual content, and general rowdiness. He was fined by the FCC in 2004, and subsequently left radio for satellite broadcasting.

<sup>15</sup> *Amos 'n Andy*

A radio show which aired from 1943 to 1955 and was later revised as a television program, *Amos 'n Andy* has become synonymous with a brand of black-face minstrelsy that is now considered flagrantly racist.

<sup>16</sup> Janet Jackson's breast

During the halftime show of the 2004 Superbowl, one of Janet Jackson's breasts was bared to 89 million viewers. Ms. Jackson later claimed it was an unintentional accident, but the station that aired the incident was nevertheless fined more than half a million dollars.