ruled that the FCC was right in denying a WITV petition to hold up issuing any grant in either Miami's ch. 7 or ch. 10 cases. WITV sought to stay the grants until the then pending deintermixture proceedings were completed.

The appeals court decision was written by Circuit Judge Charles Fahy, for himself and Judges Wilbur K. Miller and John A. Danaher. The court held that the Miami case was similar to the Corpus Christi case, decided last year. In that case, the court ruled that the FCC had the power to continue making vhf grants even though it was considering deintermixture in that city.

Biscayne operates WCKR and WCKT (TV) and is an amalgamation of James Cox (*Miami News*) and John S. Knight (*Miami Herald*) interests, with Nile Trammell, former NBC president, owning a 15% balance.

Boston—The Boston ch. 5 comparative hearing is among four applicants, with Greater Boston Tv Corp. (local interests, some of whom identified with WORL Boston) favored in a Jan. 1956 initial decision. Other applicants are Allen B. DuMont Labs., Massachusetts Bay Telecasters Inc. (local interests) and WHDH Boston. It is reliably understood that by a vote of 4 to 1, with two commissioners not participating, the Commission favored making the ch. 5 grant to WHDH (Boston *Herald-Traveler*).

Seattle—KIRO has been favored twice for ch. 7 by a hearing examiner's recommendations and is understood to be likewise favored by a strong majority of the Commission. Other applicants are KXA and KVI Seattle. This case has gone through two hearings—the second ordered by the FCC to take testimony regarding qualifications of Saul Haas, one of KIRO principals.

Indianapolis—Four applicants are vying for ch. 13. An initial decision in June 1955 favored Mid-West Tv Corp. (local interests). Other applicants are WIRE and WIBC Indianapolis and Crosley (WLW and WLWT [TV] Cincinnati, WLWC [TV] Columbus and WLWD [TV] Dayton, all Ohio and WLWA [TV] Atlanta, Ga.) Prevailing sentiment at the Commission is disposed to make the grant to Crosley.

Other pending tv hearing cases—

In Orlando, Fla., WORZ Orlando holds an initial decision for a ch. 9 grant. Opposing is WLOF that city. Majority control of WLOF would be held by Harris H. Thomson, if FCC approves of his purchase of John H. Kluge's 37% (see story page 92).

In Buffalo, N. Y., the three-party Great Lakes Tv Inc. holds an initial decision for ch. 7 there. Great Lakes is owned equally by principals associated with the *Buffalo Courier-Express*, WSTV Inc. (Berkman-Laux interests) and WKAL Rome-WKTV (TV) Utica, N. Y. Other applicants are WKBW Buffalo and Leon Wyszatycki under the name Greater Erie Broadcasting Co.

In Biloxi, WVMI that city won an examiner's initial decision for ch. 13 twice. Its opposition is the same city's WLOX.

In Casper, an examiner only last week recommended the ch. 6 grant to Donald Lewis Hathaway, following the withdrawal of competing Casper Mt. Tv Corp. (see story page 91).

THERE'S A MINT IN TELEVISION, BUT DON'T TAKE WOODEN NICKELS

A SPOKESMAN for one of tv's most successful advertisers—Revlon Inc.—described last week how the cosmetic firm continually discovered a "retail gold rush following announcements" on its programs.

Revlon has enjoyed a consistent success for its some 30 products primarily through the popularity of its veteran the *$64,000 Question*, followed about a year later on CBS-TV by another quiz program, the *$64,000 Challenge*.

While Revlon's vice president George Abrams praised tv Tuesday at the timebuying and selling seminar held in New York by The Radio & Television Executives Society, he also had a warning for "neophyte" advertisers.

These, he said, are advertisers who are taking their first "plunge" into the medium, uncertain as to whether it is "glamor" or "coverage" (or perhaps both) they seek from tv.

"While television is dynamic," he asserted, "it is not 'right' for every advertiser." And as advice to the neopyhtes, Mr. Abrams cautioned: "Don't buy television until you learn as much as possible about the medium."

REVLON'S ABRAMS

Early in his talk, Mr. Abrams pinned down what he considered to be examples of how television "can be a dream and also a nightmare" for the advertiser, by contrasting Philip Morris' experience with *I Love Lucy* (CBS-TV) with that of Revlon's programs.

PM learned, according to Mr. Abrams, that "a top television show doesn't guarantee success at the sales counter." But, he reflected, Revlon found just this success at the sales counter through a top-rated show. In fact, he said, many Revlon products, "isolated" to tv program commercials showed "fantastic results" in retail shops. The day after a tv commercial for a Revlon product was shown on CBS-TV, he recalled that Stern's Department Store in New York put up a huge sign with arrow on the street floor which read "this way to the Revlon counter."

Mr. Abrams' talk was titled, "A Frank Look at Television."

In warning the tv newcomer, Mr. Abrams cautioned that there are two different "prices" in big-time television—the "going price" (what it takes to stay on television) and the "differential price" (what it takes to get something out of television).

At another point in his talk, Mr. Abrams asserted: "Lousy programs can only produce lousy ratings." To drive his point home, he specifically mentioned Revlon's program failure—*Can Do* which had a short-lived stay recently on NBC-TV. Of programs, he said he wanted to emphasize they "are expensive enough" but "not always good enough."

Even with good shows, he continued, tv still can be a pitfall for the advertiser. The "good shows" oftentimes encourage competing networks to program strong against them and thus divide the audience. A period of "neutralization" he called it. This, he said, "may satisfy the networks but not the advertiser." After an advertiser in effect has purchased an audience with a good show, he suddenly finds he has "the same show with half of the audience."

Tv's Strong Points

But, Mr. Abrams emphasized, Revlon had no complaint with television. These, he said, are the big plusses of television:

- It has motion—demonstration . . . "live and believable action"—that is not present in any other medium. He noted that Revlon had a sales increase of 400% for just one of its products after live tv commercial exposure (see story, page 38).
- It has intimacy—"nothing but real life is so close to a viewer . . . tv is salesmanship in the home on the closest basis."

In expanding his advice to advertisers to get to know the medium better before "plunging," Mr. Abrams asserted that Revlon had spent $5 million in "mediocre programs" in time before its "hit" came along. And, he said, the firm continues experimentation for "bigger and better programs."

For the small advertiser, he said, the ideal place in the medium is in spot tv. He cited "piggy back" positions on major network shows as an advantage in providing a ready-made audience. The spot advertiser, Mr. Abrams said, sacrifices prestige "but it can have coverage."

In all of eight years study and experience with television, Mr. Abrams said he had yet to see "a failure" in spot television. But, he declared, spot television has its "weak spots" and advertisers should consider them:

- There is a need for "good" availabilities.
- There is a danger in buying if the adver-