

Remarks by Commissioner James H. Quello
Before the
Federal Communications Bar Association
Marriott Hotel, Washington, DC
September 19, 1991

NEW TERM, NEW BALL GAME

Thank you, etc. Generous introductions are always the most impressive part of my speaking appearances. In fact, some introductions have been so captivating I could hardly wait to hear what I was going to say. Anyway, today it's my job to speak and your job to listen -- I just hope you don't finish before I do.

I was honored to be a replacement speaker for that distinguished Congressional communications leader, John Dingell. I want you to know and your president and my good friend, John Lane, can confirm, that I volunteered to substitute for the distinguished chairman way before the recent article in U.S. News and World Report headlined "Congress' Most Feared Democrat." Hell, I've feared and respected him for over 30 years -- I refer to him as my Congressional Godfather and when I sense he is concerned or exasperated with the course of telecommunications issues, I always try to have coffee with him.

As you may know, I have fortunately enjoyed reasonably good Congressional relations on both sides of the political aisle. My relationship may have taken a turn for the better when four years ago I advised my fellow commissioners to add "your oversight Senators and Congressmen" to the Fourth Commandment. I said it is a good idea to honor them -- and let the record show I think it is an appropriate well-deserved deference.

Well, today we are breaking some new ground at this FCBA lunch. I believe, in fact I know, that I'm by far the most senior (polite word for oldest) active FCC Commissioner to ever appear before this august body. I'm glad that I flunked retirement and honored that President Bush remembered that I lost to him in tennis several times -- and reappointed me.

It all started last January when Chairman Al Sikes asked "How do you feel about reappointment? Your term is up June 30th."

I said "O.K., but I want to be wanted this time -- Al, you probably read that I have delusions of adequacy and 70% of my marbles -- a good local norm. There are many times I even feel useful."

Chairman Sikes said "Well, I want you" I considered that a very significant want.

Apparently, enough your members and enough of your influential clients also wanted me. So with apologies to Bartles and James, I'd like to say "Thank you for your support."

I believe I'm up to the challenges and mental turmoil of the job. However, physically -- anyone who says he can do at 75 what he was doing at 25 wasn't doing much at 25!

At my official swearing-in, I thanked the audience and said the widespread support was particularly gratifying because I had been at the FCC long enough to have voted against everyone at least once. The audience shouted back "Twice"! So twice it is -- and if I find out who the S.A. lawyers were who did the shouting I might even be tempted to go for "thrice."

At reappointment time I always remember receiving a wire from longtime friend, Chuck Adams, author and advertising executive stating "Congratulations. Hang in there until they name the building after you." I appreciate the sentiment but that honor has probably been pre-empted by distinguished Chairman Rosel Hyde or Bob Lee.

However, I might challenge them in the future when I achieve a dramatic distinction all my own. When my term expires in 1996 I plan to enlist the support of the grey panthers, the AARP and the Dick Wiley and Ward Quaal Foundations for the Aging and be appointed the very first active wheelchair Commissioner! I have five more years to plot my course. Also, I believe I can be a formidable competitor in wheelchair tennis now in vogue.

I want to share a senior citizen experience with you. Think twice before attending the 50th anniversary of your college graduating class. The former egghead academic boors are now richer than you are and making big grants to the University. Also the misnamed "Dumb jock" athletes of your class appear with second wives half their age and also make big contributions to the University. However, I always make some contribution to the alumni club -- not so much for what the college did for me, but kinda in reparation for what I did to it when I was a reporter and editor vigorously implementing my journalism prof's principle of "Comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable." Then too, my wife, Mary, also a Michigan State grad, pointed to one of my former girlfriends and said "Ha -- she doesn't look so hot!" I said she sure looked hot when I was dating her. Another memorable event was when the MSU Communication's Dean proposed showing a transcript of my college grades on a large screen as an encouragement to mediocre students. Fortunately, the President emeritus recalled I spent most of my quality time editing the college paper and working on the radio station.

I don't want to belabor the positive aspects of senior citizenship but there are a few. First, you have had time to develop a becoming sense of self unimportance. Then too, most of the communications press seems to respect age -- fortunately in my case, they stopped using the lethal device of quoting me exactly verbatim. I could not possibly survive that drastic kind of press abuse. (Quote Goethe on aging if time permits.)

This is an exciting challenging time to be at the FCC. During the past few years, there has been a veritable explosion of technological developments and contentious issues in all fields of communications. It is apparent that neither the FCC nor the FCBA have been deregulated out of business. In fact, the communications marketplace is brimming with new controversial developments and regulations that require evaluation, interpretation, clarification -- providing, cynics say, seemingly infinite billable hours. Some uncharitable souls even profess that law firms have incentives to generate crisis and regulatory contention. Surely such base motivation is far beneath the august legal profession -- one of the world's oldest if not the oldest, I am told.

Seriously, lawyers of the communications bar don't need to generate crises -- the crises facing the FCC are mostly self generating. In fact, we need your help.

The FCC needs expert comments and input from the best legal minds of the FCBA, from your clients, and guidance from Congress and the courts to address the important and often contentious problems. There are so many communications issues -- many with billable hours potential like: finsyn; prime time access; effective competition; must carry; retransmission consent; the timely attic to basement review; media cross ownership restrictions; political advertising clarification; children's TV; deciding relative merit of auctions or lotteries; telco entry into cable with introduction of the multi-band wonders of fiber transmission offering telecomputer services, data processing, interactive services, electronic newspapers, home shopping, etc.; indecency-obscenity enforcement; EEO requirements; comparative hearing and license renewal reforms; station brokerage agreements; implementing phone company relief from MFJ restrictions; special tariffs; spectrum allocations auctions or lotteries; spectrum compression technology; DAB, HDTV and DBS developments; global considerations, etc. All these and related developments affect the public, millions of shareholders, top management of the various communications companies and the future communications well-being of America. Each of these important subjects could easily absorb an hour speech or a long chapter in a communications book. Let's take just one current topic, DAB, for example.

DAB is the most revolutionary and promising improvement for radio in modern times -- particularly for the troubled AM service. FCC must encourage full speed ahead and explore every technical possibility to develop a terrestrial in-band or a hybrid satellite-local service system. DAB practical tests are scheduled for the NAB convention next spring. To its credit, the NAB is in the forefront of developing this exciting new technology.

Also, digital compression of audio transmission promises to multiply the channels available for radio programming of the future. This represents both a future challenge and a multi-channel opportunity for radio operators. It also presents a potential problem of diluting an already over saturated radio marketplace. As I have previously stated, I believe those who have pioneered or who have a large longtime investment in developing communications in America deserve a priority consideration in instituting advanced technologies affecting their business.

Also, I believe the most useful contribution the FCC could make to AM radio improvement, and in many cases AM salvation, is to promulgate actions that reduce the clutter of interference and improve coverage.

Thus, I believe a substantial priority should be allotted to licensees whose movement to the new expanded band 1605-1705 would reduce interference. As I see it, the most practical way of establishing the expanded band and perhaps the only way would be to permit simulcasting on the present band and expanded band until the millions of current radio receivers are replaced with expanded band receivers -- Estimated time is 5 to 8 years. This process could be expedited by major automobile companies promptly installing expanded band receivers in cars.

Another example would be the current auctions versus lottery controversy. I'd like to propose a middle road. I believe a more responsible plan than present lotteries should have been instituted long ago for awarding non-broadcast spectrum. The ship has already sailed on valuable cellular grants. Several billion dollars worth of spectrum has been allocated without any return to the government. Lotteries have spawned application mills and generated immediate wealth for winners who had no intention of operating the spectrum. Comparative hearings, the best method for evaluating the most qualified applicants, would seriously delay the entire process and cause an almost impossible administrative burden for the FCC. Auctions would favor the wealthy and well established who could outbid and thus then sell the spectrum or operate as they see fit. I believe a more responsible method would be a lottery with a 1% application fee,

with the lottery winner paying 5% of the appraised value of the spectrum. This method should include a requirement that winners operate the system for two years. The FCC would arrange for expert appraisal of the current marketplace value of the spectrum. For simplicity's sake, let's assume an appraised value of one million dollars for personal communications systems or cellular grants. To qualify for the lottery, each applicant would be required to post a non-refundable application fee of 1% or \$10,000. The winner would be required to pay an additional 4% up front or \$40,000 (for a total of \$50,000) and be required to operate the cellular system for two years before selling. The result: the government would receive some reasonable payment for a valuable spectrum; only responsible entities willing to serve the public by operating the new spectrum would apply; the monetary amount could be easily financed by winners of a valuable business spectrum. This is an initial draft proposal that should be subjected to further comment and to fine-tuning.

Like the question of spectrum management, FCC issues and developments must be addressed in the swiftly changing and ever-evolving communications environment. FCC regulations must consider the greatly increased competitive environment for communication services. Today broadcasting spectrum scarcity has been replaced by program channel abundance with many more oncoming channels which reach specific demographic audiences.

For example, several years ago TV listings in newspapers typically carried three networks plus one or two independent and PBS stations. Today in all major papers -- locally The Washington Post and The Washington Times -- or in my former home town, the Detroit News and Free Press, now carry daily listings of 23 to 25 channels of programming -- in the process promoting the competitive and increasingly popular cable services. This multi-channel abundance in a competitive marketplace certainly de-emphasizes any possible charges of undue media control or lack of diversity by broadcasters.

A recent survey reported by Chairman Al Sikes revealed that an average hypothetical person, aged 34, working and living in a typical urban area has access to a 36 channel cable system, nine over-the-air television signals, and 24 AM and FM radio broadcast signals. She can subscribe to one of nine long-distance carriers, to one of two cellular radiotelephone services (directly or via five cellular resellers) and seven paging companies (including two national service providers). Other radio alternatives available range from Citizens Band (CB radio), to specialized mobile radio (SMR), to some two dozen private radio services loosely limited to members of affinity groups. Also there is access to satellite-transmitted communications, accessible through a \$1700.00 backyard receive-only earth station.

Our typical average American ordinarily has 2.2 TV sets in the home (80 percent color), 6 radios, a CD player and a video cassette recorder (VCR). This all amounts to far greater individual choice and opportunity in communications than ever before.

Legislation and regulation today must take into consideration the multiple communications choices available to consumers. FCC regulation should be based on the competitive realities of today and tomorrow's burgeoning multi-channel marketplace -- not on the communications marketplace of 20 or even 5 years ago. This makes for a contentious and sometimes an untidy regulatory process. (In this respect a lawyer friend of mine several years ago told me there are two things you should never watch made -- sausage and FCC regulations.)

My response to the very first pre-hearing confirmation question asked by the Senate majority placed a high priority on implementing advanced multi-choice technology.

You may be interested in this perceptive first question. It read "What should be the Commission's priorities for the next 5 years?" My reply was "I believe the Commission's highest priority in the next five years will be the orderly, compatible implementation of the advanced technological services of telecomputing, fiber optics, DBS, DAB, HDTV, cellular and personal phone service. Advanced technology often outstrips society's ability to integrate it into our already complex, sometimes expensive communications systems. The rate and extent of technological development will be determined by consumer acceptance and affordability, commercial practicalities, legislative and regulatory actions and by the service's beneficial contribution to total public interest.

"I believe preservation and enhancement of the all-important free universal over-the-air broadcast service should continue to be the mainspring of American mass communications In their deliberations, commissioners should apply the simple principle of the best service to the most people at the most reasonable, practical cost."

The FCC is taking some initial well-considered steps to update regulation and to implement advanced technology. In the radio area, we are looking at the issue of AM improvement, in a timely "attic-to-basement" review of the radio ownership rules and at digital audio broadcasting, or DAB. In television, we are still digesting the excellent report prepared by the Office of Plans and Policies -- Broadcast Television in a Multichannel Marketplace -- and have issued a Notice of Inquiry seeking comment on the implications of this study on the future of television and on our regulations. Also, our Advisory Committee

on Advanced Television Services has begun testing HDTV systems, and we hope to adopt a standard by mid-1993.

The OPP Report and the Commission initiatives have led some to say that broadcast television is a medium with a great future behind it. Increasingly there is talk -- some by network officials -- of the demise of one or more of the networks and even predictions about the end of free broadcast television. But, as I said when we adopted the Notice of Inquiry on our television rules, "any interpretations in the popular press about the FCC predicting the demise of broadcasting are a little premature. We are just beginning the comprehensive inquiry."

This is not to say that there is no cause for concern. I came to recognize during the finsyn proceeding that the troublesome economic and competitive environment facing broadcasters is forcing us, as regulators, to reevaluate some of our longstanding assumptions. Or, at least, it should force us to do so. I still have hopes that my colleagues will join the Chairman and me in this understanding during reconsideration of finsyn. Barring that, of course, it is up to the 7th Circuit. I truly believe the future of universal free TV is at stake -- the networks are still the largest distributors of universal free over-the-air programming. Surveys, TV critics, press articles all stress that network audience and influence have drastically eroded the past five years. Networks should now be free to negotiate for programming or produce their own programming without having to overcome outdated regulatory roadblocks. My 36 page dissent tells it all!

So what is the current situation? Ken Auletta, in his new book on the networks entitled "Three Blind Mice: How the TV Networks Lost Their Way" characterized the changes in the network business as "an earthquake that struck as if in slow motion, cracking their foundations." He points out that since 1976, the three networks have lost one-third of their viewers, primarily to cable and VCRs! These shocks to the system, he writes, "registered a 10 on the Richter scale." I noted these changes in my separate statement on finsyn. Among other things, I pointed out that:

- In 1970, 2,490 cable television systems had 4.5 million subscribers; by 1990, 10,823 cable systems had about 54 million basic subscribers.
- In 1970, cable "networks" were virtually nonexistent; by 1990, there were about 90 basic cable networks and 17 pay movie channels.

- In 1970, VCRs did not exist as a consumer product; by 1990, they were installed in 66 million households. This represents about 72 percent of all television households.

As a result of these changes:

- By 1990, prime time viewing of the three networks had dropped from 90 percent to about 57 percent, and was headed downward. The most recent "sweeps" period, ending last July, revealed that the network prime time viewing audience dropped below 50 percent - the first time ever during a "sweeps" month.

Then too, networks compete aggressively against each other as well as against cable, DBS, syndications, independent stations, VCRs, etc. For example, expert financial analyst George Michaelis noted the revenues from the syndication of the Cosby show alone totals more than all three networks in the last two or three years (in the August 30th Investors Digest).

Also, Larry Gerbrandt of the prestigious Paul Kagan Associates praised USA Network in an September 15 edition of the New York Times. Mr. Gerbrandt estimated that USA Network, a 50-50 partnership of Paramount Communications and MCA, Inc. made \$70 million last year on sales of \$270 million. He said this year USA could make more than at least two of the three major TV networks.

Applying these trends to the coming decade, the OPP Report predicts that broadcast television will still remain a "reasonably prominent" feature of the American landscape. But it also finds, and I agree, that broadcasting "will be a smaller and far less profitable business in the year 2000 than it is now" and that the impact will be most severe in smaller markets. On the radio side, the NAB recently reported that more than half of all radio stations lost money in 1990!

The OPP Report was predicated on the continuation of current trends and it acknowledged that a change in the trends could "drastically alter" the predicted outcome. In this respect, the Report is like the Ghost of Christmas Future, that told Scrooge he could avoid a dire end if he changed his life. But the Report is directed not to Scrooge, but to us. It concludes that if we change some of our rules, broadcasters could become "more effective competitors in an increasingly multichannel market." Consequently, our recent Notice of Inquiry on the future of television asks how the Commission can help -- or at least keep from hurting -- the TV situation. Similarly, the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on radio seeks to remove technical and regulatory impediments to a competitive market.

But our concerns cannot be limited to these more wide-ranging proceedings. The state of the all important free over-the-air broadcasting in the 1990s will permeate all that we do, from our choices in broad policy initiatives to how we develop advanced technology, assess forfeitures and how we view waiver requests.

Some, who may have over-interpreted the OPP Report, have suggested that changing a few of our broadcast regulations is like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. Although I reject the comparison to the Titanic, I would say this: In certain proceedings -- such as finsyn -- what we should be doing is closing portholes below the water line that inexplicably were left open. Speaking of finsyn, when it was decided last May some mistakenly called it "deregulation." But then, as Huey Long said, "if fascism comes to America, it'll be called anti-fascism." The point is, the problems confronting broadcasting are serious enough that the Commission's actions must be stronger than its rhetoric and must reflect current marketplace competitive abundance.

My comments today on the need for an orderly transition into future advanced technology should not be taken as a blanket pre-endorsement of everything in our "attic-to-basement" proceedings. We are in the process of reviewing all the arguments on both sides. Nor am I advocating turning away from the public interest standard in our day-to-day decisions. That standard is mandated by the Communications Act, and, in my experience, it is the hallmark of good broadcasting -- and good business. As I said some years ago, "I do deregulation -- I don't do anarchy."

The solution to the problem of current regulatory imbalance is not to "even the score" by handicapping competitors. The Commission cannot help preserve broadcasting by trying to restrict the entry of new technologies like DAB, DBS, interactive services and eventually the myriad services of fiber optic transmission. If we have learned one thing over the years, it is that we should not -- indeed, we cannot -- stop new, improved, technologies and services. The only logical limitations will be consumer acceptance and consumer affordability.

The folly of thwarting advanced technology reminds me of a letter written to President Andrew Jackson in 1829 by Martin Van Buren when he was Governor of New York. Van Buren urged the President to forestall the development of "a new form of transportation known as 'railroads.'" If railroads were to supplant canal boats, the Governor cautioned, "boat builders would suffer and towline, ship and harness makers would be left destitute . . . not to mention the numerous farmers . . .

employed in growing hay for horses." Also, "[i]n the event of unexpected trouble with England, the Erie Canal would be the only means by which we could ever move the supplies so vital to waging modern war."

Finally, Governor Van Buren argued that the new technology was a threat in its own right, that such railway engines "roar and snort their way through the countryside, setting fire to crops, scaring the livestock and frightening women and children" while traveling at "the enormous speed of 15 miles per hour." Van Buren concluded, "The almighty certainly never intended that people should travel at such breakneck speed." And he called on President Jackson to create an Interstate Commerce Commission "to protect the American people from the evils of 'railroads.'"

Now, I don't know whether the almighty ever intended for us to have the choice between dozens or perhaps hundreds of television channels, but as Walter Cronkite used to say, "that's the way it is." I say we should welcome everyone to the party, but at the same time, make sure our rules do not inadvertently impose a higher admission fee on the original invitees. I believe that pioneers of industries that made large investments over the years developing communications in America deserve a priority opportunity to participate in advanced technologies affecting their business.

All the recent talk about the dire economic conditions facing the broadcast industry has led to questions about maintaining the quality of the programming, both news and entertainment. I have always believed that it is impossible for broadcasters to serve the public interest unless they have the economic viability and resources to do so.

But there is a larger question about programming quality. During my confirmation hearings last summer, Chairman Inouye pointed out that I had been at the Commission for 17 years and asked if I thought TV programming had become better or worse in that time?

I said it is a difficult question because it depends so much on personal program taste, also the FCC isn't supposed to regulate content. I did say the writing and modern production techniques are vastly improved, but expressed concern about excessive violence and sex on TV available to all age groups. I also expressed my belief that TV is playing a significant role in de-sensitizing society to violence, rape, murder and sexual promiscuity.

Of course, it is generally known that people dump on TV almost as much as they dump on lawyers. People generally refer to it as the "boob tube" or "idiot box." TV is the medium that Newton Minow described as a "vast wasteland" 30 years ago and David Frost described as "an invention that permits you to be entertained in your living room by people you wouldn't have in your home." In a panel appearance opposing TV indecency and obscenity, I couldn't resist saying "Instead of prime time TV serving the public interest, we too often now have "slime time TV serving the public interest."

As you know, the FCC has a Congressionally mandated rule against obscene or indecent programming. It is generally known that I strongly support its enforcement within the bounds of the First Amendment. But I am talking about a far broader issue than that. It is again a question of everyday values being eroded through the pervasive effects of entertainment programming--most of it produced by Hollywood studios for cable and broadcasting.

"We are the nation's storytellers," said one Hollywood witness at our finsyn hearings last December. Well, I just have to believe that there are better stories to tell than what I see much of the time on TV and cable. I wonder what might be the effect on children who routinely witness murder, mayhem and invitations to casual sex as a nightly ritual in the name of entertainment. I have to wonder about the direction of our society when our fantasy lives are dominated by creative murderers, drug dealers, hookers and buckets of blood. One recent study found that the average child sees 25,000 murders on TV by the time he or she turns 18! Two weeks ago President Bush lashed out against TV violence and sex stating he is "convinced that TV excesses are having a bad effect on our children and family stability and learning."

Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your point of view, this is not a problem that can be addressed very well by the government. Even President Bush recognized the First Amendment sensitivities by noting after his criticism that he is not free to make "all-encompassing decrees from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue that fly in the face of people's rights." I second the statements made by Chairman Sikes and Commissioner Duggan at our July meeting when we adopted the future of television Notice of Inquiry. Both said that to a large extent, the fate of the TV industry is in the hands of those now running the business and that they could learn from those who have succeeded by presenting family-oriented programming.

I agree that broadcasters could do better by listening to their audience. If they don't do so, the audience will begin to speak louder. This is beginning to happen through such groups as Terry Rakolta's Americans for Responsible Television, now an effective group of over 10,000 concerned citizens. Such groups are not asking for legislative or congressional intervention. Instead they take matters into their own hands by making their views known to broadcast and cable companies and by criticizing advertising support of objectionable programming. Some have called this a First Amendment threat. That's nonsense. To the extent such organizations are not calling for regulation, they are merely exercising their own First Amendment rights. In fact, in many personal appearances the past fourteen years, I have urged frustrated citizens groups to register their objection directly with the TV stations, cable systems and, most importantly, with advertisers. They frequently get positive results without Congressional or FCC intervention that can raise First Amendment concerns. If these citizens groups represent the views of a broad cross-section of the American public who are fed up with what they see on TV, then producers, advertisers and broadcast executives would do well to listen. This is nothing more than the public marketplace at work and media executives who complain won't get much sympathy from me.

I don't want to give the impression all TV programming is bad. It is interesting to note that after spending six years researching and writing "Three Blind Mice," Ken Auletta said, "It has always been fashionable to sneer at television entertainment. I no longer do that, in part because I watch more television."

That brings to mind a call I received from an irate WJR fan about 20 years ago who insisted on talking to the manager. He said "I've been listening to your station for over 20 years and it stinks." Apparently he must have found some of the smells inoffensive -- I was tempted to send him a 20-year loyal listener pen.

In a more serious vein, some of the best programming ever produced is on the current network and cable schedules, on Fox, on CNN and on PBS. (I'll decline to name specific shows, if you don't mind.) News and public affairs coverage of war and revolutionary international developments was never better! Moreover, the recent events in the Soviet Union attest to the resilience of the network news organizations. NBC got the first dramatic footage of government soldiers retreating from Moscow; Diane Sawyer of ABC managed to interview Boris Yeltsin in the midst of the crisis; CBS also provided special coverage of the events. Worldwide, the TV media presence has been cited as a key factor in bringing about overdue political-social freedoms and a positive and peaceful outcome. Both Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin have since proclaimed that "freedom of speech is a most important condition of progress in Russian society."

This is television at its best!

The most important challenge facing the Commission in the coming decade is to take care that our policies do not erode one of our nation's most valuable institutions: universal free over-the-air television available to all the public. Congress seems dedicated to this all-encompassing principle that best serves public interest and so should all of us.

Overall, it is a challenging time to be at the FCC. The FCC has offered me the most exciting and gratifying period of my career. This is a period of revolutionary growth, contentious developments and technological advancements in all fields of communications -- and the best is still to come! The FCC's challenge will be the orderly practical implementation of advanced technology services of telecomputers, fiber optics, DBS, DAB and HDTV. We must deal, too, with the implications of increasing communications globalization.

In summary, industry, the communications bar and government must work together to implement advanced technology and to maintain and increase our communications leadership so that Americans remain the best informed, most gainfully employed and best served people in the world.

Thank you for your indulgence -- your good humor and courtesy chuckles are appreciated -- I have a final message by author Samuel Ullman on aging that I find inspiring I want to share with you.

". . . In the center of your heart and my heart there is a wireless station; so long as it receives messages of beauty, hope, cheer, courage and power . . . so long are you young. When the aerials are down, and your spirit is covered with snows of cynicism and the ice of pessimism, then you are grown old, even at 20, but as long as your aerials are up, to catch waves of optimism, there is hope you may die young (at an advanced age)"

I shouldn't add a somber note to this pleasant occasion -- but the thought occurred to me. When in the natural course of events, I am eventually called by that all-time great regulator in the sky, it shouldn't be a tragic big deal -- It will only be the logical inevitable culmination of an exciting and challenging full life.

Thanks to all of you and to all my FCC associates for being such an important part of that exciting life. Best wishes to all of you for personal fulfillment in the exciting great years ahead.

###