

Speech copy

June 10, 1980

COMMENTS BY
FCC COMMISSIONER JAMES H. QUELLO

BEFORE THE
NEW ENGLAND BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION
Boston

224

IT IS USUAL PRACTICE FOR SPEAKERS TO OPEN
 WITH SOMETHING LIKE "I'M DELIGHTED TO APPEAR
 BEFORE THIS DISTINGUISHED GROUP TODAY TO ADDRESS
 A SIGNIFICANT SUBJECT OF MUTUAL CONCERN, ETC."
 CONSIDERING THAT I COULD POSSIBLY BE A LAME DUCK
 AFTER JUNE 30TH, IT IS ESPECIALLY GRATIFYING THAT
 THE NEW ENGLAND BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION AND,
surprising that
 FRANKLY, MANY OTHER COMMUNICATIONS AND EDUCA-
 TIONAL GROUPS, HAVE EXTENDED INVITATIONS TO ME
 FOR JUNE, JULY AND AUGUST. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER
 IT'S AN ACT OF FAITH, HOPE OR CHARITY ON THEIR
 PART.

*It is a change from
 is better than Washington -- Washington
 is filled with muggers, thieves and lawyers*
(964 in the FCC alone)
also

ANYWAY, I AM PLEASSED TO BE IN BOSTON. SINCE

THREE OF MY COLLEAGUES ON THE COMMISSION ARE

EITHER BOSTON BRED OR BOSTON EDUCATED, OR BOTH,
I'M CURIOUS ABOUT WHAT ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES
CAUSE THIS YEARNING FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE, PAR-
TICULARLY IN THE COMMUNICATIONS FIELD.

I'M ESPECIALLY PLEASED TO BE HERE BECAUSE, *first,*
IT PROVIDES AN OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS
UPPERMOST IN YOUR MINDS REGARDING REGULATIONS
THAT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT YOUR FUTURE. / AND
THERE IS ONE MORE REASON--I HAVE A LOCAL FORUM
TO CORRECT A FEW OF THE MORE SIGNIFICANT OF
MANY DISTORTIONS THAT APPEARED IN A⁰ MALICIOUS,
INNACCURATE NEWSPAPER COLUMN IN THE BOSTON
GLOBE LAST FEBRUARY.

I REALIZE I AM DEFYING CONVENTIONAL WISDOM
THAT SILENCE IS THE BEST COURSE WHEN ATTACKED
IN THE PRESS. / BUT, I'M ALSO AWARE, BASED ON MY

EXPERIENCE THE FIRST TIME I SOUGHT APPOINTMENT,
THAT SILENCE IS DEFINITELY NOT ALWAYS GOLDEN. I
AM IN VERY GOOD COMPANY WHEN I COMPLAIN ABOUT
SOME OF THE PRESS EXCESSES. THOMAS JEFFERSON
WROTE, IN 1787:

THE BASIS OF OUR GOVERNMENT
BEING THE OPINION OF THE PEOPLE, THE
VERY FIRST OBJECT SHOULD BE TO KEEP
THAT RIGHT; AND WERE IT LEFT TO ME
TO DECIDE WHETHER WE SHOULD HAVE
A GOVERNMENT WITHOUT NEWSPAPERS,
OR NEWSPAPERS WITHOUT GOVERNMENT,
I SHOULD NOT HESITATE A MOMENT TO
PREFER THE LATTER.

TWENTY YEARS LATER, JEFFERSON WROTE:

NOTHING CAN NOW BE BELIEVED
WHICH IS SEEN IN A NEWSPAPER. TRUTH
ITSELF BECOMES SUSPICIOUS BY BEING
PUT INTO THAT POLLUTED VEHICLE.

APPARENTLY JEFFERSON, TOO, OCCASIONALLY READ A
BOSTON PAPER. BUT MORE ABOUT THAT LATER. LET'S

GET TO THE PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS BROADCASTERS ARE MOST INTERESTED IN.

LAST WEEK THE COMMISSION GAVE FINAL APPROVAL TO THE TEXT OF ITS 4-3 DECISION THAT FOUND RKO GENERAL NOT QUALIFIED TO REMAIN A LICENSEE. THIS EXAMPLE OF GROSS BUREAUCRATIC OVERKILL REPRESENTS THE MOST HARSH AND UNWARRANTED PUNISHMENT IN THE HISTORY OF COMMUNICATIONS. IT SENT SHOCK WAVES, AS WELL IT SHOULD, THROUGHOUT THE INDUSTRY. MY STRONG OPPOSITION TO THE DECISION IS DETAILED IN ^{my} A SEVEN PAGE DISSENT THAT IS AVAILABLE THROUGH YOUR LAWYERS OR AT THE FCC. THE DECISION AND DISSENT SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED READING FOR BROADCASTERS AND, PARTICULARLY, GROUP BROADCASTERS.

MANY OF YOU HAVE INQUIRED ABOUT THE STATUS OF OUR PROPOSED RADIO DEREGULATION. THERE IS

SOME CONFUSION AND MISCONCEPTION~~X~~ AS TO WHAT THE ✓
FCC IS OR IS NOT PROPOSING TO DEREGULATE. / TO SAVE
TIME, I HAVE FACT SHEETS FOR YOUR INFORMATION
THAT LIST~~#~~ ALL THE OPTIONS. / ^{and} I'LL BE GLAD TO ANSWER
ANY QUESTIONS. / I BELIEVE THE RADIO PROPOSALS RE-
PRESENT A GOOD OPPORTUNITY TO GET A DEREGULATORY
FOOT IN THE DOOR. / BUT REMEMBER, FCC EFFORTS ARE
LIMITED BY THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT. / ONLY LEGISLA-
TION CAN PROVIDE MAJOR DEREGULATION DEALING WITH
LICENSE TERMS, POLITICAL BROADCASTING, GOVERNMENT
INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAM FORMAT AND ALTERNATIVES
OR REFORM IN THE COMPARATIVE HEARING PROCESS. / I
HOPE THAT SOME TIME IN THE NEAR FUTURE, THE FCC
WILL CAREFULLY DELIBERATE AND THEN MAKE CON-
STRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEREGULATORY
LEGISLATION. / MY PERSONAL VIEW ADVOCATING COMPLETE

DEREGULATION HAVE BEEN PRESENTED BEFORE THE HOUSE AND SENATE SUBCOMMITTEES ON COMMUNICATIONS AND ARE A MATTER OF OFFICIAL RECORD. / IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN COMPREHENSIVE ARGUMENTS FOR TOTAL DEREGULATION WRITTEN IN LAYMAN'S LANGUAGE, YOU CAN WRITE MY OFFICE FOR A COPY.

INCIDENTALLY, BROADCASTERS WHO MANAGE THE GREATEST COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA DON'T MANAGE TO DO A VERY EFFECTIVE JOB IN COMMUNICATING THEIR *own* ACTIONS OR POLICY TO THE OVERALL PUBLIC. / THERE IS A NEED TO DISPEL EXAGGERATED CRITICISM OF DEREGULATION. / THE FCC WOULD NOT PROPOSE ^{*or support*} AN ACTION THAT WOULD ELIMINATE PSA'S, REDUCE OR ELIMINATE RADIO NEWS, OR CAUSE WIDESPREAD UNEMPLOYMENT OR ENCOURAGE OVERCOMMERCIALIZATION.

YOU HAVE A COMMUNITY SELLING JOB TO DO--IF

OR WHEN DEREGULATION IS ADOPTED, YOU HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTING MARKETPLACE COMPETITION IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

IN ADDITION TO DEREGULATION, OTHER IMPORTANT ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED ARE:

- CLEAR CHANNEL RADIO — *NPR Report and only subject to reconsideration*
- THE 10 TO 9 KHZ PROPOSALS — *policy position, Region 2 conference*
- AM STEREO *Report and only subject to reconsideration*
- SHORT FORM RENEWALS AND RANDOM AUDIT — *NPR*
- CHILDRENS TV PROGRAMMING — *from inquiry to NPR --- 5 options*
- DIRECT SATELLITE TO HOME TV TRANSMISSION — *study groups*
- THE FUTURE OF TV AND CABLE
- STATUS OF SYNDICATED EXCLUSIVITY, NETWORK — *NPR, comments in*
Cable franchise fees
 NON-DUPE AND COPYRIGHT REVISION
(Discuss or summarize all the above) CAREFUL OF EX PARTE INCLUDING QUESTIONS
Status not minute

NOW ABOUT THAT SCURRILOUS COLUMN. / I DON'T FEEL A NEED TO DEFEND MYSELF BEFORE THIS GROUP OR ANY OBJECTIVE GROUP OF LAWMAKERS OR JOURNALISTS. / I JUST WANT TO GET MY COMMENTS ON RECORD FOR ANYONE WHO MAY HAVE SEEN THE COLUMN.

AS A STAUNCH SUPPORTER OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS, I BELIEVE REPORTERS, AND PARTICULARLY COLUMNISTS, HAVE A RIGHT TO BE WRONG. I ALSO BELIEVE PUBLISHERS AND EDITORS HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MAKING SURE THEY ARE NOT WRONG TOO OFTEN OR DON'T REFLECT UNFAVORABLY ON THEMSELVES OR THEIR PUBLICATION.

I FULLY REALIZE THAT PEOPLE IN PUBLIC LIFE ARE SUBJECT TO BIASED HATCHET JOBS, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME REASONABLE LIMITATION TO SCURRILOUS STATEMENTS AND IGNORANCE OF FACT SO THAT SOME SEMBLANCE OF JOURNALISTIC DECENCY AND TRUTH CAN BE MAINTAINED.

IN THIS CONTEXT, AND IN THE INTEREST OF MORE ENLIGHTENED AND ACCURATE REPORTING, I'M CORRECTING A FEW OF THE MORE GLARING INACCURACIES AND MALICIOUS COMMENTS CONTAINED IN A TV COLUMN.

IN HIS FEBRUARY COLUMN, THE WRITER BEGAN BY STATING: "JAMES H. QUELLO ISSUED A PRESS RELEASE A FEW YEARS AGO ANNOUNCING HE WANTED TO BE APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT NIXON TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (FCC)." PRESUMABLY, HE HAD DISCOVERED A PRESS REPORT WHICH GOES BACK NEARLY SEVEN YEARS WHICH MADE A SIMILAR UNSUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATION. HE NEVER BOTHERED TO CHECK IT OUT, HOWEVER. THAT REPORT WAS EFFECTIVELY REFUTED AT THE TIME. AT NO TIME DID I ISSUE OR CAUSE TO BE ISSUED SUCH A PRESS RELEASE. I'M NOT SURE THAT ISSUING A PRESS RELEASE TO ANNOUNCE YOUR CANDIDACY FOR APPOINTIVE OFFICE INVOLVES ANY MORAL OR ETHICAL QUESTION AS THE WRITER SEEMED TO IMPLY, BUT THE FACT IS I DID NOT ISSUE SUCH A RELEASE.

THEN, IN A SWEEPING CHARGE OF GUILT-BY-ASSOCIATION, THE COLUMNIST NOTED: "THE INDUSTRY HAS ALWAYS

WANTED A MOUTHPIECE AT THE FCC, A SURE VOTE AGAINST ANY INCONVENIENT REGULATION IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST."

ANYONE WHO IS EVEN CASUALLY ACQUAINTED WITH MY RECORD AS AN FCC COMMISSIONER KNOWS THAT STATEMENT AND THE INNUENDO CONVEYED BY IT ARE RIDICULOUS.

DURING MY TENURE, I HAVE VOTED TO DENY RENEWAL TO MORE THAN TWENTY LICENSEES. I JOINED IN IMPOSING VARIOUS SANCTIONS IN OVER 600 CASES. IN THE COM-

MISSION'S ENTIRE 49 YEAR HISTORY BEFORE I JOINED IT, NOT MORE THAN 40 RENEWALS HAD BEEN DENIED. I HAVE SUPPORTED DENIAL IN EGREGIOUS INSTANCES DESPITE THE

FACT THAT I BELIEVE OUR RULES AND PRECEDENTS HAVE BECOME OVERLY PUNITIVE. DESPITE MY PERSONAL PHIL-

OSOPHY, HOWEVER, I RECOGNIZE THAT I AM OBLIGED TO UPHOLD THE LAW AND THE COMMISSION'S RULES. I ALSO STRONGLY SUPPORTED AND IN SOME CASES ADVOCATED THE INITIAL AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM AND MINORITY

OWNERSHIP PROPOSALS.

I POINTED OUT TO THE COLUMNIST ^{in a letter} THAT I ACTIVELY SUPPORTED ^{initial} THE DEREGULATION OF CABLE TELEVISION DURING A TIME WHEN CABLE AND BROADCASTING WERE ANTAGONISTS, A POSITION HARDLY REFLECTIVE OF A DESIRE TO BE "A MOUTHPIECE" FOR BROADCASTERS. / I HAVE DEFENDED BROADCASTERS AGAINST FRIVOLOUS AND VINDICTIVE PETITIONS WHEN IT BECAME CLEAR THAT THEY WERE UNFOUNDED AND CALCULATED MORE TO HARRASS THAN TO IMPROVE. / I HAVE SPOKEN OUT AGAINST THE TACTICS OF SOME PRIVATE INTEREST GROUPS WHO HAVE ATTEMPTED TO CLOAK THEMSELVES IN THE MANTLE OF "PUBLIC INTEREST." --SOME MAKE A CAREER OF GENERATING AND THEN EXPLOITING DISCONTENT. / I HAVE OPPOSED THE ABUSE OF THE COMMISSION'S PROCESSES AS WASTEFUL AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE. / IN THE VAST MAJORITY OF CASES, I HAVE FOUND BROADCASTERS MORE RESPONSIBLE, MORE ACCOUNTABLE AND MORE SOCIALLY CONSCIOUS THAN THEIR ANTAGONISTS.

CONTINUING THE UNSUPPORTED ALLEGATIONS, THE COLUMNIST WROTE: "HE PROVED HIS UNFITNESS AGAIN LAST MONTH. WHEN THE FCC VOTED TO STRIP RKO GENERAL OF WNAC CHANNEL 7 AND TWO OTHER TV STATIONS FOR LONG AND DIVERSE ABUSES, ALL OF THEM ACKNOWLEDGED IN FEDERAL COURT, QUELLO RAGED IN IRRELEVANT DISSENT." FIRST, IT SHOULD BE POINTED OUT THAT IT WAS A 4 TO 3 BY THE COMMISSION WHICH WENT AGAINST RKO GENERAL. VOTE. ALSO, THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE WHO HEARD THE CASE AND WAS INTIMATELY FAMILIAR WITH THE TOTALITY OF FACTS CONCLUDED RKO WAS QUALIFIED TO REMAIN A BROADCAST LICENSEE. THE COMMISSION'S BROADCAST BUREAU ALSO RECOMMENDED LICENSE RENEWAL. / THUS, MY DISSENT WAS NOT A POSITION OF INTEMPERATE ISOLATION BUT A REASONED JUDGMENT BASED UPON A CAREFUL REVIEW OF THE FACTS. / SECOND, IF MY DISSENTING STATEMENT WAS IRRELEVANT, THIS ALLEGED FACT ESCAPED THE EDITORS OF THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, TV GUIDE, THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST, THE WASHINGTON STAR,

FORTUNE MAGAZINE, BROADCASTING MAGAZINE AND TV DIGEST^t,
 ALL OF WHICH SAW FIT TO QUOTE MY STATEMENT, MANY OF
 THEM IN EDITORIALS. / ALSO, THE WRITER WHO PRESUMES TO
 SIT IN JUDGMENT OF MY LEGAL EXPERTISE RELIED VERY
 HEAVILY UPON HIS OWN IGNORANCE OF THE LEGAL PROCESS.
 GENERAL TIRE -- NOT THE RKO SUBSIDIARY -- ENTERED INTO
 A CONSENT DECREE WITH THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
 COMMISSION AND A SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF
 JUSTICE WHICH RESOLVED ALL ALLEGATIONS OF IMPROPRIETY
 WHICH HAD BEEN RAISED AGAINST THE PARENT COMPANY.
 NEITHER A SETTLEMENT NOR A CONSENT DECREE INVOLVES
 ANY ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF GUILT, A POINT WHICH THE
 COLUMNIST FOUND TOO SUBTLE TO GRASP. / THE SALIENT
 FACT WAS THAT NEITHER AGENCY CHOSE TO PROSECUTE AND
 NEITHER MADE ANY FINDINGS AS TO THE GRAVITY OF THE
 ALLEGED MISCONDUCT. / *This glaring ^{and careless} inaccuracy was not on some
 minor story -- it's the most significant and largest part of the history of the TCC.*

AGAIN, QUOTING FROM THE LONG LIST OF INACCURATE

CHARGES LEVELED AGAINST ME: "HE VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED THE HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE PLAN TO CHARGE A 'SPECTRUM FEE,' EVEN THOUGH HE KNOWS BROADCASTING IS MORE PROFITABLE THAN THE OIL INDUSTRY WITH FAR LESS CAPITAL OUTLAY, FAR LESS RISK, FAR LESS FLUCTUATION IN INCOME, UNDER THE PROTECTION OF A GOVERNMENT MONOPOLY." / I THINK THAT MOST OF YOU KNOW THAT I WAS AMONG THE FIRST TO ADVOCATE AND SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF A SPECTRUM FEE AS AN ELEMENT IN THE EFFORT TO DEREGULATE BROADCASTING. / I ADVOCATED SPECTRUM FEES BEFORE BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE HEARINGS. / MANY OF MY FORMER COLLEAGUES IN BROADCASTING EXPRESSED SHARP DISAPPROVAL OF MY POSITION AT THAT TIME. / AS TO "GOVERNMENT MONOPOLY" TO WHICH THE WRITER SO SWEEPINGLY REFERRED, THE RANDOM HOUSE COLLEGE DICTIONARY DEFINES MONOPOLY AS FOLLOWS: "EXCLUSIVE CONTROL OF A COMMODITY OR SERVICE IN A PARTICULAR

MARKET, OR A CONTROL THAT MAKES POSSIBLE THE MANIPULATION OF PRICES." I CERTAINLY DON'T SEE ANY MONOPOLIES AROUND IN THE MAJOR RADIO AND TELEVISION MARKETS IN THIS COUNTRY. ^{monopoly} IT IS A VERY COMMON TERM USED BY ACTIVIST GROUPS TO DENIGRATE BROADCASTING. ^{The fact is} THERE ARE MANY MORE RADIO AND TV STATIONS THAN NEWSPAPERS IN MARKETS OF ANY SIZE AND THEY COMPETE AGGRESSIVELY AGAINST ^{all other} COMPETITIVE STATIONS AND ALL OTHER MEDIA - NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, OUTDOOR ADVERTISING, DIRECT MAIL, ETC. I RECENTLY SPOKE TO A GROUP OF RADIO BROADCASTERS IN PUERTO RICO WHO, AS A GROUP, CERTAINLY DON'T CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO BE MONOPOLISTS. IN 1978, NEARLY 30% OF THE PUERTO RICAN RADIO STATIONS REPORTED LOSSES TO THE COMMISSION ON THEIR ANNUAL REPORT FORMS. DOES THAT SOUND LIKE MONOPOLY? IN MY FORMER HOME STATE OF MICHIGAN, MORE THAN 20% OF THE STATIONS REPORTED LOSSES IN 1977 AND NEARLY 23% REPORTED LOSSES

IN 1978. IN MY CURRENT STATE OF VIRGINIA, ABOUT 24%
OF THE RADIO STATIONS REPORTED LOSSES FOR 1978. / THOSE
FIGURES DON'T SEEM TO BE CONSISTENT WITH AN INDUSTRY
"...MORE PROFITABLE THAN THE OIL INDUSTRY WITH FAR
LESS CAPITAL OUTLAY, FAR LESS RISK...", ETC. THERE IS
NO DENYING THAT SOME BROADCASTING STATIONS ARE
VERY PROFITABLE BUT PEOPLE MUST BE ^{consequently} REMINDED THAT
UNCLE SAM IS A 48% PARTNER IN THOSE PROFITS, ALSO
DIVIDENDS ARE TAXED, SALARIES ARE TAXED TO SUPPORT
THE GOVERNMENT--ALL FROM PROFITABLE BUSINESSES.

A FINAL ASSERTION IN THIS FICTION-PACKED COLUMN WHICH I CHOSE TO ANSWER, DEALT PRIMARILY WITH CHILDREN'S TELEVISION. THE ASSERTION WAS: "HE HAS TRIED TO STALL THE FCC INQUIRY INTO THE ADEQUACY OF CHILDREN'S TELEVISION, HE HAS LAUGHED OFF THE FINDINGS OF NEAR-MONOPOLY IN AN FCC STUDY OF NETWORK POWER, AND HE HAS 'PHILOSOPHICALLY OPPOSED' THE PLAN TO REIMBURSE PUBLIC INTEREST PARTICIPANTS IN FCC RULEMAKING, THOUGH HE VOTED FOR A YEAR'S FINANCING."

I CERTAINLY DID NOT ATTEMPT TO STALL THE INQUIRY INTO CHILDREN'S TELEVISION. I ATTEMPTED TO OPEN THAT INQUIRY TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS INSTEAD OF TOTALLY RELYING UPON A STAFF STUDY WHICH WAS WIDELY CRITICIZED AS TOO NARROW AND NOT ADEQUATELY SUPPORTED BY FACTS. THE NETWORK STUDY

IS STILL UNDERWAY AND I VOTED FOR IT THROUGHOUT AS A QUICK LOOK AT THE RECORD WILL SHOW. / IN AN EXTREMELY RARE BURST OF CANDOR, THE COLUMNIST NOTED CORRECTLY THAT I VOTED TO PROPOSE RULES PROVIDING FOR FUNDING OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN FCC PROCEEDINGS FOR A ONE-YEAR EXPERIMENTAL PERIOD.

I HAVE GONE TO SOME LENGTH TO REBUT A SINGLE RATHER INSIGNIFICANT NEWSPAPER COLUMN TO; FIRST, GET IT OFF MY CHEST AND ALSO TO ILLUSTRATE TO YOU A MINDSET THAT IS NOT UNCOMMON THESE DAYS, EVEN IN GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CIRCLES. / I BELIEVE THAT IT REPRESENTS A POINT OF VIEW THAT IS POTENTIALLY DESTRUCTIVE NOT ONLY OF THE REGULATED INDUSTRIES BUT -- MORE IMPORTANT -- DESTRUCTIVE OF THE REAL OVERALL PUBLIC INTEREST. / IN THE MINDS OF SOME WITH

VERY LITTLE PRACTICAL MARKETPLACE EXPERIENCE,
BIG IS BAD AND SUCCESS AND PROFIT ^{are automatically} SUSPECT. /

I HAVE STATED MANY TIMES THAT I LIKE TO REGU-
LATE HEALTHY, SUCCESSFUL INDUSTRIES. / I BELIEVE
RULEMAKING CAN BE MORE CONSTRUCTIVELY ACCOMPLISHED
IN A SPIRIT OF MUTUAL COOPERATION. / AT TIMES ADVER-
SARY ACTION IS UNAVOIDABLE, BUT IT SHOULD BE RE-
SERVED FOR MAJOR AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT AFTER
THOROUGH DIALOGUE AND DELIBERATION. /

I WISH YOU CONTINUED ACHIEVEMENT AND PROGRESS
IN THE CHALLENGING, EXCITING YEARS AHEAD. / WITH AD-
VANCED TECHNOLOGY AND BROADCASTING INGENUITY, YOUR
BROADCAST SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC WILL GROW AND EX-
PAND. / JUST REMEMBER THAT YOUR PRIVATE INTERESTS
ARE BEST SERVED BY DEDICATED PRIMARY EMPHASIS ON
the total SERVING PUBLIC INTERESTS.