

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER
JAMES H. QUELLO

February 9, 1987

Mr. Sam Donaldson
White House Press Correspondent
ABC News
1717 DeSales St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Donaldson,

Your article in the February Washingtonian Magazine was typical of autobiographical efforts in that it tended to treat its subject with great deference. Since you attempted to enhance your self-image at my expense, I believe it would be appropriate to review the record of what I said and the context in which I said it.

The context was a speech I delivered to "The Business of TV News Conference" at the Vista Hotel in Washington on March 11, 1985. It was meant to be a serious effort to look at the business of television news and to point out some of what I believed to be excesses. I expressed the view that to the extent television has trivialized officials and institutions which are important to the fabric of our society, it has performed a public disservice.

In an Associated Press interview following that speech, I referred to "the insolent approach to the president by some nationally-known reporters at press conferences . . ." Quite naturally, your name came up when the AP reporter and I were discussing the subject.

In the interest of accuracy, I did express disapproval but did not hyperbolize that your questioning Mr. Reagan about his relationship with his son constituted ". . . the nastiest, most underhanded, most vicious question ever heard." Perhaps you were only taking a little journalistic license. Do you do that often?

Mr. Sam Donaldson
February 9, 1987
Page Two

Your rationalization that insolence and boorishness are valuable tools of the journalist's trade leaves me bewildered. It may enhance your sense of self-importance but I am at a loss to understand what those qualities bring to the quest for relevant truth.

Sincerely,


James H. Quello

Enclosures:

Speech-"Press Under Fire: Jefferson Revisited"
AP Article

Copy: Philip Merrill, Publisher
John A. Limpert, Editor



After his second divorce, Donaldson met Jan Smith at ABC. Despite an age difference of 22 years, they began dating. During their courtship when she moved to Kansas City to become a reporter, in 1983 they married. Above is a honeymoon shot in Washington. Independent Network News in Washington.

can even be a little pixyish. Once, as he stood on the pavement at Checkpoint Charlie looking into Communist East Berlin, I yelled out to him to be careful not to cross the line. "You don't want to get captured by the Commies," I joked.

On hearing this, Reagan lifted his leg and, with a devilish smile on his face, swung it in the air across the line. Fortunately for the Free World, he didn't fall over.

Because of this ability to laugh at himself, Reagan spars with reporters better than Carter did. But Carter did have a quick wit when it came to casting humor in an outward direction. On one occasion, Carter hit home in a brief exchange in India. We had been taken to a small village near New Delhi (re-named Carterpuri by the Indians for the occasion) to see how the village solved its energy problem. Carterpuri solved its energy problem by throwing all the cow manure from its herds into a large pit, then siphoning off the methane gas to light the village lamps. So it came to pass that we all stood on the lip of the manure pit inspecting the

process.

"If I fell in, you'd pull me out, wouldn't you, Mr. President?" I joked.

"Certainly," Carter replied—pause—"after a suitable interval."

GETTING PERSONAL

One morning after the serious questioning at one of Reagan's mini press conferences in the White House briefing room, I asked him as he was leaving the podium: "Are you and your son Michael closer to resolving your differences?" He ducked the question by replying that he would give me the same answer his wife, Nancy, had given me the day before when I had put the question to her during a Christmas-tree photo opportunity: "Merry Christmas," he said.

Well, you would have thought by the outrage registered in some quarters that I had inquired as to the First Couple's sex life—something *Los Angeles Times* reporter George Skelton once did in an interview with Reagan. (More power to you, George.) A Nixon appointee on the Federal Communications Commission, James Quello, thundered that I had asked the nastiest, most underhanded, most vicious question ever heard. I thought

Quello's nomination of my humble effort a little too generous, as well as ham-handed, coming from the FCC.

But balanced against Quello's blast came a flood of letters from ordinary citizens wanting more information on the First Family's domestic dispute. They said they had been reading about it in all the papers and newsmagazines and wondered why the President hadn't answered the question. And when Patti Davis, the Reagans' daughter, wrote a novel that reflected an unflattering view of her parents, it was natural for me to ask Reagan if he had read the book and what he thought about it. Reagan replied that he found it "interesting fiction." Quello has yet to weigh in on that exchange.

Let me sum up my philosophy of covering the White House. Covering Presidents is important work, and it never stops. Neither the press nor the President is ever off-duty. I want to put questions to Presidents directly, not just to their press secretaries and other aides. As to what questions are appropriate and how they should be asked, let's put it this way: If you send me to cover a pie-baking contest on Mother's Day, I'm going to ask dear old Mom whether she used artificial sweetener in violation of the rules, and while she's at it, could I see the receipt for the apples to prove she didn't steal them? I maintain that if Mom has nothing to hide, no harm will be done. But the questions should be asked.

THE "AW, SHUCKS" PRESIDENT

Reporters were just as surprised as everyone else when the Iran arms sale and secret *contra* payments came to light, but to those of us who cover Ronald Reagan regularly it was not surprising that it could happen.

Reagan can turn on a big "aw, shucks" smile, incline his head in that self-deprecating fashion, and charm the pants off a lady wrestler. Unlike Jimmy Carter, whose smile more resembled a rictus than an expression of affability, Reagan probably means it. For instance, Carter hated to make small talk. Reagan loves it. Carter gave visitors the impression that he couldn't wait for them to leave so he might get back to work. Reagan makes visitors feel he has all the



Donaldson's reputation as a political insider and his friendship with Jimmy Carter's administration led to his being shut off from the White House and access to Ronald Reagan.

time in the

more than to

Reagan to

somehow g

told him yo

and needed

you the shi

another sid

with his po

and calcula

shirt, he mi

undershirt

that would

Social Secu

relatives of

children fro

All in the na

Reagan l

wants to u

doesn't take

Cannon, the

and resident

has called h

non jokes th

the Presiden

a title so sir

could unders

Reagan's

sues doesn't

lectual abili

to take the

ASSOCIATED PRESS

BROADCAST NEWS

WASHINGTON - An "insolent approach" and "undignified assaults" by TV and radio reporters are hurting chances of getting relief from government regulation of election and political issues broadcasts, a member of the Federal Communications Commission said on Tuesday.

Commissioner James H. Quello, in an interview repeated a warning he gave to an industry group on Monday that attempts to get rid of federal rules requiring broadcasters to be fair when they discuss important controversial issues and give equal time when they put candidates on the air, may be doomed until Congress thinks broadcasters have earned full freedom.

In his speech to a conference on The Business of TV News, Quello was critical of "the insolent approach to the president by some nationally known reporters at press conferences...."

In the interview, Quello was particularly critical of a question asked by Sam Donaldson of ABC News at the end of a presidential news conference on Dec. 9. "Are you and your son, Michael, closer to resolving your differences?" Donaldson asked after formal questioning had ended, referring to a much-reported family feud.

"Sam, I think yesterday Nancy gave you a perfect answer? Merry Christmas," Reagan replied.

Quello said President Reagan has been seen by the public as "reacting graciously to undignified assaults" when he answers such questions.

"The adversary mentality of the press is reaching serious proportions and... this may have serious adverse consequences for the press - particularly the broadcast press," Quello, a former newscaster said.

ABC News Washington bureau chief George Watson said Donaldson "does his job when he asks tough questions," but conceded that all reporters, Donaldson included ask questions that might be "better phrased" or were "better left unsaid."

"We believe Sam is eminently fair to whomever he is covering and that includes Democratic and Republican presidents," Watson said.

In his speech, Quello complained, "Television has trivialized officials and institutions which are important to the fabric of our society, it has performed a public disservice and it caters to those who would retain and even tighten the straightjacket on electronic journalism."

Quello has often testified before Congress and said at FCC meetings that he favors repeal and said "Perhaps there is a message we should all

see next page....

16

Quello ...contd

heed when Congress, the elected representatives of the people, so adamantly refuses to repeal the restrictive fairness doctrine and Section 315. The First Amendment notwithstanding, Congress may be insisting that the electronic press gain full freedom the old-fashioned way - they may have to earn it," he concluded.

Lou Adler, president of the Radio Television News Directors Association, called Quello's choice of words, "cute" but "unfortunate."

"I don't think it is a proper statement to make given the history of this country." he said.

"If we have to earn our freedom under the First Amendment, that is unfortunate," Adler said in a telephone interview from New York where he is vice president and news director of WOR Radio. "I don't believe Congress is telling us that," he said. "I think it is a cute line, but I think it is misplaced."

He said he thought the Commission should repeal the fairness doctrine without waiting for Congressional action.

Quello said his advisors don't think the FCC has the authority to drop the doctrine, although the commission created it. Congress later embraced the doctrine as law.

Adler agreed with Quello, "We are arrogant too often. We are rude too much of the time." ✓

"We have very poor public relations and we have to do something about it," he said. ✓

3/12/85 1834 EST

PRESS UNDER FIRE: JEFFERSON REVISITED

**REMARKS BY
COMMISSIONER JAMES H. QUELLO
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

**The Business of TV News Conference
March 11, 1985
Vista Hotel
Washington, DC**

When I agreed to do this speech I didn't know it was going to be carried on C-Span. C-Span is the only TV network I know that hasn't been the subject of speculation about a Ted Turner takeover. I've been getting calls all week about hostile takeovers, and after consulting with my lawyer I want to take this opportunity to set the record straight. None of the following people were in my office last week exploring a possible takeover of CBS: Jesse Helms; Jesse Jackson; Jerry Falwell; Grant Tinker; T. Boone Pickens; Slim Pickens; Marlin Perkins; Ike Turner; Tina Turner; Nat Turner; or Lana Turner.

This disclaimer does not include exploratory phone calls I may have received or inquiries about a tender offer for ABC. I hope this statement puts all the rumors to rest so that I can again concentrate on floating my own rumor concerning an unleveraged takeover of CNN.

Seriously, television news is very much in the public mind these days. There are those who are becoming more and more distrustful of an adversarial press that has been accused of discrediting the government of its own country and undermining national will. While I have no plans to participate in any takeover attempts, I reluctantly have concluded that the adversary mentality of the press is reaching serious proportions and that this may have serious adverse consequences for the press -- particularly the broadcast press. As the Washington Post recently noted: "[W]ithin the government, and here and there in the courts, faith in the free market of news and ideas seems to be declining. The hunger to regulate that market is on the rise."

I want to emphasize at the start that I speak not as a would-be censor. I am a former broadcaster and newscaster. I register my comments from the vantage point of one who has not only been on the "other side" -- but would still like to be on the "journalist's side." While I am a government official charged with the licensing of broadcast stations, my record opposing the discriminatory fairness doctrine and supporting full First Amendment rights for broadcasters is second to none. Accordingly, I see no bar to the exercise of some First Amendment rights of my own.

If Jesus Christ had a second coming to earth to become president of the United States, he would no doubt be manufactured into a stumble-bum, or an inept "nonleader" by that segment of the press establishment that views its role in society as that of an "adversary" to any incumbent. I certainly think that Presidents Ford, Carter and Reagan would appreciate my point.

In this "adversary" posture, were George Washington and his Continental Army preparing to cross the Delaware, the press would be concentrating on the inhumane suffering of underclothed and even barefoot American soldiers in the bitter cold of Valley Forge. I can also imagine the line of questioning to the soldiers: Did you know your leader is a member of the wealthy landed gentry? . . . That he is warmly-clothed, riding a horse, relatively comfortable, and that he will reap all the glory while you have a good chance of being maimed or killed? . . . Did you know General Washington doesn't actually know the number of enemy, and has to resort to distorted estimates of their strength? . . . Do you know that Cornwallis accused Washington on a network interview of being a "war-monger" and a "self-serving glory seeker" at your expense? . . . Do you realize Paul Revere didn't even notify the press whether the British were coming by land or by sea? . . . Aren't you in grave danger here at Valley Forge? . . . Wouldn't you rather be back in your warm home making love to your wife or sweetheart? . . . Do you realize the British would reduce their forces to a token police force of only 50,000 mercenaries if you agreed to disarm and disarm?

Benedict Arnold gets broadcast time under the Fairness Doctrine!
A few might even editorialize: "Isn't British red better than dead?"

In my view, several recent events have tended to erode public trust in media, particularly the electronic media.

An honorable field general selected to lead our troops in an unpopular, undeclared war certainly not of his making, was unjustly maligned in CBS' "The Uncounted Enemy, a Vietnam Deception." It is now apparent that the battle to clear the general's name would have been better fought in the court of public opinion rather than in a libel court which required clear and convincing evidence of malice. As I see it, General Westmoreland made a command decision regarding enemy strength which he had the right and obligation to make, right or wrong. The one-sided documentary charging conspiracy represented shoddy journalism. To CBS's credit, their own in-house investigation revealed violations of guidelines and poor journalistic practice. CBS, usually well-known for its news and public affairs excellence, won the law suit, but suffered a journalistic embarrassment and, I think, a public relations defeat.

In another example of journalistic malfeasance, an Israeli general won critical battles for his beleaguered country, a strong ally of the United States, but was maligned by inaccurate reporting by Time, a prestigious national magazine that usually knows better.

Still another recent example is ABC's unbelievable accusation that the CIA -- the U.S. government -- actually employed a murder squad to kill a Honolulu financial figure. The CIA vehemently denied the charge, and ABC, without an apology and after a long delay, merely admitted it could not substantiate the charge.

Finally, I think the insolent approach to the President by some nationally known reporters at press conferences has helped to produce the so-called "teflon President" because the President has been seen reacting graciously to undignified assaults. A discerning and sophisticated public seems more capable than ever of reaching independent judgments on candidates and issues.

The two networks mentioned above are subject to fairness doctrine complaints. It is fortunate that the present FCC doesn't believe in substituting its editorial judgment for that of a broadcaster. Our staff properly stated in the Westmoreland case that absent extrinsic evidence of an intent to deliberately distort, we cannot and will not interfere. Also, the staff dismissed the CIA's complaint as insufficient to state a claim. If these come before the full Commission, I will, of course, examine the entire record, but it is no secret that proponents of a fairness doctrine complaint -- like libel plaintiffs -- face a very high hurdle.

Freedom of the press confers upon reporters the freedom to be wrong so long as it is not done with "malice" -- a very subjective, difficult standard -- and, in the case of broadcasters, so long as there is no evidence of deliberate news distortion. However, editors, publishers and broadcast executives have the responsibility to make sure reporters are not wrong too often or to such an egregious degree that they are an embarrassment to their organization or profession. In my view, broadcast owners, executives and managers should more and more assume the role of publisher or even editor-in-chief.

The major impact of television and radio today on the American way of life is in news and news analysis, not in entertainment programs. I have said it before, and now more than ever, broadcasting is most respected and remembered for its hours of exceptional journalism.

The greatest benefit most Americans derive from broadcasting is information. This potential for molding public opinion poses

an enormous responsibility and challenge. It calls for more top management training and involvement in that most vitally important aspect of broadcast business -- news. Top management must emphasize truth and responsibility in news and public affairs reporting over the individual quest for ratings, money and power.

Of course, criticism of the press is not a new phenomenon. A good friend and former news director suggested that I could gain perspective by reviewing the history of the press in America.

Thomas Jefferson, of course, was a great champion of press freedom at a critical time in our nation's history. He wrote in 1787 the following:

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.

Nevertheless, Jefferson, himself, was an ardent critic of the press. In 1807, he wrote:

Perhaps an editor might begin a reformation in some such way as this. Divide his paper into four chapters, heading the 1st, Truths. 2d, Probabilities. 3d, Possibilities. 4th, Lies. The first chapter would be very short.

Some years later, Mr. Jefferson had apparently abandoned any hope that the press could be salvaged. He told a friend:

I do not take a single newspaper, nor read one a month, and I feel myself infinitely the happier for it.

The press in Jefferson's day took great delight in doing what the press has always done: biting the hand that feeds it. The press so values its independence that it happily denounces friend and enemy alike and then seeks refuge in Mr. Jefferson's First Amendment. Jefferson believed that abuse of a free press was self-correcting as he wrote to friends in Hartford:

Conscious that there was not a truth on earth which I feared should be known, I have lent myself willingly on the subject of a

great experiment, which was to prove that an administration, conducting itself with integrity and common understanding, cannot be battered down, even by the falsehoods of a licentious press. . . .

I have never therefore even contradicted the thousands of calumnies so industriously propagated against myself. But the fact being once established, that the press is impotent when it abandons itself to falsehood, I leave to others to restore it to its strength, by recalling it within the pale of truth.

Jefferson spoke of press freedom as an experiment; and that experiment has lasted for nearly two hundred years. That might raise the inference that it is no longer an experiment and that its permanence is assured. I would like to caution otherwise.

Freedom of the press, like all freedoms under our form of government, is conferred by the people. That carries with it the obvious notion that it can be taken away by the people. To the extent that the American people perceive that the press, especially the electronic press, is pursuing its self interest to the detriment of the public interest, the press has reason for concern.

It is clear that television is the most pervasive form of the press. In recent years, surveys have consistently shown that more Americans turn to television for news than to any other medium. This must be regarded as a "two-edged sword" by those who have careers in television news. It is obviously flattering to be the press of choice and to exercise the greatest impact on a majority of Americans. That popularity, however, carries with it a public awareness of your role that requires the highest standards of professionalism. That public awareness may also contribute to the unique government regulations that apply to electronic journalism. Television has chosen to focus a spotlight on some of the nation's most prominent figures and institutions, and often the glare from that spotlight has been harsh and decidedly unflattering. To the extent that television has exposed real flaws in those individuals and institutions, it has performed a function for which journalism is uniquely suited. To the extent, however, that television has trivialized officials and institutions which are important to the fabric of our society, it has performed a public disservice and it caters to those who would retain and even tighten the straightjacket on electronic journalism.

Jefferson believed that abuse of the First Amendment by the press is self-correcting and that there will always be those who

will call the press to account for its excesses. I can hardly disagree with Jefferson on this topic, but I wonder about the manner in which any needed corrections might come about. Is it possible that the press in general, and the electronic press in particular, might become so powerful and so arrogant that the public would approve, or acquiesce in, a remedy that goes far beyond merely correcting the problem? I hope not.

It has been suggested that the proper role of the press is to be an adversary of government. I believe that this is a simplistic and dangerous philosophy. The proper role of the press is to seek the truth and to inform. The press must present facts in a timely manner and in a context that is calculated to educate the populace in the most truthful, complete manner possible.

I urge -- just as recent self-criticism by the press suggests -- that the media re-examine its attitudes, its manners and -- most importantly -- its recent tendency to act solely as an "adversary."

It ought to be clear that "adversarial" excesses by the media will destroy its most valuable asset -- its credibility. Without that credibility, the will have also lost its most fundamental value to society. I further suggest that the media seriously reconsider the time honored journalistic concepts of "fairness," "objectivity," and yes, a little "humility." As Jack Webb was fond of saying on his TV show, "Just give us the facts." I think the public echoes that view. It is a presumptuous notion to believe that the media was annointed on high as the nation's resident "adversary."

A free press is vital to a democratic form of government because the policies of such a government are formed ultimately by the people. An uninformed or a misinformed electorate can result in dangerous policies and ill-advised actions. A press that cannot or will not perform its informational role under the highest standards of public trust does not not deserve public support. That, I believe, is what Jefferson was telling us nearly two centuries ago and I believe it applies today.

Perhaps there is a message we should all heed when Congress, the elected representatives of the people, so adamantly refuses to repeal the restrictive fairness doctrine and Section 315. The First Amendment notwithstanding, Congress may be insisting that the electronic press gain full freedom the old-fashioned way -- they may have to earn it.

###

COPIES OF LETTER TO SAM DONALDSON WITH (1) COPY OF WASHINGTONIAN
ARTICLE, (2) COPY OF AP COVERAGE OF 3/11/85 SPEECH, AND
(3) JEFFERSON REVISITED SPEECH DELIVERED ON 3/11/85 WERE SENT
TO THE FOLLOWING:

Ward R. Quaal

Charles Z. Wick

Patrick J. Buchanan

Dr. John McLaughlin

Sterling "Red" Quinlan

Susie Quello

Richard B. Quello

James H. Quello

Kathy Maschmeyer

General Don Hittle

Worth Kramer

Lynn Townsend

John Kruse

Frank Stella

Mr. and Mrs. Steve Fecht

General Ken Cooper

Colonel Artpoyd Artwahl

Colonel Frank Lester

Richard Wiley

Charles Crutchfield