

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER JAMES H. QUELLO  
BEFORE THE DETROIT ADCRAFT CLUB  
DETROIT HERITAGE HOTEL

OCTOBER 18, 1974

IT'S VERY GRATIFYING TO SEE ALL MY  
OLD FRIENDS OF THE "ADCRAFT ACES" OUT IN  
FORCE. I WAS AN INTITIAL MEMBER OF THIS  
VOLUNTEER EMERGENCY ATTENDANCE ORGANIZA-  
TION AND I APPRECIATE YOUR LOYAL RESPONSE  
TO THIS SPECIAL CALL-TO-ARMS TO HELP A  
FORMER COMRADE.

ANYWAY, IT'S GOOD TO BE BACK HOME  
AMONG OLD FRIENDS IN DETROIT. AT LEAST, I  
DON'T HAVE TO SEARCH FOR A MUTUALITY OF  
INTERESTS FOR THIS AUDIENCE. HOWEVER, I  
HAVE TO ADMIT TO CONSIDERABLE CONCERN OVER

WHAT APPROACH TO TAKE BEFORE THIS IMPRESSIVE  
GATHERING OF ADVERTISING AND JOURNALISTIC  
EXPERTISE AND INFLUENCE.

I FINALLY DECIDED THAT AS LONG AS  
MY PERSPECTIVE ON FCC ISSUES AND PROBLEMS  
WILL NECESSARILY BE MORE JOURNALISTIC THAN  
LEGALISTIC -- WHY NOT TELL IT LIKE IT IS --  
OR AT LEAST AS I SEE IT. LET ME SHARE WITH  
YOU MY IMPRESSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS DURING  
THE FIRST FEW MONTHS AND, IN THE PROCESS,  
I'LL PASS ALONG SOME OF MY VIEWS ON KEY  
ISSUES BEFORE THE COMMISSION.

I'LL POSE QUESTIONS MOST COMMONLY  
ASKED REFLECTING SUBJECTS MOST AUDIENCES ARE

MOST INTERESTED IN -- A SELF-INFLICTED PRESS  
CONFERENCE IF YOU WILL.

THE MOST UNIVERSAL QUESTION ASKED  
IS "HOW DO YOU FIND THE TRANSITION FROM A  
BROADCASTER TO A COMMISSIONER? WHAT ARE YOUR  
REAL IMPRESSIONS OF THE FCC?"

FIRST, I'M IMPRESSED WITH THE KNOW-  
LEDGE, EVEN-HANDEDNESS AND COMPETENCE OF  
THE STAFF -- I'M SOMEWHAT DISTRESSED BY THE  
TIME-LAG AND BACKLOG.

ONE THING -- I'M OVER THE OLD JOUR-  
NALISTIC IDEA THAT ALL GOVERNMENT WORKERS  
ARE FEEDING AT THE PUBLIC TROUGH AND THEY  
ARE UNDERWORKED AND OVERPAID. THE WORKLOAD

IS HEAVY AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES ARE SOMETIMES AWESOME.

THE COMMISSION IS A FULL-TIME, EIGHT DAY A WEEK JOB FOR THE CONSCIENTIOUS. THE REGULAR WEEKLY COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE IN ADDITION TO HEARINGS, ORAL ARGUMENTS, CONFERENCES AND APPOINTMENTS. AT THE REGULAR MEETING, THERE ARE USUALLY 40 TO 50 ITEMS FROM 4 PAGES TO 100 PAGES IN LENGTH FOR COMMISSION ACTION. MOST OF YOUR WORK IS QUASI-JUDICIAL. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ARE PREPARED AFTER PAINSTAKING STUDY AND CAREFUL DELIBERATION CITING LEGAL AND FCC PRECEDENT. MOST STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ARE REASONABLE AND LOGICAL. CHARGES ARE SOMETIMES MADE THAT



THE COMMISSION IS OVER-INFLUENCED OR EVEN RUN BY THE STAFF. WITH THE VOLUME OF WORK AND A STAFF OF SOME 2,000 PEOPLE, THE COMMISSION MUST RELY ON THE STAFF. EVEN INDIVIDUAL BUREAUS HAVE MORE READING, ISSUES AND CORRESPONDENCE THAN THEY CAN KEEP PACE WITH. HOWEVER, ONLY COMMISSIONERS HAVE A VOTE. NOTHING IN POLICY CHANGES OR CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED WITHOUT A MAJORITY OF COMMISSION VOTES. AND THE AUTHORITY OF THAT VOTE CARRIES WITH IT AN AWESOME RESPONSIBILITY FOR REASON AND JUDGMENT.

YOU DO MEET INTERESTING PEOPLE ON THE COMMISSION. YOUR EXPOSURE TO PEOPLE AND EVENTS IS DIFFERENT THAN WHEN YOU ARE

IN THE BROADCAST BUSINESS.

FOR EXAMPLE, I MADE ONE OF THE  
LEAD STORIES ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE WALL  
STREET JOURNAL LAST WEEK (OCTOBER 9TH).  
(IT NEVER HAPPENED WHEN I WAS AN EXEC AT  
WJR). SOME OF YOU MAY HAVE SEEN IT. THE  
LEAD PARAGRAPH READ "WHILE JAMES H. QUELLO  
WAS LOBBYING FOR HIS SEAT ON THE FCC, A  
CONGRESSMAN ASKED HIM 'WHY DO YOU WANT THAT  
DAMNED JOB? CONGRESS WILL BEAT YOU UP AND  
THE COURTS WILL OVERRULE YOU.'" THEN IT WENT  
ON "NOW, AFTER SEVERAL MONTHS ON THE JOB,  
MR. QUELLO HAS CONCLUDED THAT FCC STANDS  
FOR 'FROM CRISIS TO CRISIS.'"

ACTUALLY, THE CONGRESSMAN WAS JOHN DINGELL. SOMETIMES WHEN I WAS GOING THROUGH THE LENGTHY CONFIRMATION PROCESS, I WONDERED WHY I REALLY WANTED IT. YOU SEE, YOU HAVE FOR YOUR SPEAKER TODAY SOMEONE WHO HAD THE DUBIOUS DISTINCTION OF SURVIVING THE LONGEST CONFIRMATION HEARING ON RECORD -- LONGER THAN PRESIDENT FORD'S HEARING FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OR SECRETARY OF STATE KISSINGER. BUT, OF COURSE, THEY WERE TRYING FOR RELATIVELY PLACID NON-CONTROVERSIAL JOBS.

THE GAME PLAN SEEMED LOGICAL ENOUGH. THE REPUBLICANS NOMINATE YOU AND THE DEMOCRATS CONFIRM YOU -- I NEVER DID QUITE UNDERSTAND WHAT ALL THE SHOOTING WAS ABOUT "IN BETWEEN."

ALL I KNOW WAS THAT I WAS MANUFACTURED INTO  
A CONTROVERSIAL CHARACTER BECAUSE I CAME  
FROM THE BROADCAST INDUSTRY.

WELL, THEY SAY IN POLITICS, IF YOU  
CAN'T STAND THE HEAT, STAY OUT OF THE KITCHEN --  
I REALIZED THIS GOING IN BUT I HAD NO IDEA THEY  
WOULD BURN THE WHOLE DAMNED KITCHEN DOWN!

YOU REMEMBER WHEN THE PUBLICITY  
BROKE -- AND THE VOLUME WAS UNBELIEVABLE,  
SOMEONE SAID, "HEY, YOU'RE GETTING FAMOUS --  
YOU'LL MAKE 'WHO'S WHO.'" I SAID, "HELL, NO.  
I'M GETTING NOTORIOUS -- (THERE'S QUITE A  
DIFFERENCE) AND I'LL MAKE "WHAT'S THIS"!

AFTER THE OPPOSITION REALLY STARTED  
(MOST FROM COALITIONS I NEVER KNEW BEFORE),

SOMEONE SAID "YOU ARE AN ITALIAN WHO NEEDS TWO GODFATHERS -- THANK GOODNESS I HAD THEM IN SENATORS PHIL HART AND BOB GRIFFIN. ALSO, I RECEIVED CRUCIAL SUPPORT FROM THEN CONGRESSMAN LU NEDZI, JOHN DINGELL, BILL FORD, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, JUDGE DAMON KEITH AND URBAN LEAGUE DIRECTOR FRANCIS KORNEGAY, ALL OF WHOM TESTIFIED FOR ME. -- (AND MANY OTHERS, ETC.)

THE HEARINGS WERE EDUCATIONAL IN THAT I BECAME AWARE OF SOME OF THE LOGICAL CONCERNS OF THOSE OPPOSING A NOMINEE FROM THE BROADCAST INDUSTRY. HOWEVER, I WAS

DISILLUSIONED, TOO, BY DISTORTED CHARGES  
AND FACTS THAT FORTUNATELY WERE DISCOUNTED  
BY MEMBERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE. I  
BECAME AWARE FOR THE FIRST TIME THAT SOME  
CITIZENS' GROUPS ARE PRIMARILY ADVOCATES  
FOR THEIR OWN PRIVATE VERSION OF THE  
PUBLIC INTEREST AND THAT A FEW INDIVIDUALS  
DEPEND FOR THEIR EXISTENCE ON PROMOTING  
AND EXPLOITING DISCONTENT. HOWEVER,  
SOME CONSUMER ACTIVISTS REPRESENT A  
SIZABLE CONSTITUENCY WHOSE VIEWS MERIT  
CAREFUL CONSIDERATION IN FCC DELIBERATIONS.  
SOME OF THEIR PROPOSALS HAVE SERVED AS CATALYSTS

AND HAVE BENEFITED THE PUBLIC. HOWEVER, THEIR VIEWS SHOULD NOT BE THE SOLE, OR EVEN DOMINANT, FACTORS IN DETERMINING PUBLIC INTEREST. THERE ARE MANY OTHER CONSUMER VIEWPOINTS AND PUBLIC GROUPS, MANY IN DIS-  
AGREEMENT WITH CONSUMER ACTIVISTS, THAT MUST ALSO BE CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING TOTAL PUBLIC INTEREST. THERE IS CONSIDERABLE DISAGREEMENT AMONG MANY INTELLIGENT INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS OF SINCERE INTENTIONS AND WORTHY PURPOSES, AS TO JUST WHAT DOES CONSTITUTE "THE PUBLIC INTEREST" ON ANY GIVEN ISSUE.

NATURALLY, WITH MY BACKGROUND I CAN'T AGREE WITH GROUPS STRONGLY ADVOCATING THAT THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY AND OTHER MAJOR INDUSTRIES BE SUBJECTED TO DAILY REGULATORY DECISIONS MADE EXCLUSIVELY BY AGENCY APPOINTEES WITHOUT FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE OF THE INDUSTRY OR OF BUSINESS GENERALLY -- OR WITHOUT A FULL APPRECIATION OF THE PRACTICAL IMPACT OF THEIR DECISIONS AND ACTIONS.

I'M GRATEFUL FOR MY BROADCAST EXPERIENCE. AT LEAST I CAN UNDERSTAND ABOUT 65% OF THE FCC AGENDA WITHOUT PROLONGED BRIEFING. HOWEVER, EVEN WITH SOME EXPERIENCE,



THE DELIBERATIONS AND DECISIONS ARE AWESOME  
YOU REALIZE THAT SOME OF THE INTERESTED  
PARTIES IN HEAVILY-CONTESTED FCC ISSUES ARE  
GOING TO OBJECT TO YOUR DECISION EITHER WAY.  
IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT A MAN IS JUDGED BY  
HIS FRIENDS -- WHICH MIGHT BE ANOTHER WAY OF  
SAYING THERE IS NO  
/WAY OF JUDGING AN FCC COMMISSIONER. ALL YOU  
CAN DO IS STUDY ISSUES OBJECTIVELY, EVALUATE  
ALL THE EVIDENCE AND TRY TO ARRIVE AT DECISIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS THAT BEST SERVE  
THE TOTAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

ANOTHER EARLY IMPRESSION IS THAT  
FCC COMMISSIONERS MEET SUCH INTERESTING  
AND IMPORTANT PEOPLE (NOT ALWAYS SYNONY-  
MOUS). YOU HAVE TO HAVE MET A FEW TO GET T F

APPOINTMENT, BUT YOU MEET MANY MORE AFTER.  
FOR EXAMPLE, I WAS IMPRESSED WHEN MR. JOHN  
DEBUTTS, DYNAMIC CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF  
AT&T, PAID A COURTESY CALL. (RELATE  
HUMOROUS ANECDOTE). MY GUIDING PRINCIPLE  
IN COMMUNICATIONS DECISIONS AND DELIBERATIONS  
-- OVERSIMPLIFIED, BUT BASIC -- "WHATEVER  
OFFERS THE AVERAGE PERSON THE BEST SERVICE  
AT THE MOST REASONABLE PRICE"...TALKS EASY,  
BUT IMPLEMENTS HARD WITH ALL KINDS OF  
RAMIFICATIONS, ETC. (I FAVOR A NEW SOCIALLY  
CONSCIOUS FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM OVER  
PATERNALISTIC GOVERNMENT CONTROL.)

A FEW WEEKS AGO I ATTENDED A SIGMA DELTA CHI DINNER IN WASHINGTON -- SAT AT THE 3 PLACES DOWN SPEAKERS TABLE 3 PLACES DOWN WITH THE THEN VICE PRESIDENT GERALD FORD (RELATE STORY).

NOW ON TO ISSUES THAT IMPRESSED ME MOST EARLY IN MY FRESHMAN YEAR: THE TWO MOST SIGNIFICANT ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION SINCE I HAVE BEEN THERE HAVE BEEN THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE, NEWSPAPER-BROADCASTING CROSS-OWNERSHIP ISSUE, AND PRIME PROGRAM TIME ACCESS FOR POLITICAL CONSIDERATION.

THE COMMISSION HAS REVISED, AND HOPEFULLY, SIMPLIFIED THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE. THERE WERE MANY PROPOSALS REQUIRING MORE REGULATION PRESENTED TO THE COMMISSION.

I ADMIT I CAN'T UNDERSTAND THE LOGIC OF MORE AND MORE REGULATION AND CONTROLS TO GUARANTEE FREEDOM. I ADMIT TO SOME AMBIVALENCE REGARDING A DOCTRINE WHICH CAUSES A GOVERNMENT AGENCY TO INTERFERE IN ANY WAY WITH RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT. THE FIRST AMENDMENT WAS WRITTEN, AFTER ALL, TO PROTECT THE PEOPLE FROM GOVERNMENT INTRUSION INTO OUR INHERENT RIGHTS TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND RELIGION AND THOSE RIGHTS MUST BE PROTECTED. PHILOSOPHICALLY, I BELIEVE BROADCAST JOURNALISTS ARE ENTITLED TO THE SAME FREEDOM AS JOURNALISTS IN OTHER MEDIA, AND THAT THEY HAVE DEMONSTRATED

OVER THE YEARS THEIR ABILITY TO ACT  
INDEPENDENTLY AND RESPONSIBLY.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATION COMMISSION  
IS CHARGED, HOWEVER, BY STATUTE, WITH THE  
RESPONSIBILITY OF MAINTAINING A CLIMATE OF  
FAIRNESS IN THE USE OF BROADCAST FACILITIES  
AND THAT RESPONSIBILITY MUST BE MET. I  
WONDERED HOW TWO DIFFERENT STANDARDS  
CAN BE APPLIED. IN THE OFTEN-QUOTED  
LANDMARK "RED LION" DECISION OF 1969,  
THE SUPREME COURT AFFIRMED THE  
CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE.  
ALSO, THE COURT HELD THAT QUOTE: "DIFFERENCES

IN THE CHARACTERISTICS OF NEWS MEDIA JUSTIFY DIFFERENCES IN THE FIRST AMENDMENT STANDARDS APPLIED TO THEM." THE COMMISSION SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN GIVEN CONSIDERABLE LATITUDE IN INTERPRETING AND ENFORCING THE "FAIRNESS" CONCEPT. HOWEVER, MY POSITION IS THAT WE SHOULD PROMOTE FREEDOM OF SPEECH RATHER THAN TO ERECT A STRUCTURE OF RULES AND REGULATIONS SO CUMBERSOME TO PUBLIC AND BROADCASTER ALIKE THAT THEY HAVE THE EFFECT OF LIMITING, RATHER THAN PROMOTING, THIS PRECIOUS FREEDOM.

I BELIEVE THAT THE FAIRNESS REPORT  
WHICH HAS BEEN ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION  
DOES ACCOMPLISH THE PROTECTION WHICH CONGRESS  
MANDATED IN THE ACT AND, YET, DOES NOT  
IMPOSE A HEAVY REGULATORY BURDEN ON ANYONE  
CONCERNED. BROADCASTERS WHO ARE CONCERNED  
ABOUT FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION SHOULD  
HAVE NO TROUBLE LIVING WITH THIS NEW INTER-  
PRETATION OF THE DOCTRINE EVEN THOUGH THEY  
MAY SHARE MY PHILOSOPHICAL VIEW -- AND THE  
PUBLIC WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE ASSURANCE THAT  
A VARIETY OF VIEWPOINTS WILL BE PRESENTED ON  
EACH SIGNIFICANT ISSUE OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.



HAVING SAID THAT, I WILL ADMIT THAT I LIVED COMFORTABLY AS A BROADCASTER WITH THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE AND IN FACT HAD AN "OPEN DOOR" ON ANYONE WHO WANTED TO DISCUSS CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES. I WOULD NOT FAVOR ABOLISHMENT OF THE DOCTRINE AS MUCH AS IT OFFENDS MY JOURNALISTIC SENSIBILITIES. THERE MUST BE REASONABLE BALANCES AND COUNTER-BALANCES TO PROTECT AGAINST POSSIBLE UNDUE INFLUENCE OF (1) GOVERNMENT OR (2) PRIVATE INTERESTS OR EVEN PUBLIC INTEREST ACTIVIST GROUPS WITH THEIR OWN PRIVATE VERSION OF PUBLIC INTEREST.



OF COURSE, I WAS MOST IMPRESSED IN EXPERIENCING MY FIRST FULL-FLEDGED FCC ORAL ARGUMENT-- IT WAS ON CROSS-OWNERSHIP OF NEWSPAPERS AND BROADCASTING FACILITIES.

I HAVE TO ADMIT THAT I WAS ENCHANTED BY THE LOGIC, REASONING, WORDSMANSHIP AND SKILLED PRESENTATION OF MEMBERS OF THE FCBA. IT WAS THE FIRST TIME I HAD SEEN THEM IN ACTION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF A COMMISSIONER. AND IT WAS AN ENLIGHTENING AND MEMORABLE EXPERIENCE.

HOWEVER, THE JURY IS STILL OUT ON THIS ISSUE--IT IS INAPPROPRIATE FOR ME TO STATE OR SURMISE ANY CONCLUSIONS. BUT, I WILL REPEAT

TWO STATEMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS THAT I MADE  
DURING THE ARGUMENT ON THE PUBLIC RECORD --  
I PRO AND I CON. I'M ON RECORD AS STATING  
I DON'T BELIEVE THERE IS ANY PUBLIC OUTCRY  
FOR DIVESTITURE -- THAT I DOUBTED, FOR EXAMPLE,  
THAT A PUBLIC REFERENDUM AS TO WHETHER OR  
NOT THE WASHINGTON POST SHOULD DIVEST ITSELF  
FROM ITS TV PROPERTY WOULD CARRY. I ALSO  
NOTED THAT NOT A SINGLE TV STATION OR NEWSPAPER  
COMPETING WITH A COMBINATION TESTIFIED THAT  
IT WAS COMPETITIVELY DISADVANTAGED OR ECONO-  
MICALLY INJURED. / ON THE OTHER SIDE, I WAS  
BOTHERED TRYING TO RECONCILE THE COMPLETE  
AUTONOMY OF OPERATIONS TESTIFIED TO BY TV

STATION EXECUTIVES WITH THE LICENSEE RESPONSIBILITY THAT REQUIRES ASCERTAINMENT, INVOLVEMENT AND DIRECTION. I ASKED THE QUESTION (STATE QUESTION) -- THE REPLY WAS INCONCLUSIVE. DURING MY CONFIRMATION HEARING, I STATED THERE ARE SO MANY VARIABLES FROM MARKET TO MARKET THAT CROSS-OWNERSHIP MAY NOT LEND ITSELF TO SWEEPING GENERAL RULES AND MUST BE DEALT WITH ON A CASE-TO-CASE BASIS. DURING THE ORAL ARGUMENT, IT WAS APPARENT THAT MANY CROSS-OWNERSHIP OPERATIONS EXCELLED IN SERVING THE PUBLIC. ON THE OTHER HAND, THERE WERE SOME CONCENTRATIONS SO EXTENSIVE THAT ONE MIGHT QUESTION THE AMOUNT OF INDEPENDENT AND DIVERSE VIEWPOINTS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC IN THAT LOCALITY.

WHILE ON THE SUBJECT OF NEWS SOURCES,  
I'D LIKE TO COMMENT ON THE INCREASING IMPORTANCE  
OF BROADCAST JOURNALISM. I BELIEVE THE MAJOR  
IMPACT OF TV AND RADIO ON THE AMERICAN WAY  
OF LIFE TODAY IS IN NEWS AND NEWS ANALYSIS --  
NOT IN ENTERTAINMENT PROGRAMS, AS ENJOYABLE  
AS THEY MAY BE. I THINK YOU WILL AGREE THAT  
BROADCASTING IS MOST REMEMBERED AND RESPECTED  
FOR ITS HOURS OF EXCEPTIONAL JOURNALISM --  
AND THAT THE GREATEST BENEFIT MOST AMERICANS  
DERIVE AND EXPECT FROM BROADCASTING IS INFOR-  
MATION. RECENT RESEARCH INDICATES MORE  
INITIAL  
AMERICANS ARE GETTING/NEWS FROM TV AND RADIO  
THAN NEWSPAPERS. THIS POTENTIAL FOR MOLDING  
PUBLIC OPINION POSES AN ENORMOUS RESPONSIBILITY  
AND CHALLENGE.

IT SEEMS THAT OWNERS, EXECUTIVES AND MANAGERS OF THE FUTURE WILL MORE AND MORE ASSUME ROLES OF PUBLISHERS AND EDITORS-IN-CHIEF. IT IS MY BELIEF THAT THERE SHOULD BE MORE TOP-LEVEL MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS ON NEWS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. I ALSO BELIEVE GENERALLY SPEAKING THAT STATIONS AND NETWORKS SHOULD HAVE LARGER NEWS STAFFS CAPABLE OF MORE INVESTIGATIVE AND MORE DETAILED "ON-THE-SPOT" REPORTING. A MICHIGAN JUDGE, IN DENYING COURTROOM ACCESS TO TV CAMERAS, MENTIONED THAT HE OBJECTED TO TELEVISION'S HASTY AND SPORADIC 1 SHOT 1 MINUTE COVERAGE OF IMPORTANT CASES MORE THAN THE INTRUSION OF TV CAMERAS IN THE COURTROOM. (DISCUSS MEETING WITH MICHIGAN BAR ASSOCIATION). PRESS OBJECTIVE IS TRUTH:

LAWYERS OBJECTIVE IS PRESENTING HIS CLIENTS  
CASE , RIGHT OR WRONG, IN THE MOST PERSUASIVE  
AND CONVINCING WAY POSSIBLE--AT TIMES THIS  
MEANS CIRCUMVENTING THE TRUE FACTS.

I WAS QUOTED, WHEN FIRST CONFIRMED,  
AND WHEN IT WAS A HOT ISSUE, THAT I WOULD NOT  
CURB NEWS COMMENTARY ON THE PRESIDENT'S  
OR VICE PRESIDENT'S SPEECHES. I BELIEVE  
IN FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF THE  
PRESS. I BELIEVE NEWSMEN HAVE THE RIGHT TO  
BE WRONG AND THAT NEWS EXECUTIVES HAVE THE  
RESPONSIBILITY OF SEEING THAT THEY'RE NOT  
WRONG TOO OFTEN. I BELIEVE THAT NEWSMEN  
HAVE THE RIGHT AND OBLIGATION TO SEEK THE  
TRUTH--THE FACTS. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT  
FREEDOM OF SPEECH APPLIES TO GOVERNMENT



HIGH CRIME RATE. "JAWBONING" MIGHT WELL BE SUPPLANTED BY CORRECTIVE ACTION. IF THE NEED IS GREAT ENOUGH, CONGRESS DOES HAVE THE POWER (AND PERHAPS THE OBLIGATION) TO ACT TO CORRECT ABUSES.

I APPLAUD THE BROADCAST INDUSTRY'S NEW CODE FOR CHILDREN'S PROGRAMMING. IN MY EARLY PUBLIC APPEARANCES, I WAS QUOTED AS SAYING THAT COMMERCIALS ON CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS SHOULD BE CAREFULLY SCREENED AND JUDICIOUSLY REDUCED. THEY HAVE BEEN JUDICIOUSLY REDUCED: NOW I HOPE AND TRUST THEY WILL BE CAREFULLY SCREENED. I AM GLAD TO NOTE, TOO, THAT SOME NETWORKS ARE NOW SUBTLY INJECTING MORE PRO-SOCIAL THEMES AND MORE EDUCATION INTO ENTERTAINMENT PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN. I BELIEVE



ABC HAS TAKEN THE LEAD IN THIS AREA. I BELIEVE  
THE NETWORKS AND THE NAB HAVE DEMONSTRATED  
THEY CAN ACT RESPONSIBLY THROUGH SELF-REGULATION.

I CAN'T LET THIS OPPORTUNITY PASS  
WITHOUT GIVING YOU MY PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY  
ON THE PUBLIC SERVICE INVOLVEMENT BY STATION  
EXECUTIVES. I REALIZE THAT THE ALL IMPORTANT  
SHOWING FOR A STATION'S PUBLIC INTEREST RECORD  
FOR THE FCC  
/IS WHAT IS ACTUALLY BROADCAST ON THE AIR---  
PROGRAMMING THAT MAKES A SHOWING AT LICENSE  
RENEWAL TIME IN THE NEWS, PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND  
OTHER CATEGORIES. I AGREE THIS SHOULD  
BE THE PRIME CONSIDERATION. HOWEVER, I BELIEVE  
OFFICIAL RECOGNITION SHOULD BE ACCORDED  
STATIONS WHOSE BROADCAST EXECUTIVES AND  
PERSONNEL TAKE THE EXTRA TIME AND EFFORT

TO BECOME PERSONALLY INVOLVED---WHO ASSUME  
ACTIVE ROLES IN COMMUNITY CHARITABLE, EDUCA-  
TIONAL, RELIGIOUS, GOVERNMENT OR CIVIC PROJECTS---  
EXTRA PUBLIC INTEREST BROWNIE POINTS, IF YOU  
WILL, FOR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ABOVE AND  
BEYOND THE CALL OF ASCERTAINMENT DUTY.-- SOME  
KIND OF FCC CREDIT FOR TIME CONSUMING SERVICE  
ON GOVERNMENTAL STUDY COMMITTEES, ON BOARDS  
AND COMMISSIONS, OR AS CHAIRMAN OF PROJECTS.

TO GIVE A CONCRETE EXAMPLE EVERYONE  
CAN UNDERSTAND---LET'S TAKE A MAJOR PUBLIC  
SERVICE DRIVE LIKE THE COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL UNITED  
WAY, COMMUNITY CHEST OR TORCH DRIVE FUND IN ALL  
COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT AMERICA. IT IS CALLED  
THE UNITED FOUNDATION IN DETROIT WHERE THIS

COORDINATED "GIVE ONCE FOR ALL" CONCEPT WAS  
ORIGINATED IN 1949. ALONG WITH SCHEDULING  
AND RUNNING FILM FOR THIS OR OTHER MAJOR  
CHARITIES, I'D LIKE TO SEE THE TV-RADIO CHAIRMAN  
CONDUCT MEETINGS, EXCHANGE IDEAS, GET COMMIT-  
MENTS FROM STATIONS, PICK UP THE TAB FOR A  
LUNCH, IF NECESSARY. THEN ACTUALLY CREATE,  
PRODUCE AND DISTRIBUTE ANNOUNCEMENTS,  
DOCUMENTARIES AND FILM CLIPS TO OTHER STATIONS.  
THE LEADING, MORE PROFITABLE, BIG STATIONS  
COULD ROTATE THE CHAIRMANSHIP RESPONSIBILITY.  
AND I BELIEVE STATIONS WITH THE LARGEST AUDIENCE  
AND PROFITS SHOULD VOLUNTEER SUBSTANTIAL  
COMMITMENTS OF TIME AND MONEY, FIRST TO  
PROGRAMMING AND THEN TO PUBLIC SERVICE  
INVOLVEMENT.

I'D LIKE TO SEE THE COMMISSION  
RECOGNIZE AND ENCOURAGE THIS TYPE OF  
INVOLVEMENT. WE SHOULD ADOPT A POLICY  
OF SENDING LETTERS OR CERTIFICATES OF  
COMMENDATION TO STATIONS FOR PERSONAL  
PUBLIC SERVICE OR CIVIC INVOLVEMENT ABOVE  
AND BEYOND THE CALL OF ASCERTAINMENT OR  
LICENSE RENEWAL PERCENTAGES. A COPY SHOULD  
BE FILED IN THE STATION'S RECORDS.

THE BROADCASTER HAS A UNIQUE OPPOR-  
TUNITY BECAUSE OF THE FACT HE CONTROLS SUCH  
A VITAL MEDIUM TO BECOME A LEADER IN HIS  
COMMUNITY. IT HAS ADVANTAGES. (QUOTE ADVANTAGES)

MANY BROADCASTERS ARE CIVIC  
ACTIVISTS, AND PERSONALLY INVOLVED AND  
SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED. NOW I DON'T  
BELIEVE THERE IS ANYTHING WRONG WITH  
PROFITS BUT LET'S RECOGNIZE THOSE WHO  
FLOW A SUBSTANTIAL PART OF IT BACK FOR  
THE GOOD OF THE COMMUNITY --AND ALSO  
THOSE WHO DO SCHEDULE PUBLIC SERVICE  
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PROGRAMS IN PRIME  
TIME -- RATHER THAN UNSOLD TIME. AND  
LET'S ENCOURAGE, AND EVEN PROD, THOSE  
WHO DON'T.

IN A PRESS CONFERENCE IN LANSING

LAST WEEK, I WAS QUOTED AS FAVORING TV-RADIO  
ADVERTISING OF STATE-RUN LOTTERIES. THROUGH  
THE WIRE SERVICE, I WAS QUOTED ON WASHINGTON  
RADIO AND TV STATIONS. THIS RESULTED IN  
INQUIRIES FROM SEVERAL SENATORS, THE U.S.  
GAMBLING COMMISSION AND THE UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE. I CONFIRMED THE  
QUOTES -- AND I WANT TO ADD THAT LAWS THAT  
PROHIBIT ADVERTISING OF STATE-APPROVED  
LOTTERIES ARE OUTDATED AND DO NOT REFLECT  
THE SOCIAL, MORAL OR POLITICAL THINKING OF  
TODAY. REMEMBER, THE PEOPLE OF MICHIGAN  
VOTED FOR THE LOTTERY IN A STATEWIDE PUBLIC  
REFERENDUM -- IN MY MIND THAT MAKES IT LEGAL

AND SHOULD MAKE IT LEGAL FOR ADVERTISING,  
TOO. HOWEVER, AT THE MOMENT, THE DEPARTMENT  
OF JUSTICE IS UNWILLING TO SUPPORT ANY CHANGE  
IN THE STATUTE WHICH CONTROLS THE COMMISSION'S  
RULE IN THIS MATTER. JUSTICE CONTENDS THAT  
THE ENTIRE QUESTION OF THE LEGALITY OF STATE  
LOTTERIES IS IN NEED OF RESOLUTION FIRST. YOU  
MAY RECALL THAT ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE HAD  
A MEETING WITH A NUMBER OF GOVERNORS WHOSE  
STATES CURRENTLY OPERATE LOTTERIES AND, IN  
THAT MEETING, POINTED UP THE POSSIBILITY THAT  
THOSE LOTTERIES MIGHT BE ILLEGAL. THE SUPREME  
COURT WILL ULTIMATELY DECIDE THE QUESTION AND I  
HOPE THAT IT WILL BE DECIDED QUICKLY SO THAT THE  
INCONSISTENCY I SPOKE OF WILL BE REMOVED.



ANOTHER QUESTION WHICH CAME UP IN EAST LANSING WAS ONE HAVING TO DO WITH THE COMMISSION'S "EQUAL TIME" RULE WHICH REQUIRES BROADCAST STATIONS TO PROVIDE EQUAL TIME FOR ALL CANDIDATES VYING FOR THE SAME OFFICE. I SIMPLY DON'T THINK THAT RULE IS REASONABLE. IN CASES OF FRINGECANDIDATES WHO BARELY QUALIFY FOR THE BALLOT, I CAN SEE NO REASON WHY THEY SHOULD RECEIVE TIME EQUAL TO THAT OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES IN A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN. I DON'T BELIEVE THE MINOR CANDIDATES SHOULD BE IGNORED BY THE BROADCAST MEDIA, BUT I DON'T THINK THEY NEED BE CONSIDERED EQUAL TO THE MAJOR CANDIDATES. AFTER ALL, OURS IS BASICALLY A TWO-PARTY SYSTEM AND I BELIEVE THE COMMISSION'S RULES SHOULD REFLECT THAT



FACT. BEYOND THAT, THE PRESENT "EQUAL TIME" RULE RESULTS IN INHIBITING RATHER THAN PROMOTING DEBATE, IN MANY CASES, SINCE TIME AVAILABLE TO THE MAJOR CANDIDATES IS LIMITED BY THE NUMBER OF MINOR CANDIDATES WHO MUST BE AFFORDED EQUAL TIME.

I ALSO GET QUESTIONS ABOUT THE "FAIRNESS DOCTRINE" AND ITS APPLICATION AS IT AFFECTS ADVERTISING, JOURNALISM AND FIRST AMENDMENT GUARANTEES. I REGRET THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE BUT THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, REQUIRES THE COMMISSION TO HAVE SOME MECHANISM DESIGNED TO PROMOTE FAIRNESS IN THE USE OF BROADCASTING FACILITIES. THE COMMISSION RECENTLY REVIEWED

THE DOCTRINE AND REMOVED ANY BASIS FOR INTERPRETATIONS PROMOTING 'SO-CALLED "COUNTER ADVERTISING". WHAT REMAINS IS, I BELIEVE, A "FAIR" DOCTRINE WHICH CARRIES OUT THE STATUTORY MANDATE WITHOUT IMPOSING ANY UNDUE BURDEN UPON ANYONE CONCERNED.

ANOTHER THING THAT COULDN'T HAPPEN TO ME AS A BROADCASTER IS TO BE DESIGNATED "CABLE COMMISSIONER." I HAVE MY OWN PREDETERMINED METHOD OF HANDLING THE COMPLEX CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES OF PAY CABLE AND CABLE DE-REGULATION. WE ARE CONDUCTING THREE DAYS OF HEARINGS NEXT WEEK. (BOTH INDUSTRY SPOKESMEN POLARIZED). I'LL LISTEN TO ALL ARGUMENTS, CAREFULLY DELIBERATE, AGONIZE OVER THE DECISION

AND THEN ON "D" DAY (DECISION DAY), I'LL BE IN  
THE HOSPITAL WITH THE FLU.

SERIOUSLY, I PLAN TO STUDY ISSUES,  
WEIGH ALL FACTS AND STRIVE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS  
OR DECISIONS THAT BEST SERVE OVERALL PUBLIC  
INTEREST.

I'M GRATEFUL TO THE ADCRAFT CLUB  
AND TO THE GOVERNMENT LEADERS AND FRIENDS  
WHO WERE A SOURCE OF ENCOURAGEMENT AND  
SUPPORT DURING THE HECTIC INITIAL PERIOD.

I PLEDGE TO YOU AND TO THEM THAT I  
WILL DISCHARGE MY RESPONSIBILITIES SO AS TO  
MERIT YOUR CONTINUED CONFIDENCE AND TRUST --  
AND SO THAT A FUTURE INDUSTRY CANDIDATE WHO  
ASPIRES TO THE JOB WON'T HAVE THE SAME TROUBLE  
I HAD IN BEING CONFIRMED.