

SPEECH BY COMMISSIONER JAMES H. QUELLO
NAB REGIONAL MEETING
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
November 20, 1974.

AFTER NEARLY SEVEN MONTHS ON THE
JOB AS AN FCC COMMISSIONER, I'M BEGINNING
TO HAVE A FULL APPRECIATION OF A REMARK
MADE TO ME BY A CONGRESSIONAL FRIEND OF
MINE WHEN MY NOMINATION WAS UNDER
CHALLENGE. HE QUESTIONED WHY I WOULD
WANT A JOB WHERE CONGRESS WOULD QUESTION
MY DECISIONS AND THE COURTS WOULD REVERSE
THEM. I AM ENJOYING THE JOB, HOWEVER, AND
FINDING NO LACK OF CHALLENGE IN PURSUIT OF
THE "PUBLIC INTEREST, CONVENIENCE AND
NECESSITY."

2

THERE ARE A GOOD MANY MATTERS NOW
PENDING BEFORE THE COMMISSION WHICH CAN
HAVE PROFOUND EFFECTS UPON OUR MASS
COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA. I'M NOT PREPARED
TO OFFER ANYTHING DEFINITIVE ON THESE
ISSUES, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SHARE WITH
YOU SOME OF MY THINKING ON A FEW OF THEM.

THE COMMISSION CONTINUES TO WRESTLE
WITH THE NEWSPAPER-BROADCASTING CROSS-
OWNERSHIP QUESTION. I DON'T KNOW WHAT
THE FINAL DECISION WILL BE IN THAT MATTER,
BUT I CAN SAY THAT I DON'T BELIEVE THAT
ANY SWEEPING DIVESTITURE REQUIREMENT WILL
EMERGE FROM OUR DELIBERATIONS. SOME

3

DIVESTITURE MAY BE NECESSARY IN CASES
WHERE IT APPEARS EVIDENT THAT A SERIOUS
LACK OF DIVERSITY ADVERSELY AFFECTS THE
PUBLIC INTEREST. AND, IT'S POSSIBLE THAT
PROSPECTIVE RULES MAY BE WRITTEN WHICH
PREVENT NEW CROSS-OWNERSHIP SITUATIONS
FROM ARISING IN THE FUTURE.

YOU MAY HAVE READ THAT THE COMMISSION
HAS INSTRUCTED THE STAFF TO PREPARE A
DECISION IN THE PRIME TIME ACCESS RULE
PROCEEDING. THE DECISION ESSENTIALLY
MAINTAINS THE PRIME TIME ACCESS RULE WHICH
IS IN EFFECT NOW IN THAT NO SPECIFIC ACCESS
"WINDOW" IS PRESCRIBED AND NETWORK PRO-
GRAMMING IS LIMITED TO THREE HOURS BETWEEN

7 P.M. AND 11 P.M., OR 6 P.M. AND 11 P.M.,
 IN THE CENTRAL AND MOUNTAIN TIME ZONES.
 THE EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE ARE: SPECIAL
 NEWS PROGRAMS AND POLITICAL BROADCASTS,
 REGULAR NETWORK NEWS BROADCASTS WHEN
 ADJACENT TO A FULL HOUR OF LOCAL NEWS
 PROGRAMMING, RUNOVERS OF LIVE NETWORK
 SPORTS COVERAGE, SPECIAL SPORTS EVENTS
 AND CHILDREN'S PROGRAMMING AND PUBLIC
 AFFAIRS PROGRAMS AND DOCUMENTARIES. THIS
 DECISION WAS REACHED ONLY AFTER CAREFUL--
 I MIGHT EVEN SAY "EXHAUSTIVE"--CONSIDERATION
 OF ALL OF THE ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING
 OUTRIGHT REPEAL OF ALL PRIME TIME RULES.
 FRANKLY, MY FEELING IS THAT THE COMMISSION

SHOULD HAVE STAYED AWAY FROM THE RULE
IN THE FIRST PLACE BUT, ONCE LAUNCHED ON
THE COURSE OF ATTEMPTING TO PROVIDE ACCESS,
I BELIEVE WE SHOULD SEE IT THROUGH. THE
ACCESS RULE SHOULD BE GIVEN A CHANCE TO
WORK WITHOUT FURTHER CHANGES FOR A REASON-
ABLE PERIOD OF TIME AND THEN, AFTER EVALUA-
TION, WE CAN TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT IT TO
DETERMINE WHETHER THE WHOLE IDEA HAS BEEN
WORTHWHILE.

WE ARE ALSO CONSIDERING THE NETWORK
RE-RUN QUESTION AND TRYING TO DETERMINE
WHETHER THE COMMISSION HAS A LEGITIMATE
INTEREST IN THIS AREA. THE COMMISSION HAS
ATTEMPTED TO MAINTAIN A COURSE THAT WOULD

KEEP IT AWAY FROM DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN
THIS KIND OF PROGRAMMING DECISION BUT
THERE ARE MOUNTING PRESSURES WHICH COULD
HAVE THE RESULT OF FORCING US FROM THAT
PATH. AT THIS POINT, I'M NOT PERSUADED THAT
THE NUMBER OF NETWORK RE-RUNS IN PRIME
TIME IS AN ISSUE SUFFICIENTLY GROUNDED IN
THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO JUSTIFY DIRECT COM-
MISSION INVOLVEMENT. BUT, AS I HAVE SAID,
THE MATTER REMAINS UNDER CONSIDERATION.
IN THE AREA OF CHILDREN'S TV, WE HAVE
ATTEMPTED TO AVOID DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN
PROGRAMMING DECISIONS BY ISSUING A POLICY
STATEMENT SETTING FORTH GUIDELINES WHICH
WE BELIEVE WILL AID BROADCASTERS IN MEETING

THEIR SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN CHILDREN'S
PROGRAMMING. I WOULD HOPE THAT THESE
GUIDELINES WILL BE ENOUGH TO SOLVE THE
PROBLEMS WHICH EXIST. IF NOT, YOU MAY REST
ASSURED THE COMMISSION WILL RE-VISIT THIS
ISSUE.

AND, THERE IS THIS ISSUE OF SEX AND
VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION WHICH REMAINS A
CONCERN OF A CONSIDERABLE NUMBER OF
AMERICANS AND, AS A RESULT, IT HAS BECOME
A CONCERN OF THE CONGRESS. AGAIN, I WOULD
HOPE THAT THE COMMISSION COULD AVOID DIRECT
INVOLVEMENT IN DECISIONS IN THIS VERY
SENSITIVE AREA. IT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL,
HOWEVER, THAT PROGRAMMERS AND, ULTIMATELY,
BROADCAST LICENSEES, EXERCISE GREATER

RESTRAINT IN THESE AREAS IF FOR NO OTHER REASON THAN TO KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF THEM. AS I HAVE WARNED BEFORE, IF A DIRECT COROLLARY IS EVER ESTABLISHED BETWEEN EXCESSIVE VIOLENCE ON TV AND THE HIGH CRIME RATE, THE FCC HAS NOT ONLY THE RIGHT BUT THE OBLIGATION TO TAKE CORRECTIVE ACTION OR EVEN RECOMMEND APPROPRIATE LEGISLATION.

WE HAVE ALSO BEEN LOOKING AT THE RULES FOR PAY CABLE AND, AFTER SOME COMPROMISE, HAVE GENERALLY SETTLED ON A TENTATIVE POSITION. WHERE THE PAY TV RULES NOW CALL FOR ACCESS TO FEATURE FILMS BY THE PAY CABLE ENTREPRENEUR DURING THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF THE FILM'S RELEASE, WE HAVE EXTENDED THAT TIME TO THREE YEARS. THE NEW RULES WILL LIKELY MAKE ALL FILMS UNDER CONTRACT TO A GIVEN LOCAL MARKET AVAILABLE TO PAY TELEVISION IN THAT LOCAL MARKET.

REGARDLESS OF AGE. AND, FILMS NOT BROADCAST
WITHIN THE MARKET WITHIN THE PRECEDING
FOUR YEARS WILL BE AVAILABLE TO PAY TV
BEGINNING THE TENTH YEAR AFTER THEATRICAL
RELEASE. OF COURSE, THOSE RULES APPLY ONLY
TO THE TOP ONE-HUNDRED MARKETS IN THE
COUNTRY AND CABLE SYSTEMS OUTSIDE THOSE
MARKETS WOULD BE EXEMPT. FOREIGN LANGUAGE
FILMS WOULD ALSO BE EXEMPT.

WE'RE ALSO TAKING A LOOK AT SPORTS
CARRIAGE ON PAY TV. I SUSPECT THAT THE RULES
REGARDING "PAY" SPORTS WILL REMAIN ESSENTIALLY
THE SAME AS THEY ARE NOW.

WE ARE ALSO STUDYING THE VERY DIFFICULT
QUESTION OF HOW MUCH DISTANT SIGNAL SPORTS

CARRIAGE SHOULD BE PERMITTED ON CABLE TELEVISION. I HAVE TO SAY THAT DISTANT-SIGNAL CARRIAGE OF AN EVENT NOT AVAILABLE TO LOCAL TELEVISION DUE TO "BLACKOUT" RULES IS NOT LIKELY TO BE APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION. THE COMMISSION'S DOCKET 19417 IS PROPOSING RULE CHANGES WHICH WOULD BE RESPONSIVE TO PUBLIC LAW 87-331, WHICH EXEMPTS THE FOUR MAJOR PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS FROM THE ANTI-TRUST LAWS AND, AMONG OTHER THINGS, PERMITS HOME-GAME BLACKOUTS. WE WILL STUDY THAT WHOLE PROBLEM IN GREAT DETAIL IN AN EFFORT TO COME UP WITH RULES THAT BALANCE THE INTERESTS OF THE BROADCASTER, THE CABLE OPERATOR AND THE SPORTS

ENTREPRENEUR INSOFAR AS THOSE INTERESTS
ARE LIKELY TO SERVE THE ULTIMATE PUBLIC
INTEREST.

THERE IS ANOTHER ISSUE WHICH CONCERNS
ME VERY MUCH AND THAT IS THE PRACTICE BY
SOME BROADCASTERS OF OVER-RESPONDING TO
PRESSURES FROM ACTIVIST GROUPS AT LICENSE
RENEWAL TIME. AS YOU KNOW, THE COMMISSION
HAS A POLICY OF ENCOURAGING LICENSEES TO
MEET WITH LOCAL GROUPS AND TO RESPOND TO
THE LEGITIMATE CONCERNS OF THOSE GROUPS
INSOFAR AS THOSE CONCERNS ARE SHARED BY
SIGNIFICANT SEGMENTS OF THE TOTAL AUDIENCE
SERVED BY THE LICENSEE. THIS POLICY--WHICH
I BELIEVE IS A GOOD ONE--HAS APPARENTLY

BEEN MISINTERPRETED BY SOME LICENSEES TO PERMIT AN ABROGATION OF PROGRAMMING RESPONSIBILITY. THERE SEEMS TO BE A TREND TOWARD RESTRICTIVE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN LICENSEES AND COMMUNITY GROUPS WHICH SEVERELY LIMIT LICENSEES' JUDGMENT IN PROGRAMMING THEIR FACILITIES. WHEN SUCH AN AGREEMENT RESULTS FROM THE THREAT OF A PETITION TO DENY, I INTEND TO QUESTION IT. THE RULES--AND, I BELIEVE, THE PUBLIC INTEREST--REQUIRE THE LICENSEE TO ASCERTAIN THE NEEDS AND INTERESTS OF HIS COMMUNITY THROUGH A RATHER EXTENSIVE SAMPLING OF THE VIEWPOINTS OF MANY COMMUNITY LEADERS AND FROM THE GENERAL PUBLIC. AS A RESULT

1

OF THAT ASCERTAINMENT PROCESS, THE BROADCASTER IS THEN REQUIRED TO EXERCISE HIS PROGRAMMING AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES IN A MANNER HE FEELS BEST RESPONDS TO THOSE NEEDS AND INTERESTS. WHEN AN ACTIVIST GROUP, WITH ITS OWN PRIVATE VIEWS OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST, INTRUDES INTO THIS PROCESS SEEKING DISPROPORTIONATE AND SPECIAL CONSIDERATION, THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF COMMUNITY ASCERTAINMENT IS DENIED. OFTEN, THE CONSTITUENCY OF SUCH A GROUP IS ILL-DEFINED AND USUALLY REPRESENTS ONLY A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION SERVED BY THE STATION.

THEREFORE, I MUST ASSUME THAT THE COMMISSION'S ASCERTAINMENT POLICY MORE ACCURATELY REVEALS THE COMMUNITY'S

COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS AND INTERESTS THAN DO THE REPRESENTATIONS OF SOME ACTIVIST GROUPS. INsofar AS THEY DO REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF SIGNIFICANT SEGMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY, THEIR VIEWS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE OVERALL ASCERTAINMENT PROCESS.

THERE ARE ALSO SOME ISSUES WHICH ARE NOT NOW UNDER ACTIVE CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMISSION BUT WHICH ARE, IN MY OPINION, MATTERS OF SERIOUS CONCERN.

DURING A RECENT VISIT TO MY HOME STATE OF MICHIGAN, I WAS ASKED TO COMMENT ON THE INCONSISTENCY WHICH IS APPARENT WHEN STATE LOTTERIES ARE NOT PERMITTED TO ADVERTISE ON LOCAL RADIO AND TELEVISION. I SAID THEN--

AND I CONTINUE TO BELIEVE--THAT THE PRO-
HIBITION AGAINST BROADCAST PROMOTION OF
STATE-APPROVED LOTTERIES SHOULD BE REMOVED.
WHETHER OR NOT I PERSONALLY APPROVE OR
DISAPPROVE OF LOTTERIES, THE FACT IS THAT
LOTTERIES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE
REFERENDUM PROCESS IN MY STATE AND IN
OTHER STATES. LOTTERIES HAVE BEEN RECOG-
NIZED IN THOSE STATES AS LEGITIMATE MEANS
OF INCREASING BADLY-NEEDED REVENUES AND,
THEREFORE, I CAN SEE NO LOGICAL REASON WHY
THEY SHOULD NOT BE PROMOTED AS LEGITIMATE,
STATE-APPROVED ENTERPRISES. I RECOGNIZE
THAT LOTTERIES CAN HAVE SOME NEGATIVE

SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES AS WELL AS POSITIVE
ONES, BUT, IN THOSE STATES WHOSE CITIZENS
HAVE APPROVED LOTTERIES AS A MATTER OF
PUBLIC POLICY, I BELIEVE THEY CAN LEGITI-
MATELY BE PROMOTED ON THE AIR AS WELL AS
IN NEWSPAPERS, ON BILLBOARDS AND BY OTHER
MEANS OF ADVERTISING. OF COURSE, THIS ISSUE
CANNOT BE DECIDED BY THE COMMISSION SINCE
SECTION 1304, TITLE 18, OF THE UNITED STATES
CODE PROHIBITS THE BROADCAST OF "...ANY
ADVERTISEMENT OF OR INFORMATION CONCERNING
ANY LOTTERY, GIFT ENTERPRISE, OR SIMILAR
SCHEME OFFERING PRIZES DEPENDENT IN WHOLE
OR IN PART UPON LOT OR CHANCE..." THE
SUPREME COURT HAS GRANTED A PETITION TO
REVIEW A LOWER COURT RULING IN THIS MATTER,

1

HOWEVER, AND IT IS MY HOPE THAT THE ISSUE WILL BE RESOLVED IN THE NEAR FUTURE. AS IT IS NOW, I BELIEVE OUR LOTTERY LAWS ARE OUTDATED AND DO NOT REFLECT THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL OR MORAL THINKING OF TODAY.

THERE IS ANOTHER MATTER OF SOME CONCERN TO ME AND IT, TOO, IS BEYOND THE REACH OF THE COMMISSION. I CONTINUE TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT THE SO-CALLED EQUAL TIME PROVISION OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT REGARDING BROADCAST APPEARANCES BY POLITICAL CANDIDATES. AS BROADCASTERS. I'M SURE YOU'VE DEALT WITH THIS PROVISION AND THAT YOU RECOGNIZE SOME OF THE PROBLEMS THAT GO WITH IT. IN MY VIEW, THE REQUIREMENT THAT EACH CANDIDATE FOR THE SAME OFFICE BE AFFORDED THE SAME OPPORTUNITY FOR USE OF BROADCAST TIME IS

COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE IN TERMS OF ACCOMPLISHING
WHAT THE ACT PURPORTS TO ACCOMPLISH IN THAT
AREA. ASSUMING THE ACT CONTEMPLATED THE
WIDEST POSSIBLE DISSEMINATION OF THE VIEWS
OF CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE, I THINK IT
CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT THIS PROVISION HAS
HAD THE EFFECT OF SERIOUSLY LIMITING THE
EXPOSURE OF CANDIDATES' VIEWS IN THOSE CON-
TESTS WHERE THERE ARE MANY CANDIDATES. I
WOULD FAVOR ABOLITION OF THE "EQUAL TIME"
RULE AND SIMPLY REQUIRE COMPLIANCE WITH
THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE AS RECENTLY INTERPRETED
BY THE COMMISSION IN THE FAIRNESS REPORT.

I JOINED THE COMMISSION SHORTLY BEFORE
THE FAIRNESS REPORT WAS ISSUED AND I HAD THE

OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FINAL STAGES OF ITS PREPARATION. AS I HAVE STATED, I SUBSCRIBE TO THE POLICY ENUNCIATED IN THAT REPORT AND I BELIEVE THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOCTRINE TO BE REASONABLE AND IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST. I HAVE SAID THAT I HAD SOME PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS WITH THE DOCTRINE BASED UPON FIRST AMENDMENT CONSIDERATIONS. HOWEVER, THE COURTS HAVE HELD THAT THE DOCTRINE AFFIRMS THE FIRST AMENDMENT IN THAT IT PROMOTES FREEDOM OF SPEECH. I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT THE COMMISSION APPROACHES ENFORCEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE IN THAT SPIRIT.

ONE OF THE THINGS WHICH HAS BEEN BROUGHT HOME TO ME SINCE BECOMING A

COMMISSIONER IS THAT MY PUBLIC STATEMENTS ARE OCCASIONALLY SUBJECT TO MISINTERPRETATION. FOR EXAMPLE, I SPOKE AT THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FM BROADCASTERS CONVENTION IN NEW ORLEANS, LAST MONTH, AND MADE A BRIEF REFERENCE TO PUBLIC SERVICE OBLIGATIONS OF FM BROADCASTERS. I'VE HAD SOME MAIL SINCE, SUGGESTING THAT I WAS THREATENING TO REPLACE GOOD MUSIC ON FM WITH DULL AND DREARY PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMMING, NEWS THAT IS ALREADY HEARD ON MANY OTHER STATIONS, AND UNPALATABLE PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS WHICH OFTEN PROMOTE UNDESIRABLE GOALS. FOR THE RECORD, I'D LIKE TO RESTATE AND CLARIFY MY POSITION

VIS-A-VIS FM BROADCASTING AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE OBLIGATION. FIRST, I HAVE NO DESIRE TO INVOLVE THE FCC IN PROGRAMMING DECISIONS WHICH I CONSIDER PROPERLY AND SOLELY IN THE HANDS OF THE BROADCAST LICENSEE. FURTHERMORE, I ALSO ENJOY LISTENING TO PLEASANT MUSIC WITH MINIMUM INTERRUPTIONS. HOWEVER, OUR SYSTEM OF COMMERCIAL BROADCASTING PROVIDES FOR THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF SUCH SERVICES THROUGH ADVERTISING THEREBY ASSURING SOME INTERRUPTION OF THE PROGRAM FORMAT TO PRESENT THAT ADVERTISING. I BELIEVE THE ACT ALSO RECOGNIZED THAT USE OF VALUABLE SPECTRUM SPACE CARRIED WITH IT THE RESPONSIBILITY

TO PROVIDE SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC WHICH BROADCASTING IS UNIQUELY ABLE TO PROVIDE; THAT IS, TIMELY INFORMATION AFFECTING THE AUDIENCE IN THEIR DAILY LIVES. THAT ALSO HAPPENS TO BE, IN MY VIEW, A GOOD DEFINITION OF NEWS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMMING AND, THEREFORE, I BELIEVE SUCH PROGRAMMING SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN FM BROADCASTING AS WELL AS IN ALL OTHER COMMERCIAL BROADCASTING. I HASTEN TO ADD THAT I AM NOT PRESCRIBING THE AMOUNT OF TIME DEVOTED TO THE INFORMATION PORTIONS OF FM BROADCASTING NOR AM I SUGGESTING RATIOS OF NEWS TO ENTERTAINMENT. HOWEVER, I DO EXPECT THE PUBLIC SERVICE EFFORT OF ANY LICENSEE TO BE

2

MORE THAN PERFUNCTORY SINCE HIS OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC SERVICE IS GREAT. I WOULD LEAVE TO EACH BROADCASTER TO DECIDE THE MEANS AND THE FORMAT IN WHICH TO PERFORM THIS SERVICE IN A MANNER WHICH IS MOST APPROPRIATE TO THE AUDIENCE HE IS ATTEMPTING TO SERVE. PUBLIC SERVICE NEED NOT--AND SHOULD NOT--BE OBTRUSIVE AND OBJECTIONABLE. IT'S BEEN MY EXPERIENCE THAT BROADCASTERS ARE GENERALLY VERY INNOVATIVE AND TALENTED PEOPLE AND I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT THEY'LL CONTINUE TO SERVE THEIR COMMUNITIES VERY ABLY.

IN NEW ORLEANS, I WAS SIMPLY RECOGNIZING THE "COMING OF AGE" OF FM BROADCASTING

AFTER ALL THOSE YEARS OF WAITING FOR FM
 TO BECOME TRULY VIABLE AND CAPABLE OF
 SUSTAINING PUBLIC ATTENTION. THE COMMISSION
 HAS, TRADITIONALLY AND REALISTICALLY,
 ATTEMPTED TO EASE THE BURDENS ON DEVELOPING
 COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRIES IN AN EFFORT TO
 EASE AND ACCELERATE THEIR PROGRESS TOWARD
 VIABILITY. THE PATH HAS BEEN A LONG AND
 HARD ONE FOR FM RADIO, BUT IT IS APPARENT
 THAT FM HAS "ARRIVED" AND IS CONTINUING TO
 GROW. I BELIEVE THAT, AS FM TAKES ITS LONG-
 AWAITED POSITION ALONGSIDE OTHER BROADCASTERS,
 IT SHOULD AND MUST ASSUME ITS FAIR SHARE OF
 THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC.
 IT'S NOT FAIR TO LEAVE IT TO THE "OTHER GUY"

TO PROVIDE THE MINIMAL NEWS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. FURTHERMORE, I'M CERTAIN THAT THE FM BROADCASTERS EXPECT AND ACCEPT THIS RESPONSIBILITY AND WILL CONTINUE TO ACTIVELY SEEK BETTER AND BETTER MEANS OF DISCHARGING IT.

THIS WHOLE BROAD AREA OF PUBLIC SERVICE IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT, IT SEEMS TO ME, IF BROADCASTING IS TO CONTINUE TO HOLD THE IMPORTANT POSITION IN OUR SOCIETY IT HAS HELD FOR MANY YEARS. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE EVEN MORE PARTICIPATION BY BROADCASTERS IN COMMUNITY EVENTS BOTH ON AND OFF THE AIR. THROUGH MY EXPERIENCE IN BROADCASTING, I'M CONVINCED OF THE HIGH

VALUE, TO BROADCASTING AND THE COMMUNITY,
OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY BROADCASTERS
IN THE WORTHWHILE PROJECTS OF THEIR COM-
MUNITIES. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE--AND THIS IS
MY PERSONAL POSITION--FCC RECOGNITION OF
BROADCASTERS' COMMUNITY EFFORTS WHICH ARE
NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO PROGRAMMING. I
WOULD LIKE TO SEE COMMISSION ACKNOWLEDGE-
MENT OF THE LONG HOURS AND GREAT EFFORT
PUT FORTH BY MANY BROADCASTERS TO FURTHER
COMMUNITY GOALS BY SERVING ON IMPORTANT
COMMITTEES AND BOARDS, FOR EXAMPLE.
THROUGH PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, I KNOW HOW
VALUABLE THIS KIND OF SERVICE CAN BE IN
ASCERTAINING AND RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS
AND INTERESTS OF A COMMUNITY.

FINALLY, I'D LIKE TO SHARE WITH YOU SOME OF MY VIEWS OF THE FCC, BEFORE AND AFTER. BEFORE GOING TO WASHINGTON, MY VIEW OF THE COMMISSION TENDED TO BE A LITTLE APPREHENSIVE. WHILE I CONSIDERED MYSELF A RESPONSIBLE, CONCIENTIOUS BROADCASTER, I WASN'T SURE THAT THE REALITIES OF DAY IN, AND DAY OUT BROADCASTING WERE APPRECIATED IN THE IVORY TOWER ATMOSPHERE OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL. THEREFORE, I CAN UNDERSTAND IF SOME OF YOU MIGHT HOLD SOME OF THE VIEWS I HELD. LET ME ASSURE YOU THAT I HAVE COME TO HOLD GREAT RESPECT FOR MY COLLEAGUES ON THE COMMISSION AND FOR THE STAFF OF THE BROADCAST BUREAU. THE BUREAU, IT SEEMS TO ME, CONTAINS

Joe Vegas
Nov 20, 1974

INDIVIDUALS WITH A PROFOUND UNDERSTANDING
OF BROADCASTING AND A SYMPATHETIC UNDER-
STANDING OF MANY OF THE PROBLEMS FACED BY

BROADCASTERS. I HOPE THAT YOU'LL COME TO

I cloud with:

eventually

REGARD THE BUREAU--AND THE COMMISSION--AS

8

Broadcast

you

Copy

PARTNERS IN A COMMON EFFORT TO PROVIDE
THE BEST BROADCASTING SERVICE POSSIBLE.

THAT GOAL, OF COURSE, IS A PART OF THE

COMMISSION'S STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITY AND

THERE ARE MANY FINE PEOPLE IN WASHINGTON

AND AROUND THE COUNTRY DEDICATED TO THAT

GOAL. IT ALSO IS THE GOAL OF EVERY GOOD

BROADCASTER IN THE SENSE THAT THE BETTER

YOU SERVE THE PUBLIC, ~~OVER THE LONG PULL,~~

THE LARGER THE AUDIENCE YOU CAN EXPECT.

I KNOW THERE ARE MANY COMPONENTS WHICH
 COME TOGETHER TO BUILD AND MAINTAIN A
 SUCCESSFUL BROADCASTING FACILITY, BUT IN
 MY MIND, TRUE PUBLIC SERVICE STANDS OUT AS
 THE ONLY FIRM BASE UPON WHICH TO BUILD A
 DOMINANT COMMUNITY IDENTITY. PUBLIC
 SERVICE IS THE FOUNDATION THAT BUILDS
 GOODWILL, ASSURES COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE
 AND, NOT INCIDENTALLY, MAXIMIZES YOUR
 SHARE OF BUSINESS."

THANK YOU.

I enjoyed the opportunity to bring you a
 little insight into the foibles, faults and
 virtues of regulations. I wish the Texas Association
 of Business and Business Executives continued success
 and growth in the challenging times ahead.

(perhaps, some day we can reach the millennium
 where government and industry ^{cooperatively} will work together to foster
 a new era of prosperity and well being for our country's
 most productive service but desirable work for all Americans.