

than the preponderance of legal scholars and students at the table. We have to get the stuff on. Specifically, I am here to talk to one point. That is what I was asked to talk about. How the Fairness Doctrine, where it seems to be going, affects me in trying to maintain an organization of 900 people with respect to our function, what we are paid for, what our obligations are to society.

The legal arguments, and this includes people whose views I agree with, and who expressed them much better than I did, seemed to me to live in a vacuum. Nobody has to put anything out. Nobody has to get anything on. It is better to follow the rules than to do anything practical in terms of problems.

There has been a great deal of talk about public interest and no reference to what the public is interested in. Mrs. Pilpel kept parroting or coupling the words "fairness" and "diversity."

I truly believe that as the Fairness Doctrine or as the personal attack subhead of the Fairness Doctrine get more and more specific in their application, there will not be more diversity but there will be less.

We can always do programs about rivers and creeks, and I guess somebody could object to that, though not too many. I am worried about self-censorship, by professionals and journalists. I am worried that each one of them must so concern himself, improperly or unjustifiably, with the threat of somebody catching him short, that he will hold back his training, his instincts, his talents, and the result will be less and less challenging, and less stimulating, television journalism.

Also, by the way, I think one thing ought to be clear. I said that enough of this regulation would reduce journalism—television news presentations in various forms—to the dull and frivolous.

Mrs. Pilpel seemed to think that I thought the rest of television was something more than dull and frivolous. I won't speak to that. For the rest of television, I am merely a viewer, like anybody else. A lot of us like it and those who don't like it don't watch it much. Those who don't watch it much know they don't like it.

The general problem is in my specific case, in my experience, that if you are too careful in maintaining all these theoretical criteria in some small station at some distant place, you are inhibiting a very large operation that I am associated with from doing what it ought to do.

Like everything else, there are certain relative goods to be matched against each other to decide which is the more important.

Dean BARROW. Mrs. Pilpel?

Mrs. PILPEL. I am somewhat puzzled by what Mr. Frank just said and by what other speakers have said. Perhaps they could answer this question.

Section 315(a) does refer to the obligation imposed on broadcasters to afford reasonable opportunities for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

I assume this is the Fairness Doctrine. This is what I understand the Fairness Doctrine to be.

Those who object to the Fairness Doctrine, then, presumably would object to section 315(a), but they don't seem to. Apparently they are