

view, and somebody else builds up in that station and can buy it out and that viewpoint then goes to him.

In each of these cases what I am saying is you give a powerful speech opportunity to one and foreclose others from this. Having given it to him, and this isn't like Hyde Park, isn't like the newspapers, and it isn't like other areas because it is limited, this having been done, doesn't he have a responsibility in that area to let the ones we have shut out in?

Mr. JAFFE. Not under the Fairness Doctrine. The Fairness Doctrine doesn't say that anybody in particular is entitled to speak. It just says that the various points of view must be represented. But it doesn't proceed at all in terms of anybody's rights, as I understand it. It does in connection with the right to reply, if you have been personally attacked.

But the Fairness Doctrine generally doesn't speak at all in terms of anybody's rights. As a matter of fact, I think you have overstated the picture. I think there is a much greater variety of ownership in radio and TV than you express, and quite different points of view will be expressed. Even if there is some limitation, it doesn't follow that the way you do it is to have a law.

Mr. ADAMS. You are aware, of course, of the linkage between the major newspapers and the major television outlets in a great portion of the 50 major markets. This being so, as you build this during the coming years, you arrive at a point where if you have two V's in an area and two newspapers, and the newspapers own each V, where do you get the opportunity for this opposing viewpoint?

When we talk of freedom of speech, I talk of the freedom of speech of the individuals who say "We have a right to be on." This doesn't mean an individual. We have already made that determination when we let the broadcaster on and kept somebody else off.

But I would like to know what your feeling is about the trust, call it, or call it public service, whatever it is, the responsibility of that broadcaster because of what the Government has given him.

Mr. JAFFE. I think it is part of the public responsibility of the stations to put on general programs representing various points of view, and that on the whole this is more or less done. I don't really object to the Fairness Doctrine because it seems to me so relaxed a doctrine. It really has so little sanction behind it. It probably sets a good model.

I don't, on the other hand, regard it as a very significant doctrine. It doesn't seem to me that with respect to the formation of general opinion it is terribly important that every particular TV and every particular radio be policed with respect to the expression of views that happen to come off on this particular station.

It seems to me that public opinion is not formed in terms of particular audiences that have listened to particular stations and have heard particular things, but in terms of a whole mass operation of communications that are constantly impinging upon people.

Maybe there is a distinction between local broadcasting in small places with respect to small local issues. It may well be that there the operation of a station and its position is more crucial. But take things like Vietnam, all these large issues, and the claim that if station A lets so-and-so speak about Vietnam to one effect, then they should let somebody else who has the opposite view speak to the other effect on Vietnam, as if it were significant that one particular station on a particular