

So in the news area, you would get conformity by saying it is popular to be on this side of this issue and our listenership approves of this stand and, therefore, we will go this way.

That, then, becomes station news and editorial policy.

Mr. CORPORON. But I don't think it operates this way in practice.

Mr. ADAMS. Don't you think it operates that way in practice in television media now in terms of areas of programing?

Mr. CORPORON. I think that the broadcaster in one market finds a popular formula, whether it be in news or in the entertainment field. I think if another station comes in and wants to compete, he sees that station A has got the jump on him, with enormous ratings, very successful, and he may try to imitate.

But, it is just as likely he may try to find another area of programing or another style of news presentation and present a different point of view. I think if you go market to market you will find this does exist.

Mr. ADAMS. Don't you think the market is more imitative than innovative?

Mr. CORPORON. There is a great deal of imitation; yes. There is not enough innovation. I am quick to concede that. Of course, there is always room for more. But I still contend the basic point that the constituency, because you do have multiple ownership in most markets, does act as an absolute guarantee, that it acts as a great encouragement to fairness, and I think it works.

In conclusion, I think the listeners are more likely or just as likely to arrive at a correct conclusion as to whether it is truly in the public interest than the FCC Commissioners, not because the Commissioners are inferior people, but because the listeners are in that given audience, they are in the given community. I think they can best decide.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman.

Dean BARROW. Congressman Springer.

Mr. SPRINGER. We have just gone through educational TV. Personally, I come back again to the two amendments, which I was responsible for getting in there, that you get guaranteed nonpartisanship, not something that somebody is going to give you who owns a local station, but something that the FCC would, in their power, guarantee to every single citizen.

This comes about not by virtue of a newspaper, but by virtue of your having been given a grant to the public airways. This isn't something someone is supposed to give me. If I have a run-in with Brock Adams, then do I have to go to another station to say, "Will you hear my side of the story?"

What I have said here is that you are guaranteed this right and all you have to do is ask for it and you can get it. If you take a poll of this committee, I don't think you would find a single one—if you could find one, I would like to know him—on this committee who would be in favor of abandoning this to the ownership of a TV station to make that decision.

Somehow or other, if this is the proposal that is being made here by industry generally, I think it certainly wouldn't strike home with the members of this committee.

Personally, I can't understand what is unfair about making the public airways available to a citizen who has been offended or chal-