

In point of fact, the FCC has allowed this concentration to take place, and I don't notice any discernible trend toward decreasing the amount of concentration today. It seems to me a lot more could be done with diversifying the market structure than has been done.

Instead, reliance has been placed upon the more direct form of control by the Fairness Doctrine than upon attempting to shape and structure a market which would have built-in assurance of diversity and fairness.

The CHAIRMAN. Dean Barrow?

Dean BARROW. Chairman Staggers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Robinson, would you suggest legislation about this multiple ownership, about this joining of newspapers and TV?

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not sure I would make newspaper interests an absolute disqualification. In any event I am not sure that the tendency has not gone almost beyond repair at this point. I would suggest that either by resolution, or by perhaps legislation, there should be a very substantial and very meaningful adverse factor on the diversification of mass communications media criterion generally.

That would include not only broadcast-newspaper ownership, but it would include joint ownership of television stations, including perhaps an increased tightening of the multiple-ownership rules that now exist, and perhaps a reinstatement of the top 50 rule-making proceeding which was recently terminated, to control the degree of concentration in the top 50 markets.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you, Professor Robinson, give this committee the benefit of your suggestions in writing along this line?

Mr. ROBINSON. I would be happy to do so. I really haven't crystalized any particular proposal other than on one proposal, which would be to reinstate the rule-making proceeding on the top 50 markets.

Dean BARROW. Dr. Goldin.

Mr. GOLDIN. I am happy to take this occasion to state I am glad to associate myself with him.

Dean BARROW. Are you associating yourself with his total position? I think you might want to clarify that.

Mr. GOLDIN. No; but enough so that I can say I am basically in agreement with Mr. Robinson.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to ask Mr. Goldin a question.

In the event there was no limitation of the spectrum space, and any legally, technically, and financially qualified applicant could find a place, through CATV, satellite, multiplexing, all the technology that is around the corner, would you still feel there was a justification and a necessity for some kind of surveillance by an instrumentality of government?

Mr. GOLDIN. I think then you get close to the idea that every man can publish his own pamphlet concept. If you get to that point, then I will reconsider my position.

Mr. PORTER. I have always claimed my theoretical right to compete with the New York Times though I have never found it too practical.

Mr. ADAMS. I don't want to get too legalistic about the first amendment problem that is involved. I would ask you gentlemen who are defending this position if they would comment on this of anyone wants to.