

troversial matters. For more than 2 years we have had an educational crisis in my community. Many private citizens, as well as ad hoc committees, and formal groups have studied the problem.

There have been proposed solutions and there have been counter-proposals and amended proposals. A blue ribbon committee of civic leaders and private citizens (the Charter Committee) was formed to attack the problem with the aid of a reputable outside survey.

The boards of education of both the city and county reached prior agreement and announced publicly that they would accept and be bound by the Charter Committee's recommendations.

The Charter Committee recommended merger of the two school districts. Not simple merger, but a rather complicated so-called umbrella plan which amounted to a unique approach to the growing problem of elementary and secondary public education.

We covered these developments as well as we were able within the confines of our regular news programs. But various groups began springing up in opposition to the Charter Committee report, thus effectively blocking any of our attempts at planning any additional special programming to provide the community with information vital to their understanding of the controversy.

Or how about this one? The chamber of commerce complained about our running Federal water pollution control spots, contending they didn't apply to this area. Now I believe we're doing and have done a lot in my community to control water pollution. But the fact that Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Kentucky Governor Louie Nunn discussed this problem of Federal standards, last month, indicates there's more to be accomplished than the chamber would admit.

We had a controversy last spring about open housing in my community. It led to nightly street demonstrations for a time, and even caused cancellation of some of the events normally held in conjunction with the Kentucky Derby. We were vitally concerned that our community have as much information about this crucial issue as possible. But the emotion of the issue, coupled with the number of groups with varying viewpoints that sprang up to participate just militated against opening the doors of our studios to the parade of groups and individuals who would be demanding a "fair" hearing under the fairness doctrine.

Once a broadcaster has decided to program in the area covered by the fairness doctrine, he has the immediate obligation to present all sides of the issue in question.

But who decides what are the responsible sides of a given issue? Is it the broadcaster? The FCC? The general public? Is it really possible for an agency with a liberal outlook to define what is responsible in the same context as a conservative would?

Then, assuming the broadcaster has embarked on the hazardous course of programming on a controversial issue, and assuming further he has afforded all sides an opportunity to be heard, who determines whether he has, in fact, acted fairly?

Editorials have been treated separately from controversial issues, and controversy has been classified as political and nonpolitical so it is necessary to refer continually to those classifications. The Congress itself apparently has distinguished between political and nonpolitical