

our attention on problems that are of vital concern to each of us as individuals. Government is no longer remote or impersonal.

This increase in news analysis, in news interpretation, requires an even greater dedication on your part to the development of a broader understanding and an intensified interest in seeking out all the facts. The inherent danger is that news interpretation will slip over some undefined line and no longer be interpretive but editorial without being labeled as such. The danger exists that documentaries may begin to reflect a single point of view rather than many. All of us, of course, harbor personal opinions on a variety of subjects and you in the television and radio industry are no exception. How difficult it is, and how difficult it will continue to be, not to incorporate some of those opinions, some of those feelings, however subtly, into these interpretive broadcasts. Not only should this be guarded against in the interest in maintaining high journalistic standards, but it should be guarded against to protect the integrity of the radio and television industry. Certainly if objectivity is abandoned in news interpretation, the public will lose confidence. The facts, as presented, will lack authority simply because too many viewers will realize that the station presenting the interpretation has an axe to grind. And without this public confidence, without this public reliance upon the radio and television industry as an authoritative source, your role in public service will be greatly diminished.

There is another development within the industry that is relatively new and, in my opinion, is certainly in the public interest. An increasing number of radio and television stations are willing to broadcast clearly labeled editorials on questions of importance. It had always seemed odd to me that only one medium in communications—news-papers—editorialized daily while the radio and television industry seemed reluctant to do so. Of course, I was vaguely familiar with certain regulations established by the Federal Communications Commission regarding the equal time provision. However, I never considered it to be a major stumbling block. Now I am happy to see that this hurdle apparently has been overcome. I think editorial comment in all media ought to be encouraged. A democracy thrives on a conflict of ideas because such a conflict guarantees that each idea will be thoroughly discussed before and not after it becomes effective. I am also happy to note that the radio and television industry is embarking on a program of presenting more news. Programs now 15 minutes long will be extended to 30 minutes in several instances. A number of people, consciously or unconsciously, have regarded radio and television news broadcasts as something similar to an ad-