

*Times*: "A hundred selective comments will not change the public's mind." However, as a result of television and television pictures showing the distress of the Kurds, the attitude of the President changed gradually but magnificently, according to Daniel Schorr. We see, therefore, that the impact of television is not always negative.

We should also consider the impact on the public. The public is selective too. The public retains what it wants to retain from what is seen on television, on the basis of its prejudices, its viewpoint, its way of looking at television. The impact on other media such as the printed press is enormous. The impact of television on the print medium is not always positive. I think that the print medium tends now, far more than in the past, to see things in terms of conflicts because of television, because the ground rules are generally laid down by television and debates are seen from the perspective of television.

In the case of terrorism, journalists must take an ethical standpoint in considering the effect on hostages and also the effect on other potential terrorists through the process of imitation. On these points, the book shows us that the subjectivity of responses varies according to the person asked. If you were to ask a police chief whether live television coverage influences and encourages acts of terrorism, 93 percent would answer yes. Live coverage encourages terrorism. If you asked television news managers the same question, 35 percent would answer yes.

We can appreciate the extent to which the subjectivity of one's answers will vary according to the viewpoint of the person answering. We observed the same thing yesterday in the discussion on censorship, between the military and journalists. On the one hand, there was freedom of the press defended by journalists, while on the other there was censorship, not censorship in itself, but censorship on behalf of national security, which is also an important value in a democratic society. In this sense, there is a debate on values, between national security and freedom of the press. I think we have to strike a balance between these values and also between speech in general and speech as used by journalists. And I think it is important to note that it is rhetorical here, since both the military and the press know very well that in the reality of daily life they are condemned to get on with each other.