2011 Mack Road
Douglasville, GA 30135

Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
RECEIVED
JAN 22 1993
FCC MAIL ROOM
RECEIVED
JAN 22 1993
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

re. MM Docket No. 92-254

Dear Mr. Secretary,

I am writing regarding the case of Daniel Becker's political advertisements which depicted the remains of unborn babies who had been killed by abortion. While I agree that these images are disturbing, I believe it was Becker's point, precisely, that we should be disturbed by the gore of abortion, which is instead tolerated because the media has refused to expose the truth about abortion.

I see a strong parellel to the media's treatment of the Vietnam War. Up to a point people had tolerated that war. When the media started showing the graphic and bloody images of massacres, however, people found the war unacceptable. Any objective observer would have to agree that the images broadcast into American homes night after night were as

horrific as those of our slaughtered children. But any honest person would recognize that the difference with the abortion issue is that the media is philosophically committed to preserving the right to kill unborn children and is unwilling to expose the facts about the methods and results of abortion.

Surely, if the news media chose to present an exposé on the devastation of abortion, indecency would not be raised as an objection. In fact, nightly depictions of disasters, wars, nude dancing, or murders show images that are disturbing for both me and my children, yet are defended under freedom of speech provisions of the Constitution. The fact that, because of political considerations, the media chooses not to expose what happens to our children in abortion is all the more reason that a candidate like Daniel Becker must have the freedom to air the truth.

The content of prime time programming is intentionally disturbing or horrifying without any purpose of opening a dialogue regarding policies or practices accepted within established government and media circles.

In fact, the very purpose of the First Amendment is not to allow the indecent and obscene things that are produced for titillation and sensationalism, but for the very reason that Daniel Becker produced his ads: That those who oppose government policies should have the freedom to express their opposition. Indeed, if his appeal is denied and his political voice stifled, the First Amendment is worthless, and the continued production of trash based on "freedom of speech" will be evidence only of its corruption.

Sincerely,

Anna Marie P. Davis
(404) 942-1870