

RECEIVED

MM DOCKET 92-254

RECEIVED

FEB 3 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FEB 3 4 35 PM '93

FCC - MAIL ROOM

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

To Whom This May Concern:

I am writing because I am concerned that the FCC will be ruling shortly, on whether or not pictures or videos of aborted babies may be used in campaign ads.

Yes these pictures & videos are gruesome but we are a society that watches the most explicit violence, in the form of torture, rape, murder etc., as entertainment. If abortion is not the murder of babies why does it bother this same society to see these babies bodies.

To inform the public, we are shown whales & seals being clubbed to death. Why is the media so afraid to inform the public about abortion so an informed "Choice" can be made.

I believe a candidate has a 1st Amendment right to express their beliefs in any manner they see fit. Please continue to allow them to do so.

Sincerely
Judith Kerschner
20243 Linden Tree
Katy, TX 77449

92-254

January 13, 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
1919 M STREET
WASHINGTON DC 20554

RECEIVED

FEB 3 1993

FCC MAIL ROOM

TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN:

I am writing to voice my concern that the FCC will be ruling shortly, on whether or not pictures/videos of aborted babies may be used in the campaign ads for candidates running for Federal offices. Although these pictures/videos are gruesome to look at, the fact remains that abortion has gruesome consequences. Someone always dies. I believe that it is within the guaranteed 1st amendment rights of a candidate for Federal office to express their personal beliefs during a campaign, in the manner that the candidate judges necessary, in order to reflect these beliefs. There are many of us who believe that abortion is murder, and continue to work for its ultimate demise, however politically incorrect this position may be. Please continue to support the guaranteed rights given to us by the United States Constitution, even if we do not agree. I ask that you will rule to continue to allow that the pictures/videos of aborted babies can be shown in campaign ads by candidates running for Federal offices.

Sincerely,

George Gibson
Brendy Gibson

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

92-254

Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED
FEB 5 1993
FCC MAIL ROOM

Dear FCC:

I am writing this letter on behalf of Michael Bailey and the pro-life commercials that he televised during his bid for Representative of the Ninth Indiana district. I understand that you are still reviewing the content of those commercials, and the controversy they created.

I am in full support of those commercials. Yes, they are very graphic. Yes, they are very difficult to look at. And yes, young children may become disturbed or upset after viewing one. But, I ask you, why are the children disturbed? Because, in their innocent, untainted eyes, they can recognize the full extent of the horror that is represented there. Those young viewers understand that we are killing BABIES. We are killing the next American generation.

Many people have been touched in a positive way by these commercials. During his campaign, Mr. Bailey received dozens of calls from women in crisis pregnancies who had decided to abort, but, after seeing one of his commercials, decided to carry their pregnancies to term, and let their babies live. Many others, who had had abortions, were referred to organizations who could help them deal with the painful feelings that they were still experiencing. And many Americans, not just in our district, but nationwide, have come to terms with their feelings on abortion, and realized that it is an industry that doesn't really care about women's right to choose, but only how much money this industry can squeeze out of a woman in crisis.

During the last few months, I have taken the opportunity to watch more television and take note of what people are seeing on a daily basis.

An episode of Civil Wars, a prime-time show, recently displayed total female nudity. But, not only was the infamous scene shown during the show's broadcast, but Entertainment Tonight show aired the scene during their 7:30 broadcast.

An afternoon cartoon geared specifically toward children, Tiny Toons, recently had an episode that very blatantly encouraged its young viewers to rise up in defiance against their parents and any others who would screen what the children should be allowed to watch on TV.

A morning "game show", the Love Connection, matches couples for dates, and then reviews the dates. Couples who had sex, or wanted to have sex in their dates, consistently score high in audience approval, while couples who remain chaste score low. Perhaps this show should be called the Pimp Connection.

Phil Donahue's main theme, lately, appears to be homosexual couples who are encouraging TEENS to exercise their "right" to express their homosexuality. Since homosexuals cannot biologically reproduce, they are using Mr. Donahue's show for recruitment purposes, and he allows it.

I haven't even mentioned soap operas, yet. Ad the Fox affiliate in our area regularly runs daytime movies where the violence and profanity have been left

intact in order to accurately portray the characters or intent of the movies, according to their disclaimers.

All of these shows are on broadcast TV. Cable and satellite TV are infinitely worse.

During the past year, network news repeatedly bombarded us with 30 seconds of the Rodney King. incident. I find it odd that the people who allow all of the above to be broadcast would object to the FIFTEEN second commercials produced by Mr. Bailey.

Finally, Faith Daniels had a show about this controversy. Her guests included Katheryn Copeland, the plaintiff in the law suit, and Mr. Bailey. Mrs. Copeland's attorney, Mr. Wilder, was seated in the audience. During the show, Ms. Daniel's approached MRS. Wilder and asked her opinion. Mrs. Wilder was NOT seated next to her husband. Instead, she was seated in another section of the audience, portrayed as an objective viewer, and her identity purposely not revealed. For a show that claims to want to expose truth, this kind of deception goes beyond being inappropriate or indecent. It should be ILLEGAL.

The television industry cries "censorship" whenever responsible citizens expose the indecency and obscenities that stations regularly broadcast. Now, it is Mr. Bailey's turn to cry "censorship". What's good for the goose is good for the gander. If you rule against Mr. Bailey, you must rule against the rest of the television industry, as well. Frankly, I don't think Mr. Bailey would object to that kind of ruling, if you TRULY wans to clean up television.

Sincerely,

Rena M. Bell
16005 Memphis-Blue Lick Rd.
Henryville, IN 47126

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

9+

9