

I do not support a loosening of restrictions on offensive content, including but not limited to language and nudity, based on concepts of deliberate placement, isolation or repetition. Offensive language is just that, regardless of its density throughout a program. Individual nudity is not accepted in public, sexual or otherwise, nor should it be allowed on public broadcast. Public broadcast is a common asset and should be appropriate for the general public and if it is allowed to become unsuitable for significant portions of society, particularly families and those who understand the negative outcomes of repeated exposure to vulgar content, it will become devalued as a medium for education, entertainment, marketing and news as viewership decreases. If any change is to be considered, let it be to tighten restrictions to include offensive material that has crept into acceptance over the past years!

The argument that the enforcement of established standards has become excessively expensive is surprisingly shallow and does not address the root cause: despite clear restrictions, media organizations continue to broadcast material that is offensive to the public. At least two other solutions should be considered as well: additional federal funding as granted from expressed public interest and higher fines to further discourage offenses and to subsidize enforcement.

All ranges of appropriate and inappropriate programming are already available via Internet, cable and satellite media providers. Those wishing to experience more offensive programming should continue to turn to these, leaving public broadcast wholly appropriate for all ages and sensitivities.

Lastly, I suggest that any changes to the FCC's policies be submitted to a more formal public review. Furthermore, please evaluate establishing differing standards based on state or regional standards as well as different bands of public broadcast with varying levels of objectionable material.