I oppose any changes to the current FCC indecency standards that would allow television and radio stations to broadcast expletives and nudity on the public airwaves, even if brief or "fleeting."

The Supreme Court has confirmed the FCC's authority to enforce policies regarding expletives and nudity, especially during times when children are likely to be watching or listening.

Such displays are inappropriate and damaging. To allow such use of language is degrading both to those who are involved in employing them, and to those who then hear them. If we want our society as a whole to progress we should be encouraging use of more formal and appropriate vocabulary which will better prepare individuals to succeed in the workplace and in their personal interactions with others. Freedom of speech was intended to protect the rights of individuals to voice their opinions and to allow for open communication. This does not mean that public broadcasts should have the right to employ explicit language in order to do so. Personally I find it offensive, and would actually encourage stricter policies regarding the language that is permitted in public broadcasts.

My opinion fully extends to displays of nudity. Whether these displays are sexual or nonsexual in nature, they are completely inappropriate. The way I see it there are three viewpoints to consider with this issue, and none of them are amenable allowing such displays. They are:

(1) There are people out there who actually want to see nudity displayed on television.
(2) There are people who don't care whether or not nudity is displayed on television.
(3) There are people who don't want nudity displayed on television.

In terms of those who actually want to see nudity on television, there is a name for that - pornography. This has been proven to have many deep-rooted psychological affects that are damaging to individuals. Allowing such displays to be publicly broadcast without restriction is the effective equivalent of mitigating these negative affects and encouraging the proliferation of pornography. Furthermore, for individuals for which this is the case, there are avenues that they can take which are not public and accessible to children.

For the second group of individuals, there is no reason to change the law to allow such displays when it will not matter to them one way or the other.

For the third group of individuals, changing the law will simply create distress and unrest. An opposition against nudity and profanity in public is deeply rooted in the core beliefs of many individuals. To blatantly disregard their wishes and rights to live free from such influences would be immoral in light of the fact that there is no identifiable benefit to society of allowing such displays.

In conclusion, relaxing the current policy would not serve the public interest and I urge the FCC to

reject all proposals that would allow for the broadcast of expletives and nudity on FCC-licensed stations.