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Throughout the history of this country, there has been an effort on the part of our government to protect us from indecent and obscene entertainment. In fact, until the 1960s, movies were edited by censoring boards to remove indecent material. This was of course struck down as being unconstitutional.

Now, government has a much more subtle way of censoring broadcast entertainment. Any radio or television station that broadcasts material which the Federal Communications Commission deems indecent or obscene is subject to severe fines. The Supreme Court has defined what is "obscene," but the rules for what is "indecent" are not defined with such clarity. Obscene material is banned even for what is "indecent" are not defined with such clarity. Obscene material is banned even...

One problem with the FCC-imposed fines is the fact that they do not only prohibit the broadcaster from exerting his creativity, but they infringe on the viewers' or listener's rights to enjoy such broadcasting. Do we really need any protection from shocking or "harmful" language? The only protection we need from such terrible broadcasting is a swift change of the dial or remote control.

The great majority of people in this country would probably rather have the power to choose between various alternatives in the broadcasting media than have the government select what they can and cannot see. The forces supporting and pushing for such fines are small in number, dogmatic in their beliefs, and perhaps religiously motivated. They would most likely support actual censorship of much material present in not just broadcasting, but also the printed media.

Our government should follow the footsteps of our European neighbors and quit its policy of regulating the broadcasting media. It is an antiquated idea which has absolutely no place in today's society because it not only infringes on the public's right to choose what it wants to watch, but it also imposes on the very principle of free speech. One problem with the FCC fines is the fact that they not only prohibit the broadcaster from exerting his creativity, but they infringe on the viewer's or listener's rights to enjoy such broadcasting. Do we really need any protection from shocking or "harmful" language? The only protection we need from such terrible broadcasting is a swift change of the dial or remote control.

The great majority of people in this country would probably rather have the power to choose between various alternatives in the broadcasting media than have the government select what they can and cannot see. The forces supporting and pushing for such fines are small in number, dogmatic in their beliefs, and perhaps religiously motivated. They would most likely support actual censorship of much material present in not just broadcasting, but also the printed media.

Our government should follow the footsteps of our European neighbors and quit its policy of regulating the broadcasting media. It is an antiquated idea which has absolutely no place in today's society because it not only infringes on the public's right to choose what it wants to watch.