STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER JONATHAN S. ADELSTEIN
CONCURRING IN PART, DISSENTING IN PART

Re: *Complaints Regarding Various Television Broadcasts Between February 2, 2002 and March 8, 2005,* Order

Today's *Order* is pursuant to a grant from the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit of the Commission's voluntary remand request to reconsider portions of the March 15, 2006, *Omnibus Order*.[1] In that decision, I concurred in part and dissented in part because I believed the Commission had failed to develop a consistent and coherent indecency enforcement policy. It was my hope that the Commission would use this remand to clarify and rationalize our indecency regime,[2] but regulatory convenience and avoidance have prevailed instead. I am, therefore, compelled again to concur in part and dissent in part.

The proverbial "elephant in the room" looming over today's decision is the *Golden Globe Awards Order*,[3] which inexplicably has been pending reconsideration for more than two and one-half years. While the Commission has simply refused to review the *Golden Globe* case, we have relied upon, expanded and applied it more than any other indecency case in the past two years. As the foundational basis for the Commission's decision in the cases involved in this remand, we should review and finalize this watershed decision.[4]

As I stated in the *Omnibus Order*, "by failing to address the many serious concerns raised in the *Golden Globe Awards* case, before prohibiting the use of additional words, we fall short of meeting the [appropriate] constitutional standard and walking the tightrope of a restrained enforcement policy."[5] Today, we fail again. Litigation strategy should not be the dominant factor guiding policy when First Amendment protections are at stake.

In its remand request, the Commission asked the Second Circuit for an opportunity to consider the concerns of broadcasters before issuing a final decision. Yet squandering this opportunity, the Commission fails to consider fully all concerns relating to an August 22, 2003, complaint against the December 9, 2002, broadcast of "The Billboard Music Awards" by WTTG(TV) in Washington, D.C.

---

[1] *Complaints Regarding Various Television Broadcasts Between February 2, 2002 and March 8, 2005,* Notices of Apparent Liability and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 21 FCC Rcd 2664 (2006) *("Omnibus Order").*

[2] Today's decision presumes that the general statement that the Commission's "collective experience and knowledge, developed through constant interaction with lawmakers, courts, broadcasters, public interest groups, and ordinary citizens," *and nothing more*, is sufficient to inform the public and broadcasters what we believe are the national, contemporary community standards of the broadcast medium. *In re Infinity Radio License, Inc.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 5022, 5026 (2004); *compare*, *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 (1997) (finding the terms "indecent", "patently offensive" and "in context" were so vague that criminal enforcement would violate the fundamental constitutional principles, but while recognizing "the history of extensive government regulation of broadcasting").

[3] *Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the "Golden Globe Awards" Program*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 19859 (Enf. Bur. 2003), *reversed*, 19 FCC Rcd 4975 (2004) ("*Golden Globe Awards Order*"), *petitions for stay and recon. pending* (since April 2004) .

[4] *Golden Globe Awards Order* at ¶¶ 9, 12 and 14 (eviscerating our longstanding standard for "isolated or fleeting" expletives, establishing that any use of the "F-word" or a variation, in any context, "invariably invokes a coarse sexual image," and changing our 30-year standard of what constitutes profanity).

[5] *Omnibus Order*, Statement of Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein, concurring in part, dissenting in part, 21 FCC Rcd *at* 2726.

This *Order* does not adequately address the Enforcement Bureau's December 18, 2002, decision letter, which denied the same complaint on the merits.[6] No one filed either a petition for reconsideration or an application for review and, consequentially, the decision letter became a final order. It seems patently unfair for the Commission to re-adjudicate the same complaint, involving the same parties on the same cause of action, first in the initial decision letter, then in the *Omnibus Order*, and then again in today's *Order*. The Supreme Court has held that the principle of *res judicata* applies to an adjudicative administrative proceeding where the agency has properly resolved disputes of fact and the parties have had an adequate opportunity to litigate.[7] The Commission should not have re-adjudicated this complaint a second time in the *Omnibus Order*. Certainly today, the third time around, this complaint should be dismissed, or the Commission should reverse the Enforcement Bureau's decision letter and the resultant final order.

More broadly, today's *Order* notes that the Supreme Court in *Pacifica* stressed context and we have repeatedly said "the full context in which the material appeared is critically important." Yet the Commission's analyses of the 2002 and 2003 broadcasts of "The Billboard Music Awards" are limited exclusively to a few seconds of a two-hour program. No consideration whatsoever is given to the entirety of the program. While it is perfectly reasonable to conclude that, after considering the entire program, the vulgarity and shock value of a particular scene permeated and dominated the program, the Commission should consider the totality of the program, rather than limit our consideration to an isolated programming segment.

Similarly, the Commission's justification for denying the complaint against the December 12, 2004, broadcast of "The Early Show," and reversing its indecency and profanity findings reflect the arbitrary, subjective and inconsistent nature of the Commission's decision-making.[8] In the *Omnibus Order*, the Commission concluded that the use of the s-word was shocking "*particularly* during a morning news interview,"[9] and that this "vulgarity in a morning television interview is *of particular concern* and *weighs heavily* in our analysis."[10] Today, without any legal support found in American jurisprudence, the Commission, *sua sponte*, creates a new "plausible"[11] standard to determine the threshold question of whether a particular program segment qualifies as a "*bona fide* news interview."[12] While the Commission admits that "there is no outright news exemption from our indecency rules," it will nevertheless defer to a broadcaster's "plausible characterization of its own programming." I not only fail to find a legal basis for the Commission's latest invention,[13] I also fail to understand the justification for

---

[6] The decision letter dismissing a complaint against the December 9, 2002, broadcast of "The Billboard Music Awards" by WTTG (TV), Washington, D.C., was referenced in footnote 32 of the *Golden Globe Awards Order*, and in footnote 9 of my Statement in that *Order*.

[7] *United States v. Utah Constr. & Min. Co.*, 384 U.S. 394, 422 (1966).

[8] In the *Omnibus Order*, with respect to "The Early Show," the Commission said: "In rare contexts, language that is presumptively profane will not be found to be profane where it is demonstrably essential to the nature of an artistic or educational work or essential to informing viewers on a matter of public importance. We caution, however, that we will find this to be the case only in unusual circumstances, and such circumstances are clearly not present here." *Omnibus Order*, ¶ 144.

[9] *See Omnibus Order,* 21 FCC Rcd at 2699 ¶ 141 [emphasis added].

[10] *Id.* [emphasis added].

[11] ¶ 72, *supra.*

[12] *Id.* [emphasis in original].

[13] Looking at this contorted reasoning one must wonder whether the Commission is attempting to avoid reconsideration of its policy enunciated in the *Omnibus Order* that, consistent with *Golden Globe,* any variant, of the S-word is inherently excretory. *Omnibus Order* at 2699 ¶ 139.

(continued....)

such a shift in reasoning. While the creation of this "infotainment" exception that can be invoked by a broadcaster's plausible characterization" may be convenient in this order today, it will surely create unintended consequences in future cases.

Even as applied, this new "plausible" standard is problematic. In this case, the CBS "Early Show" interview of contestants from the CBS program "Survivor: Vanuatu" was a cross promotion of a network's primetime entertainment programming on the same network's morning show. It stretches the bounds to argue this is legitimate news or public affairs programming. It is unreasonable to say that the latest contestant to be voted off the island or the latest contestant to hear "you're fired" or even "come on down" is "serious public affairs programming."[14] The network creates its own "reality" on a reality show, and we are somehow to believe that developments within its own artificial world are news? The only news here is how far this Commission is willing to stretch the definition of "news."

I also dissent in part from the Commission's decision to dismiss numerous complaints against several nationally televised episodes of the ABC network program "NYPD Blue" because the complaints did not come from viewers who resided in the station's media market. While the Commission has not changed its decision on the merits of the complaints, it has relied on an arbitrary procedural change in our enforcement policy that creates an unnecessary disconnect between the basis of our indecency authority and our enforcement policy, and encourages letter-writing campaigns, which will further burden Commission resources.

The Commission has long maintained, and does not now dispute, that we enforce a national, contemporary community standard, not a local one. For instance, in an effort to justify its authority in today's *Order*, the Commission observes that the broadcast medium has a "special nature" and "a uniquely pervasive presence in American life."[15] The Commission points out the "the Supreme Court emphasized the 'pervasive presence [of the broadcast medium] in the lives of all Americans' and that indecent broadcasts invade the privacy of the home."[16] Yet, the Commission's new enforcement policy is inconsistent with the national standard we impose and the pervasiveness of the medium we regulate.

This new enforcement policy is also inconsistent with the Commission's reasoning in other sections of today's *Order*. For example, as an important factor weighing in support of its finding that the 2002 and 2003 broadcasts of "The Billboard Music Awards" are indecent, the Commission cites Nielsen rating data on the total number of children under 18 and children between ages 2 and 11 who watched the programs, nationally. Yet based on our enforcement policy, the Commission will actually only protect children in the particular local media market where there is a complaint.[17]

The consequences of this new policy reveal its lack of logic. When the Commission determines a *national* network broadcast violates our *national* community standards, we will only fine the *local* station that has a complaint filed against it by a viewer in its media market. Although our obligation is to enforce the law to protect all children, we will only fine a local station that has the misfortune of being in a market where a parent or an adult made the effort to complain. This policy is misguided because a

---

(...continued from previous page)

[14] *Peter Branton*, 6 FCC Rcd 610 (1991).

[15] *FCC v. Pacifica Foundation*, 438 U.S. 726, 748 (1978).

[16] *See id.*, citing *Rowan v. Post Office Dept.*, 397 U.S. 728 (1970).

[17] *Order*, ¶¶ 18, 59 and 65.

sufficient and valid complaint is truly the first, and an important, step in our indecency enforcement regime. The complaint and the complainant serve an important role, but the real party in interest is the Commission, acting on behalf the public, rather than the specific individual or organization that brings allegedly indecent material to our attention.

According to the new enforcement policy, even after we have determined the complained-of material is indecent, we will willfully blind ourselves to the potentially millions of children and households that watched the indecent program. The new policy would fine only the local station and only if the complainant is in its coverage area. Other stations will essentially be "sitting ducks," waiting for an in-market viewer to file a complaint about the same program, in order for the Commission to act. I do not understand how we can say we are faithfully enforcing the law when we are aware of violations of the law that we simply choose to ignore.

This is not the restrained enforcement policy encouraged by the Supreme Court in *Pacifica*.[18] Restraint applies to the standard we use in our decision-making and the manner in which we decide what constitutes actionable, indecent material.[19] Restraint applies to the development of a coherent framework that is based on rational and principled distinctions.

The power to limit speech should be exercised responsibly, and with the utmost caution. While I agree with some aspects of today's *Order*, I respectfully cannot support our reasoning. For that reason, I concur in part and dissent in part.

---

[18] *Pacifica*, 438 U.S. at 763, POWELL J, *concurring in part and concurring in judgment.*

[19] The Commission claims that "the sufficiency of a complaint is the first step rather that the last step in the Commission's analysis." *Order*, ¶ 77. However, in the single complaint filed against the "The 2002 Billboard Music Awards," for example, the complainant does not even aver that she watched the program. Quite the contrary, the complaint was filed "on behalf of the Parents Television Council and its over 800,000 members." The complainant alleges, the broadcast "was seen in homes across the country on the Fox network, and in Washington DC." Based on the Commission's reasoning in today's *Order* and the *Golden Globe Awards Order,* this complaint does not state a *prima facie* case to justify Commission action. *See Order*, ¶¶ 40 and 65 (stating that "[i]n the *Golden Globe Awards Order*, the Commission concluded that the F-Word was profane within the meaning of Section 1464 because, in context, it contained vulgar and coarse language 'so grossly offensive to members of the public who *actually hear* it as to amount to a nuisance'") (emphasis added). *See also Order*, ¶ 75 (stating that complaints against "NYPD Blue" are justifiably dismissed because "none of the complaints contains any claim that the out-of market complainant actually viewed the complained-of broadcasts") (emphasis added).