

Jan. 1974

This statement was simply in reference to indications of public dissatisfaction with certain practices by programmers including the excessive use of violence, certain advertising abuses, etc. Certainly nothing improper should be inferred from a voluntary response by the industry to public pressure even though that response might have been prompted, at least in part, by a desire on the part of the industry to avert formal restrictions upon its practices.

It should be obvious that the Commission is made aware of public dissatisfactions relating to broadcasting. We often have options in our approach to dealing with such problems one of which is to ascertain whether the industry is sufficiently aware of the dissatisfaction to take remedial action on its own. In those instances where the industry fails to perceive the seriousness of a problem, the Commission--once it has satisfied itself that action is necessary--can formulate an appropriate policy or propose a rule aimed at correcting any deficiency. Where the industry does agree that a problem exists and sets out to resolve the problem on its own it sometimes appears reasonable to forestall more formal measures until the effectiveness of self-regulation can be assessed. Whether this process is described as "regulation by raised eyebrow" or "jawboning" or "moral suasion" is a highly subjective judgment. The use of vernacular carries with it some risk of misinterpretation. In the example used, Family Viewing Time, it is clear that the industry did perceive a problem and elected to attempt to solve it without formal governmental requirements. To the extent that the industry

50

effort is effective, I submit that the public is better served than it would be with another set of rules, particularly since the area of programming is an area which the Commission has traditionally been reluctant to enter.