

Lawyers For The Talent

Entertainment Law

Richard Dooling

Contents

First Amendment - Indecency	1
<i>FCC v. Pacifica Foundation</i>	2
Fleeting Expletives	2
<i>FCC v. Fox Television Stations</i> (Fox I)	3
<i>FCC v. Fox Television Stations</i> (Fox II)	3

First Amendment - Indecency

Just as we get comfortable with the notion that speech is either protected or unprotected under the First Amendment, and that there are certain specific categories of unprotected speech, along comes some speech, George Carlin's *Seven Dirty Words* routine, in the 1970s, that the Federal Communications Commission wishes to *regulate* but not *ban*.

The words in Carlin's routine are dirty words, but they are not "prurient" or obscene within the meaning of the *Miller* test. They are not fighting words or incitement, defamatory, or a threat. They are not so-called "crime-facilitating speech," like conspiracy or fraud. Also recall that seven years before *Pacifica*, the Supreme Court had said, in *Cohen v. California* that California could not arrest a man for wearing a jacket that said Fuck The Draft.

Please listen to [George Carlin's 7 Dirty Words routine](#), which is the subject of the litigation in *FCC v. Pacifica*. It's low comedy, but also wise about how the First Amendment works.

Never mind *why* we have tabooed words. Assume we all know we want to ban some dirty words, or some racist words, or some communist words. Carlin's

performance dramatizes how difficult it is to define such word categories with precision. Meaning that any attempt to make a list of prohibited words, or a “speech code,” will ultimately censor protected speech, including protected speech like Carlin’s comedy routine.

Seven years before *Pacifica*, Justice Harlan wrote that the f-word was a matter of taste, not law:

How is one to distinguish this from any other offensive word? Surely the State has no right to cleanse public debate to the point where it is grammatically palatable to the most squeamish among us. Yet no readily ascertainable general principle exists for stopping short of that result were we to affirm the judgment below. For, while the particular four-letter word being litigated here is perhaps more distasteful than most others of its genre, it is nevertheless often true that one man’s vulgarity is another’s lyric. Indeed, we think it is largely because governmental officials cannot make principled distinctions in this area that the Constitution leaves matters of taste and style so largely to the individual.

Here in 21st century, Carlin’s routine is funny. The words he uses there have lost their charge. They are barely “dirty” or tabooed here in the 2000s. But we have our own tabooed speech. Imagine a Netflix special with a white male comedian doing a routine called, “The Seven Racist Words You Can’t Say On Television”. Funny? I don’t think so.

With that in mind, Read *Pacifica* with care. It’s not too long. I would download and print the entire Westlaw decision and read it.

FCC v. Pacifica Foundation

U.S. Supreme Court (1978)

- [case at Google Scholar](#)
- [case at Westlaw](#)
- [case at Wikipedia](#)

Fleeting Expletives

Pacifica is still with us. It’s why we don’t normally hear Carlin’s seven dirty words on broadcast television during the hours of 6 AM to 10 PM to this day. The FCC

purports to regulate [obscenity, indecency and profanity](#) and purport to know these things [when they see and hear them](#).

Pacifica spoke of Carlin's "barrage" of dirty words, but by the 2000s, the FCC was threatening fines for the broadcast of even a single dirty word during prime time TV.

Please just read *about Fox I* and *Fox II*, so that we are able to explain why *Pacifica* is still with us, even though it no longer makes any sense to make separate rules for cable TV and broadcast television. Don't they all arrive on the same fiber optic cable or satellite dish?

The dissents in *Fox II* spell *Pacifica's* doom, as we observed last week in class.

***FCC v. Fox Television Stations* (Fox I)**

- [case at Google Scholar](#)
- [case at Westlaw](#)
- [case at Wikipedia]([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/FCC_v._Fox_Television_Stations,Inc.\(2009\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/FCC_v._Fox_Television_Stations,Inc.(2009)))

***FCC v. Fox Television Stations* (Fox II)**

- [case at Google Scholar](#)
- [case at Westlaw](#)
- [case at Wikipedia](#).