

NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION OF  
BROADCASTERS

# POLITICAL BROADCAST CATECHISM

(Ninth Edition)

*Jan 1980*





# **Political Broadcast Catechism**

**(Ninth Edition)**

**June 1980**

**Prepared for the Members of the  
National Association of Broadcasters  
by its  
Legal Department**

Copyright 1980  
National Association of Broadcasters  
1771 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Additional copies are available by writing:

Publications Manager  
National Association of Broadcasters  
1771 N Street NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Price to NAB members — \$3.00  
Price to nonmembers — \$9.00

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page No.</i>
Foreword .....	1
I. Political Broadcasts Under Sections 312 and 315	
of the Communications Act .....	2
A. The Communications Act and FCC Political	
Broadcast Rules and Regulations .....	2
Logging .....	2
Record Retention .....	2
Sponsorship Identification .....	2
B. The "Legally Qualified" Candidate .....	4
C. What Constitutes A "Use" of Broadcast Facilities? .....	6
Employee-Candidates .....	7
Exempt and Non-Exempt Appearances .....	8
D. When Are Candidates Opposing Candidates? .....	10
E. Programs Within The Scope of Section 315 .....	11
F. What Constitutes Equal Opportunities? .....	11
G. Limitations As To Use of Facilities by a Candidate .....	13
H. Period Within Which Request Must Be Made .....	15
I. What Rates May Be Charged Candidates? .....	16
Lowest Unit Charge .....	16
Equal Opportunities and Lowest Unit Charge .....	21
Charges Made for Comparable Use .....	22
J. Reasonable Access .....	25
II. The Fairness Doctrine and Political Broadcasts .....	29
A. Controversial Issues in General .....	30
B. Political Editorializing .....	33
C. Quasi-Equal Opportunities (Zapple Doctrine) .....	34
D. Personal Attack .....	35
III. FCC Handling of Complaints and Inquiries Concerning	
Political Broadcasts .....	37
IV. Political Broadcast Agreement Form .....	38
Index .....	41



# POLITICAL BROADCAST CATECHISM

## Foreword

This Ninth Edition of the *Political Broadcast Catechism* represents an effort to consolidate into one document all of the material necessary to a broadcaster in making informed decisions in the area of political broadcasting. Because of the importance placed by the Federal Communications Commission on the broadcaster's responsible execution of his obligations in this area, this *Political Broadcast Catechism* was prepared to assist the radio and television broadcaster in achieving judicious solutions to the problems which may arise.

We would like to express our appreciation to Stephen A. Sharp, Esq., who undertook the responsibility of revising this ninth edition of the *Catechism* to reflect changes in the law and its interpretation which have occurred since 1976.

The complexity of political broadcasting has increased steadily over the years. Perhaps its zenith was with the enactment of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974. Title I of the 1971 Act (known as the Campaign Communications Reform Act) which amended Sections 312 and 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 imposes new requirements on licensees in the area of political broadcasting. These requirements now can be categorized as follows: 1) rate practices (lowest unit charge); and (2) reasonable access. These two subjects are discussed separately herein.

Although the basic requirements of the new law are set forth in Sections 312 and 315, the Commission has issued specific FCC Guidelines and interpretations to assist stations in implementation of the new laws. Except for the most recent rulings and interpretations, the Commission's *New Primer on Political Broadcasting*, 69 FCC 2d 2209 (1978), provides a comprehensive review of the Commission's political broadcast rules and policies.

Of particular interest in this ninth edition of the *Catechism* are the Commission's and court's recent rulings on the scope and nature of broadcasters' responsibility to provide candidates for Federal elective office "reasonable access." Since the "reasonable access" provision was enacted in 1971, the Commission has continued to adopt policies and rulings which ever more strictly define broadcasters'

obligations. The recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals in *CBS v. FCC*, No. 79-2403 (March 14, 1980) upholding the Commission's ruling in *Carter-Mondale Presidential Committee, Inc.*, stands to substantially affect broadcasters' and candidates' rights and obligations. The effect of that decision is reflected in Section J, "Reasonable Access." That decision will be appealed, and, undoubtedly, the Commission will issue more rulings in this area as the 1980 campaign progresses. Thus, broadcasters should keep close watch for changes in the Commission's application of the "reasonable access" provision and its other political broadcasting rules and regulations as well.

The *Catechism* itself is divided into two sections which can be summarized as follows:

- I. POLITICAL BROADCASTS UNDER SECTIONS 312 AND 315 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT—the obligations of broadcast licensees under the Communications Act generally and as affected by the Campaign Communications Reform Act; the regulations of the FCC concerning political broadcasting; the FCC Guidelines implementing the Campaign Communications Reform Act; FCC and court decisions in the political broadcast area.
- II. THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE—the obligations of broadcast licensees in the political broadcast area as affected by the fairness doctrine; the personal attack and political editorializing rules of the F.C.C.; the quasi-equal opportunities or "Zapple" doctrine; controversial issues in general; F.C.C. and court decisions in the area of the fairness doctrine as it applies to political broadcasts.

There is no attempt in this *Catechism* to set forth definitive conclusions on every aspect of political broadcasting. Rather, the *Catechism* should be viewed as a basic reference tool for the broadcaster, a guide book which sets forth analyses of fundamental problem areas where reliable decisions have been reached. Use of the *Catechism's* Index will greatly facilitate the finding of answers to questions which might arise.



## I. POLITICAL BROADCASTS UNDER SECTIONS 312 AND 315 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

### A

#### The Communications Act and FCC Political Broadcast Rules and Regulations

1. Q. What does the Communications Act say about political broadcasts?

A. Sections 312(a) and 315 are the principal provisions of the Communications Act relative to political broadcasting and are set forth at p. 40 of this *Catechism*.

In addition, the sponsorship identification requirements of Section 317 of the Act are also pertinent to political broadcasts. That section reads, in part, as follows:

"Sec. 317. (a) (1) All matter broadcast by any radio station for which any money, service or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid, or promised to, or charged, or accepted by, the station so broadcasting, from any person, shall, at the time the same is so broadcast, be announced as paid for or furnished, as the case may be, by such person. . . .

"(2) Nothing in this section shall preclude the Commission from requiring that an appropriate announcement shall be made at the time of the broadcast in the case of any political program or any program involving the discussion of any controversial issue for which any films, records, transcripts, talent, scripts, or other material or service of any kind have been furnished, without charge or at a nominal charge, directly or indirectly, as an inducement to the broadcast of such program."

2. Q. What Commission or other official rules and regulations implement Section 312(a) and 315 of the Communications Act?

A. F.C.C. Rule 73.1940 implements Section 315 of the Communications Act. This rule (set forth at p. 40 of this *Catechism*) replaces identical provisions which formerly applied separately to AM, FM, TV and Noncommercial Educational FM stations. In addition to the F.C.C. rules cited above, the commission has issued the *New Primer on Political Broadcasting* cited in the Foreword and another *Public Notice* of September 3, 1975, 40 Fed. Reg. 41936 (September 9, 1974), entitled "Applicability of Sponsorship Identification Rules."

In some instances, it will be discovered that the F.C.C. rules cited above are inconsistent with amended Section 315 and the F.C.C. Guidelines; such inconsistencies should be resolved in favor of Section 315 and the Guidelines.

#### LOGGING

3. Q. What are the logging requirements for political broadcasts?

A. In addition to the usual program logging requirements as to the name of program sponsorship, etc., a log entry must be made for each announcement or program presenting a political candidate, showing the name and political affiliation of such candidate (Section 73.1810). Of course, such an entry would not be required for an appearance by a candidate which is exempt under Section 315.

#### RECORD RETENTION

4. Q. Is the licensee required to keep a script or recording of political announcements or programs?

A. No. However, many stations keep recordings or scripts as a safety factor in the event the station should be drawn into any controversy which might subsequently arise pertaining to the political broadcast. Also, scripts or summaries of editorials endorsing political candidates must be made available to opposing candidates.

5. Q. What political broadcast records must be kept?

A. The FCC Rules (Section 73.1940(d)) require licensees to keep and allow public inspection of any request for political broadcast time made by or on behalf of a candidate, together with an appropriate notation showing the disposition made of any such request and the charges made, if any, if the request is granted. Such records must be kept for two years.

*Note:* As in the case of other station public file information, the public's right is to view the political broadcast file during the station's normal business hours. Stations do not have to provide political broadcast file information by telephone or by mail unless they choose to do so. In the latter event, the furnishing of such information should be on a non-discriminatory basis.

#### SPONSORSHIP IDENTIFICATION

6. Q. What Commission rules govern sponsorship announcements for political broadcasts?

A. Section 73.1212 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), of the Commission's rules provides as follows:

(a) When a broadcast station transmits any matter for which money, service, or other valuable consideration is either directly or indirectly paid or promised to, or charged or accepted by such station, the station, at the time of the broadcast, shall an-



nounce (1) that such matter is sponsored, paid for, or furnished, either in whole or in part, and (2) by whom or on whose behalf such consideration was supplied: *Provided, however,* That "service or other valuable consideration" shall not include any service or property furnished either without or at a nominal charge for use on, or in connection with, a broadcast unless it is so furnished in consideration for an identification of any person, product, service, trademark, or brand name beyond an identification reasonably related to the use of such service or property on the broadcast.

(i) For the purposes of this section, the term "sponsored" shall be deemed to have the same meaning as "paid for."

(b) The licensee of each broadcast station shall exercise reasonable diligence to obtain from its employees, and from other persons with whom it deals directly in connection with any matter for broadcast, information to enable such licensee to make the announcement required by this section.

(c) In any case where a report has been made to a broadcast station as required by section 508 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, of circumstances which would have required an announcement under this section had the consideration been received by such broadcast station, an appropriate announcement shall be made by such station.

(d) In the case of any political broadcast matter or any broadcast matter involving the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance for which any film, record, transcription, talent, script, or other material or service of any kind is furnished, either directly or indirectly, to a station as an inducement for broadcasting such matter, an announcement shall be made both at the beginning and conclusion of such broadcast on which such material or service is used that such film, record, transcription, talent, script, or other material or service has been furnished to such station in connection with the transmission of such broadcast matter: *Provided, however,* That in the case of any broadcast of 5 minutes' duration or less, only one such announcement need be made either at the beginning or conclusion of the broadcast.

(e) The announcement required by this section shall, in addition to stating the fact that the broadcast matter was sponsored, paid for or furnished, fully and fairly disclose the true identity of the person or persons, or corporation, committee, association or other unincorporated group, or other entity by whom or on whose behalf such payment is made or promised, or from whom or on whose behalf such services or other valuable consideration is received, or by whom the material or services referred to in paragraph (d) of this section are furnished. Where an agent or other person or entity contracts or otherwise makes arrangements with a station on behalf of

another, and such fact is known or by the exercise of reasonable diligence, as specified in paragraph (b) of this section, could be known to the station, the announcement shall disclose the identity of the person or persons or entity on whose behalf such agent is acting instead of the name of such agent. Where the material broadcast is political matter or matter involving the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance and a corporation, committee, association or other unincorporated group, or other entity is paying for or furnishing the broadcast matter, the station shall, in addition to making the announcement required by this section, require that a list of the chief executive officers or members of the executive committee or of the board of directors of the corporation, committee, association or other unincorporated group, or other entity shall be made available for public inspection at the location specified by the licensee under § 1.526 of this Chapter. If the broadcast is originated by a network, the list may, instead, be retained at the headquarters office of the network or at the location where the origination station maintains its public inspection file under § 1.526 of this chapter. Such lists shall be kept and made available for a period of two years.

7. Q. Is the announcement "this is a paid political broadcast" sufficient to satisfy the above cited sponsorship identification rules?

A. No. In fact, this announcement is not required by the rules, but is often given so that stations may disassociate themselves from the political views expressed. What is required is the specific identification of the person or group sponsoring the broadcast. (See § 73.1212 above.) Thus "paid for by the Committee for Political Action for Mr. X," would fulfill the requirement for a program sponsored by this organization. Similarly, "sponsored by etc." also would fulfill the requirement.

8. Q. Do the following announcements satisfy the sponsor ID rules: "State Citizens for Smith" and "Authority of Smith Committee"?

A. No. In a *Public Notice* issued jointly by the FCC and the Federal Election Commission on June 19, 1978 (FCC 78-419), the Commission stressed that paid political announcements or programs must be announced in the statutory language of Section 317. Mere mention of the sponsoring organization is not sufficient. The announcement must state that the broadcast matter is "paid for" or "sponsored by" that sponsor. Thus, the above-mentioned announcements should read "Paid for by (or "sponsored by") State Citizens for Smith" and "Paid for by (or "sponsored by") Smith Committee."

9. Q. Is the announcement "Paid for by a lot of people who want to see Sam Grossman elected to the United States Senate" sufficient to satisfy sponsorship identification?

A. No. The language is too general. It does not convey to listeners and viewers that the announcement

is sponsored by a specific entity, i.e., a committee, organization, association, etc. supporting Mr. Grossman's candidacy. In other words, the sponsor must be a specific person or entity. (Letter to *KOOL Radio-Television, Inc.* 26 F.C.C. 2d 42 [1970]).

10. Q. Must the announcement also specify whether it is or is not authorized by a particular candidate?

A. Yes. The Federal Election Campaign Act (2 U.S.C. § 4410) and the Federal Election Commission's rules (11 C.F.R. § 110.11) require that broadcast communications which expressly advocate either the election or the defeat of a "clearly identified" candidate for federal office must make clear whether the broadcast was authorized by a particular candidate or not authorized by any candidate. (See Joint Public Notice of FCC and FEC, FCC 78-419, June 19, 1978). State election laws affecting political broadcasts by candidates for state or local office vary from state to state.

11. Q. Are there special requirements for announcements which solicit political contributions?

A. No. The 1979 amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act repealed the requirements that solicitations must state that the committee's report is filed with the Federal Election Commission.

12. Q. Are stations required to announce the names of the officers of organizations or groups which sponsor political programs or announcements?

A. No. While paragraph (e) of the Commission's sponsorship identification rules (see Q. and A. 6) requires stations to record the names of such officers,

there is no requirement to announce those names. Some state and local jurisdictions do require the announcement of such information in political advertising for non-federal candidates, however, and it would be wise to check local law on this point. The joint *Public Notice* by the FCC and the FEC specifies the required notices for each commission and preempts any state laws which attempt to impose additional notices on political advertising by federal candidates or committees.

13. Q. Must a station disclose that material used in newscasts or other programming has been supplied to the station by a candidate?

A. Yes, paragraph (d) of the Commission's sponsorship identification rules provides that such an announcement must be made in the case of any political or controversial discussion programming for which any records, transcriptions, talent, scripts, or other material or services have been provided as an inducement to the broadcasting of such programming. However, the Commission has ruled that with respect to the use of candidate-supplied material in *bona fide* newscasts, it will only apply the rule to audio tape or film furnished by the candidate. The rule will not be applied to printed matter such as news releases or advance copies of speeches. (*First Report*, Docket No. 19260, 36 F.C.C. 2d 40 [1972]).

14. Q. Must the sponsorship identification announcement be computed as commercial time and, thus, included within the candidate's spot or program time.

A. Yes, sponsorship identification announcements always are considered commercial time and must be computed as such.

## B

### The "Legally Qualified" Candidate

15. Q. Who is a legally qualified candidate for public office?

A. The Commission's Rules define a "legally qualified candidate" as follows:

(1) A legally qualified candidate for public office is any person who:

(i) has publicly announced his or her intention to run for nomination or office;

(ii) is qualified under the applicable local, state or federal law to hold the office for which he or she is a candidate; and,

(iii) has met the qualifications set forth in either subparagraphs (2), (3), or (4), below.

(2) A person seeking election to any public office including that of President or Vice President of the United States, or nomination for any public office except that of President or Vice President, by means

of a primary, general or special election, shall be considered a legally qualified candidate if, in addition to meeting the criteria set forth in subparagraph (1) above, that person:

(i) has qualified for a place on the ballot, or

(ii) has publicly committed himself or herself to seeking election by the write-in method and is eligible under applicable law to be voted for by sticker, by writing in his or her name on the ballot or by other method, and makes a substantial showing that he or she is a *bona fide* candidate for nomination or office.

Persons seeking election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States shall, for the purposes of the Communications Act and the rules thereunder, be considered legally qualified candidates only in those states or territories (or the District of Columbia) in which they have met the re-



quirements set forth in paragraph (a) (1) and (2) of this rule: Except, that any such person who has met the requirements set forth in paragraph (a) (1) and (2) in at least 10 states (or nine and the District of Columbia) shall be considered a legally qualified candidate for election in all states, territories and the District of Columbia for purposes of this Act.

(3) A person seeking nomination to any public office, except that of President or Vice President of the United States, by means of a convention, caucus or similar procedure, shall be considered a legally qualified candidate if, in addition to meeting the requirements set forth in paragraph (a) (1) above, that person makes a substantial showing that he or she is a bona fide candidate for such nomination: Except, that no person shall be considered a legally qualified candidate for nomination by the means set forth in this paragraph prior to 90 days before the beginning of the convention, caucus or similar procedure in which he or she seeks nomination.

(4) A person seeking nomination for the office of President or Vice President of the United States shall, for the purposes of the Communications Act and the rules thereunder, be considered a legally qualified candidate only in those states or territories (or the District of Columbia) in which, in addition to meeting the requirements set forth in paragraph (a) (1) above,

(i) he or she, or proposed delegates on his or her behalf, have qualified for the primary or Presidential preference ballot in that state, territory of the District of Columbia, or

(ii) he or she has made a substantial showing of bona fide candidacy for such nomination in that state, territory or the District of Columbia; Except, that any such person meeting the requirements set forth in paragraph (a) (1) and (4) in at least ten states (or nine and the District of Columbia) shall be considered a legally qualified candidate for nomination in all states, territories and the District of Columbia for purposes of this Act.

16. Q. Need a candidate be on the ballot to be legally qualified?

A. Not always. The term "legally qualified candidate" includes persons not listed on the ballot if (1) they have committed themselves publicly to seeking election as a "write-in" candidate, (2) they are eligible under applicable law to be voted for by writing their names on the ballot, by sticker, or by other method, and (3) they make a substantial showing that they are bona fide candidates for election or nomination. (*Legally Qualified Candidates for Public Office*, 43 RR 2d 905).

17. Q. What constitutes a "substantial showing" that an individual is a bona fide candidate?

A. The term "substantial showing" of bona fide candidacy as used in paragraphs (a) (2), (3) and (4) above means evidence that the person claiming to be

a candidate has engaged to a substantial degree in activities commonly associated with political campaigning. Such activities normally would include making campaign speeches, distributing campaign literature, issuing press releases, maintaining a campaign committee, and establishing campaign headquarters (even though the headquarters in some instances might be the residence of the candidate or his campaign manager). Not all of the listed activities are necessarily required in each case to demonstrate a substantial showing, and there may be activities not listed herein which would contribute to such a showing. See F.C.C. Rule 73.1940 (a) (5).

18. Q. Where a name is on the ballot must it be presumed that the individual is a legally qualified candidate for public office?

A. Not always. In some states individuals may campaign for the position of delegate to a party convention. Although their names may appear on the ballot, it has been held that such positions are not a "public office." Thus, "candidates" for the position of delegates in these states are not candidates for public office and are not, therefore, entitled to the rights afforded to legally qualified candidates for public office described by federal law. Be sure to check your local laws on this point.

19. Q. Who has the burden of proof in establishing whether a person is a legally qualified candidate?

A. A candidate requesting equal opportunity of a licensee, or a candidate complaining to the F.C.C. of a licensee's non-compliance with Section 315, has the burden of proving that he and his opponent are legally qualified candidates for the same public office (F.C.C. Rule 73.1940).

20. Q. May a station deny a candidate "equal opportunity" because it believes that the candidate has no possibility of being elected or nominated?

A. No. Section 315 does not permit any such subjective determination by the station with respect to a candidate's chances of nomination or election. (Letter to CBS, Inc., 40 F.C.C. 244 [1952]).

21. Q. May a person be considered a legally qualified candidate where he has made only a public announcement of his candidacy and has not yet filed the required forms or paid the required fees for securing a place on the ballot in either the primary or general election?

A. The answer depends on applicable state law. In some states persons may be voted for by the electorate whether or not they have gone through the procedures required for getting their names placed on the ballot itself. In such a state, the announcement of a person's candidacy—if determined to be *bona fide*—is sufficient to bring him within the purview of Section 315. (*Flory v. FCC*, 44 L.W. 2331 [December 23, 1975]) in other states, however, candidates may not be "legally qualified" until they have fulfilled

certain prescribed procedures. (Letter to *Senator Earle C. Clements*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 751 [1954]).

22. Q. May an incumbent, or even a non-incumbent political figure, be considered a legally qualified candidate for nomination as his party's candidate for President of the United States prior to the time he publicly announces that he is a candidate for that nomination?

A. To be a legally qualified candidate, a person must as a prerequisite publicly announce his candidacy. (*Senator Eugene McCarthy*, 11 F.C.C. 2d 511 [1968] *aff'd*, 390 F.2d 471 [D.C. Cir. 1968]). But a formal declaration of candidacy is not necessarily essential to satisfy the public announcement requirement, and qualifying for a place on the ballot or making a substantial showing of *bona fide* candidacy may be enough. (*NCCB*, \_\_\_\_ F.C.C. 2d \_\_\_\_, 46 R.R.2d 1, FCC 79-440, August 15, 1979.)

23. Q. Must a person prove his legal qualifications prior to the date set for nomination or the actual election?

A. Yes. However, once the date of nomination or election has passed, it cannot be said that one who failed timely to qualify therefor is still a "candidate." The holding of the primary or general election terminates the possibility of affording "equal opportunity," thus mooting the question of the rights, if any, the claimant might have been entitled to under Section 315 before the election. (Letter to *Socialist*

*Workers' Party*, 40 F.C.C. 281 [1956]; letter to *Lar Daly*, 40 F.C.C. 273 [1956], *appeal dismissed sub. nom. Daly v. U.S.*, Case No. 11,946 [U.S.C.A. 7th Cir. 1957], *cert denied*, 355 U.S. 826 [1957]). In any event, all requests by political candidates for "equal opportunities" under Section 315 must be submitted within one week of the day on which the first prior use occurred. (F.C.C. Rules 73.1940).

24. Q. Under the circumstances stated in the preceding question, is any post-election remedy available to the candidate under Section 315?

A. None, insofar as a candidate may desire retroactive "equal opportunity." But this is not to suggest that a station can avoid its statutory obligation under Section 315 by waiting until an election has been held and only then disposing of demands for "equal opportunities."

25. Q. When a state attorney general or other appropriate state official having jurisdiction to decide a candidate's legal qualification has ruled that a candidate is not legally qualified under local election laws, can a licensee be required to afford such person "equal opportunity" under Section 315?

A. In such instances, the ruling of the state attorney general or other official will prevail, absent a judicial determination. (Telegram to *Ralph Muncy*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 766 [1956]; letter to *Socialist Workers' Party*, 40 F.C.C. 280 [1956]; *In re Lester Posner*, 15 F.C.C. 2d 807 [1968]).

## C

### What Constitutes a "Use" of Broadcast Facilities?

As a general rule, any *use* of broadcast facilities by a legally qualified candidate imposes an obligation on broadcast station licensees to afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for the same office. However, exemptions are provided in Section 315 for appearances by a legally qualified candidate on any—

- (1) *bona fide* newscast,
- (2) *bona fide* news interview,
- (3) *bona fide* news documentary (if the appearance of the candidate is incidental to the presentation of the subject or subjects covered by the news documentary), or
- (4) on-the-spot coverage of *bona fide* news events (including, but not limited to, political conventions and activities incidental thereto).

It should be noted that the term "use" of broadcast facilities is of critical importance in determining what rights and responsibilities accrue to candidates and broadcasters. Whether a broadcast is a "use" decides whether a station may censor the broadcast (see Section G, "Limitations as to Use of

Facilities by a Candidate," p. 13). It also determines whether the lowest unit charge provision in Section 315(b) applies (see Section I, "What Rates May Be Charged Candidates," p. 16), and whether a candidate's broadcast will entitle his opponent to equal opportunities under Section 315. (discussed in Section C, "What Constitutes a Use of Broadcast Facilities," p. 6). In addition, "reasonable access" will be provided only for a "use" by a candidate for federal office. (See Section J, "Reasonable Access," p. 25).

26. Q. Must a broadcaster give equal opportunity to a candidate whose opponent has broadcast in some other capacity than as a candidate?

A. Yes. Section 315 does not distinguish between types of uses. For example, a weekly report of a congressman to his constituents via radio or television is a broadcast by a legally qualified candidate for public office as soon as he becomes a candidate for reelection. His opponent must, therefore, be given equal opportunity for time on the air. If an actor becomes a legally qualified candidate for public office, the telecast of his movies thereafter will be a use, entitling his opponents to equal time, if the actor is



identifiable in the movies. (*Adrian Wiess (Ronald Reagan films)*, 58 F.C.C.2d 342 (1976), *review denied* 58 F.C.C.2d 1889 (1976); *Pat Paulsen*, 33 F.C.C.2d 385 (1972), *aff'd. sub nom. Paulsen v. FCC*, 491 F.2d 887 (9th Cir. 1974)).

27. Q. If a candidate appears on a variety program for a brief bow or statement, are his opponents entitled to "equal opportunities" on the basis of such an appearance?

A. Yes. Such an appearance, no matter how brief or perfunctory, is a "use" of a station's facilities within Section 315.

28. Q. A non-candidate reads a political script while the candidate is shown either on silent film, by a photograph over the screen, or sitting in the studio. Are the candidate's opponents entitled to equal opportunities?

A. Yes. The appearance of any candidate in any of these three situations constitutes a "use" of the station's facilities, thus entitling opposing candidates to equal opportunities (Letter to *Harry M. Plotkin*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 758 [1966]).

29. Q. A public service television announcement was taped featuring a singing group of about 100 people, many of whom were well known celebrities in various fields. No one's name was mentioned nor were any voices separately identifiable. One of the participants later became a legally qualified candidate for public office. In the PSA, he is visible in two video shots both of which were of a few seconds duration and at long range. Did these PSA's constitute a "use"?

A. No. Since the duration of the shots were too fleeting and the camera range too distant for the candidate to be readily identified in the group of 100 persons, his appearances were not a "use" within the meaning of Section 315(a) of the Communications Act. (Letter to *National Urban Coalition*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 123 [1970]). The NAB Legal Department believes this ruling to be highly significant because by stressing the word "readily identifiable" the Commission appears to have rejected an absolute standard whereby Section 315 rights would arise in every case where a candidate might possibly be identifiable.

#### EMPLOYEE CANDIDATES

30. Q. A television station employs an announcer who, "off camera" and unidentified, supplies the audio portion of required station identification announcements, public service announcements, and commercial announcements. In the event that this employee announced his candidacy for the city council, would his opponent be entitled to equal opportunity?

A. No. The employee's appearance for purposes of making commercial, non-commercial and station identification announcements would not constitute

a "use" where the announcer himself was neither shown nor identified in any way. (Letter to *WNEP*, 40 F.C.C. 431 [1965]).

31. Q. If a person regularly employed as a station announcer, who by name or listener familiarity is identifiable, were to continue his on-air duties after having qualified as a candidate for public office, would Section 315 apply?

A. Yes. Such appearances of a candidate are a "use" under Section 315. (Letter to *KUGN*, 40 F.C.C. 293 [1958]; letter to *KTTV*, 40 F.C.C. 282 [1957]; letter to *Kenneth Spengler*, 40 F.C.C. 279 [1956]).

32. Q. May a candidate who has previously broadcast sports events, but who states that only people who knew him personally would be able to identify his voice, continue to broadcast commercial announcements without identification during the campaign without triggering Section 315?

A. Yes. The question as to whether the announcer's voice is in fact so well known that he is identifiable to the general public is a matter for the licensee's reasonable good faith judgment. (Letter to *A. W. Davis*, 17 F.C.C. 2d 613 [1969]).

33. Q. What alternatives are available to a station with a readily identifiable on-air employee who becomes a legally qualified candidate for public office?

A. There are three possible alternatives:

1. Remove the employee from the air for the duration of his candidacy.
2. Leave the employee on the air and be fully prepared to afford equal opportunity to any opposing candidate for all appearances of the employee-candidate for the seven days prior to the opponent's request. There is no obligation on the part of the station to inform opposing candidates of their rights to equal opportunities arising from the employee-candidate's on-air duties. Of course, equal opportunities under these circumstances would involve free time.
3. Seek a waiver from the employee-candidate's opponent(s) to the effect that the opponent(s) waives any equal opportunity rights he may acquire as a result of appearances by the employee-candidate during the normal course of his station duties. Such a waiver should be contingent upon the understanding that the employee-candidate would make no reference, directly or indirectly, to his candidacy during such appearances. The F.C.C. has recognized the validity of equal opportunities waivers (see Q. and A. 62 p. 12). It must be understood that opposing candidates are under no obligation whatsoever to agree to such waivers and their refusal to do so cannot be exploited.

## EXEMPT AND NON-EXEMPT APPEARANCES

As indicated above, Section 315 provides that appearances by legally qualified candidates on specified types of news programs are deemed not to be a "use" of broadcast facilities within the meaning of that section. In determining whether a particular program is within the scope of one of these specified news-type programs, the basic question is whether the program meets the standard of "*bona fide*." To establish whether such a program is, in fact, a "*bona fide*" program, the following considerations, among others, may be pertinent: (1) the format, nature and content of the program; (2) whether the format, nature and content of the program has changed since its inception and, if so, in what respects; (3) who initiates the program; (4) who produces and controls the program; (5) when was the program initiated; (6) is the program regularly scheduled; and (7) if the program is regularly scheduled, the time and day of the week when it is broadcast.

It should be noted that although a particular news program may be exempt from the operation of Section 315, the station, nevertheless, may be subject to the obligations of the fairness doctrine whenever such an exempt program involves the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance. (For a discussion of the fairness doctrine, see Part II, p. 29). However, if it is established that the candidate's broadcast appearance constitutes a non-exempt Section 315 "use", the station's only obligation is to comply with the requirements of equal opportunity; thus, the station has no general fairness doctrine obligations arising out of a non-exempt Section 315 "use" by a candidate; generally speaking, the obligations of Section 315 and of the fairness doctrine are mutually exclusive.

**34. Q.** How can a licensee tell if its program is exempt as a *bona fide* news interview program?

**A.** A *bona fide* news interview program must be regularly scheduled, follow an interview (question and answer) format, and the content, format and participants must be controlled by the broadcaster. Telephone call-in shows where listener comments are predominant are not exempt. *Jane Steiner*, 7 F.C.C.2d 857 (1967). An interview program produced quarterly has been considered regularly scheduled. *Storer Broadcasting Co.*, 58 F.C.C.2d 982 (1976).

**35. Q.** Can a news interview program scheduled to begin only eleven weeks before the start of an election campaign qualify as an exempt program under Section 315 during that campaign?

**A.** No. Under the particular facts of this case the Commission said that it could not rule that the program was exempt. They emphasized that their "rulings favoring exemption have been limited to programs broadcast over a substantial period of time in the past." (Letter to *WIBC*, 33 F.C.C.2d 629 [1972]).

**36. Q.** Certain networks had presented over their facilities various candidates for the Democratic nomination for president on the programs "Meet the Press," "Face the Nation" and "College News Conference." Said programs were regularly scheduled and consisted of questions being asked of prominent individuals by newsmen and others. Would a candidate for the same nomination in a state primary be entitled to "equal opportunity"?

**A.** No. The programs were regularly scheduled, *bona fide* news interviews and were of the type which Congress intended to exempt from the "equal opportunities" requirement of Section 315. (Letter to *Andrew J. Easter*, 40 F.C.C. 307 [1960]; letters to *Charles V. Falkenberg*, 40 F.C.C. 310 [1960], 40 F.C.C. 311 [1960]; letter to *Congressman Frank Kowalski*, 40 F.C.C. 355 [1962]).

**37. Q.** The Democratic nominee for Vice President is interviewed on a regularly scheduled program which often deals with newsworthy topics and presents interviews with newsworthy individuals, but on other occasions consists of entertainment programming and a conventional talk show format. Would other legally qualified candidates for Vice President be entitled to "equal opportunities"?

**A.** Yes. The program is not exempt as a *bona fide* news interview program because the entire program is not always devoted to coverage of news events. To be exempt, a program must deal with newsworthy topics and individuals on a regularly scheduled basis. Thus, for example, the Commission has ruled that the "Tomorrow" show is not exempt. On the other hand, the "Today" show in which the news interview format is regularly used along with other news segments such as newscasts, documentaries, and coverage of news events, has been considered exempt by the Commission. (*National Broadcasting Co.*, 40 R.R. 2d 1727 [1977]). The Commission has ruled that appearances by candidates on the "Good Morning America" program are exempt because it is a news program. *American Broadcasting Companies, Inc.*, \_\_\_ F.C.C.2d \_\_\_, FCC 79-779 (January 6, 1980).

**38. Q.** A sheriff who was a candidate for nomination for U.S. Representative in Congress conducted a daily program, regularly scheduled since 1958, on which he reported on the activities of his office. Would his opponent be entitled to "equal opportunity"?

**A.** Yes. In light of the fact that the format and content of the program were determined by the sheriff and not by the station, the program was not of a type intended by Congress to be exempt from the "equal opportunities" requirement of Section 315. (Letter to *WCLG*, 40 F.C.C. 308, [1960]).

**39. Q.** A local station desires to cover live the upcoming civic association's monthly meeting which is featuring a debate between two opposing candidates. Neither the station nor the candidates has



any control over the format of the debate-question and answer session. Does the station's coverage of the debate fall within the exemption for on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event?

A. Yes. In 1975, the Commission overruled a prior decision to the contrary. The Commission indicated that it will consider such live coverage of political debates exempt from the equal time requirements as on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event. To fall within the exemption the debate must not be arranged or controlled in any way by the station. (*Aspen Institute Program on Communications, etc.*, 55 F.C.C. 2d 697 [1975]).

40. Q. A national press wire service has arranged a debate between two opposing candidates at its annual convention. After all arrangements have been made, the wire service invites a local station to broadcast the debate "live". The station decides to broadcast the debate, based on its judgment that the event was singularly newsworthy. After the debate, several other candidates for the same office approach the station and request equal time. Are they entitled to equal opportunity?

A. No, the station's live coverage of the debate would fall within the exemption for "on-the-spot coverage of *bona fide* news events." The Commission's ruling described in the preceding question Q & A 39 also overruled the Commission's prior decision that coverage of political debates in the above circumstances was not exempt. Again, however, a debate which is arranged by the station or over which the station exercises any control will *not* be exempt even under the Commission's ruling. (*Aspen Institute Program on Communications, etc.*, 55 F.C.C. 2d 697 [1975]).

41. Q. A station tapes a debate like those described in questions 39 and 40 and broadcasts the taped debate in its entirety on a delayed basis. Although the debate, if broadcast live, would be exempt from the equal opportunity provisions of Section 315 as "on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event," is the exemption lost automatically if the debate is taped and broadcast on a delayed basis?

A. No. The Commission has stated that "the delayed broadcasts of *bona fide* news events does not necessarily remove the Section 315 exemption from that broadcast." Thus, a broadcaster may make a reasonable, good faith judgment as to the need for a delayed rather than a live broadcast and "judge the applicability of the exemption in terms of the current newsworthiness of the event." However, the Commission stated that a delay exceeding one day (24 hours) would be questionable, absent unusual circumstances. (*Delaware Broadcasting Co.*, 60 F.C.C.2d 1030 (1976), affirmed *sub nom. Office of Communications of the United Church of Christ v. FCC*, 590 F.2d 1062 (D.C. Cir. 1978)).

42. Q. What is necessary for a broadcast to be exempt as on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event?

A. Coverage need not be live nor must the event necessarily be covered in its entirety. Any news event is eligible for on-the-spot coverage, not only candidate debates and news conferences. To understand the scope of this exemption it is necessary to understand the meaning of "coverage" and how the Commission looks to licensee reasonableness and good faith. Coverage refers to the role of the broadcaster as observer and reporter, rather than as sponsor or participant. Reasonableness measures the method of coverage used by the broadcaster against the newsworthiness of the event being covered. Broadcaster good faith means not using broadcast coverage to favor a particular candidate.

43. Q. Are acceptance speeches by successful candidates for nomination for the candidacy of a particular party for a given office, a use by a legally qualified candidate for election to that office?

A. Generally no. If the broadcast of an acceptance speech is on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event, then opponents of the candidate would not be entitled to equal opportunities. However, should a candidate buy broadcast time for his acceptance speech, then it would appear that the speech would not be exempt from Section 315, and equal opportunities would have to be afforded to his opponents.

44. Q. When a station, as part of a *bona fide* newscast, uses film clips showing a legally qualified candidate participating as one of a group in official ceremonies and the newscaster, in commenting on the ceremonies, mentions the candidate and others by name and describes their participation, has there been a "use" under Section 315?

A. No. Such an appearance clearly would fall within the exemption for *bona fide* newscasts under Section 315.

45. Q. Does an appearance on a program such as a Congressman's Weekly Report, attain exempt status when the Weekly Report is broadcast as part of a program not subject to the equal opportunities provision, such as a *bona fide* newscast?

A. No. A contrary view would be inconsistent with the legislative intent, and recognition of such an exemption would, in effect, subordinate substance to form. (Letter to Congressman Clark W. Thompson, 40 F.C.C. 328 [1962]; letter to Congressman Clem Miller, 40 F.C.C. 353 [1962]).

46. Q. Are appearances by a candidate in press release type film clips or audio tapes prepared and supplied by him to the station and broadcast as part of station's regularly scheduled newscasts, "uses" within the meaning of Section 315?

A. Not generally. While the preceding rulings clearly do not exempt the use of candidate-supplied programs in newscasts, it must be assumed that

broadcast of such film clips or tapes as part of an exempt newscast would not constitute "uses" under Section 315 where the station has exercised some degree of journalistic discretion in its use of the material. However, since the clips and tapes were supplied by the candidate as an inducement to their broadcast, an appropriate sponsorship identification announcement would be required under the Commission's rules. (FCC Rule 73.1212).

47. Q. Is coverage of a press conference held by a candidate for public office exempt from the equal opportunities requirement of Section 315 of the Act?

A. Yes, when considered newsworthy in the *bona fide* news judgment of the broadcaster, press conferences of the President and all other candidates for political office broadcast *live, and in their entirety*, qualify for exemption as "on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event." (*Aspen Institute Program on Communications, etc.*, 55 F.C.C. 2d 697 [1975]).

48. Q. Is a broadcast of a report of the president to the American people concerning specific, current, and extraordinary international events a "use" entitling other presidential candidates to equal time?

A. No. A 1956 ruling held that President Eisenhower's address on the Suez Crisis was exempt because the "equal time" provision is not applicable when the president uses the air lanes in reporting to the nation on an international crisis. The Commission found that there was nothing in the legislative history of the 1959 amendment to change this holding and in this instance found that President Johnson's report on the replacement of the head of the Soviet Union and the explosion of a nuclear device by Communist China was a *bona fide* news event of an extraordinary nature within the exemption of Section 315. (Letter to *Dean Burch*, 40 F.C.C. 408 [1964]).

## D

### When Are Candidates Opposing Candidates?

49. Q. What public offices are included within the meaning of Section 315?

A. Under the Commission's rules, the equal opportunities provision of Section 315 is applicable to both primary and general elections, and public offices include all offices filled by special or general election on a municipal, county, state or national level as well as the nomination by any recognized party as a candidate for such an office.

50. Q. If the station makes time available to candidates seeking the nomination of one party for a particular office, does Section 315 require that it afford equal opportunities to the candidates seeking the nomination of other parties for the same office?

A. No. The Commission has held that, while both primary elections or nominating conventions and general elections are comprehended within the terms of Section 315, the primary elections or conventions held by one party are to be considered separately from the primary elections or conventions of other parties, and, therefore, "equal opportunities" need only be afforded legally qualified candidates for nomination for the same office at the same party's primary or nominating convention. (Letter to *KWFT*, 40 F.C.C. 237 [1948]; letter to *Arnold Peterson*, 40 F.C.C. 240 [1952]; letter to *WCDL*, 40 F.C.C. 259 [1953]; letter to *Richard B. Kay*, 24 F.C.C.2d 246 [1970]). Of course, these rulings do not affect a Federal candidate's right to reasonable access under the new provision of Section 312(a). See "Reasonable Access" Part I, Section J, p. 25).

51. Q. Are candidates for positions of authority in a political party considered candidates for public office?

A. Candidates for the position of nominee of a political party for election to a public office are considered candidates for that office. (See *Kay v. FCC*, 443 F.2d 638 (D.C. Cir. 1970)). A candidate for election to a party's county committee, however, is not seeking public office, but a party position. (*Malcolm Cornell*, 31 F.C.C.2d 649 [1971]). Whether the position of party delegate to a national party nominating convention is considered a public office is a question on which the Commission will give deference to the appropriate state officials. (See *KNBC-TV*, 23 F.C.C.2d 765 (1968); *Russell H. Morgan*, 58 F.C.C.2d 964 [1976]).

52. Q. If there is only one candidate for each party's nomination for a particular office in the primary and one candidate makes a use of a station's facilities, must the station afford equal opportunities to the other party's candidates prior to the actual primary election?

A. The answer depends on state law as to when a candidate is deemed nominated. For example, if a state has a provision to the effect that all persons designated for uncontested offices in a primary election will be deemed nominated without balloting, the two candidates of opposing parties would become opposing candidates before the ballots were cast in a primary election. However, the F.C.C. has interpreted one such situation in New York and



refused to grant "equal opportunities" since at the time the candidate used the station's facilities it was still possible under New York law to file petitions requesting the opportunity to write in the name of an undesignated candidate and thus the candidates were not deemed nominated. (Letter to *Mrs. Eleanor Clark French*, 40 F.C.C. 417 [1964]; letter to *Martin R. Fine*, 24 F.C.C. 2d 464 [1970]).

53. Q. Is the subject of a recall election a candidate for public office?

A. Where the ballot offers only the choice of recalling or not recalling an officeholder, the incumbent official is not a legally qualified candidate for public office. Although no equal opportunity rights apply to such an election, the fairness doctrine would apply. (*New Primer on Political Broadcasting*, 69 F.C.C.2d 2209, 2237 (1978)). Where the ballot includes both the question concerning whether an official should be recalled and candidates to succeed the incumbent if he is recalled, the incumbent and all challengers will be considered legally qualified candidates. (*KOAA-TV*, 68 F.C.C.2d 79 (1978)).

## E

### Programs Within The Scope of Section 315

54. Q. Does Section 315 apply to one speaking for or on behalf of the candidate, as contrasted with the candidate himself?

A. No. Section 315 applies *only* to legally qualified candidates. Candidate A has no legal right to demand time where B, not a candidate, has spoken against A or in behalf of another candidate. (*Felix v. Westinghouse Radio Stations*, 186 F.2d 1 [3d Cir. 1950], *cert. denied*, 341 U.S. 909 [1951].) However, in the above described circumstance the Commission's so-called "Zapple" doctrine may afford quasi-equal

opportunities to supporters or spokesmen of a candidate. (See "Quasi-Equal Opportunities", Part II, Section C, p. 34).

55. Q. Does Section 315 apply to broadcasts by a legally qualified candidate where such broadcasts originate and are limited to a foreign station whose signals are received in the United States?

A. No. Section 315 applies only to stations licensed by the FCC. (Letter to *Gregory Pillon*, 40 F.C.C. 267 [1965]).

## F

### What Constitutes Equal Opportunities?

56. Q. If a station sells time to candidate A, must the station give free time to opposing candidates who request it?

A. No. The law requires "equal opportunities" for candidates—not "equal time." This means that the other candidates must be allowed to purchase comparable time at an equal rate.

57. Q. Is a station's obligation under Section 315 met if it offers a candidate the same amount of time an opposing candidate has received, where the time of the day or week afforded the first candidate is superior to that offered his opponent?

A. No. The station in providing equal opportunities must consider the desirability of the time segment allotted as well as its length. And while there is no requirement that a station afford candidate B exactly the same time of day on exactly the same day of the week as candidate A, the time segments offered must be comparable as to desirability.

58. Q. An announcer-candidate conducted a 45 minute interview program Monday through Friday. His opponent requested equal opportunity in the form of spot announcements equal to the total on-air time of the announcer-candidate. Was the opponent entitled to the spot announcements?

A. No. The opponent was technically entitled to the same amount of time in comparable time periods to those used by the announcer-candidate. The F.C.C. noted, however, that in such complex circumstances it will leave the working out of the mechanics of the problem to the parties subject to the rule of reason. (Letter to *RKO General, Inc.*, 25 F.C.C.2d 117 [1970]).

59. Q. Must a station advise a candidate by mail or telephone that time has been sold to other candidates?

A. No. It is the candidate's obligation to derive this information from the station's political file. It should be noted again that a station is required to keep a public record of all requests for time by or on behalf of political candidates, together with a record of the disposition and the charges made, if any, for each broadcast. (Section [d] of F.C.C. Rule 73.1940)

However, if a station chooses to advise a candidate of the sale of time to his opposition, it must provide the same information to the candidate's opponents. The licensee is not permitted to discriminate between opposing candidates in any way.

60. Q. Must a station advise a candidate that it has given free time to opposing candidates?

A. Not generally. However, if time is to be given free within 72 hours prior to the day of the election, the licensee should notify opposing candidates sufficiently in advance to have a reasonable opportunity to request equal time.

61. Q. A licensee offered broadcast time to all the candidates for a particular office for a joint appearance. If one candidate rejects the offer and other candidates accept and appear, would the first candidate be entitled to equal opportunity because of the appearances of those candidates who accepted the offer?

A. Yes, provided the request is made by the candidate within the one-week period specified by the Rules. The Commission has stated: "Where the licensee permits one candidate to use his facilities, Section 315 then—simply by virtue of *that* use—requires the licensee to 'afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station.'" (Letter to *Nicholas Zapple*, 40 F.C.C. 357 [1962]).

62. Q. A station intends to devote a block of time on a sustaining basis for use by candidates for various offices. May the licensee require candidates to waive "equal opportunities" if they are unable, fail, or do not wish to appear on the particular program?

A. Yes. A licensee may make such an offer of free time contingent on all candidates, agreeing to appear or to waive their rights to equal opportunities. He further may ask the candidates who agree to appear on the program to waive any rights to equal opportunities if, for any reason, they are subsequently unwilling or unable to appear on the program. It would then be up to the candidates to determine whether to waive or make some other decision based on their rights under Section 315. Waivers given with full knowledge of the relevant facts concerning the broadcast (and assuming, of course, that the disclosed broadcast conditions were adhered to) generally would be binding.

If one or more of the candidates will not waive or wishes to attach some other conditions, the matter then becomes one for the licensee's judgment of what, in the circumstances, best would serve his area's needs. For example, in some circumstances, because of the importance of the race in his area, a licensee might decide that it would continue to be worthwhile to present the program, and then afford one candidate time at a later date. (Letter to *Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters*, 5 F.C.C. 2d 479 [1966]).

63. Q. Under the circumstances stated in the preceding question, may the licensee make a factual report to all candidates that a particular candidate has refused to sign a waiver, and that the offer of free time is withdrawn?

A. Yes. Withdrawal of the offer is not precluded by Section 315, but rather is a matter for the licensee's good faith, reasonable judgment. However, the Commission has stressed that any candidate who does not agree to the terms of the licensee's offer is exercising rights expressly bestowed upon him by the Congress. It, therefore, would be inappropriate for the licensee to impute blame to such a candidate, or to indicate that the candidate was acting improperly. What is involved are the perfectly proper judgments, both by the candidate as to his Section 315 rights and the licensee as to what best will serve his audience in the circumstances.

For similar reasons, a licensee could not properly use a threat to blame failure of the negotiations on a particular candidate as a means to dictate the format of the program. Any such dictation would constitute prohibited censorship over an important facet of "the material broadcast." (Letter to *Kirkland, Ellis, Hudson, Chaffetz and Masters*, 5 F.C.C. 2d 479 [1966].)

64. Q. Two out of four candidates of the same party in a primary election were given free time by a television station for a one-half hour face-to-face debate. The other two candidates were offered free time in comparable time segments to engage in a one-half hour debate or talk in separate 15 minute programs. The two candidates not in the original debate protested to the Commission and stated that all four should be included in the same debate. Was the equal opportunity requirement met by this station when it did not grant this demand?

A. The station fulfilled the requirements of the equal opportunity provision when it offered all candidates equal amounts of time free of charge in comparable time periods. Section 315 does not include the right to appear on the same program with other candidates since a station cannot compel political candidates to appear on the same program. (*In re Messrs. William F. Ryan and Paul O'Dwyer*, 14 F.C.C. 2d 633 [1968]; *In re Constitutional Party and Frank W. Gaydosh*, 14 F.C.C. 2d 255 [1968], *Petition for Reconsideration denied*, 14 F.C.C. 2d 861 [1968]).

65. Q. If one political candidate buys station facilities more heavily than another, is a station required to call a halt to such sales because of the resulting imbalance?

A. No. Section 315 requires only that all candidates be afforded an equal opportunity to use the facilities of the station. (Letter to *Mrs. M. R. Oliver*, 40 F.C.C. 253 [1952]). Of course, a station may now wish to set some limits in order to insure its ability to provide reasonable access to federal candidates.

66. Q. If a station has a policy of confining political broadcasts to sustaining time, but has so many requests for political time that it cannot handle them all within its sustaining schedule, may it refuse time to a candidate whose opponent has already been



granted time, on the basis of its established policy of not cancelling commercial programs in favor of political broadcasts?

A. No. The station cannot rely upon its policy if the latter conflicts with the "equal opportunity" requirement of Section 315. (Letter to *Stephens Broadcasting Co.*, 11 F.C.C. 61 [1945]).

67. Q. If one candidate has been nominated by parties A, B, and C, while a second candidate for the same office is nominated only by Party D, how should time be allocated as between the two candidates?

A. Section 315 has reference only to the use of facilities by persons who are candidates for public office and not to the political parties which may have nominated such candidates. Accordingly, if broadcast time is made available for the use of a candidate for public office, the provisions of Section 315 require that equal opportunity be afforded each person who is a candidate for the same office, without regard to the number of nominations that any particular candidate may have. (Letter to *Thomas W. Wilson*, 40 F.C.C. 235 [1946].)

68. Q. If a person who is a candidate for both governor and state senator appears in a broadcast promoting his race for the governorship, is a senatorial opponent entitled to equal opportunities?

A. Yes. Any 315 use by the candidate would require that equal opportunity be accorded all legally qualified candidates who are opposing him for *either* office, even though his appearance was allegedly as a candidate for governor and was devoted to that contest. (Letter to *KATC*, 28 F.C.C. 2d 403 [1971]).

69. Q. If a station broadcasts a non-exempt program sponsored by a commercial advertiser which includes one or more qualified candidates as speakers or guests, what are its obligations with respect to affording equal opportunities to other candidates for the same office?

A. If candidates are permitted to appear, without cost to themselves, on non-exempt programs sponsored by commercial advertisers, opposing can-

didates are entitled to receive comparable time, also, at no cost. (Letter to *Senator Moroney*, 40 F.C.C. 251 [1952]).

70. Q. Where time charges for a 15-minute special program featuring speeches by political candidates are not paid for by the candidates but by a labor union, what are a station's obligations with respect to affording "equal opportunities" to other candidates for the same office?

A. Precedent cited in the preceding question is not applicable in circumstances where a political committee organization, such as a union, purchases time specifically on behalf of candidates. Thus, opposing candidates are not entitled to free time. (Telegram to *Thomas J. Dougherty*, 40 F.C.C. 426 [1954]).

71. Q. Where a candidate for office in a state or local election appears on a national network non-exempt program, is an opposing candidate for the same office entitled to equal opportunity over stations which carried the original program and serve the area in which the election campaign is occurring?

A. Yes. Under such circumstances an opposing candidate would be entitled to time on such stations. (Letter to *Senator Monroney*, 40 F.C.C. 251 [1952]).

72. Q. In affording "equal opportunities," may a station limit the use of its facilities solely to the use of a microphone?

A. A station must treat opposing candidates the same with respect to the use of its facilities and if it permits one candidate to use facilities over and beyond the microphone, it must permit a similar usage by other qualified candidates. (Letter to *D. L. Grace*, 40 F.C.C. 297 [1958]).

73. Q. May a station meet its "equal opportunity" obligation by insisting on a live appearance of the candidate?

A. No. Some candidates may prefer to participate by pre-recorded video tape or film. Requiring a live appearance would constitute censorship in violation of Section 315. (Letter to *WOR-TV*, 40 F.C.C. 376 [1962]).

## G

### Limitations as to Use of Facilities by a Candidate

74. Q. May a station delete material in a broadcast by a candidate because it believes the material contained therein is, or may be, libelous?

A. No. Any such action would entail censorship which is expressly prohibited by Section 315 of the Communications Act. (*Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America v. WDAY, Inc.*, 360 U.S. 525, [1959]).

75. Q. If a station has agreed to provide (or is obligated under the equal opportunity provision of Sec-

tion 315 to provide) a candidate with broadcast time, can the station then refuse to carry the candidate's particular broadcast matter if it learns that the candidate's appearance will involve the expression of highly inflammatory or extremely unpopular points of view which other individuals claim will incite a violent social reaction.

A. No. The Commission has stated that even in a situation where a candidate's appearance involves the expression of opinions which can be character-

ized as highly offensive or inflammatory, such as blatant racial slurs, the no-censorship provision of Section 315 prohibits a station's refusal to carry the broadcasts. In the Commission's judgment, "[a] contrary conclusion would permit anyone to prevent a candidate from exercising his rights under Section 315 [simply] by threatening a violent reaction." As stated by the Commission, "the public interest is best served by permitting the expression of any views that do not involve 'a clear and present danger of serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance, or unrest'." (See letter to Mr. Lonnie King, *Atlanta NAACP*, F.C.C. 72-711 [1972]).

**76. Q.** If a candidate does make libelous or slanderous remarks, is the station liable therefor?

**A.** No. A broadcast station licensee who does not directly participate in the libel is free from liability which might otherwise be incurred under state law, because of the operation of Section 315, which precludes a licensee from preventing a candidate's utterances. The United States Supreme Court has ruled that since a licensee could not censor a broadcast under Section 315, Congress could not have intended to compel a station licensee to broadcast libelous statements of a legally qualified candidate and at the same time subject the licensee to the risk of damage suits. (*Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America v. WDAY, Inc.*, *supra*.)

**77. Q.** Candidate B made an agreement with a station that he would receive equal opportunity free because of the appearance of an opposing Candidate A. Candidate B desired to have some high school students sing and entertain on the program he would broadcast under his equal opportunity rights. During the program, he also wanted to have the keys to a car presented to the winner of the automobile by a member of a merchant's association. Does Section 315 prohibit the station from restricting the appearance by an opposing candidate, and if any of these persons thus appearing utter libelous statements, does Section 315 guarantee immunity to the station from civil action based on these utterances?

**A.** Yes to both questions. The Commission held in this case that where a candidate's personal appearance, either vocal or visual, is the focus of the program presented, the program constitutes a Section 315 "use" and the station is prohibited from censoring the candidate's choice of program material. The Commission stressed that this general rule will be applied in circumstances where the candidate's personal appearance(s) is substantial in length and integrally involved in the program, and where the program is under the control and direction of the candidate. (*In re Gray Communications Systems, Inc.*, 14 F.C.C. 2d 766 [1968]; *Herald Publishing Company*, 14 F.C.C. 2d 767 [1968]; *Petition for Reconsideration denied, In re Gray Communications Systems, Inc.*, 19 F.C.C. 2d 532, 534 [1969]).

**78. Q.** Does the same immunity apply in a case where the chairman of a political party's campaign committee, not himself a candidate, broadcasts a speech in support of a candidate?

**A.** No. The no censorship provision of Section 315 applies only to broadcasts which involve "uses" by legally qualified candidates. Therefore, since a station may censor the political speeches of persons other than legally qualified candidates, the licensee may be held liable for slanderous or libelous statements of a non-candidate if he does not require that the offensive statements be deleted. (*Felix v. Westinghouse Radio Stations*, 186 F. 2d 1 [3d Cir. 1950], *cert. denied*, 341 U.S. 909 [1950]).

**79. Q.** May a licensee require a candidate for public office to sign an indemnification agreement?

**A.** No. The Commission has ruled that in view of the decision in the *WDAY* case, a requirement for indemnification serves no purpose and may be inhibiting in the candidate's use of a station. The Commission believes that "the courts would hold a licensee free from liability for any claim arising out of a 'use' by a candidate where a licensee was unable under the no censorship provision of Section 315 to prevent the act which gave rise to the claim" and that "the cost of defending a suit where there is no liability is part of the normal cost of doing business which a licensee assumes in the operation of its station." (*Humphrey Campaign*, 37 F.C.C. 2d 57 [1972]).

**80. Q.** Although a licensee clearly may not require a candidate to indemnify a station for any liability arising from his statements during his "use" of the licensee's station, may the licensee require indemnification for any liability arising from other aspects of the candidate's broadcast, e.g., statements by supporters who appear with the candidate or background music for which the station is not licensed?

**A.** No. The Commission has ruled that if a use is present, the no-censorship provision of Section 315 applies "to all program material presented as part of the candidate's use . . . with no right of prior approval by the licensee." (*Gray Communications System, Inc.*, 19 F.C.C. 2d 532, 535 [1969]; *Humphrey Campaign*, 37 F.C.C. 2d 576 [1972]). For general guidelines regarding when a "use" is present, see Q & A 98.

**81. Q.** If a candidate secures time under Section 315, must he talk about a subject directly related to his candidacy?

**A.** No. The candidate may use the time as he deems best. To deny a person time on the grounds that he was not using it in furtherance of his candidacy would be an exercise of censorship prohibited by Section 315. (Letter to *WMCA, Inc.*, 40 F.C.C. 241 [1952]).

**82. Q.** If a station makes time available to an office holder who is also a legally qualified candidate for



reelection and the office holder limits his talks to nonpartisan and informative material, may other legally qualified candidates, who obtain time, be limited to the same subjects or the same type of broadcast?

A. No. Other qualified candidates may use the facilities as they deem best in their own interest. (Letter to *Congressman Allen Oakley Hunter*, 40 F.C.C. 246 [1952]).

83. Q. May a licensee, as a condition to allowing a candidate the use of its broadcast facilities, require the candidate to submit an advance script of his program?

A. Yes. A broadcaster may ask for an advance script or tape to learn whether the broadcast would be a use, to learn whether a paid broadcast carries the proper sponsorship identification, and to ensure that the broadcast is of the agreed upon length. When asking for a script or tape in advance, the broadcaster must inform the candidate that licensees may not censor the content of a use.

84. Q. What can a station do if a candidate contemplates a speech including obscene or defamatory passages?

A. The licensee should attempt to *persuade* the candidate to delete it. However, if the candidate insists, the licensee, under the no censorship provisions of Section 315, must allow the candidate to go on the air with his material uncensored.

85. Q. Is it censorship for a broadcaster to delete part of the content of a use in order to insert sponsorship identification?

A. No. A broadcaster may stop carrying the broadcast sufficiently far in advance of the end of the agreed upon time period to insert proper sponsorship identification.

86. Q. Must a station grant an equal time request from a candidate who delays making his request until a day or two before the election in order to saturate pre-election broadcast time?

A. The Commission has indicated that where a candidate waits until a day or two before the election to request equal opportunities under Section 315, a licensee would be justified in denying the purchase of time *equal* to that used by an opposing candidate during the week preceding the request. In such cases, the Commission will consider that a licensee has provided "equal opportunities" if he affords less than precisely equal time to the candidate making the last minute requests for equal opportunities. Licensees should keep in mind that "[t]he thrust of this so-called 'eleventh hour rule' is that a licensee will not be expected to accommodate last minute equal opportunities requests made by parties who have sat on their Section 315 rights in situations where the grant of such requests would seriously interfere with the licensee's duty to program in the public interest, or where such a grant would give the last minute purchaser an unfair advantage over prior use candidates by allowing the purchaser to saturate broadcast time during the last few days before an election." (*Summa Corporation* [KLAS], 49 F.C.C. 2d 443, 448 [1974]; *Honorable Allen Oakley Hunter*, 40 F.C.C. 246 [1952]).

87. Q. May a station require political candidates to pay in advance for all time purchased?

A. Yes. Because of the nature of political campaigns, a requirement of advance payment is reasonable. Indeed, the NAB agreement form for political broadcasts provides for advance payment. Stations may extend credit to candidates if they wish, but in such cases all opposing candidates should be treated uniformly.

## H

### Period Within Which Request Must Be Made

88. Q. When must a candidate make a request of the station for opportunities equal to those afforded his opponent?

A. Within one week of the day on which the first prior use giving rise to the right of equal opportunities occurred. If the person was not a candidate at the time of such first prior use, his request must be made within one week of the first subsequent use after he became a candidate. (Section [e] of F.C.C. Rule 73.1940).

89. Q. A United States Senator, an unopposed candidate in his party's primary, had been broadcasting a weekly program entitled "Your Senator Reports." If he becomes opposed in his party's primary, would his opponent be entitled to request "equal op-

portunities" with respect to all broadcasts of "Your Senator Reports" since the time the incumbent announced his candidacy?

A. No. A legally qualified candidate announcing his candidacy for the above nomination would be entitled to "equal opportunity" only for the broadcast of "Your Senator Reports" which was aired during the week preceding the opponent's announcement of his candidacy. (Letter to *Senator Joseph C. Clark*, 40 F.C.C. 332 [1962]).

90. Q. A, B, and C were all legally qualified candidates for the same public office as of August 29. A approached the station licensee for purchase of broadcast time and appeared on September 1. On September 5, B requested equal opportunity to respond to A's use, and C made a similar request on

September 10, claiming his request to be timely made within 7 days of B's request. The licensee granted B's request but not C's. C appealed to the Commission to compel the licensee to afford him equal time. Must the licensee grant the request?

A. The licensee properly refused C's request, that request being made more than 7 days after A's first prior use. There of course is no validity to the claim that the request was within 7 days of B's request for time.

91. Q. Under the same facts as above, D became a legally qualified candidate for the same public office on September 10. On September 15, B appeared on the licensee's station in compliance with his earlier request. The next day, September 16, D requested equal opportunity to respond to B, which request was promptly rejected by the licensee who contended that D's request was made more than 7 days after A's first prior use. Must the licensee grant D's request?

A. The licensee was incorrect in refusing D's request. D, who became a legal candidate after A's first prior use, may properly request equal time within 7 days of a subsequent use, which in this case was B's appearance on September 15.

92. Q. Four days prior to an announced broadcast use by a political candidate, one of the candidates opponents for the same office requested time based on that specific future use. The station denied the request because the opponent had not asked for equal opportunity within 1 week after the day on which the prior use occurred. Had the opposing candidate complied with the 7-day rule with his request made prior to the broadcast?

A. Yes. The Commission has always considered as valid and appropriate an equal opportunity request made prior to a Section 315 broadcast *if the request is based on a specific future use which was known or announced prior to the actual broadcast.* (Letter to Socialist Workers Party, 15 F.C.C. 2d 96 [1968]). A blanket request as to "all future appearances of candidate X" would probably lack the specificity to be treated as a valid request for equal opportunities. However, where a station allows a candidate to use its facilities in a "fixed and continuing pattern," such as the sale of a spot announcement schedule, an opponent's equal opportunity request will cover the seven days prior to the request and all later uses already scheduled. (KLAS-TV, 42 F.C.C.2d 894 [1973]).

## I

### What Rates May be Charged Candidates?

As indicated in the Foreword, Section 315 has been amended by the Campaign Communications Reform Act so as to affect the rate practices applicable to certain political broadcasts. Section 315(b) now requires that during the forty-five (45) days preceding a primary election and during the sixty (60) days preceding a general or special election,\* the charges made for the use of a broadcasting station by any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office cannot exceed the lowest unit charge of the station for the same class and amount of time for the same period. At any other time the charges made for a use by a legally qualified candidate are to be those which would be made for a comparable use of the station by other users. Thus, the effect of this amendment is to create two classes of charges applicable to political broadcasting—lowest unit charge and comparable use charge. In order to avoid confusion we will discuss each of these classes separately.

#### LOWEST UNIT CHARGE

93. Q. What is the meaning of the term "lowest unit charge"?

\* The 45 and 60 day periods include election day. (Letter to Glenn J. Sedam, Jr., FCC Report No. 10869, Aug. 17, 1972).

A. The term "lowest unit charge" refers to the full statutory phrase "lowest unit charge of the station for the same class and amount of time for the same period." The term "class" refers to rate categories such as fixed-position spots, preemptible spots, run-of-schedule and special-rate packages. The term "amount of time" refers to the unit of time purchased, such as 30 seconds, 60 seconds, 5 minutes or 1 hour. The term "same period" refers to the period of the broadcast day such as prime time, drive time, class A, class B or other classifications established by the station. The term "lowest unit charge" also provides the candidate with the benefit of all discounts, frequency and otherwise, offered to the most favored commercial advertiser for the same class and amount of time for the same period, without regard to the frequency of use by the candidate. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 1).

94. Q. To whom does the lowest unit charge provision of Section 315(b) (1) apply?

A. The lowest unit charge provision applies to all persons who meet the requirements of a "legally qualified candidate," as discussed in Section I. B of this *Catechism* on p. 4. Thus, any legally qualified candidate for any public office, federal, state or local, is eligible to receive the lowest unit charge. (F.C.C. Guideline V. 2).



95. Q. When does the lowest unit charge provision apply?

A. Three circumstances must coexist in order to trigger application of the lowest unit charge. First, the actual use of broadcast time must occur within the 45 days before a primary or primary run-off election or within the 60 days before a general or special election; second, the use *must* involve a personal appearance by the candidate through his voice or image; and, third, the candidate's appearance must be "in connection with his campaign." If the broadcast use does not include *all three* of these elements, the lowest unit charge provision does not apply.

96. Q. A person is a legally qualified candidate for nomination for the presidency. He is running in the primary election of a state in the eastern part of the United States. During the period of 45 days before that primary election he wishes to purchase time on stations in that state and on stations in each of three western states. The situation with regard to each of the western states is as follows: (1) in state A, a presidential primary election has already been held in the state; (2) in state B, the delegates to the national nominating convention have already been selected by a state convention; (3) in state C, a presidential primary election is yet to be held in the state, the person is running in that primary, but that primary will occur more than 45 days after the proposed use of the stations in state C. On what stations is the candidate entitled to the lowest unit charge?

A. He is entitled to the lowest unit charge only on the stations in the eastern state where he is running in the primary election. In the western states he would be entitled to rates on a "comparable use" basis under the provisions of Section 315(b) (2). The intent of the lowest unit charge provision is that it is to apply only in situations where an election is being held in the service area of the station on which time is being purchased. If the person in this case subsequently receives the nomination of his party at its national convention, then under the provisions of Section 315(b) (1) he would be entitled to the lowest unit charge in stations in all of the 50 states during the 60-day period preceding the presidential election. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 19).

97. Q. Is a candidate for nomination by a convention or a caucus of a political party held to select a nominee entitled to lowest unit charge?

A. Yes. Where there is an open meeting in which members of the public may participate in selecting delegates to attend a nominating convention, the lowest unit charge provision would apply both to candidates for the position of delegate and to a candidate for the office at issue who wants to influence the public to select delegates favorable to him. (See *Reagan for President Committee*, \_\_\_\_ F.C.C.2d \_\_\_\_, FCC 80-9, January 14, 1980).

98. Q. How long must a candidate appear in the particular program or spot announcement, in order to qualify the broadcast matter for lowest unit charge treatment?

A. The determination as to whether the lowest unit charge applies to a particular purchase of broadcast time by or on behalf of a candidate generally does not depend upon the particular length of a candidate's appearance in the broadcast. In the case of *spot announcements*, the Commission has specifically ruled that the same standards which establish whether a candidate's appearance is sufficient to constitute a "use" under the equal opportunity provisions of Section 315 also should be applied to determine whether a spot announcement is a broadcast "use" eligible for lowest unit charge treatment; thus, any appearance by the candidate in a spot announcement in which he is identified or identifiable through his voice or image qualifies the spot announcement for lowest unit charge. (Letter to *Charles F. Dykas*, Report No. 10796, July 19, 1972). The Commission has given no ruling as to the situation of a candidate's appearances in broadcast *programs*, but it seems clear that an appearance by a candidate in a program which is sufficient to invoke the no-censorship provisions of Section 315 will also serve to qualify the program for lowest unit charge treatment; thus, where a candidate's appearance, either visual or vocal, in a program is substantial in length, integrally involved in the program, exists as the focus of the program, and is part of a program under the direction and control of the candidate, the lowest unit charge will apply. Conversely, when a candidate's appearance is only an incidental inclusion in a program on which another person is the central figure, the lowest unit charge will not apply. (*In re Gray Communications*, 14 F.C.C. 2d 532 [1969]).

99. Q. Does the lowest unit charge provision apply to political broadcasts by groups, organizations or persons other than candidates?

A. No. As stated in Q.'s and A.'s 85 and 86, the lowest unit charge provision applies only to broadcast appearances by candidates for public office. If a group presents a political broadcast which contains no identified or identifiable appearance by a legally qualified candidate for public office, the lowest unit charge does not apply. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 14).

100. Q. A local businessman appears in spot announcements promoting his furniture store. Subsequently, he becomes a candidate for public office. Will these spots for his store qualify for the lowest unit charge?

A. No. Since these spot announcements are not made "in connection with his campaign" for public office, they do not qualify for lowest unit charge. However, in terms of equal opportunity rights of his opponents, these spot announcements would constitute a "use."

**101. Q.** If a candidate is identified or identifiable but his appearance is solely limited to making the sponsorship identification announcement, is this sufficient to make the entire spot announcement a "use" by that candidate?

**A.** Yes. The Commission has held whenever a candidate makes any appearance in a political spot announcement, in which he is identified or identifiable by voice or picture, the entire announcement is a "use" by that candidate. (Letter to *WITL*, July 2, 1975).

**102. Q.** May a station with both "national" and "local" rates charge a candidate falling within the purview of Section 315 (b) (1) its lowest rate charge based on its "national" rates?

**A.** No. The calculation of the lowest unit charge must be based on its "local" rates (if they are lower than its "national" rates) regardless of whether a candidate is running for municipal, county, state, or national office. "National" and "local" are not viewed as different "classes" of service under the provisions of Section 315(b) (1). (F.C.C. Guidelines VI. 17).

**103. Q.** In computing the lowest unit charge under the provisions of Section 315(b) (1), is the calculation based on the rate card of the station or on the rates actually charged by the station if they differ from those on the rate card?

**A.** The calculation is based on whatever will give the lowest unit rate for the same class and amount of time during the same period of the day. If use of the rate card gives the lowest unit rate, the rate card is the basis used. If use of the actual charges gives the lowest unit rate, actual charges are used in determining rates for candidates. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 18).

**104. Q.** A station has over a period of years had a spot announcement contract with a particular commercial advertiser and has renewed the contract from time to time with unchanged rates set at the time the contract was entered into although the rates of the station to other advertisers have increased. May the station, in determining the lowest unit charge, disregard the rates given to the advertiser with the rate protection agreement and focus solely on the current rates generally offered to advertisers?

**A.** No. The station must compute the charge to the candidate on the basis of whatever rates give the lowest unit charge for the same class and amount of time for the same period. Since the advertiser with the long standing contract is being given the lowest station rate, his rates must be taken into account in computing the lowest unit charge. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 10).

**105. Q.** What would be some concrete examples of the way in which frequency discounts are included in a determination of the lowest unit charge?

**A.** Set forth below are four examples of the manner in which discounts are taken into account in determining the lowest unit charge.

(a) A licensee sells one fixed-position, 1-minute spot in prime time to commercial advertisers for \$15. It sells 500 such spots for \$5,000. It must sell one such spot to a candidate for not more than \$10.

(b) A licensee sells one immediately preemptible 30-second spot in drive time to commercial advertisers for \$10. It sells 100 such spots for \$750. It must sell one such spot to a candidate for not more than \$7.50.

(c) A licensee's best rate per spot for run-of-schedule, 1-minute spots is 1,000 for \$1,000. Its rate for one such run-of-schedule spot is \$4. It must sell one such spot to a candidate for not more than \$1.

(d) A licensee has provided a long-standing advertising client with a special \$2,500-500 time rate for 30-second spot announcements in drive time. It must sell one such spot to a candidate for not more than \$5.

**106. Q.** Are bonus spots to be counted in arriving at a determination of "lowest unit charge"?

**A.** Yes. Bonus spots are included within the lowest unit charge determination and, therefore, may serve to reduce further the rate at which a candidate may buy time. Thus, for example, if a station gives 10 bonus spots to every purchaser of a \$2,000 package which normally includes 1000-60 second spots in drive time, the candidate may buy one such spot for \$1.98 (\$2,000 divided by 1010 spots).

**107. Q.** If a station sells advertising to certain non-profit organizations to advertise their quasi-commercial ventures (e.g., the sale of Christmas trees to raise money), and the station has a policy of giving to such organizations free announcements at least equal in number to the commercial announcements purchased, must the free spots be taken into account in determining "lowest unit charge"?

**A.** No. In this particular type of situation, where a station policy provides free spots equal to the commercial announcements purchased to promote a non-profit organization's quasi-commercial venture, the free spots are not to be treated like bonus spots for purposes of determining the lowest unit charge (Letter to *KGWA*, 34 F.C.C. 2d 1103 [1972]). However, the free spots must be logged as commercial matter.

**108. Q.** Are trade outs, barter transactions, or per inquiry arrangements to be used in computing the lowest unit charge?

**A.** No. Although stations engage in trade outs, barter and per inquiry advertising arrangements in dealing with advertisers, only transactions involving sale of time for monetary consideration are to be used as the basis for calculating the lowest unit charge. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 21).



109. Q. Does the fact that a station may provide advertising time without charge to certain parties serve to commit the station to a zero rate as its lowest unit charge?

A. No. The lowest unit charge provision is not applicable to situations when an advertiser is not charged an amount for *any* of his announcements. (Letter to *KRSN*, June 29, 1972. The situation discussed here is not to be confused with the situation of bonus spots. See Q. and A. 94).

110. Q. If a station is obligated to run during the 45 or 60 day statutory period a "make good" spot which was part of a low rate arrangement that is no longer in effect, as might be the case where a station has changed from its summer to its higher fall rates, must that no longer existent rate arrangement of which the "make good" was once a part be included in computing the lowest unit charge?

A. No. "Make good" spots are not to be counted in arriving at a determination of lowest unit charge.

111. Q. If a station offers a special package plan which reflects a selection, for example, of 30 second spot announcements distributed over different time periods, must the station sell the candidate one such spot at the applicable lowest unit charge?

A. No. In the situation of a package plan which reflects a distribution of spot announcements over desirable and less desirable time periods of the day, the candidate must buy one run of the package in order to receive the lowest unit charge per spot as based on the package rate. In other words, if a station sells a package of 1500 spot announcements for \$1,500 which includes a daily distribution of 1 spot announcement in morning drive time, 1 spot announcement in the afternoon, and 1 spot announcement in evening drive time, the candidate must buy at least 1 spot in the morning, 1 in the afternoon, and 1 in the evening in order to be eligible for the lowest unit charge of \$1.00 per spot announcement. He cannot "cherry-pick" by demanding only drive time spots at the lowest unit charge for the package.

112. Q. Does the provision for lowest unit charge apply to both time charges *and* other charges by a station in connection with political broadcasts?

A. No. The provision applies only to charges for purchase of time. It does not cover additional charges customarily made by a station for other services, which may be termed production oriented, such as charges for use of a television studio, audio- or video-taping, or line charges and remote technical crew charges when the broadcast is to be picked up outside the station. Moreover, the provision does not apply to additional charges that might be incurred if a candidate sought to purchase full sponsorship of an existing program for which there is an established program charge in addition to a time charge. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 15).

113. Q. If a candidate purchases time from a station through an agency, may the station include the agency commission in the lowest unit charge?

A. Yes. However, if a candidate purchases time directly from a station without the use of an agency, the lowest unit charge must exclude the amount usually paid for agency commission. For example, if a 1-minute spot announcement costs \$100 and an agency is allowed \$15, a candidate placing a spot through an agency must pay \$100. But if a candidate places the spot directly, without the use of an agency, he pays \$85. Although a candidate who purchases time directly from the station without use of an agency can be charged for any production costs incurred by the station in preparing his spots or programs, he cannot be charged for any station services which are provided free of charge to commercial advertisers who do not use an agency. See Q. and A. 112. (F.C.C. Guidelines VI. 16).

114. Q. Must commissions to sales representatives be deducted from the lowest unit charge?

A. No. Sales representatives are customarily viewed as agents of the station and not of the advertiser or advertising agency. Commissions to sales representatives are, therefore, similar to the compensation paid to employees or salesmen of the station and are to be viewed as the station's own cost of doing business. (Letter to *Eugene T. Smith*, 34 F.C.C. 2d 622 [1972]).

115. Q. If two or more candidates together purchase spot announcements in which they jointly appear, is each candidate entitled to share the single lowest unit charge for the spot announcement or is each candidate required to pay the entire lowest unit charge?

A. The lowest unit charge is a time charge and not a charge based upon the number of candidates sharing the broadcast use. Thus, if two or more candidates are buying time for a joint use, they are together entitled to share the applicable lowest unit charge.

116. Q. By statute a state provides that broadcast stations may carry legal notices at rates fixed by the statute. This rate is quite low so that for a particular broadcast station in that state the lowest unit charge for such notices for the same class and amount of time for the same period is less than the lowest unit charge based on "normal" rates. Must the lowest unit charge for candidates to be calculated on the basis of the statutory rate for legal notices?

A. No. Since the rates for legal notices are set by statute rather than by the station, they are not used for calculation of the lowest unit charge for candidates. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 20).

117. Q. May the lowest unit charge vary with the day of the week on which a candidate uses a station?

A. Yes. For example, a television station might charge commercial advertisers more for 1-minute, fixed-position spots between 7:00-7:30 p.m. on Sunday than it does for such spots on Monday through Friday; and the charges on Monday through Friday might exceed the charges for such spots on Saturday. In computing the lowest unit charge which must not be exceeded in selling time to candidates, stations, in addition to taking into account the class and amount of time for the same period of the day, may take into account the day of the week, if rates of the station vary with the day of the week. In the example given above, the station would not be required to sell time to a candidate for use on Sunday between 7:00-7:30 p.m. at rates not exceeding the lowest unit charge for Saturday night. If a station does not vary its charges to commercial advertisers with the day of the week, it may not do so with candidates for public office. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 2).

118. Q. What is the base period for determining lowest unit charge?

A. Lowest unit charge is determined by the cost of any matter for the "same class and amount of time for the same period" broadcast during either the 60 or 45 day statutory period involved. Exceptions have been recognized by the Commission for rate changes made during the statutory period because of seasonality and audience surveys, as discussed in the following two Q.'s and A.'s.

119. Q. A general election is to be held on November 2. As required by Section 315(b), the lowest unit charge must be made to candidates during the preceding 60 days, commencing September 3. Pursuant to normal practices, a station on September 20 charges from its summer rates to its higher fall rates. Is the lowest unit charge during the entire 60-day period preceding the election based on summer rates?

A. No. From September 3 to September 20, the lowest unit charge is based on the summer rates. On and after September 20, the fall rates are used as the basis for computation of the lowest unit charge. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 3).

120. Q. For a particular community, ARB and Nielsen television market reports are issued six times a year. Upon receipt of these reports it is the normal business practice of a television station in the community to reexamine its rates and revise some of them. During the 60-day period preceding a general election, such a rate revision occurs which results in increased rates for adjacencies to program A shown in prime time, and a decrease in rates for adjacencies to program B in prime time. What is the basis for calculation of the lowest unit charge for adjacencies of the two programs during the 60-day period?

A. Candidates using adjacencies to either program A or program B prior to the rate change are entitled to be charged not more than the lowest unit rate for such adjacencies prior to the rate change, and those

using adjacencies to either program after the rate change are entitled to be charged not more than the lowest unit charge after the rate change. Thus, the lowest unit rate for candidates for adjacencies to program A prior to the rate change is lower than the lowest unit rate after the rate change. As to adjacencies to program B, the lowest unit rate prior to the rate change is higher than the lowest unit rate after the rate change. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 4).

*Note:* Although in Q.'s and A.'s 119 and 120 the charges to opposing candidates may differ, no discrimination has resulted under the law since both candidates are receiving the lowest unit charge at the time of use. Of course, this non-discriminatory difference in charges only pertains where rate changes occur during the statutory period as a result of seasonality or audience surveys. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 5).

121. Q. Do the lowest unit charge provisions apply to purchases of time on the networks?

A. Yes. Although the Campaign Communications Reform Act does not specifically refer to networks, the provisions are intended to apply to purchase of network time. A network is in a real sense selling time on behalf of station licensees and the Commission interprets new Section 315 (b) (1) as applying to the combination of licensees in the network as well as to the individual licensees. Thus, charges to legally qualified candidates purchasing network time may not exceed the lowest unit charge for the same class and amount of time for the same period of the broadcast day on a network. Candidates are entitled to be charged not more than the lowest unit rate regardless of the number of times they use the network. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 5)

122. Q. If a candidate makes a contract with a station for lowest unit charge based upon the station's other rate arrangements existing at the time of the contract, and later, at the time when the candidate's spots are actually to be run, low viewer ratings have resulted in a reduced spot rate for the time period or program during which the candidate's spots are to be shown, is the candidate entitled to a rate adjustment based on the fact that the spot rates have dropped even lower since the time of his original contract with the station?

A. Yes. Unlike the regular commercial advertiser who contracts for a fixed and immutable spot rate for the run of his contract, the candidate buying time for a use which is to occur during the 45 or 60 day statutory period is entitled to the full benefit of any lowering of rates which will result in a new and reduced lowest unit charge. It must be kept in mind that it is the rate which prevails at the date of the candidate's actual broadcast use which governs the determination of lowest unit charge. If the price of a spot on the date of use is lower than in the price for which the candidate contracted in advance, the candidate is entitled to the lower price and is to be given a rebate (if the spot has previously been paid for) or



an adjustment (if the spot has not yet been paid for). (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 5).

123. Q. Are stations permitted to charge less than the lowest unit charge during the 45 or 60 day period before an election?

A. Yes. Section 315(b) (1) provides that charges made by stations shall not exceed the lowest unit charge for the same class and amount of time for the same period. Stations are free to charge less than the lowest unit charge. However, if they do, they must give the same low rate to other candidates for all offices purchasing the same class and amount of time for the same period. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 22). The Commission has ruled, for example, that a station may not charge candidates from outlying portions of its service area less than its lowest unit charge while continuing to charge "close in" candidates its full lowest unit charge, even though the station is only seeking to encourage political debate. (*Marmet Professional Corp.*, 40 R.R. 2d 1219 [1977]).

#### EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES AND LOWEST UNIT CHARGE

The questions and answers presented above have focused solely upon the manner in which a station arrives at a determination of the lowest unit charge in a situation where there has been no request for "equal opportunity" the determination of the lowest unit charge may become more complicated. In the questions and answers to follow, this second aspect of the lowest unit charge will be discussed. In order to present this subject comprehensively, a discussion of the phrase "charges made for comparable use", as used in the Campaign Communications Reform Act, must be considered as well.

124. Q. Under what circumstances does the "charges made for comparable use" provision of Section 315(b) (2) apply?

A. Unlike the lowest unit charge provision, the provision in the law for "charges made for comparable use" has no restrictions and applies to all broadcast uses by legally qualified candidates for public office which occur outside the 45 or 60 day statutory period; thus, a candidate's broadcast appearances which relate to a forthcoming election more than 45 or 60 days away or to a forthcoming nomination for election by a convention or caucus of a political party held to nominate a candidate would both receive charges based upon a comparable use. (F.C.C. Guideline V. 3; VI. 25).

125. Q. If Candidate A purchases time for broadcast appearances to occur prior to the 45 or 60 day statutory period and pays for the time on the basis of "comparable use", what would opponent Candidate B pay for spot announcements purchased on the basis of an "equal opportunity" request and broadcast during the 45 or 60 day statutory period during which the lowest unit charge applies?

A. Ordinarily, when a candidate makes a request for "equal opportunity", he is entitled to the same

amount of time upon the same rate terms as his opponent received. However, the Campaign Communications Reform Act may (in certain instances) change this result insofar as the rates are concerned. Thus, if as in the example offered, Candidate B's broadcasts are to take place during the time in which the lowest unit charge applies, Candidate B will be charged on the basis of the lowest unit charge prevailing at the time of his broadcast use. Although the Commission's rules provide that "... no licensee shall make any discrimination between candidates in charges ..." (Section [c] of F.C.C. Rule 73.1940, the difference in rates charged Candidates A and B does not amount to discrimination under the Commission's rules since the difference is a result of rates set by statute. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 7).

126. Q. If during the 60 day statutory period preceding a general election, the rates of a station, pursuant to normal business practices, change from summer to higher fall rates, and the lowest unit charge is less before the rate change than after the rate change, what rates would be charged to Candidate A who buys time for broadcast during the statutory period but *prior* to the rate increase and to opponent Candidate B who makes an "equal opportunity" request for a broadcast use also to take place during the statutory period but *after* the rate increase?

A. Although in situations not involving "equal opportunity" the lowest unit charge for candidates using the station prior to the seasonal rate change is based on summer rates, and for those using the station after the change is based on fall rates, the situation is different in cases involving "equal opportunity." The candidate in such a situation is entitled to be charged the same lower summer rate as the candidate to whom he is responding. Therefore, in the example offered, Candidate B must be charged the same rate as Candidate A. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 8).

127. Q. If during the 45 day statutory period preceding a primary election, the rates of a station, pursuant to normal business practices, change from spring rates to lower summer rates, and the lowest unit charge is lower after the rate change than before the rate change, what rates would be charged to Candidate A who buys time for broadcast during the statutory period but *prior* to the rate decrease and to opponent Candidate B who makes an "equal opportunities" request for a broadcast use also to take place during the statutory period but *after* the rate decrease?

A. Again, if no "equal opportunity" were involved, the lowest unit charge for candidates using the station prior to the seasonal rate change would be based on spring rates, and for those using the station after the rate change would be based on summer rates. However, even where "equal opportunity" is involved in the fact situation here the same

result is obtained. Candidate A is to be charged based on the spring rates and Candidate B is to be charged based on the summer rates. The result obtained is thus directly the opposite of that in Q. and A. 113. The reason for the result lies in the fact that Section 315(b) (1) of the law states that, during the statutory period, the charges made for the use of any broadcasting station by a candidate shall *not exceed* the lowest unit charge (for the same class and amount of time for the same period). If Candidate B were charged the same rate for his broadcast time as Candidate A, the charge would be based on the higher spring rates and would *exceed* the summer lowest unit charge prevailing at the time of Candidate B's use. The law thus serves to set a ceiling on the rate which Candidate B can be charged.

*Note:* The answers to Q's and A's 126 and 127 would also be applicable to rate changes based on audience surveys. The conclusion to be drawn from these Q.'s and A.'s can be stated as follows: If a candidate buys time for a broadcast use to occur during the statutory period, and his opponent makes an "equal opportunity" request for a broadcast use also to take place during the statutory period, both candidates will be charged the same rate based upon the lowest unit charge prevailing at the time of the first candidate's broadcast use unless at the time of the opponent's broadcast use, the station's rates have decreased as a result of seasonality or audience surveys thus creating a more favorable lowest unit charge; the opponent candidate then by law has the benefit of that new more favorable lowest unit charge.

128. Q. During the 60-day period preceding a general election, the rates of a station, pursuant to normal business practices, change from summer to higher fall rates. The lowest unit charges are therefore less before the rate change than afterwards. Candidate A purchases 50 fixed-position, 1-minute spots in prime time to be aired before the rate change. Pursuant to Section 315(a), Candidate B requests "equal opportunity" to respond to Candidate A in fixed-position, 1-minute spots in prime time to be aired after the seasonal rate change. Candidate B requests 100 such spots. At what rate is Candidate B charged?

A. Candidate B is entitled to 50 such spots at the rate charged Candidate A to satisfy the "equal opportunity" requirement. For the remaining 50 spots he may be charged not more than the lowest unit rate based on the higher fall rates. It should be noted that the sale to Candidate B of 50 spots at the low summer rates to satisfy the "equal opportunity" requirement does not affect the rates to be charged him or other candidates using the station after the change to the higher fall rates on other than an "equal opportunity" basis. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 9).

129. Q. A candidate contracts with a station for use of its facilities during a period 60 days prior to a

general election. The contract specifies no set rate to be charged, but instead, provides that the rate to be charged will not exceed the lowest unit charge being made on the date(s) contracted for. May such contracts be entered into by stations?

A. Yes. There is nothing in the new law concerning the type of contract a station may enter into with a candidate. (However, a contract providing that regardless of the lowest unit charge being made on the date of use by the candidate the candidate must pay a higher rate specified in the contract would be contrary to the public policy established by the new law.)

130. Q. Candidate A purchases through an advertising agency spot announcements to be broadcast during the statutory period and pays \$100 based upon a computation of lowest unit charge which included, as the law permits, the 15% agency commission, thus, netting the station \$85. Candidate B, requesting "equal opportunity" for a broadcast use also to occur during the statutory period, makes his purchase of time directly from the station without the benefit of an agency. Does "equal opportunity" demand that Candidate B also be charged the same \$100 lowest unit charge received by A which would include the 15% agency commission?

A. No. Candidate B would pay only \$85 since as to him the lowest unit charge does not include an agency commission. The result obtained is thus directly contrary to that achieved in a situation involving "equal opportunity" wholly outside the statutory period, when the lowest unit charge does not apply. (See Q. and A. 143, p. 24). The reason why Candidate B is insulated from payment of a rate equivalent to that paid by Candidate A is that the Campaign Communications Reform Act specifies that the charges made to a candidate during the statutory period may not *exceed* the lowest unit charge (for the same class and amount of time for the same period). In this regard, the Commission has ruled that if a candidate uses an advertising agency, the lowest unit charge as to him always includes the combined sum of the agency commission and the time charge; for a candidate not using an agency, the lowest unit charge is limited solely to the time charge. (See Q. and A. 113, p. 19). If Candidate B were thus charged Candidate A's lowest unit charge, the charge to Candidate B would *exceed* the particular lowest unit charge normally applicable to B. (F.C.C. Guideline VI. 16).

#### CHARGES MADE FOR COMPARABLE USE

The questions and answers in the immediately preceding section have focused exclusively upon the manner in which a station arrives at a determination of the rates which candidates are to be charged when the broadcast use of a candidate requesting "equal opportunity" falls within the statutory period during which the lowest unit charge applies. In the questions and answers to follow, the matter of



the rates to be charged candidates will be discussed from the perspective of the broadcast use of a candidate requesting "equal opportunity" which falls *outside* the statutory period when the lowest unit charge applies. The discussion to follow merely represents a restatement of the familiar and long-standing "equal opportunities" requirements which prevailed in the situation of *all* broadcast appearances by legally qualified candidates prior to enactment of the Campaign Communications Reform Act and which now pertain only in the situation of broadcast uses by candidates which occur outside the 45 or 60 day statutory period.

**131. Q.** May a station charge premium rates for political broadcasts which occur outside the 45 or 60 day statutory period?

**A.** No. Section 315(b) (2) provides that the charges made for the use of a station by a candidate outside the statutory period "shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes."

**132. Q.** Does the above requirement apply to political broadcasts by persons other than legally qualified candidates?

**A.** Yes. In the past this requirement has applied only to candidates for public office. At one time the Commission ruled that a station may adopt whatever policy it desires for political broadcasts by spokespersons for a candidate, or by organizations or persons who are not candidates for office, consistent with its obligation to operate in the public interest. (Letter to *Congressman Diggs, Jr.*, 40 F.C.C. 265 [1955]). However, today such a discriminatory policy against political broadcasts by persons other than candidates to the extent that such persons would be subjected to *higher* rates than commercial advertisers probably would be unacceptable. The thrust of the Campaign Communications Reform Act taken together with current F.C.C. attitudes towards political broadcasting suggests that a station should not establish premium rates for political broadcasts by persons other than candidates. Instead, a station's charges to such individuals should be based on charges made for a comparable use.

**133. Q.** May a station with both "national" and "local" rates charge a candidate for local office its "national" rate?

**A.** No. A station may not charge a candidate more than the rate the station would charge if the candidate were a commercial advertiser whose advertising was directed to promoting its business within the same area as that within which persons may vote for the particular office for which such person is a candidate. (Letter to *Waldo E. Spence*, 40 F.C.C. 392 [1964]).

**134. Q.** Considering the limited geographical area which a member of the House of Representatives serves, must candidates for the House be charged the "local" instead of the "national" rate?

**A.** This question cannot be answered categorically. To determine the maximum rates which could be charged under Section 315, the Commission would have to know the criteria a station uses in classifying "local" versus "national" advertisers before it could determine what are "comparable charges." In making this determination, the Commission does not prescribe rates but merely requires equality of treatment as between Section 315 broadcasts and commercial advertising. (Letter to *Congressman Simpson*, 40 F.C.C. 286 [1957]).

**135. Q.** Is a political candidate entitled to receive discounts?

**A.** Yes. Political candidates are entitled to the same discounts that would be accorded persons other than candidates for public office under the conditions specified, as well as to such special discounts for programs coming within Section 315 as the station may choose to give on a nondiscriminatory basis. (Letter to *Waldo E. Spence*, 40 F.C.C. 392 [1964]).

**136. Q.** If candidate A purchases ten time segments over a station which offers a discount rate for purchase of that amount of time, is candidate B entitled to the discount rate if he purchases less time than the minimum to which discounts are applicable?

**A.** No. A station is, under such circumstances, only required to make available the discount privileges to each legally qualified candidate on the same basis.

**137. Q.** If a station has a "spot" rate of two dollars per "spot" announcement, with a rate reduction to one dollar if 100 or more such "spots" are purchased on a bulk time sales contract, and if one candidate arranges with an advertiser having such a bulk time contract to utilize five of these spots at the one dollar rate, is the station obligated to sell the candidates of other parties for the same office time at the same one dollar rate?

**A.** Yes. Other legally qualified candidates are entitled to take advantage of the same reduced rate. (F.C.C. letter to *Senator Monroney*, 40 F.C.C. 252 [1952]).

**138. Q.** Where a group of candidates for different offices pool their resources to purchase a block of time at a discount, and an individual candidate opposing one of the group seeks time on the station, to what rate is he entitled?

**A.** He is entitled to be charged the same rate as his opponent, since the provisions of Section 315 run to candidates themselves and they are entitled to be treated equally with their individual opponents. (F.C.C. *Report and Order*, Docket 11092, 40 F.C.C. 1075 [1954]).

**139. Q.** A station carries "run of schedule" spots (ROS) at its convenience and discretion, without any guarantee of placement, and makes such spots available to commercial advertisers at a reduced rate

under a package agreement. On the basis that equal opportunities could not be guaranteed to opponents, could the station refuse to sell ROS spots to federal candidates?

A. No. ROS spots must be made available to federal candidates to the extent available to commercial advertisers. (See Q. and A. 158.)

The Commission has stressed that Section 315 requires that "equal opportunities" be afforded rival candidates. Therefore, where one candidate purchases ROS spots, "equal opportunities" does not require that opposing candidates be permitted to purchase, at ROS rates, the same time periods actually obtained by the first candidate on a chance basis. Equal opportunities are satisfied by affording the other candidates an equivalent number of ROS spots at ROS rates or comparable time periods to those of the first candidate at the prescribed rates for such time periods. Such candidates, after being fully informed of the nature of these ROS spots, could then determine whether they wished to purchase them, with their uncertain times of presentation, or to purchase spots at fixed times with the higher rates charged for such spots. If ROS spots are chosen, the licensee must, of course, act in good faith and scrupulously follow normal procedures in the allotment of the ROS spots. (Letter to *Triangle Publications, Inc.*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 760 [1967]).

140. Q. A licensee informed the Commission that it sold both preemptible and nonpreemptible spot announcements to commercial advertisers on time available basis and the purchase orders specify the times of their broadcast. However, nonpreemptible spot purchasers can select any time previously scheduled for preemptible time spots in addition to other available times. If the preemptible spots were subsequently preempted no charge was made for them. The licensee did not sell preemptible spots to candidates because it reasoned that if one candidate for public office purchased preemptible spot announcements and they were actually used by him, equal opportunity would require that his opponent be permitted to buy spots at preemptible spot prices and have them broadcast when scheduled regardless of whether or not a purchaser of nonpreemptible spots requested that availability. Could the licensee refuse to sell preemptible spot announcements to political candidates?

A. No. If the licensee sells both preemptible and nonpreemptible spot announcements to commercial advertisers it must make them both available to political candidates at the same rates charged commercial advertisers. However, Section 315(b) of the Communications Act does not require the sale of nonpreemptible spots at preemptible spot rates. If one political candidate buys preemptible spots and they are broadcast, his opponents are entitled to buy preemptible or nonpreemptible spots. If the opponents desire to make certain that their spots will

be broadcast, nonpreemptible spots at nonpreemptible rates should be made available to them. But if the opponents buy preemptible spots and they are preempted by nonpreemptible spots, these opponents are then entitled to buy a number of spots equal to those broadcast by the first candidate, but now they must pay the higher nonpreemptible rates. (Letter to *WHDH, Inc.*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 763 [1967]).

141. Q. When a candidate and his immediate family own all the stock in a corporate licensee and the candidate is the president and general manager, can he pay for time to the corporate licensee from which he derives his income and have the licensee make a similar charge to an opposing candidate?

A. Yes. The fact that a candidate has a financial interest in a corporate licensee does not affect the licensee's obligation under Section 315. Thus, the rates which the licensee may charge to other legally qualified candidates will be governed by the rate which the stockholder candidate actually pays to the licensee. If no charge is made to the stockholder candidate, it follows that other legally qualified candidates are entitled to equal time without charge. (Letter to *Charles W. Stratton*, 40 F.C.C. 288 [1957]).

142. Q. A political candidate purchased time through an advertising public relations agency which he heads. Since he shares in the profit, would the 15-percent agency commission be a "rebate" and thereby become a violation of Section 315?

A. No. There is no Commission rule or regulation which would prevent or forbid a political candidate from using the services of his own advertising agency. (Letter to *Jason L. Shrinsky*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 770 [1966]).

143. Q. A station regularly does business through advertising agencies and gives its customary commission. For example, candidate A purchases \$100 worth of time through an agency. The station received \$85. Candidate B, not utilizing an agency, demands the same amount of time from the station for \$85. Is he entitled to it?

A. No. The law requires that each candidate be afforded time upon equal terms. Here, following its customary practice, the station has accepted A's time purchase through a recognized agency. The fact that the station receives only \$85 has no bearing on the fact that the cost to A was \$100. B is entitled to the same terms, no more, no less. It should be noted that the result obtained here is directly the opposite of that achieved in a situation when the "lowest unit charge" applies. (See Q. and A. 130)

144. Q. A licensee adopted and has consistently maintained a policy whereby agency commissions were not paid in connection with political advertising placed by recognized advertising agencies on behalf of a candidate for local office. It adopted and has consistently maintained a similar policy with respect to agency commission in connection with local commercial advertising. The station's most recent



local retail rate card indicates that its established policy is "all rates net to station." Therefore, a candidate who utilized an advertising agency would pay the same station rate as one who did not, but the advertising agency would charge its client-candidate the station rate plus 15-percent agency commission. Is this policy consistent with the mandates of Section 315 of the Act and the rules?

A. Yes. Because the station's rate policy is applicable to both commercial and political advertising, such policy does not contravene Section 315 of the Act nor the Rules. (*In re KSEE*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 762 [1968]).

145. Q. A station adopted and maintained a policy under which commissions were not paid to advertising agencies in connection with political advertising although it did pay such commissions in connection with commercial advertising. Further, in the case of commercial advertisers, the station performed those functions which the advertising agency would normally perform, but in the case of political advertisers, the station performed no such services. An agency which had placed political advertising over the station in a recent election made a demand of the station for payment of the agency commission. Was the station's policy consistent with Section 315 of the Communications Act?

A. No. The Commission has held that such a policy violated both Section 315(b) of the Act and F.C.C. Rule 73.1940; that the benefits accruing to a candidate from the use of an advertising agency were neither remote, intangible nor insubstantial; and that while under the station's policy, a commercial advertiser would, in addition to broadcast time, receive the services of an advertising agency merely by paying the station's established card rate, the political advertiser, in return for payment of the same card

rate, would receive only broadcast time. The Commission held that such a resultant inequality in treatment vis-a-vis commercial advertisers is clearly prohibited by the Act and the Rules. (Letter to *Marcus Cohn, Esq.*, 40 FCC 388 [1964]).

146. Q. A station increased its advertising rates 30 percent on August 1. Some legally qualified candidates had purchased time before the rate change for use in the month of August. If their opposing legally qualified candidates request "equal opportunities" based on the use of this time, can they be charged the increased rate for time?

A. No. The rate charged these opposing candidates must be the rate charged their political opponents. Therefore, they should pay the rate in effect before the price change.

147. Q. Time is sold to candidate A for a "talkathon." Candidate B demands an equal allotment of time, and arrangements are made to sell comparable time to him at the same rate as it was sold to A. B uses part of his time and then cancels his order for the remainder. When billed for time, B insists that he was under no obligation to pay for unused time on the theory that the station has suffered no loss because, under Section 315, the station was required to keep time available to him on call. Is B correct?

A. No. It is true that a station having sold time to one candidate should stand ready to sell comparable time to his opponent. But it does not follow that a candidate, having committed himself to paying for the use of specific time, can break a contract and renege on the ground that the station was obligated to hold it open for him. Under these circumstances, the station is not obligated to hold any specific time segment open and is entitled to require the same contract and the same provisions for cancellation as in the case of commercial users.

## J

### Reasonable Access

The Campaign Communications Reform Act of 1971 added a new subsection (7) to Section 312(a) of the Communications Act. The new subsection specifies that a station license may be revoked "[f]or willful or repeated failure to allow reasonable access to or to permit purchase of reasonable amounts of time for the use of a broadcasting station by a legally qualified candidate for federal elective office on behalf of his candidacy." In the questions and answers that follow, the shorthand term "reasonable access" will be used to refer to the full statutory Section 312(a)(7).

148. Q. To what candidates do the reasonable access provisions of Section 312(a) apply?

A. The provisions apply only to legally qualified candidates for federal elective office.

149. Q. What are the access rights of state and local candidates?

A. "Stations are expected to devote times to campaigns of state and local candidates in proportion to the significance of the campaigns and the amount of public interest in them. However, the law does not require stations to permit access to candidates for every non-federal office, whereas it does require them to permit access to all candidates for federal office if the candidate requests it."

"Regardless of whether candidates are for federal or non-federal office, a station may not refuse all requests for time simply because they do not fit into the station's particular format. For example, a station that normally broadcasts only music and spot announcements will not be meeting its obligations if

it refuses to accept or schedule any political discussion running longer than one minute." (*Public Notice*, "The Law of Political Broadcasting and Cablecasting." 69 F.C.C. 2d 2209, 2286-87.

150. Q. For purposes of reasonable access, who is a legally qualified candidate for federal elective office?

A. The definition of "a legally qualified candidate" for federal elective office is the same for purposes of reasonable access as for purposes of equal opportunity or "lowest unit charge." See Part I.B of this Catechism, p. 4. (F.C.C. Guideline VII. 2). However, a person requesting time need only be a legally qualified candidate at the actual time of the broadcast, not when the request is made. (*Carter-Mondale Presidential Committee v. ABC, CBS and NBC*, \_\_\_\_ F.C.C.2d \_\_\_\_, FCC 79-750, November 21, 1979, para. 30.)

151. Q. Does the provision for reasonable access apply to persons or groups requesting access to or purchase of time on a station for themselves as spokespersons on behalf of a candidate?

A. No. The provision applies only to requests for "use" of a station by a federal candidate. The standard of what constitutes a "use" of a station for purposes of administering reasonable access is the same as the standard concerning "equal opportunities" and "lowest unit charge," i.e. the use must involve an identified or identifiable appearance by the candidate through his voice or image. (F.C.C. Guideline VIII. 4).

152. Q. What right of access should be afforded by a station to individuals who are merely spokespersons or supporters of candidates?

A. Such individuals have no right of access under Section 312(a) (7). The station thus must govern its conduct by the "public interest, convenience, or necessity" standard of Sections 307 and 309 of the Communications Act discussed in Q. and A. 149. See also letter to *Nicholas Zapple*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 707 (1970). (F.C.C. Guideline VIII. 4.).

153. Q. How is a station to comply with the requirement of Section 312(a) (7) that he give reasonable access to his station to, or permit the purchase of reasonable amounts of time by, candidates for Federal elective office?

A. The Commission has stated that "reasonable access" cannot be defined exactly because what is "reasonable" in one case may not be "reasonable" in a different set of circumstances. For example, a station covering only a couple of campaigns for federal office would be expected to provide greater access to each federal candidate than a station covering numerous campaigns for federal office with a multiplicity of candidates (See *Public Notice*, 43 RR 2d 1353, 1395).

The Commission has stated:

Congress clearly did not intend, to take the extreme case, that during the closing days of a cam-

paign stations should be required to accommodate requests for political time to the exclusion of all or most other types of programming or advertising. Important as an informed electorate is in our society, there are other elements in the public interest standard, and the public is entitled to other kinds of programming than political. It was not intended that all or most time be preempted for political broadcasts. The foregoing appears to be the only definite statement that may be made about the new section, since no all-embracing standard can be set. The test of whether a licensee has met the requirement of the new section is one of reasonableness. The Commission will not substitute its judgment for that of the licensee, but, rather, it will determine in any case that may arise whether the licensee can be said to have acted reasonably and in good faith in fulfilling his obligations under this section.

We are aware of the fact that a myriad of situations can arise that will present difficult problems. One conceivable method of trying to act reasonably and in good faith might be for licensees, prior to an election campaign for federal offices, to meet with candidates in an effort to work out the problem of reasonable access for them on their stations. Such conferences might cover, among other things, the subjects of the amount of time that the station proposes to sell or give candidates, the amount and types of its other programming, the 7-day rule, and the amount of advertising it proposes to sell to commercial advertisers." (Licensee Responsibility As to Political Broadcasts, 15 F.C.C. 2d 94 [1968]).

154. Q. How will the FCC determine whether the licensee acted reasonably and in good faith?

A. The Commission has placed upon the broadcaster the burden of proving that it has acted reasonably. The broadcaster must file, "in response to a complaint, a full explanation" of its decision. That explanation must show that the broadcaster considered the individual needs of the candidate (as expressed by the candidate), the amount of time provided to the candidate previously, the potential disruption of regular programming, the number of other candidates likely to invoke equal opportunity rights, and the timing of the request. *CBS v. FCC*, \_\_\_\_ F.2d \_\_\_\_, D.C. Cir. No. 79-2403, March 14, 1980.

155. Q. May a station establish a campaign coverage period and refuse to provide reasonable access before that period commences?

A. No. If the campaign is underway, reasonable access must be given. The Commission will decide whether the campaign is underway and when the statutory obligations attach. It will consider factors such as announcements of candidacy, the establishment of campaign organizations, fund raising activities, endorsements, media coverage, and (where applicable) the progress of the delegate selection process. (*Carter-Mondale Presidential Committee*,



*Inc.*, \_\_\_\_ F.C.C.2d \_\_\_\_, FCC 79-750, November 21, 1979, *recon. denied*, \_\_\_\_ F.C.C.2d \_\_\_\_, FCC 79-773, November 28, 1979, *aff'd. sub nom.*, *CBS v. FCC*, \_\_\_\_ F.2d \_\_\_\_, D.C. Cir. No. 79-2403, March 14, 1980.) Reasonable access must be provided *at least* 45 days before a primary and *at least* 60 days before a general or special election.

156. Q. May a licensee adopt a rigid policy of refusing to sell or give *prime time program time* to federal candidates?

A. No. In its *Public Notice* (43 RR 2d 1353, 1395), the Commission stated,

Both commercial and noncommercial educational stations must make available program time during prime-time periods unless unusual circumstances exist. The Commission has recognized that there may be situations where the number of candidates in a federal election may make it impossible for a station to make prime-time program time available, and the Commission will continue to make exceptions to the prime-time program time policy where circumstances dictate. ("Prime time" for purposes of enforcement of the reasonable access statute means the part or parts of the day in which the audience is likely to be largest. For TV, the 7-11 p.m. period is recognized as prime time in the Eastern and Pacific time zones, and the 6-10 p.m. period in the Central and Mountain time zones. For radio, prime time usually means "drive time," the periods when most persons are driving to or from work.)

157. Q. Must a station make prime time (or drive time) spots available to federal candidates?

A. Yes. Commercial stations must make prime time spot announcements available to federal candidates. (*Public Notice*, 43 RR 2d 1353, 1396).

158. Q. May a station refuse to sell certain types and lengths of spots to federal candidates?

A. No. Stations may not adopt a policy that flatly bans federal candidates from access to the types, lengths and classes of time which they sell to commercial advertisers. However, this does not mean a station must sell federal candidates everything they request. Thus, for example, a station which sells fixed position spots to commercial advertisers must sell some fixed position spots to federal candidates, but need not grant every request for fixed position spots by a federal candidate.

159. Q. Must a station sell program time to a federal candidate even though it does not offer program time to anyone else?

A. Yes. It is not enough for the licensee to argue that, since it does not sell program time to commercial advertisers, it does not have to sell such time to political candidates. Reasonable access imposes an affirmative obligation on licensees, standing inde-

pendently of their commercial practices. (*D. J. Leary*, 69 F.C.C. 2d 1265, 44 R.R. 2d 8331 [1978]).

160. Q. Is a station required to sell programs of any length requested by federal candidate?

A. Not necessarily. For example, where a station had adopted a policy permitting legally qualified candidates for federal elective office to purchase reasonable amounts of prime time programming, it was not unreasonable of the station to refuse one candidate's request to purchase a 4½ hour block of programming for a political telethon. (*Honorable Pete Flaherty*, 48 F.C.C. 2d 838 [1974]).

161. Q. If a commercial station gives reasonable amounts of free time to candidates for federal elective office, must it also permit purchase of reasonable amounts of time?

A. No. A commercial station is required either to provide reasonable amounts of free time or permit purchase of reasonable amounts of time. It is not required to do both. However, the Commission has stated:

If a commercial station chooses to donate rather than sell time to candidates, it must make available to Federal candidates under the reasonable access statute free spot time of the various lengths, classes and periods which are available to commercial advertisers.

(*Public Notice*, 43 RR 2d 1353, 1396)

162. Q. May a federal candidate demand placement of his spots at a specific time or on a specific program?

A. No. The Commission has ruled that a federal candidate "is not entitled to a particular placement of his or her announcement on a station's broadcast schedule." It recognized that this would be very difficult if a candidate wanted his or her spot placed next to a highly rated program that was broadcast only once, or very rarely and if opposing candidates demanded "equal opportunities." Also some stations do not sell time to candidates during newscasts.

163. Q. Does Section 312(a)(7) on reasonable access apply to noncommercial educational stations, and other nonprofit stations, as well as to commercial stations?

A. Yes. There are no provisions in the Campaign Communications Reform Act exempting such stations, nor is there anything in the legislative history of the Act that would indicate that such an exemption was intended. Both types of stations would be required to give reasonable access to legally qualified candidates for federal elective office. (F.C.C. Guideline VIII. 9).

164. Q. May noncommercial educational stations and nonprofit stations charge for broadcast time by or on behalf of legally qualified candidates for federal elective office?

A. Under the provisions of the Commission rules, noncommercial educational stations operating on channels reserved for noncommercial educational uses are not permitted to levy charges for time—for political broadcasts or otherwise. Some such stations presently are providing political programming without charge, and it appears that as a practical matter the new provision will not greatly alter their practices. On the other hand, those stations that do not engage in such programming will be required under the new law to provide reasonable access to candidates without charge. Noncommercial educational stations that are operating on unreserved channels, and nonprofit stations that are not educational, e.g., those offering religious broadcasting, may charge for political broadcast time (if their charters or articles of incorporation permit them to make time charges) although it is their policy normally not to charge for any time. If they do charge, notice must be given to the Commission of this change in operation. The lowest unit charge provisions of Section 315(b) cannot apply to such stations since they have no rates on which to base such a charge. However, any charges made must be reasonable when viewed in the light of charges made by

commercial stations in the same broadcast service licensed to serve the same community. If the charges made by nonprofit stations are unduly high, it is conceivable that they might be construed as an attempt to circumvent the reasonable access provision of Section 312(a)(7). Noncommercial educational stations and nonprofit stations, whether giving free time for political broadcasts or charging for such time, may make necessary charges for production-oriented services, and for other things of the type mentioned in Q. and A. 112 (F.C.C. Guideline VIII. 10).

165. Q. May the Commission regulate the rates to be charged for political broadcasts?

A. The Commission has held that it has the power to limit a station's rates for programming where there is not already established a lowest unit charge. The Commission has held such rates unreasonable and has placed the burden on the broadcaster to "justify its rate to specific factors if . . . the program rate . . . on its face bears no reasonable relation to the lowest unit charge that is applicable to spot announcements." (*D. J. Leary*, 69 F.C.C. 2d 831, 834 [1978]).



## II. THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE AND POLITICAL BROADCASTS

Any discussion of political broadcasting must involve consideration of the "fairness doctrine." Essentially, the "fairness doctrine" states that when a licensee permits his facilities to be used to air a controversial issue of public importance, he must afford reasonable opportunity for the presentation of contrasting points of view. The treatment of the "fairness doctrine" in this publication will be confined to a narrow examination of four aspects of the "fairness doctrine" which relate to political broadcasts. The four aspects will be taken up in the following headings: 1) controversial issues in general; 2) political editorializing; 3) quasi-equal opportunities ("Zapple" doctrine); and 4) personal attack. There is no attempt in the following questions and answers to present a comprehensive or definitive view on the current status of the "fairness doctrine." The doctrine is often difficult to apply and is in a constant state of development. Since one goal of this *Catechism* is to provide stations with a reliable reference tool in the area of political broadcasts, it was decided that completeness should be sacrificed in the interest of certainty. Therefore, the discussion presented in the sections below represents an exploration of only those areas of the "fairness doctrine" affecting political broadcasting where reliable and final decisions have been reached.

Although the "fairness doctrine" has been in existence since 1949, as stated above it continues to be fraught with uncertainties and must be approached in broad, rather than specific terms. The Commission, aware of this, has attempted to give some clarification of the effect of the "fairness doctrine" vis-a-vis the "equal opportunities" requirements of Section 315. Thus, it has stated:

The fairness doctrine itself deals with the broader question of affording reasonable opportunity for the presentation of contrasting viewpoints on controversial issues of public importance. Generally speaking, it does not apply with the precision of the "equal opportunities" requirement. Rather, the licensee in applying the fairness doctrine, is called upon to make

reasonable judgments in good faith on the facts of each situation—as to whether a controversial issue of public importance is involved, as to what viewpoints have been or should be presented, as to the format and spokesmen to present the viewpoints, and all the other facets of such programming. In passing on any complaint in this area, the Commission's role is not to substitute its judgment for that of the licensee as to any of the above programming decisions, but rather to determine whether the licensee can be said to have acted reasonably and in good faith. There is thus room for considerably more discretion on the part of the licensee under the fairness doctrine than under the "equal opportunities" requirement. (See "Applicability of the Fairness Doctrine in the Handling of Controversial Issues of Public Importance." 40 F.C.C. 598 [1964]).

It is important to keep in mind the distinction between appearances by candidates which involve the precise formula of equal opportunity under Section 315, and the discussion of controversial issues by persons other than candidates, which brings into play the very imprecise formula of the "fairness doctrine." When a candidate appears, equal opportunity is mandatory and Section 315 permits no discretion. When issues are discussed by persons other than candidates, reasonable opportunity comes into play, and the licensee is permitted wide discretion, except to the extent that the rules on personal attack and political editorializing apply.

In July, 1974, the FCC issued its *Fairness Report*, 48 F.C.C. 2d 1 (1974) which restates and clarifies the essential principles and policies of the fairness doctrine. Summarized herein are some of the principal points of the Report. It should be noted that this information is intended only as a very brief and general guide to the current parameters of the fairness doctrine. Any questions which might arise under a particular set of circumstances should be referred to station counsel.

## Controversial Issues in General

166. Q. What obligation does a licensee have in the "fairness doctrine" area?

A. Where broadcast matter is directed at issues rather than individuals, the obligation upon the station is much more general than under the personal attack and political editorializing rules. Here, the licensee is under no obligation to send copies to any particular person or to afford time to any particular group. His obligation is to determine whether opposing points of view, in fact, have been presented over his facilities. This may be achieved in any number of ways; as for example, round-table discussions, news programs, documentaries, etc.

With regard to discharging this obligation, the Commission has said:

The licensee, in applying the fairness doctrine, is called upon to make reasonable judgments in good faith on the facts of each situation—as to whether a controversial issue of public importance is involved, as to what viewpoints have been or should be presented as to the format and spokesman to present the viewpoints, and all the other facets of such programming . . . in passing on any complaint in this area, the Commission's role is not to substitute its judgment for that of the licensee as to any of the above programming decisions, but rather to determine whether the licensee can be said to have acted reasonably and in good faith.

167. Q. What constitutes a "controversial issue of public importance"?

A. The following guidelines are useful in determining what constitutes a "controversial issue of public importance":

(1) An issue is not necessarily one of "public importance" merely because it has received broadcast or newspaper coverage. The degree of media coverage is only one factor to be considered. (2) The Commission suggests that the principal test of "public importance" is "a subjective evaluation of the impact that the issue is likely to have on the community at large." (3) The Commission suggests an objective approach to determining whether an issue is "controversial" is to measure "the degree of attention paid an issue by government officials, community leaders, and the media." (4) Absent unusual circumstances, any issue on which the general public is asked to vote is presumed to be a controversial issue of public importance, e.g., ballot propositions. (5) Discussion of mere private disputes of no consequence to the general public does not trigger the fairness doctrine. (6) An opportunity for fairness response is not required "as a result of offhand or insubstantial statements." The Commission emphasized it is opposed to a "policy of requiring

fairness, statement by statement or inference by inference." (*Fairness Report*, 48 F.C.C. 2d 1 [1974]).

168. Q. What is the controversial issue of public importance in an election campaign?

A. While campaign issues may raise several controversial issues of public importance, the primary issue will be, "Who, among all of the candidates running for a particular office, should be elected?" There will be at least as many viewpoints on that issue as there are candidates. *U.S. Labor Party v. KIXI and KING-TV*, 57 F.C.C. 2d 1273 (1976).

169. Q. Does the fairness doctrine apply to statements made in candidate uses?

A. No. The Commission has stated specifically that the fairness doctrine does not apply to candidate uses.

170. Q. Does the mere fact that a particular subject is "newsworthy" establish that subject as a controversial issue of public importance to which the fairness doctrine would apply?

A. No. "Newsworthiness" and "controversial issue of public importance" are not synonymous terms. A licensee in its editorial judgment may elect to give broadcast coverage to a story which, although it embraces a matter of dispute or controversy, does not rise to the level of an issue of public importance. To permit any other conclusion, would deluge the broadcast media with fairness doctrine complaints premised upon the redress of mere private disputes. Such a situation both would interfere with the licensee's primary duty to operate in the public interest and would inhibit the "robust public debate" which the fairness doctrine was designed to promote. (*Dorothy Healey v. FCC*, 460 F.2d 917 [1972]).

171. Q. Does the "fairness doctrine" apply only to local controversial issues?

A. No. The keystone of the fairness doctrine and of the public interest is the right of the public to be informed—to have presented to it the "conflicting views of public importance." Where a licensee permits the use of its facilities for the expression of views on controversial local, regional or national issues of public importance, he must afford reasonable opportunities for the presentation of contrasting views by spokespersons for other responsible groups. (Letter to *Cullman Broadcasting Co., Inc.*, 40 F.C.C. 576 [1963]).

172. Q. Which principle is applied to political spot announcements when candidates do not appear therein?—The "fairness doctrine" or Section 315?

A. The fairness doctrine is to be applied in such a situation. The "equal opportunities" provision of Section 315 applies only to uses by candidates and not to those speaking in behalf of or against can-



didates. When spot announcements do not contemplate the appearance of a candidate, the "equal opportunities" provision of Section 315 would not be applicable. The "fairness doctrine," however, is applicable. (Letter to *Lawrence M. C. Smith*, 40 F.C.C. 549 [1963]). The so-called "Zapple Doctrine" also may be applicable. (See Section II.C, below).

**173. Q.** Does the "fairness doctrine" require that equal time be afforded to opposing viewpoints?

**A.** The licensee is not required to provide "equal time" for the various points of view. The Commission believes that no precise mathematical time ratio (e.g., 3 to 1, or 5 to 1) is appropriate for all cases. The licensee is expected to exercise good faith and reasonableness in considering the particular facts and circumstances of each case. One approach which the Commission regards as patently unreasonable is "consistently to present one side in prime time and to relegate the contrasting viewpoint to periods outside prime time." It also suggests there can be an imbalance from the sheer weight on one side as against the other stemming from the total amount of time afforded, the frequency of presentation, the size of the listening audience, or of a combination of factors. (*Fairness Report*, 48 F.C.C. 2d 1, 16, 17 [1974]).

**174. Q.** Must a licensee afford reasonable opportunity for presentation of all viewpoints in an issue?

**A.** No. Where there may be several different contrasting viewpoints or shades of opinion on a given issue, the licensee is not expected to afford an opportunity for presentation of all these views. The Commission expects the licensee to make a good faith effort to identify the "major viewpoints and shades of opinion" being debated in the community and afford provision for their presentation. (*Fairness Report*, 48 F.C.C. 2d 1, 15 [1974]).

**175. Q.** Must all sides of a controversial issue be presented on the same program?

**A.** No. The licensee is given wide discretion in choosing the methods by which discussion of controversial issues is presented. The Commission concluded that any rigid requirement in this respect would seriously limit the ability of the licensee to serve the public interest. "Forum and roundtable discussions, while often excellent techniques of presenting a fair cross section of differing viewpoints on a given issue, are not the only appropriate devices for . . . discussion, and in some circumstances may not be particularly appropriate or advantageous." (*Report on Editorializing by Broadcast Licenses*, 25 R.R. 1901 [1960]).

**176. Q.** How, then, does the Commission determine whether fairness has been achieved on a specific issue?

**A.** The licensee's overall performance is considered. Thus, where complaint is made, the licensee is afforded the opportunity to set out all the programs,

irrespective of the programming format, which he has devoted to the particular controversial issue during the appropriate time period. Regular news programs and in some cases even entertainment programs may contain discussion of one side of a controversial issue. (Letter to *Cullman Broadcasting Co.*, 40 F.C.C. 576 [1963]; letter to *Hon. Oren Harris*, 40 F.C.C. 582 [1963]).

**177. Q.** Does the licensee have any discretion in choosing a spokesperson?

**A.** The Commission has refused to establish standards for selecting appropriate spokespersons for opposing views but reminds licensees that they have a duty not "to stack the deck" by deliberate selections which favor one viewpoint at the expense of the other. The Commission looks toward the selection of "genuine partisans who actually believe in what they are saying." Though the *Fairness Report* does not rule out individual instances of a licensee presenting opposing views itself, it would regard as unacceptable a "policy of excluding partisan voices and always itself [the licensee] presenting views in a bland, inoffensive manner." Notably, the Commission has rejected the concept of a mandated access, either free or paid, for persons or groups wishing to express a viewpoint on a controversial issue of public importance. It concluded that the public interest would best be served "through continued reliance on the fairness doctrine which leaves questions of access and the specific handling of public issues to the licensee's journalistic discretion."

**178. Q.** May a licensee justify his failure to present an opposing viewpoint on the grounds that no appropriate spokesperson is available?

**A.** A licensee may legitimately fail to present an opposing viewpoint on the ground that no appropriate spokesperson is available. However, in such cases, he should be prepared to show that he made a diligent, good faith effort to communicate to such potential spokespersons his willingness to present their opposing views. Furthermore, in cases involving "major issues discussed in depth" this showing should include specific offers of response time to appropriate individuals in *addition to* general over-the-air announcements. Previous rulings indicate this extra obligation also applies where the licensee has presented its side of an issue in which it has a personal stake.

**179. Q.** How can a licensee go about finding a spokesperson who is willing to present opposing views?

**A.** The Commission has refused to establish a formula for all broadcasters to follow in their efforts to find a spokesperson for an opposing viewpoint. Various approaches or combinations thereof are generally acceptable, such as the following:

1. Announcements at the beginning or ending (or both) of programs presenting opinions on controversial issues that opportunity will be made available

for the expression of contrasting views upon request by responsible representatives of those views. However, announcements alone are insufficient in cases involving "major issues discussed in depth" or in which a licensee has presented its side of an issue in which it has a personal stake. (See Q. and A. 178).

2. Contacting individuals or groups who are known to have opinions contrary to those expressed on the station and offering reasonable time for a response.

3. Consulting with community leaders as to who might be an appropriate individual or group to respond on a given issue. (*Fairness Report*, 48 F.C.C. 2d 1, 14-16 [1974]).

180. Q. If one side of a controversial issue is presented, must free time be given for the discussion of the other side?

A. The Commission has stated that if the "fairness doctrine" has any validity, its fulfillment cannot be predicated upon the ability to pay although the licensee may explore the possibility of payment for the time used to respond. Thus, where the licensee has chosen to broadcast a sponsored program which for the first time presents one side of a controversial issue, he cannot reject a presentation otherwise suitable—and thus leave the public uninformed—on the grounds that he cannot obtain paid sponsorship for that presentation. (Letter to *Cullman Broadcasting Co., Inc.*, 40 F.C.C. 576 [1963]).

181. Q. If one side of a controversial issue is presented, does the licensee have any duties prior to a demand for an opportunity to present the other side?

A. Yes. This obligation cannot be met "merely through the adoption of a general policy of not refusing to broadcast opposing views where a demand is made of the station for broadcast time." The licensee must play a "conscious and positive role in encouraging the presentation of opposing viewpoints." (*Fairness Report*, 48 F.C.C. 2d 1, 1, 14 [1974]).

182. Is there any policy which a licensee can follow to meet his responsibilities regarding controversial issues under the "fairness doctrine"?

A. Since compliance with the "fairness doctrine" is left to each individual broadcaster, and since so many cases depend on their own particular facts, no one policy can be recommended uniformly. However, the Commission has written to one broadcaster stating that the following policy indicates that the broadcaster is fulfilling the obligations set forth in the *Report on Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees*, 25 RR 1901 (1949):

(a) By presenting discussion programs for which participants are sought out who will present contrasting viewpoints;

(b) By offering other time periods to specific persons who have viewpoints contrasting with

those expressed on the station's editorials, "where in the opinion of the station the issue warrants it";

(c) By broadcasting the "Editorial Mailbag" for which members of the public with opposing viewpoints are encouraged to send in their views; and

(d) By concluding each editorial with an announcement which makes known to members of the public that the station invites rebuttals by responsible groups and individuals. (Letter to *WFTV-TV*, December 3, 1964, Public Notice 60503.) But see Q's & A's 178 and 179).

This does not mean that all of the above are necessary in order to achieve compliance. Rather, licensees should use the examples set forth as guides for the formulation of their own policies.

183. Q. A ballot proposition in your state has aroused considerable controversy and you have covered both sides of the issue fully in your news and programming. A week prior to the vote on this issue the proponents request the purchase of 100 spots to be broadcast during the next few days before the vote. You sell them the 100 spots. The opponents have purchased newspaper space to express their views but are not interested in purchasing broadcast spots to counter the proponents. However, they do request free time on your station to respond. Must you make some free time available?

A. The Commission pointed out in its *Fairness Report* that if a station chooses to yield its facilities to one side of a ballot proposition for a so-called "blitz," then an imbalance is created and some opportunity for response must be afforded the other side. The licensee, however, retains considerable flexibility regarding the amount of time, format, spokesperson, and placement of opposing views. It also recognized that some ballot issue advocates take advantage of the *Cullman* principle by spending their money in nonbroadcast media, then wait for the other side to buy time on the air, and finally demand that their own views on the issue be given free broadcast exposure, thus obtaining a broadcast "subsidy" for their views. Nevertheless, the Commission concluded that the *Cullman* principle should not be abandoned because of the possible abuses of a few. Moreover, it stressed that those who rely on *Cullman* have no assurance of obtaining equality by such means since the fairness doctrine does not require equality of exposure of contrasting views. The amount of time to be afforded is a matter for the licensee's discretion.

184. Q. Can a licensee rely exclusively on its ongoing ascertainment of community needs in order to determine controversial issues of public importance?

A. No, according to the Commission's decision in *In re Complaint of Representative Patsy Mink (WHAR)*, 509 F.C.C. 2d 987 (1976). There, the



absence of the issue of strip mining from two ascertainment surveys was not conclusive in light of an extensive amount of supporting material furnished

by the complainants, which demonstrated the existence of this controversial issue of public importance.

## B

### Political Editorializing

185. Q. What do the Commission's rules regarding political editorializing provide?

A. A. The Commission's rules\* regarding political editorializing, which became effective August 14, 1967, provide as follows:

(c) Where a licensee, in an editorial, (i) endorses or (ii) opposes a legally qualified candidate or candidates, the licensee shall, within 24 hours after the editorial, transmit to respectively (i) the other qualified candidate or candidates for the same office or (ii) the candidate opposed in the editorial (1) notification of the date and the time of the editorial; (2) a script or tape of the editorial; and (3) an offer of a reasonable opportunity for a candidate or a spokesman of the candidate to respond over the licensee's facilities: *Provided, however,* That where such editorials are broadcast within 72 hours prior to the day of the election, the licensee shall comply with the provisions of this paragraph sufficiently far in advance of the broadcast to enable the candidate or candidates to have a reasonable opportunity to prepare a response and to present it in a timely fashion.

186. Do the political editorializing rules apply to editorials endorsing or opposing ballot items which do not involve candidates, e.g., a municipal bond issue?

A. No. Subsection (c) applies only to editorials endorsing, or opposing political candidates. Of course, any editorial endorsing or opposing such a ballot item would invoke the "fairness doctrine" and the obligations it imposes upon licensees.

187. Q. What must a licensee do when he broadcasts a political editorial to which the rules apply?

A. The licensee must, within 24 hours after the broadcast, send to the other candidate(s) or the candidate(s) opposed (1) notification of the date and time of the editorial; (2) a script or tape of the editorial; and (3) an offer of a reasonable opportunity for a candidate or one of his spokespersons to respond over the station's facilities. If the editorial is to be broadcast within 72 hours of election day, the licensee must provide the above enumerated information far enough in advance of the actual broadcast to enable the candidate(s) to have a reasonable opportunity to prepare a response and to present it in timely fashion following the station's editorial.

\* Section 73.1930 of the FCC Rules.

188. Q. If a station broadcasts a political editorial endorsing, or opposing, a candidate, must the station permit the other candidate(s) to reply personally?

A. No. As pointed out in Question 204, below, the Commission has stated that "the licensee may impose reasonable limitations on the reply, such as requiring the appearance of a spokesperson for the candidate to avoid any Section 315 'equal opportunities' cycle."

189. Q. A station, in complying with its obligations under the political editorializing rules, has provided the spokesperson for Candidate A with an opportunity to reply to a station editorial which endorsed opponent Candidate B. The station, in accordance with its usual practice of providing introductions to editorial reply in order to enable its audience to place the reply in perspective, has introduced the editorial reply for Candidate A by saying "This station has endorsed the candidacy of Candidate B for Mayor. Replying on behalf of Candidate A for Mayor, here is Joe Jones". Does such a statement by the station operate as a further endorsement of Candidate B for which Candidate A is entitled to an additional right of editorial reply?

A. Yes. The Commission has frequently stated that in the field of political editorializing, a station "is under an obligation to adhere scrupulously to the requirements of fairness." In the situation offered here, the station's introduction of the editorial reply by a reference to the station's earlier editorial endorsement of Candidate B serves as a further endorsement of Candidate B. Unless Candidate A has agreed to such an introductory reference either expressly or by implication (i.e., the editorial reply itself refers to the earlier station editorial), it must be presumed that such an editorial introduction on the station's part unfairly gives added publicity to Candidate B and thus imposes additional fairness doctrine responsibilities on the station so as to give Candidate A or his spokesperson a further opportunity for reply. (Letter to *Charles F. Massart*, 10 F.C.C. 2d 968 [1967]; letter to *George E. Cooley*, 10 F.C.C. 2d [1967]; letter to *WCBS*, 20 F.C.C. 2d [1969]).

190. Q. During a political campaign, a station editorializes on an issue upon which a candidate has taken an opposite position. No mention is made of the election. Does such an editorial trigger the requirements of the political editorializing rules?

A. No, not on these basic facts. However, the Commission has ruled that when an editorial, instead of merely taking a position on an issue upon which a candidate has also taken a position, directly criticizes or praises the candidate for his position on the issue, and/or comments on his capacity to function as a public official, its relevance to the candidate

and the election is obvious and the editorial thereby triggers the political editorializing rules even though it does not specifically endorse or oppose the candidate or refer to the election. (*Taft Broadcasting Co. [WDAF]*, 53 F.C.C. 2d 126 [1975]; letter to *Richard N. Hughes*, Oct. 29, 1975.)

## C

### Quasi-Equal Opportunities

191. Q. What is the quasi-equal opportunities (Zapple) doctrine?

A. Quasi-equal opportunities, also referred to as the political party corollary to the fairness doctrine, or the "Zapple" doctrine, is a doctrine established by the Commission in 1970 which specifies that when a station sells time to supporters or spokespersons of a candidate during an election campaign who urge the candidate's election, discuss the campaign issues, or criticize an opponent, then the licensee must afford comparable time to the spokesperson for an opponent. (Letter to *Nicholas Zapple*, 23 F.C.C. 2d 707 [1970]; *First Report*, Docket No. 19260, 36 F.C.C. 2d 40 [1972]).

192. Q. Does the quasi-equal opportunities doctrine apply outside campaign periods?

A. No. Since the doctrine is based on the equal opportunity requirement of Section 315, it applies only in a situation where there exist legally qualified candidates for public office. Thus, only in the case where supporters or spokespersons of one legally qualified candidate have bought time for a broadcast use in support of their candidate does a station become obligated to make time available on request to spokespersons or supporters of the opposing legally qualified candidates(s).

193. Q. If supporters of a candidate request time from a station based upon the quasi-equal opportunities doctrine, must the station provide them with free time in the event they are unable to pay for time?

A. No. As stated in the preceding question, quasi-equal opportunities is premised upon Section 315 of the Communications Act. Section 315 does not afford political candidates an inherent right of access on an unpaid basis,\* therefore, the same conclusion applies in the case of political broadcasts involving quasi-equal opportunities, i.e., a supporter of a candidate who seeks broadcast time must pay for his time if the supporter of the opposing candidate paid. If the time was provided by the station without charge to supporters of the first candidate, then anyone asking for quasi-equal opportunities should also receive time free of charge.

\* Section 315 is not to be confused with section 312(a)(7) which provides for reasonable access.

194. Q. If a legally qualified candidate appears to some significant extent in a broadcast with his supporters, may supporters of the opposing candidate demand quasi-equal opportunities?

A. No. If a broadcast use involves an identified or identifiable appearance by the candidate, then only the equal opportunity requirements of Section 315 apply. In other words, quasi-equal opportunities and equal opportunities are mutually exclusive.

195. Does the quasi-equal opportunities doctrine apply to all parties and all candidates?

A. No. Although the doctrine takes into account the policies of Section 315, it also represents an embodiment of certain elements of the fairness doctrine. Specifically, the Commission has said quasi-equal opportunities exists as a "particularization of what the public interest calls for in certain political broadcast situations in the light of Congressional policies set forth in Section 315(a)." Thus, in administering quasi-equal opportunities under the public interest standard, the station should proceed to make reasonable good faith judgments as to the significance of particular parties or candidates in his community. On this basis, a station need not provide fringe candidates or minor parties with broadcast time under quasi-equal opportunities. (*First Report*, Docket No. 19260, 36 F.C.C. 2d 40 [1972]).

196. Q. If a supporter of a candidate appears in a *bona fide* news broadcast, must the station grant the supporter of an opposing candidate a request for time based upon quasi-equal opportunities?

A. No. The Commission has said that if the provisions of Section 315 which exempt from equal opportunities appearances by candidates in *bona fide* newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of *bona fide* news events, are to have any meaning, appearances by supporters of candidates in such news broadcasts must also be exempt from application of quasi-equal opportunities. The specific news broadcast exemptions in Section 315 were designed to protect stations from having to grant equal opportunities to fringe candidates whenever a major candidate was covered in a news broadcast. Thus, in order to carry forward the statutory goal of insulating stations from having to provide broadcast time to fringe political cam-



paings, quasi-equal opportunities necessarily requires an exemption for appearances by supporters

of candidates in news broadcasts. (*First Report*, Docket No. 19260, 36 F.C.C. 2d 40 [1972]).

## D

### Personal Attack

197. Q. What do the Commission's rules regarding personal attacks provide?

A. The Commission's Rules regarding personal attacks, which became effective August 14, 1967, provide as follows:\*

(a) When, during the presentation of views on a controversial issue of public importance, an attack is made upon the honesty, character, integrity or like personal qualities of an identified person or group, the licensee shall, within a reasonable time and in no event later than 1 week after the attack, transmit to the person or group attacked (1) notification of the date, time and identification of the broadcast; (2) a script or tape (or an accurate summary if a script or tape is not available) of the attack; and (3) an offer of a reasonable opportunity to respond over the licensee's facilities.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this section shall not be applicable (i) to attacks on foreign groups or foreign public figures; (ii) to personal attacks which are made by legally qualified candidates, their authorized spokesmen, or those associated with them in the campaign, on other such candidates, their authorized spokesmen, or persons associated with the candidates in the campaign; and (iii) to *bona fide* newscasts, *bona fide* news interviews, and on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event (including commentary or analysis contained in the foregoing programs, but the provisions of paragraph (a) shall be applicable to editorials of the licensee).

Note: The fairness doctrine is applicable to situations coming within (iii), above, and, in a specific factual situation, may be applicable in the general area of political broadcasts (ii), above. See Section 315(a) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. 315(a); Public Notice: *Applicability of the Fairness Doctrine in the Handling of Controversial Issues of Public Importance*, 40 F.C.C. 598 (1964). The categories listed in (iii) are the same as those specified in Section 315(a) of the Act.

198. Q. Do the personal attack rules apply to all personal attacks made over a station's facilities?

A. No. Since the personal attack rules are an outgrowth of the "fairness doctrine," they apply only in situations where the "fairness doctrine" applies. Thus, the rules apply only to personal attacks which

are made during a *discussion of a controversial issue of public importance*. Other types of personal attacks would not invoke the "fairness doctrine." Of course, "the use of broadcast facilities for the airing of mere private disputes and attacks would raise serious public interest issues," as well as the libel and slander implications which surround any personal attack. (Docket No. 16574, 8 F.C.C. 2d 721 [1967]).

199. A. What constitutes a personal attack under the Commission's rules?

A. An attack upon the honesty, character, integrity, or like personal qualities of an identified person or group. Mere mention or reference to an individual or group in the course of a broadcast does not constitute a personal attack. (Letter to *Lar Daly*, 40 F.C.C. 494 [1960]; petition for reconsideration denied, 40 F.C.C. 496 [1960]). Even where an attack is made, however, the rule applies only if the attack occurs "during the presentation of views on a controversial issue of public importance." (See *Straus Communications, Inc. v. FCC*, 530 F.2d 1001 (D.C. Cir. 1976)).

200. Q. Are personal attacks made in the course of a political broadcast usually subject to the personal attack rules?

A. No, not usually. The personal attack rules do not apply to personal attacks occurring during "uses" by legally qualified candidates. The personal attack rules also exempt attacks by legally qualified candidates' authorized spokespersons, or those associated with them in the campaign, on other such candidates, their authorized spokespersons, or persons associated with the candidate in the campaign. Thus, the personal attack principle would seldom apply to attacks made during political broadcasts. However, this does not mean that in specific factual situations, licensees might not be subject to the general obligations of the "fairness doctrine" (see Note following subsection (b) of the rules).

201. Q. During the course of a political broadcast a candidate made a personal attack upon individuals who are neither candidates, their authorized spokespersons nor persons associated with candidates in their campaigns. Under Section 315 of the Communications Act the station carrying the broadcast is prohibited from censoring the candidate's remarks; in light of the principle established by the U.S. Supreme Court that stations are not liable for civil damages resulting from defamatory remarks broadcast by political candidates (*Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America v. WDAY, Inc.*,

\*Section 73.1920 of the F.C.C. Rules.

360 U.S. 525 [1959]), is the station protected as well from any obligation to comply with the personal attack rules?

A. Yes. The Commission has exempted attacks made during candidates' "uses" from the personal attack rule. (45 R.R. 2d 1635).

202. Q. Are personal attacks made in the course of a news broadcast subject to the Commission's personal attack rules?

A. No. Although news programming may involve application of the "fairness doctrine," the personal attack rules specifically exempt attacks made during *bona fide* newscasts, *bona fide* news interviews, and on-the-spot coverage of a *bona fide* news event (including commentary or analysis contained in any of the foregoing types of news broadcasts).

203. Q. Do the exemptions in the personal attack rules for *bona fide* newscasts, news interviews and on-the-spot coverage of *bona fide* news events encompass (1) editorials carried in such news coverage, or (2) news documentaries?

A. The exemptions do not encompass either of these two types of programming. The rules specifically provide that editorials contained in newscasts, news interviews or on-the-spot coverage are not exempted. Furthermore, the Commission made it clear in revising the personal attack rules to include these exemptions that news documentaries were not to be exempted. (Docket No. 16574, 9 F.C.C. 2d 539, 540; [1967]).

204. Q. If a station broadcasts a non-exempt personal attack upon a candidate, must the station permit the candidate to reply personally?

A. No. The Commission stated in its action adopting the rules that "the licensee may impose reasonable limitations on the reply, such as requiring the appearance of a spokesman for the candidate to avoid any Section 315 'equal opportunities' cycle." (8 F.C.C. 2d 721 [1967]). The candidate should, of course, be given a substantial voice in the selection

of the spokesperson to respond to the attack (*Times Mirror Broadcasting Co.*, 40 F.C.C. 531 [1962]).

205. Q. Must free time be afforded to answer a personal attack?

A. The Commission has stated that if a "fairness doctrine" has any validity, its fulfillment cannot be predicated upon the ability to pay. (Letter to *Cullman Broadcasting Co., Inc.*, 40 F.C.C. 576 [1963]). However, this does not mean that the licensee may not inquire whether the attacked individual is willing to pay to appear, but the person entitled to make a response cannot be denied time because he refuses to pay for it. The licensee is also free to obtain a sponsor for the program in which the reply is broadcast, but having presented a personal attack, the licensee cannot bar the individual's response simply because sponsorship is not forthcoming. (Letter to *KBHC et al.*, 1 F.C.C. 2d [1965]).

206. Q. Is the truth or falsity of a personal attack relevant to the broadcaster's obligations under the "fairness doctrine" and the personal attack rules?

A. No. The Commission has stated that the truth or falsity of an attack is not a matter for its determination and that in circumstances where the attack is based upon allegations "the licensee cannot aver that the attack is true and, therefore, there is no need to let the public hear the other side." (Letter to *WHN*, 11 F.C.C. 2d 678 [1968]). It must be assumed, however, that if the attack were based not on allegations, but rather on the determination of a judicial body, e.g., conviction of a crime, the Commission would not require the licensee to comply with the personal attack rules.

207. Q. What must a licensee do if a personal attack, subject to the rules, is made over his station?

A. The licensee is required, within one week of the attack, to transmit to the person or group attacked (1) notification of the date, time and identification of the broadcast; (2) a script or tape (or an accurate summary, if a script or tape is not available) of the attack; and (3) an offer of a reasonable opportunity to respond over the licensee's facilities.



### III. FCC HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS AND INQUIRIES CONCERNING POLITICAL BROADCASTS

The Commission will give prompt attention to all inquiries and complaints involving political broadcasts. However, the Commission encourages prior good faith negotiations between licensees and candidates seeking broadcast time or having related questions. In the past, such negotiations often have led to a disposition of the request or questions in a manner which is agreeable to all parties. Thus, a complaint relative to political broadcasting should only be filed with the Commission after such a good faith effort has been made by the parties concerned. In this way, resort to the Commission might be obviated in many instances and time—which is of such great importance in political campaigns—might be saved. If a complaint is filed, a complete

statement of facts should be furnished to the Commission as quickly as possible by both the complainant and the licensee and each should send to the other a copy of all communications directed to the Commission, including the initial complaint and response thereto.

In general, the Commission limits its interpretative rulings or advisory opinions to situations where the critical facts are explicitly stated without the possibility that subsequent events will alter them. It prefers to issue such rulings or opinions where the specific facts of a particular case in controversy are before it for decision. (Letter to *Pierson, Ball & Dowd*, 40 F.C.C. 295 [1958]).

#### IV. POLITICAL BROADCAST AGREEMENT FORM

The following suggested agreement form, prepared by the NAB Legal Department, is designed to fulfill two needs in the political broadcast area: 1) to serve as an actual agreement and 2) to satisfy the Commission's record retention requirements. A station is, of course, free to use any other type of political agreement form or forms so long as the pertinent Commission regulations are satisfied. Regardless of what kind of form a station uses, the identify of the

person(s) who will be using the broadcast time should be clearly indicated, since the provisions of Section 315 apply only when the candidate himself appears in the broadcast.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Publications Department at NAB for \$5.00 per pad of 100 forms.



# AGREEMENT FORM FOR POLITICAL BROADCASTS

STATION and LOCATION \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_ (being)  
(on behalf of) \_\_\_\_\_

a legally qualified candidate of the \_\_\_\_\_ political party for the office of \_\_\_\_\_

in the \_\_\_\_\_ election to be held on \_\_\_\_\_, do hereby request station time as follows:

\_\_\_\_\_ LENGTH OF BROADCAST \_\_\_\_\_ HOUR \_\_\_\_\_ DAYS \_\_\_\_\_ TIMES PER WEEK \_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL NO. WEEKS \_\_\_\_\_ RATE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF FIRST BROADCAST	DATE OF LAST BROADCAST
-------------------------	------------------------

Total Charges: \_\_\_\_\_

The broadcast time will be used by \_\_\_\_\_  
I represent that the advance payment for the above-described broadcast time has been furnished by \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ and you are authorized to so describe that sponsor in your log and to announce the program as paid for by such person or entity. The entity furnishing the payment, if other than an individual person, is: ( ) a corporation; ( ) a committee; ( ) an association; or ( ) other unincorporated group. The names and offices of the chief executive officers of the entity are: \_\_\_\_\_

It is my understanding that: If the time is to be used by the candidate himself within 45 days of a primary or primary runoff election, or within 60 days of a general or special election, the above charges represent the lowest unit charge of the station for the same class and amount of time for the same period; where the use is by a person or entity other than the candidate or is by the candidate but outside the aforementioned 45 or 60 day periods, the above charges do not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station by other users.

It is agreed that use of the station for the above-stated purposes will be governed by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the FCC's rules and regulations, particularly those provisions reprinted on the back hereof, which I have read and understand. I further agree to indemnify and hold harmless the station for any damages or liability that may ensue from the performance of the above-stated broadcasts. For the above-stated broadcasts I also agree to prepare a script or transcription, which will be delivered to the station at least \_\_\_\_\_ before the time of the scheduled broadcasts; (note: the two preceding sentences are not applicable if the candidate is personally using the time).

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ (Candidate, Supporter or Agent)

Accepted }  
Rejected } by \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

This application, whether accepted or rejected, will be available for public inspection for a period of two years in accordance with FCC regulations (Sections 73.3526 and 73.1940).

# LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING POLITICAL BROADCASTS

From the Communications Act of 1934, as amended:

Section 312. (a) The Commission may revoke any station license or construction permit—

• • •

(7) for willful or repeated failure to allow reasonable access to or to permit purchase of reasonable amounts of time for the use of a broadcasting station by a legally qualified candidate for Federal elective office on behalf of his candidacy.

Section 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is imposed under this subsection upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate. Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any—

- (1) bona fide newscast,
- (2) bona fide news interview,
- (3) bona fide news documentary (if the appearance of the candidate is incidental to the presentation of the subject or subjects covered by the news documentary), or
- (4) on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events (including but not limited to political conventions and activities incidental thereto).

shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection. Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed as relieving broadcasters, in connection with the presentation of newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news events, from the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

(b) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station by any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office in connection with his campaign for nomination for election, or election, to such office shall not exceed—

(1) during the forty-five days preceeding the date of a primary or primary runoff election and during the sixty days preceding the date of a general or special election in which such person is a candidate, the lowest unit charge of the station for the same class and amount of time for the same period; and

(2) at any other time, the charges made for comparable use of such station by other users thereof.

(c) For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term "broadcasting station" includes a community antenna television system.

(2) The terms "licensee" and "station licensee" when used with respect to a community antenna television system, mean the operator of such system.

(d) The Commission shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

*From the Rules of the Commission Governing Radio Broadcast Services. (The foregoing Sections of the Communications Act govern any inconsistencies between the following rules and those Sections):*

Section 73.1940. Broadcasts by candidates for public office.

(a) Definitions. (1) A legally qualified candidate for public office is any person who:

(i) has publicly announced his or her intention to run for nomination or office;

(ii) is qualified under the applicable local, state or federal law to hold the office for which he or she is a candidate; and,

(iii) has met the qualifications set forth in either subparagraphs (2), (3), or (4), below.

(2) A person seeking election to any public office including that of President or Vice President of the United States, or nomination for any public office except that of President or Vice President, by means of a primary, general or special election, shall be considered a legally qualified candidate if, in addition to meeting the criteria set forth in subparagraph (1) above, the person:

(i) has qualified for a place on the ballot, or

(ii) has publicly committed himself or herself to seeking election by the write-in method and is eligible under applicable law to be voted for by sticker, by writing in his or her name on the ballot or by other method, and makes a substantial showing that he or she is a bona fide candidate for nomination or office.

Persons seeking election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States shall, for the purposes of the Communications Act and the rules thereunder, be considered legally qualified candidates only in those states or territories (or the District of Columbia) in which they have met the requirements set forth in paragraph (a)(1) and (2) of this rule. Except, that any such person who has met the requirements set forth in paragraph (a)(1) and (2) in at least 10 states (or nine and the District of Columbia) shall be considered a legally qualified candidate for election in all states, territories and the District of Columbia for purposes of this Act.

(3) A person seeking nomination to any public office, except that of President or Vice President of the United States, by means of a convention, caucus or similar procedure, shall be considered a legally qualified candidate if, in addition to

meeting the requirements set forth in paragraph (a)(1) above, that person makes a substantial showing that he or she is a bona fide candidate for such nomination. Except, that no person shall be considered a legally qualified candidate for nomination by the means set forth in this paragraph prior to 90 days before the beginning of the convention, caucus or similar procedure in which he or she seeks nomination.

(4) A person seeking nomination for the office of President or Vice President of the United States shall, for the purposes of the Communications Act and the rules thereunder, be considered a legally qualified candidate only in those states or territories (or the District of Columbia) in which, in addition to meeting the requirements set forth in paragraph (a)(1) above,

(i) he or she, or proposed delegates on his or her behalf, have qualified for the primary or Presidential preference ballot in that state, territory or the District of Columbia, or

(ii) he or she has made a substantial showing of bona fide candidacy for such nomination in that state, territory or the District of Columbia; Except, that any such person meeting the requirements set forth in paragraph (a)(1) and (4) in at least ten states (or nine and the District of Columbia) shall be considered a legally qualified candidate for nomination in all states, territories and the District of Columbia for purposes of this Act.

(5) The term "substantial showing" of bona fide candidacy as used in paragraphs (a)(2), (3) and (4) above means evidence that the person claiming to be a candidate has engaged to a substantial degree in activities commonly associated with political campaigning. Such activities normally would include making campaign speeches, distributing campaign literature, issuing press releases, maintaining a campaign committee, and establishing campaign headquarters (even though the headquarters in some instances might be the residence of the candidate or his campaign manager). Not all of the listed activities are necessarily required in each case to demonstrate a substantial showing, and there may be activities not listed herein which would contribute to such a showing.

(b) Charges for use of stations. The charges, if any, made for the use of any broadcasting station by any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office in connection with his campaign for nomination for election, or election, to such office shall not exceed (1) during the 45 days preceding the date of a primary or primary runoff election and during the 60 days preceding the date of a general or special election in which such person is a candidate, the lowest unit charge of the station for the same class and amount of time for the same period, and (2) at any other time, the charges made for comparable use of such station by other users thereof. The rates, if any, charged all such candidates for the same office shall be uniform and shall not be rebated by any means direct or indirect. A candidate shall be charged no more than the rate the station would charge if the candidate were a commercial advertiser whose advertising was directed to promoting its business within the same area as that encompassed by the particular office for which such person is a candidate. All discount privileges otherwise offered by a station to commercial advertisers shall be available upon equal terms to all candidates for public office. (3) This paragraph shall not apply to any station which is not licensed for commercial operation.

(c) Discrimination between candidates. In making time available to candidates for public office, no licensee shall make any discrimination between candidates in practices, regulations, facilities, or services for or in connection with the service rendered pursuant to this part, or make or give any preference to any candidate for public office or subject any such candidate to any prejudice or disadvantage; nor shall any licensee make any contract or other agreement which shall have the effect of permitting any legally qualified candidate for any public office to broadcast to the exclusion of other legally qualified candidates for the same public office.

(d) Records, inspection. Every licensee shall keep and permit public inspection of a complete record (political file) of all requests for broadcast time made by or on behalf of candidates for public office, together with an appropriate notation showing the disposition made by the licensee of such requests, and the charges made, if any, if the request is granted. When free time is provided for use by or on behalf of such candidates, a record of the free time provided shall be placed in the political file. All records required by this paragraph shall be placed in the political file as soon as possible and shall be retained for a period of two years.

(e) Time of request. A request for equal opportunities must be submitted to the licensee within one week of the day on which the first prior use, giving rise to the right of equal opportunities, occurred: provided, however, that where the person was not a candidate at the time of such first prior use, he shall submit his request within one week of the first subsequent use after he has become a legally qualified candidate for the office in question.

(f) Burden of proof. A candidate requesting equal opportunities of the licensee, or complaining of noncompliance to the Commission shall have the burden of proving that he and his opponent are legally qualified candidates for the same public office.

Section 73.1810. Program Logs:

(b) the following entries shall be made in the program log: • • •

(1)(v) An entry for each program presenting a political candidate, showing the name and political affiliation of such candidate. • • •

(2)(i) An entry identifying (a) the sponsor(s) of the program, (b) the person(s) who paid for the announcement, or (c) the person(s) who furnished materials or services; and the entry shall constitute a representation that identification was announced on the air. • • •

(4)(ii) An entry for each announcement presenting a political candidate, showing the name and political affiliation of such candidate.



## INDEX

Subjects listed in this heading relate to specific political broadcast questions in this "Catechism" and are referenced by question number. For general subject headings, see the Table of Contents.

### A

Acceptance speeches . . . . .	Q. 43
Advance payment, station can require . . . . .	Q. 87
Advance scripts—	
furnished by candidate for program use . . . . .	Q. 13
no right to require from candidates . . . . .	Q. 83
Advertising agencies, purchases of time through . . . . .	Q. 113, 130, 142-145
Agency commissions . . . . .	Q. 113, 130, 142, 143
Announcement, as prerequisite for Presidential candidacy . . . . .	Q. 22
Announcements required, text of FCC Rules and Regulations . . . . .	Q. 6-13, 46
Announcer as candidate . . . . .	Q. 30-33, 58
Appearances covered by Section 315. . . . .	Q. 27, 28, 35, 45, 46
Appearances exempted under Section 315. . . . .	Q. 36, 39-44, 48, 49
Ascertainment—controversial issues . . . . .	Q. 184
Authorization. . . . .	Q. 10

### B

Ballot propositions . . . . .	Q. 167, 183
Barter . . . . .	Q. 108
"Blitz" campaign. . . . .	Q. 183
<i>Bona fide</i> news events, what constitutes . . . . .	Q. 39-43, 48, 49
<i>Bona fide</i> newscasts and news interviews, what constitutes . . . . .	Q. 34, 37, 44, 47
Bonus spots . . . . .	Q. 106
Burden of proof, in establishing candidacy . . . . .	Q. 19

### C

Cancellation of time by candidate, liability . . . . .	Q. 147
Candidacy —	
announcement of . . . . .	Q. 21, 22
failure to prove . . . . .	Q. 23, 24
licensee's evaluation of chances for election . . . . .	Q. 20
proof of <i>bona fide</i> nature of . . . . .	Q. 25
Candidate(s)—	
discrimination between . . . . .	Q. 60, 87
for a party's nomination . . . . .	Q. 50-52
for more than one office. . . . .	Q. 68
having financial interest in station . . . . .	Q. 141
legally qualified . . . . .	Q. 19-25
nominee of more than one party . . . . .	Q. 67
opposing . . . . .	Q. 49-52
station advertisers or personnel as . . . . .	Q. 30-33, 58
supplying program material . . . . .	Q. 13, 46
Caucus . . . . .	Q. 97
Censorship—	
candidate "use" . . . . .	Q. 73-75, 77, 81, 82, 84
non-candidate. . . . .	Q. 69, 71, 78, 80
sponsorship identification . . . . .	Q. 85
Ceremonies, candidate's appearance at . . . . .	Q. 44
Charge, lowest unit (see Lowest unit charge, this Index)	
Charges made for comparable use—	
applicability of . . . . .	Q. 124, 132
candidate's appearance not required in order to receive . . . . .	Q. 132
definition of . . . . .	Q. 124

determination of, as affected by	
agency commission . . . . .	Q. 143-145
cancellation of broadcast time by candidates . . . . .	Q. 147
candidate's appearance in commercially sponsored program . . . . .	Q. 69
candidate's appearance in union sponsored program . . . . .	Q. 70
candidate's financial interest in advertising agency through which broadcast time purchased . . . . .	Q. 142
candidate's financial interest in station . . . . .	Q. 141
discounts	
availability to candidates . . . . .	Q. 135
general . . . . .	Q. 135-137
preemptible and non-preemptible spot announcements . . . . .	Q. 140
run-of-schedule (ROS) spot announcements . . . . .	Q. 139
local rates . . . . .	Q. 133, 134
national rates . . . . .	Q. 133, 134
rate changes . . . . .	Q. 146
equal opportunities requests . . . . .	Q. 56, 125, 138-140, 143, 147
free time, not required . . . . .	Q. 56
general . . . . .	Q. 56, 131-147
individuals eligible to receive . . . . .	Q. 132
non-candidates, applicability to . . . . .	Q. 132
period of applicability . . . . .	Q. 131
premium rates prohibited by . . . . .	Q. 131
Charges, need to keep records of . . . . .	Q. 5
Commissions—	
agencies . . . . .	Q. 113, 130, 142, 143
employees . . . . .	Q. 114
“rep” firms . . . . .	Q. 114
Commission's Rules and Regulations, text of . . . . .	Q. 2, 8
Communications Act and political broadcasts . . . . .	Q. 1
Contributions . . . . .	Q. 11
Controversial issues—	
achieving “fairness,” Commission consideration of overall performance . . . . .	Q. 176
ascertainment . . . . .	Q. 184
ballot propositions . . . . .	Q. 183
“blitz” campaign . . . . .	Q. 183
complaint against station, what Commission looks for in determining merits . . . . .	Q. 176
determining whether issue is controversial . . . . .	Q. 167
discretion given licensees in discharging obligations under “fairness doctrine” . . . . .	Q. 177, 180
election campaign . . . . .	Q. 168
equal time, not a requisite under “fairness doctrine” . . . . .	Q. 173
free time, granting of for presentation of other side . . . . .	Q. 180
general . . . . .	Q. 166-173, 175-177, 180-182
issues—ascertainment . . . . .	Q. 184
licensee obligation to present controversial issues . . . . .	Q. 166-173, 175-177, 180, 181
local, regional and national issues, application of “fairness doctrine” to . . . . .	Q. 171
methods of presenting both sides of issue . . . . .	Q. 175
newsworthiness and controversial issues not synonymous . . . . .	Q. 170
personal stake of licensee in issue . . . . .	Q. 178
political spot announcements, applying “fairness doctrine” when candidate does not appear . . . . .	Q. 172
presenting all sides of issue, Commission allows licensee great flexibility . . . . .	Q. 175
reasonable opportunities, all sides of an issue do not have to be stated on the same program . . . . .	Q. 175
reasonable opportunity to present all viewpoints not required . . . . .	Q. 174
recall election, applicability . . . . .	Q. 53
script, no requirement to send copy when only controversial issues are involved . . . . .	Q. 166
spokesperson for a particular point of view—failure to present opposing viewpoint	
because spokesperson unavailable . . . . .	Q. 178
spokesperson for a particular point of view, how to find . . . . .	Q. 179
spokesperson for a particular point of view, licensee's discretion in choosing . . . . .	Q. 177
station policy, establishment of for purpose of fulfilling “fairness doctrine” responsibilities . . . . .	Q. 182
use . . . . .	Q. 169
Conventions, political, coverage exempted . . . . .	Q. 43
Cullman rule . . . . .	Q. 180, 183



## D

Debates	Q. 39, 40, 61, 64
Defamatory material, deletion of	Q. 84
Definition of "legally qualified candidate"	Q. 15
Delayed broadcast	Q. 41
Delegates, not public office	Q. 18
Disclaimer—see Sponsor ID	
Discrimination, prohibited between candidates	Q. 60, 87
Discrimination, rates	Q. 131, 134, 135
Drive-time—	
program time	Q. 156
spot time	Q. 157
Documentaries—	
exempt under Section 315	Section C, p. 6
not exempt under personal attack rules	Q. 203

## E

Editorializing, with respect to candidates—	
comments on candidate's capacity as public official	Q. 190
general	Q. 185-189
praising or criticizing candidate's position	Q. 190
Editorializing with respect to issue on which candidate has taken position	Q. 190
Election campaign—controversial issue	Q. 168
Employee candidates	Q. 30-33, 58
Equal opportunity—	
what constitutes	Q. 57-59, 61-73, 86
exemptions—delayed broadcast	Q. 41
exemptions—news interview	Q. 34, 37
exemptions—on the spot coverage of news events	Q. 41
limited to candidates for same office	Q. 50, 52
retroactivity of	Q. 33, 89
Equipment, limitations on usage	Q. 72
Exempt appearances	Q. 36, 39-44, 47, 48

## F

Fairness Doctrine	Part II, p. 29
For a detailed index on the Fairness Doctrine, see "Controversial Issues", "Personal Attack", "Political Editorializing", and "Quasi-Equal Opportunities", this Index.	
FCC handling of political broadcast cases	Part III, p. 38
FCC rules and regulations	Q. 2, 6
Film, supplied by candidate	Q. 13
Financial interest in station by candidate	Q. 141
Foreign broadcasts, Section 315 not applicable	Q. 55
Free time offered by station	Q. 60-64
Fringe candidates	Q. 20, 195, 196
Future "uses," requests for equal opportunities	Q. 92

## G

Good faith, definition of	Q. 42, 154
"Good Morning America"	Q. 37

## I

Immunity, provided by Section 315	Q. 76-78
Indemnification, can station require?	Q. 79, 80
Inflammatory statements by candidate, cannot be censored	Q. 75

## L

Last minute requests	Q. 86
Legal qualifications of write in candidates	Q. 16

Legal qualifications of write-in candidates . . . . .	Q. 16
Legally qualified candidate—	
definition . . . . .	Q. 15
failure to prove . . . . .	Q. 23, 24
in general . . . . .	Q. 18-25
recall election . . . . .	Q. 53
requiring proof of . . . . .	Q. 19, 25
substantial showing . . . . .	Q. 11
Liability of candidate for cancelled time . . . . .	Q. 147
Libelous material, deletion of . . . . .	Q. 74
Libelous material of candidate, licensee not liable for . . . . .	Q. 76
Libelous material of non-candidate . . . . .	Q. 78
Limitations on equipment usage . . . . .	Q. 72
Limitations on licensee discretion . . . . .	Q. 158
Limitations on use of facilities in general . . . . .	Q. 74-79, 81-84
Live appearances by candidates, cannot be required . . . . .	Q. 73
Local rates—	
in determining charges made for comparable use . . . . .	Q. 133-134
in determining lowest unit charge . . . . .	Q. 80
Logging requirements . . . . .	Q. 3
Lowest unit charge—	
appearance only in sponsorship identification announcement . . . . .	Q. 101
applicability of . . . . .	Q. 94, 95, 99-101
base period during which applicable . . . . .	Q. 118
candidate's appearance required in order to receive . . . . .	Q. 95, 98, 101
caucus . . . . .	Q. 97
convention . . . . .	Q. 97
definition of . . . . .	Q. 19, 93
determination of, as affected by	
agency commissions . . . . .	Q. 113, 130
audience survey rate adjustments . . . . .	Q. 120, 122, 126, 127
barter arrangements . . . . .	Q. 108
bonus spots . . . . .	Q. 106
commissions . . . . .	Q. 113, 114, 130
equal opportunities requests . . . . .	Q. 124-130
free advertising arrangements . . . . .	Q. 107, 109
frequency discounts . . . . .	Q. 93, 105
joint purchases by candidates . . . . .	Q. 115
local rates . . . . .	Q. 102
long-standing advertiser agreements . . . . .	Q. 104, 105
make good arrangements . . . . .	Q. 110
national rates . . . . .	Q. 102
off-the-rate card agreements . . . . .	Q. 91, 103, 104
package plans . . . . .	Q. 111
per inquiry arrangements . . . . .	Q. 108
production oriented charges . . . . .	Q. 112
public service announcements . . . . .	Q. 107
rate changes . . . . .	Q. 119, 122
rate changes . . . . .	Q. 107, 119, 122
sales representative commissions . . . . .	Q. 114
seasonal rate adjustments . . . . .	Q. 119, 126-128
single broadcasts into multiple states with differing Presidential primary election dates . . . . .	Q. 96
statutory rates for legal notices . . . . .	Q. 116
time of broadcast use . . . . .	Q. 117
trade outs . . . . .	Q. 108
general . . . . .	Q. 93-99, 102-130
individuals eligible to receive . . . . .	Q. 94-99
lower rates for political advertising not prohibited . . . . .	Q. 123
network purchases, applicability to . . . . .	Q. 121
no rate . . . . .	Q. 165
non-candidates appearance, inapplicability to . . . . .	Q. 95, 99
open contract term, permissibility of when charge undetermined . . . . .	Q. 129



period of applicability . . . . .	Q. 95
program . . . . .	Q. 165
sponsorship identification announcement . . . . .	Q. 101
time charge, definition limited to . . . . .	Q. 112
use must be in connection with campaign . . . . .	Q. 100
variations of, between candidates running for same office . . . . .	Note, p. 20, Q. 117, 125

## M

Make-good spots . . . . .	Q. 110
Material, deletion by station . . . . .	Q. 74, 78, 84
Multiple office candidate . . . . .	Q. 68
Multiple party nominees . . . . .	Q. 67

## N

Names of officers of sponsoring groups . . . . .	Q. 12
National rates—	
in determining charges for comparable use . . . . .	Q. 133, 134
in determining lowest unit charge . . . . .	Q. 102
Network programs, appearance of candidates . . . . .	Q. 71
News coverage . . . . .	Q. 42
News interviews . . . . .	Q. 34-37
News releases of candidates . . . . .	Q. 13
Newscasts . . . . .	Q. 44, 45, 47
Nominations, candidates for a party's . . . . .	Q. 50, 52
Non-candidates, political speeches by . . . . .	Q. 54, 78
Non-candidates, rates for . . . . .	Q. 132
Non-political speeches by candidates currently in office . . . . .	Q. 82

## O

Obscenity, by candidate, cannot be censored . . . . .	Q. 84
Officers of sponsoring groups . . . . .	Q. 12
Offices, public, included within Section 315 . . . . .	Q. 49
On-the-spot coverage of <i>bona fide</i> news events . . . . .	Q. 42, 43, 47, 48
On-the-spot coverage of <i>bona fide</i> news events, delayed broadcast . . . . .	Q. 41
Opposing candidates . . . . .	Q. 49-52

## P

Payment in advance, station can require . . . . .	Q. 87
Per inquiry arrangements . . . . .	Q. 108
Personal attack—	
candidate subject of attack, licensee not obligated to let him reply personally . . . . .	Q. 204
controversial issue of public importance, prerequisite for applicability of rules . . . . .	Q. 198
definition of . . . . .	Q. 197, 199
documentaries not exempted from rules . . . . .	Q. 203
editorials not exempted from rules . . . . .	Q. 203
election campaigns, personal attacks during . . . . .	Q. 200
foreign groups or individuals not covered by rules . . . . .	Q. 197
free time for reply to personal attack . . . . .	Q. 205
general . . . . .	Q. 197-207
immunity provided by section 315, not excuse for avoiding rule obligations . . . . .	Q. 201
licensee responsibility, steps to take . . . . .	Q. 197, 207
news programs exempted . . . . .	Q. 197, 203
political programs, usually exempt from rules . . . . .	Q. 197, 200
rules governing . . . . .	Q. 197
scripts, sending copy or summary to subject of attack . . . . .	Q. 197, 207
truth as element of personal attack . . . . .	Q. 206
Placement of spot announcements . . . . .	Q. 162
Political Broadcast Agreement, suggested form . . . . .	Part IV, p. 39
Political broadcast cases, FCC handling . . . . .	Part III, p. 38
Political contributions . . . . .	Q. 11

Political conventions, coverage exempted .....	Q. 43
Political editorializing—	
ballot items not involving candidates, rules do not apply .....	Q. 186
candidate adversely affected, licensee does not have to allow personal reply .....	Q. 188
comments on candidate's capacity as public official .....	Q. 190
licensee responsibility, steps to take .....	Q. 185, 187
praising or criticizing candidate's position .....	Q. 190
rules governing .....	Q. 185
station introduction of replies .....	Q. 189
Political Party Office—legally qualified candidate .....	Q. 51
Pooling of resources by candidates to obtain time .....	Q. 138
Premium rates not permitted for political broadcasts .....	Q. 131, 132
Presidency, candidates for .....	Q. 22
Press conferences .....	Q. 47
Primary election of one party separate from that of another .....	Q. 50
Prime time—	
program time .....	Q. 156
spot time .....	Q. 157
Program material, supplied by candidate .....	Q. 13, 46
Program time—	
length .....	Q. 160
reasonable access .....	Q. 159
in prime time .....	Q. 156
in drive time .....	Q. 156
Programs exempt as coverage of news events .....	Q. 43, 47, 48
Programs exempt as news interviews or newscasts .....	Q. 35, 36, 44, 47
Public inspection of records .....	Q. 5
Public offices included within Section 315 .....	Q. 18, 49

## Q

Quasi-Equal Opportunities—	
applicable only to campaign periods .....	Q. 192
<i>bona fide</i> newstype programs not included .....	Q. 196
candidate's appearance negates doctrine .....	Q. 194
definition .....	Q. 191
free time not required .....	Q. 193
fringe parties not included .....	Q. 195
general .....	Q. 191-196
minor parties not included .....	Q. 195

## R

Racial slurs by candidate, cannot be censored .....	Q. 75
Rates .....	Q. 56, 93-99, 102-147
Rates—commission regulation .....	Q. 165
For a detailed index on the subject of rates see "Charges Made for Comparable use"	
and "Lowest Unit Charge" in this Index.	
Reasonable access—	
applicable to federal candidates only .....	Q. 148
coverage period .....	Q. 154
fixed position spots .....	Q. 158
federal candidate must "use" time .....	Q. 151
free v. paid time .....	Q. 161
general .....	Q. 148-153, 163, 164
local candidates not covered .....	Q. 149
method of complying .....	Q. 153
needs of candidate .....	Q. 154
non-commercial stations covered .....	Q. 163, 164
non-profit stations covered .....	Q. 163, 164
program time .....	Q. 159
program time—length .....	Q. 160
reasonableness .....	Q. 154



spot announcements	Q. 149
spot announcements, placement	Q. 162
state candidates not covered	Q. 149
supporters of candidates not covered	Q. 152
Recall election—legally qualified candidate	Q. 53
Recordings of political broadcasts—generally no requirement to be retained	Q. 4
Record, required to be kept	Q. 4, 5
Refusal of free time offer, candidate's future rights	Q. 61-63
Refusal to sell spots	Q. 158
Requests for equal opportunities—	
period within which must be made	Q. 88-92
record of request must be retained	Q. 5
Retroactivity of equal opportunities	Q. 24
Rules and regulations, text of FCC's	Q. 2, 6

## S

Saturation buys	Q. 86, 183
Scripts, advance copies	Q. 83
Scripts, retention and need to keep records of	Q. 4
Section 315—	
applicable to candidates only	Q. 54
text of	Q. 1
Seven day rule	Q. 88-92
Slandorous remarks, deletion of	Q. 84
Solicitation of contributions	Q. 11
Speeches—	
acceptance	Q. 43
must candidacy be discussed by candidate	Q. 81, 82
non-political, by candidates currently in office	Q. 82
on behalf of candidates	Q. 54
Sponsorship identification announcement—	
appearance of candidate for lowest unit charge purposes	Q. 101
authorization	Q. 10
censorship	Q. 85
computed as commercial time	Q. 14
contributions	Q. 11
requirements	Q. 6-9, 12-14, 46
Spot announcements—	
free v. paid time	Q. 161
in drive and prime time	Q. 157
reasonable access—placement	Q. 162
type and length available to candidates	Q. 149
State laws defining candidacy	Q. 21, 25
Station personnel as candidates	Q. 30-33, 58
Station support of candidate through editorializing	Q. 185-189
Substantial showing	Q. 17
Supporters, political speeches by	Q. 54
Sustaining time, lack of it not excuse for denying 315 rights	Q. 66

## T

Tapes supplies by candidates	Q. 13
Time—	
cancellation by candidate	Q. 147
free	Q. 61-64
pooling of resources by candidates to obtain	Q. 138
purchases through advertising agencies	Q. 113, 142-145
period for requesting equal opportunities	Q. 88-92
requests for, need to keep records	Q. 5
“Tomorrow”	Q. 37
Trade outs	Q. 94, 106

## U

Union sponsored programs, appearance of candidates .....	Q. 70
"Use"—applicability of fairness doctrine .....	Q. 169
"Use," what constitutes—	
for purposes of equal opportunities .....	Q. 26-33, 35, 36, 38, 43-48
for purposes of lowest unit charge .....	Q. 98
for purposes of no-censorship provision .....	Q. 77
Use of facilities, limitations in general .....	Q. 74-79, 81-84

## W

Waiver of right to appear .....	Q. 33, 62, 63
Write-in candidates' legal qualifications .....	Q. 16

## Z

"Zapple" ruling (see Quasi-Equal Opportunities, this Index)





