United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

CASE NO. 13-1506

Curtis J Neeley Jr.

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Federal Communications Commission, et al.

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas – Fayetteville
(5:12-cv-5208-JLH)

COMMUNICATION WITH THE COURT

The included PDF addresses the fact that the current filing is resolving in another forum though only partially. Fiscal compensation for damages will be demanded from the FCC as well as the corporate Defendants on remand or in another circuit. This action has only one result exactly like there is EXACTLY one even prime number. Naked results of searches are illegal when shown to anonymous judges, anonymous minors or anonymous SCOTUS clerks who may be like Ruth Jones Esq told the Plaintiff-appelant on the phone and desire to preserve the EVIL, anonymous porn-by-wire.

This communication will reflect the reply to comments that will be filed in RN 13-86. This proceedings response time has been extended and updates will be sent to the court around May 14, 21, 28, 2013 and then on June 4, 11, 18, 25 2013 with almost the same data but with updates reflecting additional comments. The heavy case load of the Eighth Circuit is respected and Curtis J Neeley Jr was advised it may take six months to decide the IFP motion. 378 comments were posted yesterday and only two sough more porn broadcasts in the United States. J. Cobb was definitely a porn promoter but Gail Arneman was only passive-aggressive porn supporter.

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

CASE NO. 13-1506

Curtis J Neeley Jr.

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Federal Communications Commission, et al.

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas – Fayetteville
(5:12-cv-5208-JLH)

REPLY TO COMMENTS ADDRESSING GN DOCKET No. 13-86

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Genachowski sought review of the Commission's broadcast indecency policies and enforcement to ensure they are fully consistent with vital First Amendment principles and reduce the BACKLOG of pending indecency complaints revealing an utter FCC mission failure.

This reply addresses hundreds of GN 13-86 filings relevant to the *Neeley Jr v FCC et al,* (5:12-cv-5208)(13-1506) litigation that is demanding FCC regulation of interstate and world-wide wire communications used in commerce or the duty assigned in 1934 per 47 USC §151. This comment proceeding revealed a GREAT deal of dissatisfaction with the FCC by the commenters as well as a great number of comments seeking widespread broadcasts by wire or radio of anything as would generally make the FCC an agency with little practical use. No attorney in the USA would say many Eighth Circuit Judges were probably addicted to anonymous access to [sic] "internet" pornography in a filing? Why would one ruling oligarchy be different from all of the US? Public Notice was titled as follows as a PDF link to the PUBLIC NOTICE like precedes to the Eighth Circuit filing no attorney would file and that was done perhaps due a TBI?

FCC Cuts Indecency Complaints By 1 Million; Seeks Comment on Policy (3)

COMMENTS SOUGHT

Departing Chairman Genachowski asked for comments regarding the current "egregious indecency" banning policy and this quickly generated disparaging comments by one notable communications law firm of Fletcher, Heald and Hildreth posted by Harry Cole Esq as follows.

> *Indecency Alert: New Unannounced "Egregiousness" Standard Now Apparently in Effect, But More Changes May Be On the Way, Eventually*
> *"In a public notice that surely ranks among the most bizarre any of us are likely to see, the FCC's Enforcement Bureau and General Counsel have made three startling announcements about the Commission's broadcast indecency policy. According to the notice, for the last seven months or so the Enforcement folks have been applying a new – but not formally announced – standard of "indecency" which is not subject to any official definition, as far as we can determine. And while the Enforcement Bureau and GC both commit themselves to continuing to implement that undescribed "standard", they have now initiated, in a semi-comic way, an inquiry into some possibly significant changes to major elements of the Commission's indecency policy.*
> *This could have been an April Fool's Day prank, but we're guessing it wasn't..."*

Curtis J Neeley Jr feels this entry was condescending and inappropriate. The title above the "snippet" should be a PDF link to the entry. This inappropriate entry should update or disappear.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

(91,441) Comments were then received daily beginning on 3/03/2013 as follows.

<1|0, 2|0, 3|10, 4|(11), 5|(35), 6|0, 7|0, 8|(1,053), 9|(23,475), 10|(26,297), 11|(5,193), 12|(6,799), 13|0, 14|0, 15|(5,779), 16|(2,030), 17|(1,608), 18|(953), 19|(1,074), 20|0, 21|0, 22|(1,608), 23|(1,357), 24|(2,136), 25|(1,272), 26|(5,926), 27|0, 28|0, 29|(3,288), 30|(1,292), 1|(1,037), 2|(260), 3|(184), 4|0, 5|0, 6|(281), 7|(179), 8|(85), 9|(83), 10|(181), 11|(), 12|(), 13|(378), 14|(), 15|(), 16|(), 17|(), 18|(), 19|(), 20|() >

Zero comments posted "online" reflect FCC weekend time-off despite comments being sent. The comments containing the ***SCOTUS singular construct*** promoted to an invalid legal word by Sir Lord Honorable John Paul Stevens of [sic] "*internet*" were examined. The ***SCOTUS singular construct*** is an inappropriate singular slang used in US law and the comments using this ***SCOTUS singular construct*** addressed in this reply are distributed by date as follows.

Comments with the text [sic] "*internet*"

<1|0, 2|0, 3|0, 4|1, 5|1, 6|0, 7|0, 8|(3), 9|(86), 10|(143), 11|(46), 12|(49), 13|0, 14|0, 15|(61), 16|(22), 17|(20), 18|(11), 19|(15), 20|0, 21|0, 22|(21), 23|(19), 24|(23), 25|(13), 26|(27), 27|0, 28|0, 29|(19), 30|(11), 1|(9), 2|(4), 3|(5), 4|0, 5|0, 6|(6), 7|(8), 8|(0), 9|(1), 10|(3), 11|0, 12|0, 13|(5),14|(),15|(),16|(), 17|(),18|0, 19|0, 20|()>

Another term that many equate with the inappropriate construct of [sic] "*internet*" is "*online*". This colloquial term was used by day as follows and only occurred with the undefinable slang construct [sic] "*internet*" in ONLY a few comments. Karina Montgomery supported more public broadcast of "porn"and Brenda Heslop opposed more public broadcasting of "porn"until May 2, 2013.

Comments with the text "*online*"

<1|0, 2|0, 3|0, 4|(1), 5|(1), 6|0, 7|0, 8|(1), 9|(15), 10|(18), 11|(10), 12|(5), 13|0, 14|0, 15|(8), 16|(4), 17|(3), 18|(6), 19|(3), 20|0, 21|0, 22|(2), 23|(3), 24|(2), 25|(3), 26|(6), 27|0, 28|0, 29|2, 30|(1), 1|(2), 2|(0), 3|(1), 4|0, 5|0, 6|(1), 7|(0), 8|(0), 9|(1), 10|(1), 11|0, 12|0, 13|(0),14|(),15|(),16|(),17|(), 18|0, 19| 0, 20|(),>

HAYDEN PAUL GANTHER'S CONFUSION

Hayden Ganther's lengthy comment includes the following sentence that makes the twelve pages "ignorant" due to ignoring the *Pacifica* recognition that children have no First Amendment rights for parents to violate. Mr Ganther attempted to appear highly educated by Texas Christian University to perhaps be one "highly educated" counterpoint off-setting thousands of "AFA Christian reactionaries". Texas Christian University will regret having Hayden Ganther "porn-support" associated with their school. The error follows from page twelve

> "*What is being proposed is, despite what the reactionaries insist, compatible with First Amendment principles.*"

From *Pacifica* the Supreme Court acknowledged as follows **invalidating Mr Ganther's lengthy comment** and ignoring this fact for twelve "ignorant" pages.

> "*... 'a child ... is not possessed of that full capacity for individual choice which is the presupposition of First Amendment guarantees'.* ***Ginsberg v. New York****, supra, at 649-650 (STEWART, J., concurring in result). Thus, children may not be able to protect themselves from speech which, although shocking to most adults, generally may be avoided by the unwilling 438 U.S. 726, 758 through the exercise of choice.*"

There were (627) comments with the SCOTUS construct of [sic] "*internet*" and (100) comments with the term "*online*" with three (3) after Mr Ganther using both terms.

(727+) COMMENTS WITH USES OF [sic]"*internet*" AND "*online*"

Curtis J Neeley Jr. examined each of the (727+) comments and there were (36) hoping egregious indecency would now be shown on public broadcasts of video and audio in addition to public broadcasts by wire whether these wires were cable TV wires or [sic] "*internet*" wires. These commenters generally did not wish the FCC to perform the clear statutory mission of ensuring the safety of distant communications broadcast in commerce required by 47 USC §151 and hoped the egregious malfeasance occurring on public wire broadcasts now defined in 47 USC §153 ¶(59) would extend to RF broadcasts also. These (36) public comments are linked to commenter name or alias and follow.

(Alex Elert, Andrew Reis, Bob Alberti, Bob Zollo, Brad Miller, Dan Fischbach, Daniel Anderson, Daniel Lewis, David Naylor, David Woolsey, Desaun Bowen, Devin LeLeux, George Davis, Hayden Paul Ganther-12pg, Heather Loveridge, Jacob Schulz, James Frank Brockson, Jr., Jamie Pasternak, Jeromie Esterline, Jerry Jones, John Hundley, Jordan D. White, Joshua Rutterbush, Mike Cappiello, Myrle Nugent, Ndubuisi Okeh, One Million Moms(alias), Paul Shaikh, Raeford Brown, Rob Pugh, Ryan Marsh, Shayna Smith, Tony Andrys, Victor Wilson, William Russell Gray, William Spry)

The "porn" supporters listed/linked above were encountered while looking at EVERY comment with the text [sic]"internet"(627+) or "online"(100+). These "porn-hounds" would appreciate departing Chairman Genachowski's inappropriate First Amendment concerns when public safety is imperiled by "egregious" free speech or "egregious" expressions which are NOT protected by ANY Amendment. See *Schenck v. United States,* 249 U. S. 47, 249 U. S. 52, *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), and *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925).

REPETITIVE OPPOSITIONS TO THE AMERICAN FAMILY ASSOCIATION (AFA)

(325+ anti-AFA) comments wished for more “porn” on broadcasts of audio and video regardless of medium. The safety of public broadcasts of communications must be ensured per the Communications Act of 1934 as amended. The safety of distant broadcasts of wire and radio communications is required by the Communications Act of 1934 and was supported by the 1978 *Pacifica* SCOTUS ruling/explanation, as well as common sense that is apparently no longer common in much of the United States.

The (325+ anti-AFA) pornography supporters wished for expanded "porn" on RF broadcasts but did not generally use the slang of [sic]“*internet*” and were therefore given perfunctory examination due to being almost the same “*copy-and-paste*” comments in direct opposition to American Family Association(AFA). AFA comments were decidedly more genuine if misguided due to an inaccurate AFA notice.

The “AFA” Opposition’s “Cut-n-Paste” IRONY

(271) of (325) comments with “AFA” have “DO NOT BEND TO THE AFA”. Only (8) of (277) comments with “narrow mindedness" have no “ABA”. (316) comments have the text “bend”, but only (38) of these do not have “AFA”. The (38) with “bend” but no “AFA” have only 3 wanting more "porn"broadcasts. (11) have the text“censor”, [sic]“segement”, and “population”. (296) have “segment” and “population” but only (29) of these (296) have no “AFA”. One comment with “support”, Disney”, and “paste” by Joel Thomas follows verbatim from the (10) of the 94,109 comments with both “copy” and “paste”. Ironically there are (323) comments with the text of, “I support any and all”, and this ironically supports banning all indecent broadcasts like sought by Curtis J Neeley Jr currently in Court including porn-by-wire of [sic]”*internet*”.

Joel Thomas
1235 Jancey Street
Pittsburgh, PA, 15206

I, [Joel Thomas], SUPPORT ANY AND ALL changes to the current FCC indecency standards that would allow television and radio stations to broadcast expletives and nudity on the public airwaves.

If these changes go through, the network television stations will self regulate concerning nudity and expletives. My understanding is that cable networks are unregulated and therefore could show nudity and expletives as much as they want, whenever they want. But they don't, either because of corporate perception interests (Disney-owned networks come to mind), target audience (Nickelodeon for example), or for a myriad of other reasons. Same with the radio.

Even if kids see nudity/hear expletives, they won't immediately drop out of school, go into a life of crime, spontaneously explode, or anything else.

Nice copy/paste jobs the AFA did. Please don't let their zombie response sway your decision against progress.

OLIGARCHY DEFENDS ANONYMOUS "PORN-Broadcasts"

United States Court's Article III judges are Honorable Lords like once in England due to appointments for life. United States' senior citizens may retire and draw social security at age 65. Lord Honorable John Paul Stevens made the egregious error of calling 47 USC §153 ¶(59), wire communications, a "*unique and wholly new medium*" instead of **communications by both the wire medium and communications by the radio medium these ALWAYS WERE**. This mistake was made by a ruling senior citizen "Lord" at the advanced age of (77) in the twentieth year of rule after witnessing humanity first visit the moon at age (48) or four years older than Curtis J Neeley Jr now. "Lord Stevens" had forgotten the *Pacifica* ruling composed nineteen years earlier while a fresh "*unique and wholly new"* Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court at the much younger age of fifty-eight.

NO NEW "MEDIUM" EXISTS AS BECOMES MORE OBVIOUS EVERY YEAR.

United States Courts currently pretend the 1997 creation of [sic] "*internet*" was **not an egregious mistake** done to preserve anonymous pornography consumption by judges and SCOTUS clerks like Ruth Jones Esq. These unregulated broadcasts like found HERE, HERE, or HERE.

"LORD STEVENS" 1997 ERROR INVENTED [sic]"*internet*"

The "*unique and wholly new*" **usage** of 47 USC §153 ¶(59) wire communications was simply another replacement of machines connected to wires for communications besides facsimile. Telegraph machines were replaced by machines connected to wires(telephones) long before computers were connected to wires and used for communications. The [sic] "*internet*" is only advancement of telegraph machines patented in 1847 by Samuel Morse and a logical advancement in wire communications. [sic] "*Internet*" wires are still unable to make facsimiles disappear like telegraph machines quickly did due to the **continuous FCC malfeasance** and not regulating ALL distant wire communication broadcasts perhaps while trying to locate the "*unique and wholly new medium*" there has NEVER BEEN. Confinement and fines will quickly end all spam.

NO NEW MEDIUM HAS EVER EXISTED

No new medium has EVER EXISTED except in the minds of confused elderly "rulers" like "Lord Stevens" and Sir Lord Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren. Thousands (3,299+) of GN 13-86 commenters appeared to make this mistake as well with comments like, "*various forms of media, entertainment, advertising, internet, etc.*", by Bettie Glass. Ms Glass was accurately using the "*means of communications*" definition like (3,299+) other comments and not the plural of "*medium*" like used mistakenly by "Lord Stevens" in *ACLU v Reno,* (96-511) in 1997 thereby creating the imaginary singular construct for unregulated wire and radio communications called [sic] "*internet*". There were (203+) uses of the singular term medium. Many were propagation of "Lord Stevens" erroneous use of the noun though some used the adjective "medium" to describe a middle position like high-medium-low.

Radio broadcasts of 47 USC §153 ¶(59) wire communications make simultaneous usage of wire and radio communications permeate public airwaves such that UNSAFE broadcasts of unregulated 47 USC §153 ¶(59) wire communications are broadcast by both wire and radio. This will be as pervasive as FM radio signals are today soon using the common carrier protocol for time based modulation of radio signals described generally in Docket #56 of *Neeley Jr. v FCC, et al,* and like already occurs in much of China.

HUMAN RIGHTS not PROTECTED IN AMERICA

Artists or authors of indecent material, like Curtis J Neeley Jr did in the past, have a clear moral duty to prevent these indecent creations from being encountered by minors **ANYWHERE**. This moral duty should CURRENTLY be supported by 47 USC §605 for wire and radio communications until this law was ignored or repealed by Sir Lord Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren and protected elsewhere by the "Progress Clause" of the Constitution written in 1787. The RIGHT of authors and inventors was never protected in the United States due to Noah Webster coining an "Americanized" misspelling of copyright from England in 1790 and NEVER protecting RIGHTS of authors or inventors. This intentionally disparaging creation of American copy[rite] law perhaps still exist because of the untimely illness and death of inventor and author Benjamin Franklin who felt the Constitution was too important a document for coining a new term. This is perhaps why the alleged Copy[rite] Clause does not use the term copy[rite] and neither did the first "State of the Union" address given by George Washington though noting on January 8, 1790 the need for the Copy[rite] Act of 1790 that was signed on May 31, 1790 like follows.

> *"that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage, than the promotion of Science and Literature. Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of publick happiness."*

Copy + right coined for copy + rite law to deceive

Noah Webster and Benjamin Huntington quickly coined one misspelling in Congress with the US [sic] "Copyright" Act of 1790 perhaps in order to fool the entire US to think a human RIGHT was protected that was NEVER preserved or even recognized. The first usage on Earth of the term [sic] "copyright" in national law, [sic] "Copyright" Act of 1790, only protected the publication ritual or rite. This legal RITE for publishing was copied from the *1710* Statute of Anne while ignoring human RIGHTS of creators to control copies protected first by the *Hogarth's Act* or *Engraver's Act* of 1734,5 in England. Still; Today the United States blindly accepts Noah Webster's copy[rite] word misspelled intentionally as [sic] "copyright" and abuses the compound word first used by Lord Blackstone circa 1767 in *Blackstone's Commentaries on English Law* | Book two | *Rights of Things* | *Chap. 26: Of Title to Things Personal by Occupancy*. Footnotes 37 and 38 referring to prior uses in English lawsuits as "copy-right".

MISINTERPRETATIONS OF *PACIFICA*

The 1978 ruling of *Pacifica* authorized the FCC to do nothing. The Communications Act of 1934 **required** FCC regulation of interstate and world-wide communications by wire AND radio. *Pacifica* merely explained FCC regulation of RF broadcasts due to pervasiveness of signal and did not address the fact "receivers" would be required in 1978 just like access to [sic] "*internet*" wires, cable television wires, and computers or mobile phones are required today. Early misinterpretations of this ruling allowed cable TV **wire broadcasts** to escape FCC regulation and this is now obvious but ignored. It makes no difference what medium is used to broadcast communications to the public and it makes no difference if subscriptions or devices are first required. **Broadcasting is intentionally making communications available to numerous parties** and this was the rational the *Pacifica* ruling attempted to make clear.

COMMENTS SEEK BAN OF "PORN" BROADCASTS REGARDLESS OF VENUE

The following (81) commenters generally not only sought continued banning of radio/television broadcasts of nakedness and indecent audio but also sought an end to current FCC malfeasance on regulation of broadcasts by wire and radio generally whether called [sic] "*internet*" or "online".

("Aaron", Amy Garst, Ave Hurley, Betty Harrill, Blanche Day, Bob Stone, Brenda Heslop, Bruce Yovich, Calvin Simmons (good), "Carla", Carol Nibbelink, Carolyn P Black, Cecily Dossett, Christy Asbury, Craig Beitinger, Crystal Oprea, Dale Hulse, "Dan", Dana Blondo, "Danya", Dave Jackman, Denna L Davis, "Destroyed Family", Don Yeater, Emily Peterson, Frances Ivanov, George R. Jennings Jr., "Goldia", Greg Carlisle, James Bushnell, Jessica Wilemon, Joani Hatch, "Jodie", Joel Wright, Johannes Perlmuther, Johannes Perlmuther, John Pombrio way-good, Karl Mathias, Kevin McWilliams, Kurt Rowley, Ph.D., L & T Lang, Lauren Hales, Laurie Kraemer, Laurie Kraemer, Linda M Bunsen, Lindy Deen, Lucille Mendenhall, M.C.Gens, Marcus Nelson, Marcy West, Matt Packard, megan powell, michael g. O'leary, Michael Keller, Moana Wilcox, Myron Taylor, Naomi Brown, Niki Jensen, Noelle Chin, Parent Television Council, Patricia Strickland, Paul & Lori Wagner, Phil Crandall, Rayda L Renshaw, Richard C. August, Richard John, Richard P. Felix, Robert H. Pettitt, Robert Ziccarelli, Ron Raridon, Scott Obermann, Shanna Ormond, Sherry Hepler, Stephen Crowell, "Tara", Ted Kilcup, Todd Manson, Tom Kennedy, Torrie Young, W.Harrington, William Eckmann)

COMMENTS SEEK BAN OF "PORN" ON THE "*PORN-BY-WIRE*" OF [SIC] "*INTERNET*" VERY CLEARLY

Comments like by George R. Jennings Jr. were very common. There are too many to include herein without adding at least three pages.

> *"IN ADDITION PLEASE CONSIDER CLEAN INTERNET STANDARDS SIMILAR TO CLEAN AIRWAYS STANDARDS"*

PENDING LAWSUIT(S) AGAINST THE FCC

Curtis J Neeley Jr. has personally pursued the FCC in Federal Court for malfeasance and failing to protect wire communications disguised as [sic] "*internet*". Curtis J Neeley Jr. did not seek fiscal damages but change in policy and was dismissed in clear error perhaps caused by anger by senior citizen Sir Lord Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren fifty-three days after admitting senior status. This lawsuit will seek fiscal damages on remand from each FCC Commissioner and also seek a younger "ruler" or will be filed again IN OTHER VENUES if appeal is not allowed to proceed IFP to preserve anonymous access to porn.

The FCC will now face claims for fiscal damages due to failing to make 47 USC §153 ¶(59), wire communications, safe and failing to enforce 47 USC §605 and thereby allowing pervasive unauthorized publication and use of wire communications that had and still have adult filtration installed to forbid display to anonymous minors like at <deviantart.com>. Viewership of naked images "*online*" must require logging-in where identities can be tracked and verified but Defendant Google Inc and Defendant Microsoft Corporation each refuse to require this.

Nevertheless; logging-in should be required now by the FCC as well as adoption of rule sets protecting both **Free Speech AND children** that have already been served in this complaint on the FCC, the US Attorney General, Google Inc, Microsoft Corporation, and 3rd District AR Representative Steve Womack. See 47 USC §232.

USA – ADDICTED TO THE "*Forbidden Fruit*"

It has never been likely any United States' Court will rule morally and prohibit Defendant Google Inc and Defendant Microsoft Corporation from bypassing adult filtration and showing nakedness to judges, SCOTUS clerks like Ruth Jones Esq, and other anonymous viewers. It is not likely that a United States' Court will require the FCC to face a jury and be ordered to pay for malfeasance that allows anonymous pornography because many if not most **judges are addicted** to anonymous access to legal "porn" and treat this inappropriately as a right, as do most citizens.

REALITY ADMITTED

The laws of the United states will continue being ignored and this Plaintiff may be dismissed to preserve **anonymous wire and radio consumption of pornography.** Anonymous access to indecency is unsafe and illegal since wire communications first developed from telegraph to facsimile and finally to "*online*". Sending a facsimile of Janet Jackson's right nipple is felonious per 18 USC §1470, if sent to a minor. Ms Jackson's naked right nipple is the most viewed nipple in history because FCC malfeasance allows this "online" on inappropriately UNREGULATED [sic] "*internet*" wire communications like can be seen HERE or HERE or as follows. (1, 2, 3, 4).

The political drive to end porn-by-wire or unregulated [sic] "*internet*" communications may be the only manner for ending the immorality of the United States "online" like done by the Nineteenth Amendment allowing ALL adult females to vote. The Nineteenth Amendment passed **after** Susan B. Anthony unsuccessfully tried to alert SCOTUS of United States' immorality and was fined $100 for voting by SCOTUS. Susan B. Anthony died in 1906 unable to vote but remained the only female voter in the history of the United States ignoring the SCOTUS fine.

CONCLUSION – REPLY TO 13-86 COMMENTS

The majority of the hundreds of GN 13-86 comments examined by Curtis J Neeley Jr with the terms [sic] "*internet*" or "online" referred to this as another venue that was more controllable and a media where those seeking "porn"could turn as a valid alternative to RF broadcasts. Very many advised of contemplating choosing only streaming of [sic] "*internet*" wire broadcasts and abandoning RF broadcasts of television entirely. These commenters appear to trust their purchased [sic] "*internet*" filtration.

CONCLUSION – REPLY TO 13-86 COMMENTS -cont

Theself-censoring option propagates discrimination based on fiscal ability or lack of common sense counter to the mission of the FCC per 47 USC §151. There were numerous requests that the FCC simply be abolished due to decades of utter failure begun with unregulated TV wires called cable TV. **Regulation of wire communications disguised as [sic] "*internet*" or cable television wires and safe FCC search engines must now develop.** Curtis J Neeley Jr. **DEMANDS** an end to FCC malfeasance like Susan B Anthony unsuccessfully pursued the right to vote. Mr Neeley is, however, much more determined than Ms Anthony, as should almost be obvious by now or should be obvious soon.

13-86 COMMENTS SEARCHES W/LINKS

1. "I support" -internet **649**
2. "I support" +internet **6**
3. "I oppose" **51,078**
4. "media" **3,064**
5. "internet" **620**
6. "AFA" **325**
7. **"**online**" 99**
8. **"**censor**" 342**
9. **"**agree**" 555**
10. agree -"do not" **181**
11. **"**outdated**" 28**
12. "other countries" **93**
13. "against" **3025**
14. "free speech" **264**
15. "censor +policy" **57**
16. "internet" "online" **3**
17. "the" **93,732**
18. **"**fuck**" 140**
19. "wire communication" **2**
20. "AFA -bend" **47**
21. afa +bend **278**
22. "copy paste" **10**

ABOVE ARE LIVE SEARCHES

(260) "PORN" SUPPORTERS FILE COMMENTS WITHOUT "INTERNET" OR "ONLINE", PLUS (326) ANTI-AFA COMMENTS, PLUS (36) "PORN" SUPPORTERS WITH COMMENTS USING "INTERNET" OR "ONLINE" IS about (622) "porn" SUPPORTERS out of 94,013

The results LINKED above except for ## (3, 4, 13, 17) were read and examined as of May 13, 2013. Every supporter of "porn" was noted and archived. The self-identified supporters of "porn" are perpetually listed with links to their "porn-support" filings. "Supporters" of nakedness in any way, by definition, are supporters of PORN to Curtis J Neeley Jr. One is either against ALL nakedness or is a supporter of PORN. The (622) pornography supporters listed above are linked along with the (36) listed and linked herein (~622) were less relevant to this DEMAND that the FCC regulate ALL wire communications including those called [sic] "*internet*" wires for disguise.

ALL-RN_13-86_Porn-Supporter-comments.

ONE ACCEPTABLE CONCLUSION

Regulation of wire communications disguised as [sic] "*internet*" and safe FCC "search" must now develop. Not in ten years and **not after another five years, but NOW!** Curtis J Neeley Jr will pursue the current FCC malfeasance like Susan B Anthony pursued suffrage. Curtis J Neeley Jr is (44) typing this and Ms Anthony was (86) when making her last public comment. Curtis J Neeley Jr repeats Ms Anthony's prediction. Most judges on benches today will be dead and rotting in forty years, Curtis J Neeley Jr. will have reached just (84) years old if not also expired. **FAILURE IS IMPOSSIBLE**

FCC's GN 13-86 proceeding was studied by Curtis J Neeley Jr far beyond any the FCC is likely to have considered. Thousands upon thousands of people were discovered who will join this pursuit of the FCC and demanding that **ALL DISTANT BROADCASTS BE REGULATED** according to law. The [sic] "internet" that has developed over the last few decades is EVIL but can be fixed easily and will be made safe according to existing US Law before Curtis J Neeley Jr dies. No new law is needed. **FAILURE IS IMPOSSIBLE**.*

ONE ACCEPTABLE CONCLUSION -cont

The porn-by-wire of [sic] "*internet*" wire communications **must be regulated by the FCC** before becoming as pervasive as FM radio communications are today as will soon occur like has been explained adequately in *Neeley Jr v FCC, et al,* (5:12-cv-5208) Docket #56. This explanation is far beyond most judges and reveals highly abstract "top secret" military communications training. USMC 2831 PMOS personnel should generally understand and many electrical engineers will also. Wire and radio communications are already as pervasive in some of China as FM radio is in much of the United States today and must be made safe before becoming as pervasive here. This is part of the FCC mission given in 47 USC §151.

Curtis J. Neeley Jr.
2619 N Quality Lane
Suite 123
Fayetteville, AR 72703

Failure is impossible,

/s/ Curtis J Neeley Jr

Curtis J Neeley Jr.