

From: GabbieH@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/28/03 7:04PM
Subject: RE: TV & Newspaper Ownership

Please be advised that striving for fairness and balance in the media is of primary importance.

No, the same company should not be able to own both television stations and newspapers. The programming gets too one-sided.

I live in a community where "conservatives" rule the radio waves I'm thankful for the newspaper editor who helps to balance the pendulum. He is fair-minded, a person of reason and is very intelligent.

The only other format that helps to balance all the conservative talk shows in this community, is the public radio station.

My vote is to keep ownership separate ! Thank you.

J.R. Hunts, Ph.D.
Medford, Oregon

From: tc
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/29/03 2:15AM
Subject: Relaxation of Media Ownership Rules

Anthony R. Conte
80 Harvard St.
Winchester, MA 1890-1243
781-729-6154

January 28, 2003

To: FCC:

I am writing in support of the proposal to eliminate archaic FCC regulations limiting the number of media outlets that can be owned by any company. No where **else** in American society does a regulatory agency presume the authority to so minutely regulate economic activity. The whole concept of the FCC's "public interest" standard rests upon a legal fiction created in the Communications Act of 1934 that asserts the airwave belong to the public. While airwaves may exist in concept, in reality there is no practical applications of the electro-magnetic spectrum unless some company makes the capital investment in equipment, personnel and marketing to create a radio or television station.

The original media ownership regulations had the effect of protecting the monopoly position of the three television networks, and only the loosening of those regulations allowed the creation of the FOX Network which has brought badly needed political diversity to the television market

In my own city of Boston I have seen how the arbitrary prohibition of ownership of a TV station by a newspaper led to a dramatic reduction in media diversity and the domination of the Boston newspaper market by the Boston Globe. Channel 5 in Boston was once owned by the money losing Herald-Traveler Corp. which was forced to divest itself of Channel 5 the profits of which subsidized the daily Herald Traveller newspaper. After the corporation lost Channel 5 it soon after sold its newspaper to the Hearst chain and the independent Herald Traveler was lost.

I have no fear of **loss** of media diversity because the Internet has opened the door to virtually unlimited opportunities for specialized media outlets.

Very truly yours,

Anthony R. Conte

From: tc
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/29/03 2:15AM
Subject: Relaxation of Media Ownership Rules

Anthony R. Conte
80 Harvard St.
Winchester, MA 1890-1243
781-729-6154

January 28.2003

To: FCC:

I am writing in support of the proposal to eliminate archaic FCC regulations limiting the number of media outlets that can be owned by any company. No where else in American society does a regulatory agency presume the authority to so minutely regulate economic activity. The whole concept of the FCC's "public interest" standard rests upon a legal fiction created in the Communications Act of 1934 that asserts the airwave belong to the public. While airwaves may exist in concept, in reality there is no practical applications of the electro-magnetic spectrum unless some company makes the capital investment in equipment, personnel and marketing to create a radio or television station.

The original media ownership regulations had the effect of protecting the monopoly position of the three television networks, and only the loosening of those regulations allowed the creation of the FOX Network which has brought badly needed political diversity to the television market,

In my own city of Boston I have seen how the arbitrary prohibition of ownership of a TV station by a newspaper led to a dramatic reduction in media diversity and the domination of the Boston newspaper market by the Boston Globe. Channel 5 in Boston was once owned by the money losing Herald-Traveler Corp. which was forced to divest itself of Channel 5 the profits of which subsidized the daily Herald Traveller newspaper. After the corporation lost Channel 5 it soon after sold its newspaper to the Hearst chain and the independent Herald Traveler was lost.

I have no fear of loss of media diversity because the Internet has opened the door to virtually unlimited opportunities for specialized media outlets

Very truly yours,

Anthony R. Conte

From: wdale@pacbell.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/26/03 11:09AM
Subject: Say No to Media Concentration!

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

W. Dale Barker

1166 B Street #2
Yuba City, CA. 95991

From: Kevin Saari
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/20/03 7:23PM
Subject: standards

Michael K. Powell

Chairman

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am writing to tell you of my opposition to the proposed changes by your agency to the current Media Ownership Rules.

Further concentration of media ownership does not serve our democratic society based upon democratic principles, but instead undermines it. Following World War II, our government placed restrictions upon news media outlet ownership because of how totalitarian regimes used controlled media concentrated in the hands of a few corporations and government agencies to control their people and move the world towards war. The proposed changes to **the** current Media Ownership **Rules** completely undermines this principle that so many Americans have fought to defend from our countrys birth to the present.

Furthermore, the series of reports released by the FCC about the current media marketplace are focused almost entirely on the economic impact of relaxing the ownership rules. They ignore the public's interest in a diverse and independent press. *You* have also scheduled only one public hearing regarding *this* issue. The FCC has barely publicized the proposed changes, and combined with a very short public comment period I can only surmise that you hope to sneak these changes past the American people. I certainly didnt find out about them as a result of anything that was done by your agency.

You should be ashamed that an agency under your leadership is not using what is in the best interests of the American public as its guiding principle, but instead is thinking of what is most profitable for a few huge corporations who only care about the bottom line, not about what is good for democracy.

Sincerely yours,

Kevin Saari

33408 Karen Drive

Avon Lake, Ohio 44012

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Mail Plus - Powerful. Affordable. Sign up now

From: bootsy holler
To: **Mike** Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1130103 12:31AM
Subject: STOP MEDIA CONSOLIDATION

PROTECT DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA.
PROMOTE DIVERSITY, COMPETITION AND LOCALISM.
STOP THE RULES LIMITING MEDIA CONSOLIDATION.
WE NEED TO STRENGTHEN THE RULES NOT LOOSEN THEM

WHAT IS THE POINT IN HAVING COOKIE-CUTTER PROGRAMMING, IN RADIO, TV AND NEWS?

THE KIDS AND YOUNG FOLKS IN AMERICA ARE STARVING FOR ORIGINALITY.
DON'T MAKE IT WORSE.

b

B O O T S Y H O L L E R . PHOTOGRAPHER . TRYKE STUDIO . SEATTLE . 206.706.2530
produce + style + shoot
take a look : <http://www.bootsyholler.com>

From: Erikdavis313@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/27/03 8:55PM
Subject: Stop media consolidation, do not deregulate

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

If the FCC allows deregulation to occur, this would not only destroy Freedom of the Press, it would take the citizens of America's ownership of the airways away! Media giants like Fox, NBC, ABC/Disney/Aol/Time-Warner, CBS to effectively own the airways of the United States, and to pound the view-points, right wing political views, crappy TV shows into our homes and minds. This is not healthy for America nor is it in line of the Constitution of the United States. This would mean that the US Media would not fit the Capitalistic Ideal anymore because it would be the tightest and most exclusive oligopoly known!

Our media (Radio, TV, Magazines, Newspapers, and Internet Service Providers) are already a short list of conglomerates. Currently there are only three major radio conglomerates (Infiniti, Bonneville, and Clear Channel) who own the majority of these stations. They have very limited programming, and already kill the creativity of the American People. This makes money and fads more important than our ability to create. This would make us the most narrow-minded, short-sighted nation on earth, doomed to die if we deregulated further. Do not let us be in the History books on a parallel with the Roman Empire. We need media diversity, and limited ownership rights!!!!

Erik Davis

Sincerely,

Erik Davis
1236 Wesley Ave
Evanston, Illinois 60202

cc:

Senator Richard Durbin
Senator Peter Fitzgerald
Representative Jan Schakowsky

From: Rickjor@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/28/03 9:19PM
Subject: Telecom Act revisions

I am writing to oppose the 1996 Telecommunications Act's effect on the radio industry. This Act has been a disaster for the quality of radio in the United States. Please reverse **the** direction and force distributed and decentralized ownership of radio stations across the US. We need radio that offers a diversity of opinion and entertainment to reflect the diversity of the US and to foster the spread of information for our citizens to participate actively in a democracy. The 1996 Telecommunications Act has severely damaged the variety and quality of content on the radio. The **FCC** has done a disservice to the US by fostering the consolidation of radio station ownership and should reverse course immediately..

Thank you.

Richard Jordan
Email: rickjor @aol.com
360 Grove St
Medford. MA 02155

From: Jmpang@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/19/03 7:01 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am writing as a concerned citizen—not someone in the media at all—to urge you to increase, not relax the rules regarding ownership by media companies. Here in the Los Angeles market, once numerous and independent TV stations are now owned by just a few big corporations. For example, Viacom now owns both news-radio stations, KFWB and KNX, as well as KCBS-TV and KCAL-TV. Even with no decrease in the number of stations, the content, emphasis and slant to the news will be the same at all of them, since the ownership is the same and the bottom line is clearly the priority.

What has happened with the "local" radio market is a crime. Clear Channel seems to own almost every station now, controlling what music is played on the air and eliminating local voices and diversity. Almost all talk show hosts are nationally syndicated and conservative, protesting the same things over and over again. One of the last local talk-show hosts and the only one with a different point of view, veteran Michael Jackson, lost his mike when the station went to '40s music with one national D.J. The owner? Clear Channel. The reason? It's cheaper than running a local station. The losers? The listeners in Los Angeles who wanted to hear about local, regional, national and international topics, along with those who wanted to listen to someone other than a Republican mouthpiece. Clear Channel should never have been allowed to own 3000 radio stations throughout the country. Maybe as a Republican you don't mind that a few conservative voices control all the media, but it is your job to prevent that from happening. Private entities may own the stations, but the public owns the airwaves. In the drive for further profits, sleazy wins over substantial, titillating wins over thought-provoking, and flashy wins over factual. Product that will be seen by the most people, not that with the highest quality or alternative viewpoint, will be aired. And the public clearly will not be served.

It is not good if few wealthy individuals or corporations have control of the vast media—network, cable, radio and print—and can control the content seen, heard and read by millions. 2002 gave us examples of how markets need to be regulated (energy, Wall Street). Please don't relax the few regulations left on the media.

Sincerely,
Judy Pang
Palos Verdes Estates, CA

From: emily@loopylulu.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

Emily Leffler

702 Chaney Dr. #304
Takoma Park, MD, 20912

From: tomas@accessliving.org
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should strengthen all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules should serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry. This media concentration hurts our democratic processes and supports a corporate and economic agenda that leads to increasing concentrations of wealth and power.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC miss the point completely concerning the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity and the broad coverage of important issues. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become much more limited and the selection of issues covered left to corporate elites.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. As the FCC has allowed our media outlets to merge, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints has been compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country (including Chicago) and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue in a democracy when questions as

profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take **the** time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

With the deepest concern,
Tom Wilson

3950 N. Lakeshore Dr. #1501
Chicago, IL, 60613

From: george.p.atkinson@vanderbilt.edu
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 11:11 PM
Subject: I support media diversify

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions. I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thanks,
George Atkinson

Box 350569 Station B
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN. 37235

From: Lucas Larson
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/27/03 7:55AM
Subject: Keep media tree and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Lucas Larson

From: Joyce Asfour
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 9:50AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the *Newspaper/Broadcast* Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network **Rule**.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Joyce W. Asfour
6037 Cary Ave
Cincinnati, OH 45224

Get the Internet just the way you want it.
Free software, free e-mail, and free Internet access for a month!
Try Juno Web: <http://dl.www.juno.com/dynoget/tagj>.

From: Karin Schein
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 9:50AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Karin Schein