

From: Peter Hudiburg
To: LLowryMays@clearchannel.com, MarkPMays@clearchannel.com,
RandalITMays@clearchannel.com, Carolyn.Burek@clearchannel.com, **ChadGDan@clearchannel.com**,
MickeyLGayler@clearchannel.com, BillLHamersly@clearchannel.com, HerbWHill@clearchannel.com,
JulieFHill@clearchannel.com. **AceJHoran@clearchannel.com**, **KathrynMaysJohnson@clearchannel.com**,
SusanRKrieg@clearchannel.com. WRickMangum@clearchannel.com,
RandyBPalmer@clearchannel.com, William.Suffa@clearchannel.com,
David.E.Wilson@clearchannel.com, RickWWolf@clearchannel.com, **KenEWyker@clearchannel.com**,
randypalmer@clearchannel.com
Date: 3/27/03 12:17PM
Subject: Your biased news coverage, news fabrication and censorship

To: LLowryMays@clearchannel.com, MarkPMays@clearchannel.com,
RandalITMays@clearchannel.com, Carolyn.Burek@clearchannel.com,
ChadGDan@clearchannel.com, MickeyLGayler@clearchannel.com,
BillLHamersly@clearchannel.com, HerbWHill@clearchannel.com,
JulieFHill@clearchannel.com, AceJHoran@clearchannel.com,
KathrynMaysJohnson@clearchannel.com. **SusanRKrieg@clearchannel.com**,
WRickMangum@clearchannel.com. **RandyBPalmer@clearchannel.com**,
William.Suffa@clearchannel.com, David.E.Wilson@clearchannel.com,
RickWWolf@clearchannel.com, KenEWyker@clearchannel.com, **randypalmer@clearchannel.com**
Cc: mpowell@fcc.gov, kabernat@fcc.gov, mcopps@fcc.gov, kjmweb@fcc.gov,
jadelste@fcc.gov

Re: biased Clearchannel news coverage and fabrication

Dear Clearchannel Executive,

JUST THE FACTS PLEASE-WE DON'T NEED THE FEAR MONGERING

The people request, no, DEMAND unbiased reporting, or we will launch a campaign, a campaign of the people to stop your company from reporting biased interviews and stories. We will expose the monopoly of information that Clear Channel has so strongly exploited. Through grassroots campaigns we will address the mainstream media's continuing lie, biased coverage and, in your case, fabricated news stories. You are urging your listeners to mount counter pro-war demonstrations and then covering those flag waving, jeering crowds as news. We expect you to heed our request, or be prepared to face an enormous public campaign against your corporate media company.

I am disgusted and fed up with the monopoly of media, and the absence of accurate and unbiased media coverage. The events of late have truly revealed the corporate media's penchant for propaganda and fear mongering. We deplore your attempts to whip up public hysteria in support of this illegal, unprovoked invasion of Iraq.

Your censorship of all anti-war songs is also deplorable.

Evidently, you're afraid to confront the criminality of this war.

Sincerely,

Peter Hudiburg

CC:
Adelstein

Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner

From: George Caldwell
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 3/28/03 2:02PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

George Caldwell (mocus3@aol.com) writes:

Dear Sir,

I'm writing this letter because I'm greatly concerned about the life of the free press here in our great country. There seems to be a move to remove restrictions limiting ownership of newspapers and television stations. I ask you to please, please extend the debate to the public for next year. Removing these restrictions will enable a few powerful people to control the press. That would be the end of the free press in America. And as Thomas Jefferson said, Without a free press, there can be no democracy. Thank you for your consideration.

George Caldwell

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.12.96.139
Remote IP address: 64.12.96.139

From: didier murat
To: KathleenAbernathy
Date: Sat, Apr 19.2003 10:26 AM
Subject: Public comment.

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

I urge you to hold public meetings before making any changes to the current media ownership limitations.

It is my belief that the public will be losing the diversity it needs in gathering informative news, un-homogenized points of view, if a few corporations are left to control our airwaves, and printed news.

Sincerely,

Didier Murat

1251 Greenbush road

Charlotte, VT 05445 USA

(802)25 5083

From: didier murat
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 10:27 AM
Subject: Public comment.

Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

I urge you to hold public meetings before making any changes to the current media ownership limitations.

It is my belief that the public will be losing the diversity it needs in gathering informative news, un-homogenized points of view, if a few corporations are left to control our airwaves, and printed news.

Sincerely,

Didier Murat

1251 Greenbush road

Charlotte, VT 05445 USA

(802) 425 5083

From: Maurice Pennock
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 3:24 PM
Subject: FCC Deregulation Bad for Democracy

From: Maurice R. Pennock Saturday, April 19, 2003

465 E. Commrece St.
Bridgeton New Jersey, 08302

Tel: (856) 451-2333
Fax: (856) 451-3507
Email: pennockm@att.net

Dear FCC Commissioner.

Please stop the plans to end critical safeguards designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership.

I believe that the proposed deregulation will be bad for competition, the First Amendment and democracy.

Under the FCC plans, one company in a community will be able to own the newspaper, several TV and radio stations, the cable system, and the principal Internet access company. There will be fewer owners of networks, stations, and newspapers nationwide. I urge you to also call for public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect my community and the nation.

Television and other Media plays an important and powerful role in my community. It is the vehicle through which we obtain information to make decisions to shape our lives and our children's future. I am concerned about the spread of unfair and unbalanced news reporting and programming that some Media are presenting to the American People if deregulation proceeds.

I understand that television broadcasters in major cities across the United States began implementing the use of digital television signals on May 1, 1999. I want to know what responsibilities broadcasters will be required to assume in exchange for the free use of our airwaves. I am also requesting that the "Fairness Act" be reinstated to ensure that all sides of the issues are presented by the media so that people can make informed decisions.

The airwaves are a public trust, yet Congress has given exclusive control of those airwaves to major corporations for free. In return, broadcasters are supposed to act in the public interest; but this has never happened. Today, I see that critical journalism is being attacked as "Liberal" and "biased" and is being replaced with truly biased conservative corporate political views designed to shape the hearts and minds of the American people to suit the wishes of a few powerful men.

FCC Chairman Michael Powell has said that the citizenry's input is not required in deciding the outcome. He has stated that instead he needs to see hard facts generated by the FCC to support the current regulatory restrictions otherwise they will be abolished. Firstly, I disagree that the people's voice need not be heard. Secondly, I would propose that by looking at the situation that arose out of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. One can clearly see the changes since radio deregulation and that they are not good for democracy. Today, the radio waves are dominated by the Right. A condition that did not exist before deregulation. Fair-minded and honest news reporting is daily attacked as liberal and left leaning when it is clearly not. To the contrary, Clear Channel and its' 1200 radio stations all preach the conservative message. Clear Channel is one of the litigants in the current suit to deregulate the other media. The owner of Clear Channel has close ties to the President and has been a Republican supporter for years.

It is my humble opinion that such bias, amplified through a national chain of over 1200 Clear Channel

stations, has clear negative implications for a healthy democracy. The fact that Clear Channel presents such positive images of Republican values has translated into Republican support for this new deregulation proposal that may (they hope) become the same pro Republican tool for Television, Cable and News Papers. The proposed deregulation holds the dual promise of enriching investors and owners of Media Giants and helping to preserve and extend Republican grip on power. I believe that this will have disastrous effects on our democracy. Americans must understand the true nature of what is going on here.

It is clear that the Media Giants now lobbying for this deregulation are deliberately not reporting the proceedings because they feel that doing so will not serve their interest. 72% of Americans are not even aware of the impending decision in June of this year. It is not a healthy situation for democracy when the profit motives of a corporation deny people access to accurate information. Please urge the Media to act on their long held insistence that they never allow self interest to manipulate the news.

Imagine the future. A future where the trend in Media mergers continues until there is no real diversity. A world where corporate interests shape and color the events of the day to suit their interests. A world where complicit government acts on the behalf of corporations while taking only token consideration of negative consequences that will harm the population. A world where the Media backs one party with support while allowing extremist elements to spew propaganda against all potential enemies of Republicans and corporations while billing it as "entertainment". What might Television look like in this world?

Rupert Murdoch's Right Wing Fox News Network comes to mind. The programming is clearly biased to the right and clearly and openly condemns and attacks what it perceives as the "liberals" yet it proclaims to be "Fair and Balanced. I call Fox News "Attack Style" since they attack, usually with monikers and jibes all that oppose their view/message to silence debate and justify their position. Let me state clearly that it is the unfairness of the "attack style" of reporting that is my concern and not conservative viewpoints.

In the case of Fox News I believe that the source of Fox's conservative position comes directly from Rupert Murdoch and are purely self serving to him. For example, Fox news is staunchly pro war. Is it mere coincidence that Rupert Murdoch has stated that the Iraq war is a good thing because "Oil at 20\$ a Barrel is Better than and Tax Cut"? Or is it something more sinister. (Note: I am not necessarily anti-war and do believe the Iraqis have been freed) Additionally, attack style news reporting draws viewers with its sensationalism and hence advertising dollars and Rupert Murdoch becomes wealthier. Fox News is now more popular than CNN.

An example of attack style reporting is when Fox News reporters go so far as to call other reporters who asked the President how long the Iraq war will take and how much it may cost "Anti-American". In my opinion, it is completely unfair and unbalanced to apply the negative image of a subversive individual to an American who asks questions of the President. Especially questions that are clearly not "Anti-American" but are merely intended to get information about the likely cost and duration of a war we are fighting. I have heard Fox News reporters refer to citizens protesting the war as "nit-wits". Tom Daschel for stating his disappointment at the failure of diplomacy was called a "Bad American" by Fox News. Fox aired the same statement made by Mr. Daschel for weeks while a parade of individuals were interviewed with universal condemnation of not only Mr. Daschel, but because he is their leader, all Democrats. The French, German and Russian People and Governments who opposed the war are routinely referred to as "weasels".

Such opinionated and inflammatory/defamatory language used to be relegated to clearly identified editorials where it was stated before the piece that the views and opinions of the speaker were not necessarily coincident with the views of the news station. Now, there has been a blurring of the lines where opinion and condemnation of opposing views is interjected liberally in the news and is actually the opinion of the broadcaster. I am very concerned that the American people are susceptible to the attack style that Fox News is using and am concerned that they will largely believe what they are told. What will happen to America when it is acceptable to attack those who ask questions or express disappointment by branding them "Bad Americans" on the nightly news. I am concerned additionally by the likelihood that

this phenomenon will spread as more corporations losing market share to Fox will attempt to emulate their style to maintain ratings and advertisers and as more mergers put more stations under Rupert Murdoch's control.

Free market advocates will advance the theory that whatever draws more viewers and generates more advertising dollars and benefits investors is sufficient justification for doing it but I disagree. For example, there is clearly a large movement in this country to control the violence and sexual images that we see on TV especially among conservatives. The free market view would hold that, sex and violence are good because it sells and we should actually have more of it. Yet there are few who would suggest that these images are beneficial to society. In just the same way I am concerned that the type of news broadcasting we are seeing in Fox News while benefiting the corporations that produce it is not beneficial to society.

The public deserves mandatory broadcasting obligations. I respectfully request that the FCC convene hearings to hear from those of us who are concerned. We should expect something fair, balanced and informative in return for giving away such vast public resources. We do not expect to see the political atmosphere and the hearts and minds of the nation shaped by the profit motives of big corporations.

Lastly and most importantly I note that although it is universally accepted that concentration of wealth and power have negative societal consequences. Concentration of power over the media is doubly dangerous, because it is through the media that society has the opportunity to learn of, discuss, and resolve its problems, including monopolistic business practices and self serving officials. Media Monopolies are in a position not only to manipulate and distort information in an uncontested information environment, but to attack or silence criticism.

Sincerely,

Maurice R. Pennock

From: Maurice Pennock
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 3:26 PM
Subject: FCC deregulation bad for Democracy

From: Maurice R. Pennock Saturday, April 19, 2003

465 E. Commrece St.
Bridgeton New Jersey, 08302

Tel: (856) 451-2333
Fax: (856) 451-3507
Email: pennockm@att.net

Dear FCC Commissioner,

Please stop the plans to end critical safeguards designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership.

I believe that the proposed deregulation will be bad for competition, the First Amendment and democracy.

Under the FCC plans, one company in a community will be able to own the newspaper, several TV and radio stations, the cable system, and the principal Internet access company. There will be fewer owners of networks, stations, and newspapers nationwide. I urge you to also call for public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect my community and the nation.

Television and other Media plays an important and powerful role in my community. It is **the** vehicle through which we obtain information to make decisions to shape our lives and our children's future. I am concerned about the spread of unfair and unbalanced news reporting and programming that some Media are presenting to the American People if deregulation proceeds.

I understand that television broadcasters in major cities across the United States began implementing the **use** of digital television signals on May 1, 1999. I want to know what responsibilities broadcasters will be required to assume in exchange for the free **use** of our airwaves. I am also requesting that the "Fairness Act" be reinstated to ensure that all sides of the issues are presented by the media **so** that people can make informed decisions.

The airwaves are a public trust, yet Congress has given exclusive control of those airwaves to major corporations for free. In return, broadcasters are supposed to act in the public interest; but this has never happened. Today, I see that critical journalism is being attacked as "Liberal" and "biased" and is being replaced with truly biased conservative corporate political views designed to shape the hearts and minds of the American people to suit the wishes of a few powerful men.

FCC Chairman Michael Powell has said that the citizenry's input is not required in deciding the outcome. **He** has stated that instead he needs to **see** hard facts generated by the FCC to support the current regulatory restrictions otherwise they will be abolished. Firstly, I disagree that the people's voice need not be heard. Secondly, I would propose that by looking at the situation that arose out of the **Telecommunications Act of 1996. One can clearly see the changes since radio deregulation and that they** are not good for democracy. Today, the radio waves are dominated by the Right. A condition that did not exist before deregulation. Fair-minded and honest news reporting is daily attacked as liberal and **left** leaning when it is clearly not. To the contrary, Clear Channel and its' 1200 radio stations all preach the conservative message. Clear Channel is one of the Litigants in the current suit to deregulate the other media. The owner of Clear Channel has close ties to the President and has been a Republican Supporter for years.

It is my humble opinion that such bias, amplified through a national chain of over 1200 Clear Channel

stations, has clear negative implications for a healthy democracy. The fact that Clear Channel presents such positive images of Republican values has translated into Republican support for this new deregulation proposal that may (they hope) become the same pro Republican tool for Television, Cable and News Papers. The proposed deregulation holds the dual promise of enriching investors and owners of Media Giants and helping to preserve and extend Republican grip on power. I believe that this will have disastrous effects on our democracy. Americans must understand the true nature of what is going on here.

It is clear that the Media Giants now lobbying for this deregulation are deliberately not reporting the proceedings because they feel that doing so will not serve their interest. 72% of Americans are not even aware of the impending decision in June of this year. It is not a healthy situation for democracy when the profit motives of a corporation deny people access to accurate information. Please urge the Media to act on their long held insistence that they never allow self interest to manipulate the news.

Imagine the future. A future where the trend in Media mergers continues until there is no real diversity. A world where corporate interests shape and color the events of the day to suit their interests. A world where complicit government acts on the behalf of corporations while taking only token consideration of negative consequences that will harm the population. A world where the Media backs one party with support while allowing extremist elements to spew propaganda against all potential enemies of Republicans and corporations while billing it as "entertainment". What might Television look like in this world?

Rupert Murdoch's Right Wing Fox News Network comes to mind. The programming is clearly biased to the right and clearly and openly condemns and attacks what it perceives as the "liberals" yet it proclaims to be "Fair and Balanced". I call Fox News "Attack Style" since they attack, usually with monikers and jibes all that oppose their view/message to silence debate and justify their position. Let me state clearly that it is the unfairness of the "attack style" of reporting that is my concern and not conservative viewpoints.

In the case of Fox News I believe that the source of Fox's conservative position comes directly from Rupert Murdoch and are purely self serving to him. For example, Fox news is staunchly pro war. Is it mere coincidence that Rupert Murdoch has stated that the Iraq war is a good thing because "Oil at 20\$ a Barrel is Better than and Tax Cut"? Or is it something more sinister. (Note: I am not necessarily anti-war and do believe the Iraqis have been freed) Additionally, attack style news reporting draws viewers with its sensationalism and hence advertising dollars and Rupert Murdoch becomes wealthier. Fox News is now more popular than CNN.

An example of attack style reporting is when Fox News reporters go so far as to call other reporters who asked the President how long the Iraq war will take and how much it may cost "Anti-American". In my opinion, it is completely unfair and unbalanced to apply the negative image of a subversive individual to an American who asks questions of the President. Especially questions that are clearly not "Anti-American" but are merely intended to get information about the likely cost and duration of a war we are fighting. I have heard Fox News reporters refer to citizens protesting the war as "nit-wits". Tom Daschel for stating his disappointment at the failure of diplomacy was called a "Bad American" by Fox News. Fox aired the same statement made by Mr. Daschel for weeks while a parade of individuals were interviewed with universal condemnation of not only Mr. Daschel, but because he is their leader, all Democrats. The French, German and Russian People and Governments who opposed the war are routinely referred to as "weasels".

Such opinionated and inflammatory/defamatory language used to be relegated to clearly identified editorials where it was stated before the piece that the views and opinions of the speaker were not necessarily coincident with the views of the news station. Now, there has been a blurring of the lines where opinion and condemnation of opposing views is interjected liberally in the news and is actually the opinion of the broadcaster. I am very concerned that the American people are susceptible to the attack style that Fox News is using and am concerned that they will largely believe what they are told. What will happen to America when it is acceptable to attack those who ask questions or express disappointment by branding them "Bad Americans" on the nightly news. I am concerned additionally by the likelihood that

this phenomenon will spread as more corporations losing market share to Fox will attempt to emulate their style to maintain ratings and advertisers and as more mergers put more stations under Rupert Murdoch's control.

Free market advocates will advance the theory that whatever draws more viewers and generates more advertising dollars and benefits investors is sufficient justification for doing it but I disagree. For example, there is clearly a large movement in this country to control the violence and sexual images that we see on *TV* especially among conservatives. The free market view would hold that, sex and violence are good because it sells and we should actually have more of it. Yet there are few who would suggest that these images are beneficial to society. In just the same way I am concerned that the type of news broadcasting we are seeing in Fox News while benefiting the corporations that produce it is not beneficial to society.

The public deserves mandatory broadcasting obligations. I respectfully request that the FCC convene hearings to hear from those of us who are concerned. We should expect something fair, balanced and informative in return for giving away such vast public resources. We do not expect to see the political atmosphere and the hearts and minds of the nation shaped by the profit motives of big corporations.

Lastly and most importantly I note that although it is universally accepted that concentration of wealth and power have negative societal consequences. Concentration of power over the media is doubly dangerous, because it is through the media that society has the opportunity to learn of, discuss, and resolve its problems, including monopolistic business practices and self serving officials. Media Monopolies are in a position not only to manipulate and distort information in an uncontested information environment, but to attack or silence criticism.

Sincerely,

Maurice R. Pennock

From: Maurice Pennock
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 3:27 PM
Subject: FCC Deregulation bad for democracy

From: Maurice R. Pennock Saturday, April 19, 2003

465 E. Commerce St.
Bridgeton New Jersey, 08302

Tel: (856) 451-2333
Fax: (856) 451-3507
Email: pennockm@att.net

Dear FCC Commissioner,

Please stop the plans to end critical safeguards designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership.

I believe that the proposed deregulation will be bad for competition, the First Amendment and democracy.

Under the FCC plans, one company in a community will be able to own the newspaper, several TV and radio stations, the cable system, and the principal Internet access company. There will be fewer owners of networks, stations, and newspapers nationwide. I urge you to also call for public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect my community and the nation.

Television and other Media plays an important and powerful role in my community. It is the vehicle through which we obtain information to make decisions to shape our lives and our children's future. I am concerned about the spread of unfair and unbalanced news reporting and programming that some Media are presenting to the American People if deregulation proceeds.

I understand that television broadcasters in major cities across the United States began implementing the use of digital television signals on May 1, 1999. I want to know what responsibilities broadcasters will be required to assume in exchange for the free use of our airwaves. I am also requesting that the "Fairness Act" be reinstated to ensure that all sides of the issues are presented by the media so that people can make informed decisions.

The airwaves are a public trust, yet Congress has given exclusive control of those airwaves to major corporations for free. In return, broadcasters are supposed to act in the public interest; but this has never happened. Today, I see that critical journalism is being attacked as "Liberal" and "biased" and is being replaced with truly biased conservative corporate political views designed to shape the hearts and minds of the American people to suit the wishes of a few powerful men.

FCC Chairman Michael Powell has said that the citizenry's input is not required in deciding the outcome. He has stated that instead he needs to see hard facts generated by the FCC to support the current regulatory restrictions otherwise they will be abolished. Firstly, I disagree that the people's voice need not be heard. Secondly, I would propose that by looking at the situation that arose out of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. One can clearly see the changes since radio deregulation and that they are not good for democracy. Today, the radio waves are dominated by the Right. A condition that did not exist before deregulation. Fair-minded and honest news reporting is daily attacked as liberal and left leaning when it is clearly not. To the contrary, Clear Channel and its' 1200 radio stations all preach the conservative message. Clear Channel is one of the Litigants in the current suit to deregulate the other media. The owner of Clear Channel has close ties to the President and has been a Republican Supporter for years.

It is my humble opinion that such bias, amplified through a national chain of over 1200 Clear Channel

stations, has clear negative implications for a healthy democracy. The fact that Clear Channel presents such positive images of Republican values has translated into Republican support for this new deregulation proposal that may (they hope) become the same pro Republican tool for Television, Cable and News Papers. The proposed deregulation holds the dual promise of enriching investors and owners of Media Giants and helping to preserve and extend Republican grip on power. I believe that this will have disastrous effects on our democracy. Americans must understand the true nature of what is going on here.

It is clear that the Media Giants now lobbying for this deregulation are deliberately not reporting the proceedings because they feel that doing so will not serve their interest. 72% of Americans are not even aware of the impending decision in June of this year. It is not a healthy situation for democracy when the profit motives of a corporation deny people access to accurate information. Please urge the Media to act on their long held insistence that they never allow self interest to manipulate the news.

Imagine the future. A future where the trend in Media mergers continues until there is no real diversity. A world where corporate interests shape and color the events of the day to suit their interests. A world where complicit government acts on the behalf of corporations while taking only token consideration of negative consequences that will harm the population. A world where the Media backs one party with support while allowing extremist elements to spew propaganda against all potential enemies of Republicans and corporations while billing it as "entertainment". What might Television look like in this world?

Rupert Murdoch's Right Wing Fox News Network comes to mind. The programming is clearly biased to the right and clearly and openly condemns and attacks what it perceives as the "liberals" yet it proclaims to be "Fair and Balanced. I call Fox News "Attack Style" since they attack, usually with monikers and jibes all that oppose their view/message to silence debate and justify their position. Let me state clearly that it is the unfairness of the "attack style" of reporting that is my concern and not conservative viewpoints.

In the case of Fox News I believe that the source of Fox's conservative position comes directly from Rupert Murdoch and are purely self serving to him. For example, Fox news is staunchly pro war. Is it mere coincidence that Rupert Murdoch has stated that the Iraq war is a good thing because "Oil at 20\$ a Barrel is Better than and Tax Cut"? Or is it something more sinister. (Note: I am not necessarily anti-war and do believe the Iraqis have been freed) Additionally, attack style news reporting draws viewers with its sensationalism and hence advertising dollars and Rupert Murdoch becomes wealthier. Fox News is now more popular than CNN.

An example of attack style reporting is when Fox News reporters go so far as to call other reporters who asked the President how long the Iraq war will take and how much it may cost "Anti-American". In my opinion, it is completely unfair and unbalanced to apply the negative image of a subversive individual to an American who asks questions of the President. Especially questions that are clearly not "Anti-American" but are merely intended to get information about the likely cost and duration of a war we are fighting. I have heard Fox News reporters refer to citizens protesting the war as "nit-wits". Tom Daschel for stating his disappointment at the failure of diplomacy was called a "Bad American" by Fox News. Fox aired the same statement made by Mr. Daschel for weeks while a parade of individuals were interviewed with universal condemnation of not only Mr. Daschel, but because he is their leader, all Democrats. The French, German and Russian People and Governments who opposed the war are routinely referred to as "weasels".

Such opinionated and inflammatory/defamatory language used to be relegated to clearly identified editorials where it was stated before the piece that the views and opinions of the speaker were not necessarily coincident with the views of the news station. Now, there has been a blurring of the lines where opinion and condemnation of opposing views is interjected liberally in the news and is actually the opinion of the broadcaster. I am very concerned that the American people are susceptible to the attack style that Fox News is using and am concerned that they will largely believe what they are told. What will happen to America when it is acceptable to attack those who ask questions or express disappointment by branding them "Bad Americans" on the nightly news. I am concerned additionally by the likelihood that

this phenomenon will spread as more corporations losing market share to Fox will attempt to emulate their style to maintain ratings and advertisers and as more mergers put more stations under Rupert Murdoch's control.

Free market advocates will advance the theory that whatever draws more viewers and generates more advertising dollars and benefits investors is sufficient justification for doing it but I disagree. For example, there is clearly a large movement in this country to control the violence and sexual images that we see on TV especially among conservatives. The free market view would hold that, sex and violence are good because it sells and we should actually have more of it. Yet there are few who would suggest that these images are beneficial to society. In just the same way I am concerned that the type of news broadcasting we are seeing in Fox News while benefiting the corporations that produce it is not beneficial to society.

The public deserves mandatory broadcasting obligations. I respectfully request that the FCC convene hearings to hear from those of us who are concerned. We should expect something fair, balanced and informative in return for giving away such vast public resources. We do not expect to see the political atmosphere and the hearts and minds of the nation shaped by the profit motives of big corporations.

Lastly and most importantly I note that although it is universally accepted that concentration of wealth and power have negative societal consequences. Concentration of power over the media is doubly dangerous, because it is through the media that society has the opportunity to learn of, discuss, and resolve its problems, including monopolistic business practices and self-serving officials. Media Monopolies are in a position not only to manipulate and distort information in an uncontested information environment, but to attack or silence criticism.

Sincerely,

Maurice R. Pennock

From: Kathy Wilmering
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 5:38 PM
Subject: media deregulation proposals

Ms. Abernathy:

Please do not support deregulation currently proposed for media entities. The current biased coverage of the Iraqi war by the giant few conglomerates we do have demonstrates why deregulation is not warranted. We cannot have freedom when news presentation is squarely in the hands of a small number of corporations with no input from other entities.

Sincerely,

Kathy Wilmering
10716 17th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98125

From: Kathy Wilmering
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 5:39 PM
Subject: proposed media deregulation

Mr. Copps:

Please do not support deregulation currently proposed for media entities. The current biased coverage of the Iraqi war by the giant few conglomerates we do have demonstrates why deregulation is not warranted. We cannot have freedom when news presentation is squarely in the hands of a small number of corporations with no input from other entities.

Sincerely,

Kathy Wilmering
10716 17th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98125

From: fran renaud
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 5:40 PM
Subject: Less Centralized Ownership of the Media, Please

Dear Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner of FCC,
I feel the need to let you know that we need less centralized ownership of the media, not more. Too few groups, most with strongly vested partisan political interests, control what we see and hear. A handful of huge media conglomerates with enormous conflicts of interest, largely determine the information the average American receives.

I feel very strongly about this, especially considering the recent options we Vermonters, have. During these times when we are interested in hearing and seeing what is really happening, we are limited to all the sensationalism and drama that the media is feeding us.

Please give us some options, Please.....
Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,
Fran Renaud &
Woodbridge Fuller
74 School St
Westminster, VT 05158

From: kevin@rolfes.org
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 6:05 PM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Kevin Rolfes
14006 N Green Hills Loop
Austin, Texas 70737

From: Dave Cohen
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:43 AM
Subject: Media Deregulation

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media must be halted and in fact reversed. Mass media in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. These companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

David Cohen

--

From: dfelt71@yahoo.com
To: KathleenAbernathy
Date: Mon. Apr 21, 2003 9:43 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy.

Thank you for your attention. I am forwarding this pre-prepared e-mail in hopes that it will influence the FCC to resist the push from big business to monopolize media production in local markets. I am an independent media producer and I want to **see** my government's organization used for the protection of media diversity and the support of local independent production potential. I do not want to **see** the conglomerates have their way eased for buying up local producers. I do not want to **see** laws changed to accomodate the further growth of already huge companies which dominate the available mass media.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission **see** the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review

and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

DAVID FELTON
106 E. MARKHAM AVE APT B
DURHAM, North Carolina 27701

From: Dave Cohen
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon. Apr 21, 2003 9:43 AM
Subject: Media Deregulation

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media must be halted and in fact reversed. Mass media in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. These companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

David Cohen

--

From: dfelt71@yahoo.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:43 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

Thank you for your attention. I am forwarding this pre-prepared e-mail in hopes that it will influence the FCC to resist the push from big business to monopolize media production in local markets. I am an independent media producer and I want to see my government's organization used for the protection of media diversity and the support of local independent production potential. I do not want to see the conglomerates have their way eased for buying up local producers. I do not want to see laws changed to accomodate the further growth of already huge companies which dominate the available mass media.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review

and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

DAVID FELTON
106 E. MARKHAMAVE APT B
DURHAM, North Carolina 27701