

**From:** wdale@pacbell.net  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26, 2003 11:09 AM  
**Subject:** Say No to Media Concentration!

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554

07-2-71

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

02-277

**From:** ehadley54@yahoo.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26.2003 11:09 AM  
**Subject:** I support media diversity

02-277

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

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.

Thank you,  
Emily Hadley

03-277

184 Maple Ave.  
Great Barrington, MA, 01230

**From:** dhornstein152309mi@comcast.net  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26, 2003 11:09 AM  
**Subject:** I oppose media concentration!

02-277

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

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.

**From:** Tluceccav@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, april6vt@yahoo.com  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26, 2003 8:18 PM  
**Subject:** Media Control

Mr. Michael Powell  
 FTCC Chair

There's a major new development in the FCC's deregulation of corporate media consolidation. This trend is leading increasingly toward absolute control of our major information sources -- TV networks, radio, newspapers, etc. -- by a small number of large corporations, which are narrowing and slanting news coverage and other important information to maximize profits at the expense of the public interest. I'm contacting you to let you know that we think media diversity should be a top priority for the FCC, and that media concentration cripples democracy. We urge the FCC to preserve- and refrain from weakening --the rule prohibiting cross ownership of newspapers and television stations in the same market.

Sincerely

Allison, Megan; Andrews, Jerome; Arner, Carol; Arner, Thomas D.; Arnowitt-Reid, Michael; Arnowitt-Reid, Susan; Avery Lucian; Babcock, Patricia; Bachelor, Blake; Ballantyne, Hedi & Chas; Baker, Prudence; Bakunin, Mikail; Ball, Aaron; Barr, Marney; Bean, Ren; Belenky, Bob; Bellusci, Laura; Bennett, Russ; Bezaire, Paule; Bigelow, Heidi; Bill, Francis R.; Bisbee, Mary Alice; Bishop, Pearl S.; Bissex, Glenda; Black, Joan M.; Black, Joven; Black, Lydia; Black, Sally;

Blaisdell, Eric; Blouin, Patricia; Bowman, Sarah; Bottinelli, Alexandra; Braash, Andrea; Braine, Josh; Brandt, Wilmer; Bresee, Peggy; Broakiny, Joanne; Bromley, Sherwood; Brown, Anne; Browne, Abby; Browne, Ari; Browne, Anna; Browne, Richard; Browne, Cathy; Bryant, Jane; Buckley, Barbara; Burcroff, Ann; Cappuccino, Robin; Careccio, Margaret; Castellano, Allen; Cayer, Karen; Clark, Barbara; Clark, Peter L.; Coderre, Raymond; Colman, Peter; Connor, David; Cook, Susan; Coulter, Annie; Corduff, Joy; Cornell, Robin; Crocker Jr., Charles; Conlogue, Michael; Cuyler, Patty; Daggett, Priscilla; Davis, Meg; Davison, Rebecca; Dean, Jessica; Dean, Fletcher; DeAndrea, Pamela; Dellinger, David; Denison, Geraldine; Denison, Janet; DeSousa, Gloria; Dev, Elango; DeVaughn, Anne; Dimondster, Lisa; Donohue, Cathy; Donahue, Jeff; Dortna, Oliver; Down, Melissa; Driscoll, Amy; Dumas, Claire; Eckund, Cheryl; Eckund, Shawn; Edwards, Jane S.; Elbow, Linda; Elford, Judith; Ellis, Deb; Ellis, Lashaun; Ellis, Rebecca; Epstein, Nanina; Ferrar, Paul T.; Finner, Stephen L.; Fox, Priscilla; Friedman, Dr. Michael; Gainza, Joseph; Gallagher, Janine; Gaillard, Ann; Garbeck, Pati; Goldfarb, Allison; Goldfinger-Fein, Becky; Goldstein, Cheri; Gordon, Larry; Gould, Emily; Grant, Barbara; Gray, Michael; Graw, Michael; Green, Susan; Grosbach, Jean Guiles, Tim; Gustafson, Amanda; Hadden, Jacob; Hage, Mark; Hahn, Janet; Hahn, Martin; Hardink, John; Harrison, Scottie; Hartnett, Cynthia; Hawk, Oak; Hayes, Ellie; Hill, Alec; Hill, Craig; Hill, Skye; Hollar, Bryan; Hylander, David; Hutchinson, Ed; Irish, Josh; Jenks, Charlie; Johnson, Betty; Johnson, Cynthia; Jones, Elizabeth; Jordan, Josie; Joseph, Spirit; Joubert, Elenara; Kann, Elisabeth; Kelley, Eduard; Kessler, Carrie; Kesson, Kathleen; Kilian, Jon; King, Victoria; Klein, Joseph; Klein, David; Knight, Sandy; Korona, Kimberly; Krutsky, Anna; Laggner, Katlyn; Lallkin, Gregg; Larsen, Colin; Lathrop, Jean; Lathrop, Sarah; Leehman, Linda; Legare, Amanda;

02-277

Leo, Peggy; Leonard, Ellen; Lever, Tom; Lever, Theresa; Leyshon, Hal; Lewis, John E. Lieber. Susan; Lovrod, Marie; Luce, Judith; Luce, Tom; Lyons, Jane; MacKay, Alan; Maclean, Cami; Maclean, Robert; Mahoney, Peter L.; Maloney, Carole; Mahoney, Natalia; Macksoud, Anne; Maloy, Kathleen; Marrie, Stella; Martin, Chris; Martin, Meredith; Mazer, Gina; McIntire, Paige; McGinley, Mary; McGregor, Mardi; McNeil, Tom; Merrill, Jean; ; Mesner, Susan; Mueller-Harder, Erik; Milchman, Galenc; Miles, Judy; Miller, Mary; Miller, Steve; Mills, Russ; Mires, Larry; Molleur-Hanson, Anne T.; Monagas, Michelle; Monaghan, Alyson; Morton, Carolyn; Mueller, Kate; Muller, M. Dianne; Muller, Richard; Muller-Moore, Bo; Nadler, Emma; Nall, Sandra; Nichol, Lucy; Norton, Sarah; O'Hagin, Rev. Zarina; O'Hanlon, James; O'Neill, Manuel; O'Neill, Myrna Miranda; ORiordan, Jim; Oishi, Michiko; Orr, Cain; Orr, Iain; Paley, Grace; Paley, Nora; Palmer, David; Parch, Susan; Parham-Brown, Anne; Parke, Margaret; Parks, Adam; Perdue, Holly; Perkins, Peter L.; Peterson, Elizabeth; Piotrowski, Linda; Potak, Nancy; Pulver, Louis; Pyka, Marek; Quinn, Kate; Rabin, Jules; Rabin, Hannah; Rabin, Helen; Randolph, Lux; Ratheau, Margaret; Reed, Paul; Reeves-Forsythe, Harriette; Reindel, Helen Jean; Renfrew, Dan; Rice, Nancy; Richey, Alban; Richman, Suzanne; Ritz, Susan; Roberts, Marty; Roberts, Wally; Rosholt, Mary; Rubin, Richard; Russell, Susan; Ryea, Ethan; Ryan, Erin; Ryan, John Perry; Sakash, Susan; Satcowitz, Larry; Schapiro, Steven; Schlegel, Liz; Schultz, Robert; Schumann, Tamar; Schumann, Maria; Schy, Gary; Schutz, Linda; Schwartz, Gail; Scott, Victor; Sekelsky, Anne T.; Sheppard, Rebecca; Sherburn, Cecile; Shimizu, Karen; Silverman, Alice; Simmons, Robert; Simpson, James; Skea, Edmund; Smith, Don; Smith, Kim; Smith, Zia; Solbert, Ronni; St. Martin, Camille; Stanton, Ann; Starr, Loring; Stellar, Christopher; Stockwell, Merry; Striplin, Caroline; Stuart, Michael; Sussman, Susan; Sweeny, Carol; Tandon, Sarika; Taplow, Alan; Tetrault, Diane; Thayer, Alex; Tod, Dorothy; Tokar, Brian; Tonnissen, Ken; Traughber, Britten; Treece, Tom; Triguba, Andrea; Turenne, Dianne; Twombly, Nina; Twombly, Robin; Unger, Corey; VandenBergh, Richard; Van Fleet, Janet; Vogel, Bernice; Walden, Valerie L.; Walker, Carol; Wallace, Dorothy; Walters, Henry; Walters, Patricia; Warner, Kathy; Webster, Harris; Weinstock, Joanna; Weinstock, Henry; Wheelock, Bill; White, Shawn E.; Whiteley, Katharine C.; Williams-Fox, Karen; Wolf, Nancy; Wolski, Suzie; ; Wood, Chris; Wood, Harriet; Wood, Lea; Woods, Wendy; Woogmaster, Fredric; Yoong, Darlene; Youngblood, Donna; Zavez, Emma; Zavez, Maryann; Zeeland, Lu; Van Zimmie, Gretchen.

02.277

Tom Luce, April6Vt Lobby - 330+ Central Vermonters For A Just Peace On A Nonviolent Path

e-mail: [tluceccav@aol.com](mailto:tluceccav@aol.com)

join april6 e-list:

<<[april6vt-subscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:april6vt-subscribe@yahoogroups.com)>> or

<<[april6vt-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:april6vt-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)>>

website: [www.cvtnonviolence.8m.net](http://www.cvtnonviolence.8m.net)

30 Park St.

Barre, Vt 05641

Tel. 802-476-7056 (h)

Tel. 802-476-4811 (w)

Cell 802-249-8806

**From:** geodevos@yahoo.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26, 2003 11:10 AM  
**Subject:** I oppose media concentration!

02-277

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

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,  
George DeVos

po bx 3063  
apple valley,, CA. 92307

02-277

**From:** lexi hulvey  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26,2003 3:18 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownershio Rules

Michael K. Powell

Chairman

02-277

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 11, 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,

Alexis Hulvey

534 W. Fort Worth

Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012

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

02-277

**From:** PunkDaveK@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26, 2003 11:46 PM  
**Subject:** Media Control

Michael K. Powell

Chairman

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

02-277

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 country's 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 didn't 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 it's 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,

Sean David Wigglesworth

1700 Clairmont Ct

Petaluma CA. 94954

02-277

**From:** Dawn Hughes  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sat, Jan 25, 2003 11:55 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership Rules

02-277

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,

Dawn Hughes

706 South Second Street

**From:** magic man  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jan 26, 2003 12:19 AM  
**Subject:** media ownership opinon

Michael K. Powell

Chairman

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

03-277

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  
AAAAAASSHHHHAAAAMMMMMMEEDD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Sincerely yours,

James Drake

2520 W. Gunnison

Chicago IL, USA 60625

\_\_\_\_\_

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

02-277