**From:** Linda Hillemann
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Wed, Apr 16, 2003 12:23 PM
**Subject:** Media regulations

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am growing increasingly concerned about the mergers of media companies into large conglomerates which are forming monopolies on TV and radio in many media markets in the US. Alternative voices are being drowned out.

Our democracy thrives on information and discussion, but any more it seems the news we hear is only what corporate America deems fit for public consumption. We just went to war with Iraq because all we heard was the Administration's side of the argument. We didn't hear and still haven't heard what decades of sanctions have done to the population of Iraq and how tens of thousands of children and adults have been affected by the depleted uranium bomb debris from the previous Gulf war; how 300 children per month have been dying from this and water borne diseases that would have been preventable had bombed out water treatment facilities not been kept dysfunctional due to the sanctions. We don't see news about the American Gulf War vets who had smuggled themselves and water treatment facility repair supplies into Iraq to restore these water facilities for civilian populations that neither Saddam Hussein nor the US government would repair. Do you think ordinary Americans had any idea we were going to war against a population that was 50% children?

We still have not seen much of what our bombs have done to civilian populations in this current war, although Arab TV is broadcasting this all over the world. We call their coverage biased. Based on coverage here, you would think there was only one Iraqi victim: a small boy without arms whose family was killed by bombing. And this is not biased? The US media congratulates itself for being unbiased because it covers this story about one small boy. It embeds reporters in with fighting troops but not in the neighborhoods and villages of Iraq or for that matter, Afghanistan. We do not hear how angry the populations in Arab countries are now that we have taken this action in Iraq.

We will not know what hit us when the next terrorists strike in this country just like we never comprehended what hit us on 9-11. We have come no further. Our news media has done us a grave disservice, which continues in the face of this war, by refusing to cover the news that provides balance and challenges our assumptions about the world. We need to hear from alternative voices so we can learn from them and so they can know they have been heard. War does not bring peace and democracy. Dialog brings peace and democracy. Our Founders understood that when they guaranteed freedom of the press in our Constitution. I hope the FCC can remember that when it faces its decisions about deregulating the media. A few corporate voices are not representative of the voices of America. It is your responsibility to see that our voices are not silenced.

Linda Hillemann
Rt. 2 Box 2628

Ellsinore, MO. 63937

**From:** cosmcgovern
**To:** Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy
**Date:** Wed, Apr 16, 2003 3:57 PM
**Subject:** FCC deregulation

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news 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. The media 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,

Cosmea McGovern

**From:** Bettie Graves
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
**Date:** Wed, Apr 16, 2003 7:21 PM
**Subject:** FCC VOTE

Chairman Michael K. Powell:
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy:
Commissioner Michael J. Copps:
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin:
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

Dear Commissioners:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news 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. The media 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,
Bettie Graves

**From:** NMeyer52@aol.com
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Wed, Apr 16, 2003 9:35 PM
**Subject:** June regulatory meeting

Dear Mr. Powell,
I certainly hope that you will deliberate very carefully before making any dramatic decisions regarding deregulation. Too often I have heard this debate framed in the context of what is best for the consumer rather than the citizen. In our democracy it is imperative that we citizens have as many sources as possible to be educated. With media ownership concentration come fewer opportunities for the citizenry to be informed.

I attended a Town Meeting (standing room only) on 4/15/03 at Saint Michael's College. Those attending were unanimously opposed to deregulation. There has not been nearly enough dialogue. There needs to be much more debate.

Keep our democracy healthy!

Sincerely,
Nick Meyer

**From:** Sue Straus
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 2:59 AM
**Subject:** More diversity = a better democratic policy

Please remember that the airwaves and newsprint should be open to all view points. Make it possible that our news comes from different view points. I urge you to delay the vote. There must be public debate. There must be a way to make certain that money isn't the only requirement to own a station or new source. The air waves belong to the public, lets not have one company be the dictator over all we get to see in coverage of world news.

Thank you.

Susan Straus
3161 n Cambridge, #209
Chicago IL 60657-4602
sstraus2001@yahoo.com
day phone 312-346-3191.

---

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo
http://search.yahoo.com

**From:** luvyy38@yahoo.com
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 7:09 AM
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

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,

EVELYN GUARINO
2268 MORRISON AVE
UNION, New Jersey 07083-5249

**From:** nkieboom@yahoo.co.uk
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 12:31 PM
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

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,

Nik Kieboom
7 Grosvenor Mount, Hyde Park
Leeds, LS6 2DX
United Kingdom

**From:** Leslie McMahon
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 1:01 PM
**Subject:** June 2

Dear Mr. Powell,

Bernie Sanders, US Rep., hosted a town meeting I attended with several hundred people at St. Michael's College in Burlington, VT on 4/14/03. The guest speaker was Michael Copps of the FCC. As an American citizen and a librarian, I am outraged that the FCC is going to propose further deregulation of all media on June 2, 2003. I am alarmed that there has been no mention of this event in any newspaper I have read. According to Mr. Copps, three quarters of the public don't know about June 2, an event that will have a profound effect on what we see, hear, and read. I am already deeply concerned that most of our media is controlled by such a few number of giant multinational corporations.

I implore you to reconsider the date and allow more time for ordinary people to have some say in the matter, as we would have in a true democracy. Thank you.

Leslie McMahon

**CC:** poco05403@yahoo.com

**From:** Library User
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 1:18 PM
**Subject:** Media deregulation

Mr. Chairman:

I am writing to voice my opinion to any and all further deregulations of broadcast/print/radio media. The foundation of any free society is an equal, broad eschange of views, and that cannot be reached when one company ownes 10% of all radio stations (Clearchannel), or another one owns 100 newspapers and as many television stations across the country. The foundation of our political system is the idea that the people control their destiny, and that of their govornement. By handing the media over for a few rich corporations to devower, you destroy that basic tenet of our great nation.

Julian Brizzi
Jbrizzi@zoo.uvm.edu

**From:** Vega, Felice M
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 2:13 PM
**Subject:** Deregulation Vote

Dear Commissioner:
Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news 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. The media 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,

FELICE M. VEGA
San Francisco, CA

**From:** Jonathan G. Leonard
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 3:24 PM
**Subject:** <No Subject>

Dear Commissioner Powell,

It is my understanding that as early as June 2 the FCC could change media regulations allowing more media mergers to take place that would further decrease the number of owners of media outlets. I have deep concerns that large media companies such as AOL Time Warner, Bertelsmann, Disney, and Gannet will only service the wealthy in the USA. In general these large corporations support reducing taxes for the rich, are anti-union, and have no qualms about shipping jobs overseas. I fear that American democracy may be threatened if regulations are further relaxed. Please thoroughly study the potential effects of deregulation before making the decision.

Thank You,

Sincerely, Jonathan Leonard, Richmond, VT

**From:** Susan Mullins
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 3:31 PM
**Subject:** media conglomeration

We feel we must vociferously protest the media conglomeration in this country and would like to share with you the views we have sent on to the TV companies! We also want the break-up of the companies that are in existence, if all they can provide the "cleaned up", "state" messages they have heretofore been providing.

"We feel the kind of news coverage coming from the TV and the "slant" of its shows has failed the American public, abysmally.

I read about the results of agent orange on Vietnam War Vets' children in April, 2001; when I was going through chemotherapy. This was easy to connect since my father was achemist at Diamond Alkalai in Newark in 1945 - manufacturing agent orange! Within a very short time, all the members of his division were dead from cancer. His children before 1945 are fine, but I was born after.

To not tell Americans of the after effects of depleted uranium on both Iraqis and THEIR OWN CHILDREN, is criminal. We have not been able to stomach or tolerate your news casts. Please share the dark side of what we are doing. It is truly your duty to your countrymen and YOUR OWN LIVES! The current statistics are 4.5 out of 10 Americans can expect to have to deal with cancer in their lifetime.

Why is the money we are spending not considered? We are "beggaring" ourselves into what that truly infamous spokesman, Michael Savage, calls "turd" world nation status! How does it happen that Halliburton gets $7 BILLION for stopping fires in Iraq (fires that are already "capped"!) when some area of the country are going to 4 day school weeks to save 20% on teachers' salaries? Why are library hours being drastically reduced, yet we have money for DynCorp to go into Iraq with "questionable" operations? The TV should be reporting on these matters!

Please do not make the TV a curious artifact in our home. Return it to a source of information and entertainment we can respect. It would be the most "patriotic" thing you could do if the truth were told!"

Sincerely,
Susan Mullins
Richard Mullins

**From:** Maris Moon
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 4:15 PM
**Subject:** Deregulation of broadcasting ownership

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you.

Amy M. Mundie

---

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

**From:** jtczech@bellatlantic.net
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 7:55 PM
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

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,

James Czech
24 Kile Drive
Scotia, New York 12302-5729

**From:** ct56@juno.com
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:22 PM
**Subject:** Deregulation

I believe that the first duty of the FCC is to see that the public is protected from monopolies.

I understand that the Commission is now considering proposals which were submitted by SBC and Verizon. These proposals are tantamount to deregulating these two companies. Both companies are monopolies and are under the control of the California Public Utilities Commission. Deregulation has its place however jut take a look what deregulation did to the Electric Utilities. These new regulations are passed without strong oversight we headed for a with phone monopolies again and I will paying more be cause of it.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to take strong action to see that the public is protected.

Sincerely.

Charles Traut

**From:** brad kammer
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 10:27 PM
**Subject:** June 2 vote

Hello,

I am a FCC licensed programmer at WGDR, 91.1 FM, community radio station from the campus of Goddard College in Plainfield, Vermont. From a firsthand vantage point, I know that public access to the airwaves is essential for a thriving democracy. And I am afraid of the dangers that corporate controlled media has for our nation and the well being of its people. Diversity - in the media and elsewhere in the public arena - only serves to challenge and enbolden a nation such as ours.

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our currently challenged democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you.
Brad Kammer

---

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

**From:** xknowlesx@aol.com
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Fri, Apr 18, 2003 12:10 AM
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

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,

thomas costello
9798 schlagel st.
longmont, Colorado 80503

**From:** Carol Cruikshank
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:27 AM
**Subject:** Deregulation of the Media

I am a 61 year-old woman with three retail stores in California who has a profound love for the values that my country has always represented. One of those values is the respect for a free press.
It is for that reason that I strongly oppose the proposed deregulation of the media.

Carol Cruikshank
Menlo Park, California

**From:** Christopher Grotke
**To:** Mike Powell
**Date:** Fri, Apr 18, 2003 11:14 AM
**Subject:** No to looser regulation

Chairman Powell,

I've been wondering about you. Why do you bend so easily toward the major media, and ignore the citizenry? The only explanation can be bribes, payoffs, future personal profiteering, or possibly blackmail. No one with any sense sees media consolidation as a good thing.

But you do. It is very obvious to even casual observers that you are there to do the bidding of of the major media you are suppossed to be regulating.

Media consolidation is hurting us. It is hurting the economy. Millions of people are put out of work each time media companies merge. Quality decreases, and choice is eliminated.

My sense is that you want to create a single, corporate-sponsored company that tells a single story, loudly. Anything else is a threat to the secretive nature of your string-pullers.

It's sad, really. At each public meeting, citizen after citizen stands to tell your committee how media consolidation has harmed them, and you sit back and smile, hoping they will shut up and go away.

You, personally, are leading the country in the wrong direction with your belief that media consolidation is necessary. Is the soviet system the model for this? Shall we have state-sponsored messages replaced with corporate-sponsored messages, and nothing else?

Please take a moment and read the first amendment. Then the rest of the constitution. It doesn't mention anything about the rights of corporations to control all discourse, does it?

Why do you want to upset things? Why do you hate America so much? Haven't the recent wars and sacrifices meant anything to you? Are our soldiers dying for Rupert Murdoch's right to silence those he opposes?

Please, vote to extend the bans that are currently in effect.

Thanks, and if you send a form letter in response I'll know you really don't care about us at all.

c.