

*Original*

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

APR 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

*02-277*

*404 Documents*

*To: Chairman & Commissioners*

**From:** Peter Bruce Wilder  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 2:17 PM  
**Subject:** Fw: FCC June 2 Vote

02-277  
 EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

APR 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
 Office of the Secretary

----- Original Message -----

From: "Peter Bruce Wilder" <pbwilder@adelphia.net>  
 To: <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
 Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2003 2:17 PM  
 Subject: FCC June 2 Vote

- > Dear FCC Commissioners
- >
- > Your upcoming vote at the FCC, on June 2 looks as if it will remove all or
- > most restrictions on multi-ownership of media in this country.
- >
- > The obvious result will be further consolidation within the 'industry,'
- > which means more and more the silencing of local and independent voices.
- >
- >
- > The Telecommunications Act of 1996 lifted several restraints on
- cross-media
- > ownership and the results have been clear: As just one example, Clear
- > Channel Communications now owns 10%, or 1400, radio stations in this
- > country, and rising; other conglomerates are acquiring stations rapidly.
- > Within one year of the Act, 47% of all radio stations in the US changed
- > ownership in a massive rollup grab. Companies with controlling interests
- in
- > newspapers/radio/TV/magazines dropped from 26 to 10 after the 1996 Act was
- > passed.
- >
- > What we happen, of course, if the vote passes, is a sea change in access
- to
- > and diversity of good information on matters that really count in a
- > democracy. Entertainment, aka circuses, is what sells, so media have
- little
- > or no occasion/reason to inform the public. They are about listeners as
- > consumers NOT ABOUT LISTENERS AS CITIZENS.
- >
- > So, what one sees is a loss of media with any attachments, or obligation,
- to
- > a local and regional economies, cultures or communities. The distant
- > conglomerate owner has bargaining power with local advertisers that either
- > excludes them or drains them and certainly undercuts any other local
- media.
- > It also means that programming becomes LESS diverse, if that's possible,
- and
- > certainly LESS given to providing hard news and nurturing local debate on
- > controversial issues. Local businesses find it nearly impossible to
- stump
- > up the higher rates that come with a less and less competitive
- environment.
- >
- > There is little enough debate as it is. There is barely any information
- > about matters affecting the poor and even the middle class, as it is.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** Melvin Mackey  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 21, 2003 8:38 PM  
**Subject:** Further Deregulation Bad for the United States

Commissioners,

I understand there is a 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. The American public needs exposure to many points of view.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied and 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 a continuing decline of our democracy. Please use due caution.

Thank you,

Melvin Mackey  
24430 Old Mill Rd SW  
Vashon, Washington 98070

**RECEIVED**

APR 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

---

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service: 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** Jonathan R. Davey  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 23, 2003 4:52 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Jonathan R. Davey (jokay9@cox.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

Stop media concentration. Break up the media conglomerates.

APRIL 16, 2003

Powell to Congress: No Delay in Ownership Review  
Vote Scheduled for June 2

By Todd Shields

WASHINGTON -- (Mediaweek.com) Federal Communications Commission Chairman Michael Powell in correspondence released Wednesday told Congress he would not delay his planned June 2 vote on major media ownership rules, saying it is "time to make judgments."

Powell's statement came in correspondence replying to eight recent letters from federal lawmakers split on whether the agency should proceed quickly, or propose rule changes and submit them to more public comment. The five commissioners are deliberating privately on what changes to present for the June vote.

Powell in his letter dated April 11 said the agency is tardy in complying with a congressional mandate to review ownership rules every two years. He said the FCC has received "significant input from the American public," compiling a record of more than 18,000 comments. "The time to make judgments based on that record is before us," Powell wrote.

Congressional correspondents urging action by June included Rep. Billy Tauzin (R-La.), the chair of the House Commerce Committee that oversees the FCC. Those urging more public comment included 12 senators from both parties, who comprise a majority of that chamber's Commerce Committee, which likewise oversees the FCC.

At issue are rules that limit TV network size, restrict local concentrations of TV and radio ownership, and prevent daily newspapers from owning nearby broadcast stations.

The FCC's two Democratic commissioners have pushed for a delay in the rulemaking, saying more study should take place before they vote along with their three Republican colleagues.

Source: Editor & Publisher Online

---

Todd Shields (tshields@mediaweek.com) is Washington editor for E&P and Mediaweek.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 68.14.139.44  
Remote IP address: 68.14.139.44

**RECEIVED**

APR 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

## EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** Judith Binder  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 23, 2003 6:09 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

**RECEIVED**

APR 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Judith Binder (bjudy@unm.edu) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

It is with great trepidation that I write, having noted that you have been appointed for a very short duration to the Federal Communications Commission. For this I am deeply disappointed. You are, perhaps, the last individual who can speak for the people.

Return the airwaves to the public. Our Constitution guarantees that we have freedom of the press--including the electronic and wireless communications systems of the 21st Century.

I'm ashamed of spineless elected and appointed officials in Washington and in our own state who look the other way while the President wages war on women and children, promotes racial hatreds, and disenfranchises our most precious assets, our children, and the media stands by as cheerleader for the devastation of ancient artifacts. This is unconscionable.

I know that terrorism is perpetrated by insufficient knowledge. And now the FCC is poised to increase the power of a few wealthy individuals and corporations to wage war on the minds of our youth.

I urge you to convince Mr. Powell and your colleagues that a free media is the bastion of a free nation.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.167.131.167  
Remote IP address: 66.167.131.167

**From:** Stuart Gold  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 23, 2003 10:17 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes:

<http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/27715>

Is this what the FCC supports? Hurting the consumer? This is predatory and should be illegal. Don't reward the rbc's by re-monopolizing them. They need competition to keep them in check!

Keep Linesharing!

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 64.32.195.13  
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

**From:** Stuart Gold  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 23, 2003 1:30 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes:

You guys need to focus. Delivering hi-speed internet over power lines is super. However, you have many available avenues to deliver broadband NOW and you're looking to eliminate some of that access through elimination of linesharing. Why don't you concentrate on the here and now. You have a company, Covad, who can reach 50 million homes and business's TODAY, and they are on the verge of being eliminated because of the linesharing ruling.

Something doesn't equate. From this ruling (linesharing), you are eliminating companies and in the next breath you want other companies to invest in different broadband pipes (power lines). Why would a company invest in a different technology when the rules could change the next day? It happened to Covad (a facilities based competitor), see TA '96.

Use what you got! Keep Linesharing!

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 64.32.195.13  
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

**From:** Stuart Gold  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 23, 2003 5:13 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes:

"Officials plan no substantive changes to a four-page outline of rules that increase states' authority and phase out a requirement that the so-called Baby Bells let Internet access providers use their lines, said Martin, the only one of the FCC's five commissioners to back the entire proposal"

This is from an article that just hit the wires.

Can I ask the FCC one question? Where in the business world, would you have five board members of EQUAL stature, where they are voting on a proposal (say linesharing), and 4 out of 5 of them agree that eliminating linesharing is not a good idea and the one lone dissenter is able to eliminate linesharing with just his one vote?

The answer is NOWHERE. This is baloney, and 4 out of 5 of you are going to let this happen?  
Can any of you explain to the consumer why?

This is the business world and if any of you are doing this for political gain, shame on you!

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 64.32.195.13  
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

**From:** Nicole Lyman  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 23, 2003 7:10 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Nicole Lyman (betterdays@nahoo.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner,

As an American citizen I am deeply disappointed in the continuing degradation of the important regulations involving radio and television ownership. Thomas Jefferson would be ashamed by the current state of media ownership and the lax rules allowing large corporations to expand their influence over most of America. A diverse media and local influence on coverage is a staple of what it means to be an American. You can let the corporations run free under the guise of free market capitalism, but you only undermine what makes our country great. I feel a great shame building in our country and it is coming your way. What will you choose to do? With unequalled sincerity, NL

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 65.208.200.17  
Remote IP address: 65.208.200.17

**From:** Stuart Gold  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 24, 2003 9:21 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes:

Verizon profits 4 billion.  
SBC profits 5 billion.

Losing Linesharing Priceless!

The monopolies, everywhere they want to be

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 64.32.195.13  
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

**From:** Hammond, Elizabeth A.  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Johanna Mikes  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 24, 2003 11:23 AM  
**Subject:** Thank You

Commissioner Adelstein and Johanna,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with Perry Sook of Nexstar Broadcasting on Tuesday afternoon. Attached is a copy of the notice of meeting which we electronically filed in MM Docket 02-277. Please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Sook, Howard Liberman or me if we can provide you with further information in this matter.

Elizabeth

<<Adelstein EPN.pdf>>

Elizabeth A. Hammond  
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP  
1500 K Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 842-8843  
facsimile: (202) 842-8465  
ehammond@dbr.com

---

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply {e-mail address}@dbr.com, and delete the message. Thank you very much.

**From:** Ainger, Joel  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 24, 2003 1:32 PM  
**Subject:** monopoly

stop the media monopolies. clear channel, fox, g.e., etc. are un-american. no different than pravda. they stink-get them out of here. you'll feel better, my friend...

**From:** Nick Hancock  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 24, 2003 3:19 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Nick Hancock (nicholashancock@mindspring.com) writes:

First, thank you for at least holding a hearing on the issue of removing the dual network safeguards. I am writing to strongly oppose this move by a few well-connected media conglomerates (Clear Channel, chiefly) to further diminish the diversity of opinion on our nation's airwaves.

I plead with you to consider this question: How would abolishing these regulations serve the public good? I think you'll find that the only benefit is to the shareholders of these corporations. Don't allow the 4th estate to diminish any further from its already atrophied state!

Thanks for your time,  
Nick Hancock

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 204.68.210.59  
Remote IP address: 204.68.210.59

**From:** Britta Anderson  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 24, 2003 5:10 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Britta Anderson (britta@aol.com) writes:

To: FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell

Commissioners Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Kevin J. Martin, Michael J. Copps, Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear Commissioner:

I am pleased to learn that the FCC is launching a review of media ownership rules since I am extremely concerned about the massive media mergers that have changed the face of American broadcasting over the last decade. Entire communities are no longer being served by independent voices, local news and programming. Previous relaxation of ownership rules have gutted commercial radio of its variety, color, independence and sense of competition. This can hardly be deemed "broadcasting in the public interest."

For example, Clear Channel Communications already owns seven radio stations and one TV station in Rochester. Rather than continuing with further deregulation, I suggest that you push to re-regulate the industry to ensure that balanced and factual news and views are presented to the public and that radio stations do not become vehicles for political propaganda, as is the case with Rochester radio station WHAM -- A Clear Channel Station -- which is sponsoring political rallies.

We need to encourage independent ownership and diversity of programming. There was inherent wisdom in earlier FCC rulings that imposed strict limits on the number of stations one company could own. The same may be said of FCC rules prohibiting one company from owning a broadcasting station and a newspaper in the same market.

To allow the most popular sources of news, information and entertainment to be owned by a small handful of people across the nation and in any one community is extremely dangerous for our democratic process.

Sincerely,

Britta Anderson  
1165 Hidden Valley Trail  
Webster NY 14580

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.66.204.13  
Remote IP address: 66.66.204.13

**From:** David Clarkson  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 25, 2003 10:58 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

David Clarkson (clarkson@mdeverywhere.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I recently attended the hearing you and Commissioner Copsps organized at the Duke Law School and came away quite disturbed by what I heard. So I'm writing to express my opinion & concerns about the proposed deregulation of ownership limits in radio, television & newspaper.

I think that ANY further reduction of ownership caps is a very bad idea & should NOT allowed. I can think of no good reason to do so & several why this should not be allowed to proceed.

1) Further deregulation will lead to many media outlets being owned a small number of very large corporations. Many of the corporate-owned radio stations are poorly staffed as a cost-reduction measure & the programming is piped in by a satellite feed & cannot be readily interrupted or altered. This results in a reduced ability to respond to emergencies. It makes coverage of local news impossible at such stations.

2) As a consequence of a small pool of media ownership & the resulting reduction in competition, the price consumers are charged for media access will undoubtedly increase. Ex.: during the last several years, subscription to Time-Warner cable has increased by a rate in excess of that of inflation, with no improvement in the service (same program/channel selection). As well, programming quality & variation will similarly suffer; providing a wide range of programming is more costly & will, of course, be scaled back as a cost-cutting measure when consumer choice is reduced.

3) Fewer media owners will result in higher advertising cost for local businesses; with fewer ownership groups competing for advertising dollars the price of advertising would be determined not by competition for that money, but by the ability of the clients to pay what is demanded by the media owners. Furthermore, if an owner gains a monopoly in a given regional market, this owner could manipulate advertising cost by lowering advertising fees (taking a loss in that market, while covering the loss from profit in other regions), long enough to drive the few remaining local competitors out of business, then raising rates substantially afterwards.

4) Lastly, the recent incident in which the Clear Channel corporation removed the band "The Dixie Chicks" from their playlists of their radio stations (after a public comment by a band member about the President) smacks of propaganda. Clear Channel stations recently carried advertisements for pro-war/pro-America rallies, while not carrying advertising for peace demonstrations. This type of unequal coverage will only increase if media ownership is concentrated into the hands of a small number of large corporations & is contrary to principles free speech on which this country is founded.

To sum up, further deregulation of media ownership caps is not going to serve the public interests. Please do your best in preventing this from coming to pass.

Many thanks for your time & attention,

David Clarkson

5306 Beaumont Dr.  
Durham, NC 27707  
919-493-0965

clarkson@mdeverywhere.com

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.107.193.78  
Remote IP address: 12.107.193.78

**From:** Timothy Wallace  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 25, 2003 12:17 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Timothy Wallace (ctwallace@sbcglobal.net) writes:

Heard you on KPFA Friday am. Very impressed with what you had to say and your delivery. My question was: Does Congress have to ratify the proposed changes to the media ownership rules? If so, when would that happen? If not, where/and what are the logical/legal obstacles to making the new rules law as you see them?

If there's a 3/2 split between the commissioners does the change pass?

Thanks for keeping the flame alive.

Tim Wallace

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 67.113.41.74  
Remote IP address: 67.113.41.74

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Many

- > of us have been driven to public radio and television for content-rich,
- > informative news and discussion, yet Public Broadcasting is struggling.
- > Yes, supporting Public Broadcasting is one tactic, but if we hand what's
- > left of the mass media over to AOL/Time/Warner, Disney, GE, Fox (Murdoch),
- > Viacom and Clear Channel, the country will mostly be listening to what THE
- > MONEY says when it talks. Newspapers are already owned by larger and
- > larger
- > entities and publish little of value, or they have disappeared from the
- > scene. (40 years ago there were 1500 locally owned daily newspapers. There
- > are now fewer than 250.)
- >
- > So, FCC administrators, how can YOU make things more fair?
- >
- > A year from this November, I will remember that the FCC is just one among
- > many critical federal organizations that quite likely will be bent toward
- > the hard-right as it did when a very conservative, well funded, Republican
- > administration came in. Let's see if the FCC does the ethical thing, or
- > take the big money massage.
- >
- > Sincerely,
- >
- > - Peter
- >
- > Peter Bruce Wilder
- > dba Ergo Communications
- >
- > Put some E in your business:
- > <http://www.dbaergo.com>
- > 802-888-7063
- >
- >
- >

RECEIVED

APR 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** wbk01  
**To:** Sandra Ortiz  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 25, 2003 12:30 PM  
**Subject:** USC Media Consolidation Forum, Monday, April 28, 2003

On behalf of Sandra Ortiz and the USC Center for Communication Law and Policy please accepted the attached agenda for the USC Media Consolidation Forum on Monday, April 28, 2003. This agenda shows speakers as of Thursday, April 25, 2003. If there are any changes to the forum an addendum will be available at check-in on Monday.

Public comment sign up will also be available at registration on Monday morning.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at [wbk01@earthlink.net](mailto:wbk01@earthlink.net)

We look forward to seeing you at the forum on Monday, April 28, 2003.

Sandra M. Ortiz  
Executive Director  
Center for Communication Law & Policy  
University of Southern California  
Law School & Annenberg School for Communication  
Los Angeles, California 90089-0071

**From:** bianca morales  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 25, 2003 2:20 PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

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.

Sincerely,  
Blanca Morales

=====

"be the change you want to see in the world..."  
-mohandas gandhi

---

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

**From:** d t  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 25, 2003 7:11 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Limits

Dear Chairman Powell,

Five television companies--General Electric (MSNBC and NBC), News Corp (Fox), Disney (ABC), AOL-Time Warner (CNN), and Viacom (CBS)--have a stranglehold on what information the public gets to know, and corporate radio behemoths like Clear Channel Communications devour local radio stations and replace them with McRadio.

*Our democracy cannot afford this approach to the news, be it news about the war, our economy, or any other political or social issue.* The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. As it stands today, the broadcasting industry is failing to serve the public. Dissenting political viewpoints are routinely marginalized in national mainstream media, and the interests and perspectives of women, people of color, labor, local communities, and non-Christians are consistently underrepresented. Across the country, programming in the mass media that addresses local concerns is almost non-existent. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, there will be little opportunity to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints.

Please consider the following factors before and during your upcoming conference:

Newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership prohibition. Prevents broadcast TV companies from buying newspapers in communities in which they have TV stations. (Practical effect: NBC cannot buy Gannett News Service)

Local radio ownership limit. Limits the number of local radio stations that any one broadcaster can own in a single market. (Practical effect: right now Clear Channel can only own 8 stations in a local market.)

National TV ownership limit. Limits the number of local broadcast stations any one broadcast company can own to systems serving 35% of the TV households in the U.S. (Practical effect: Prevents Viacom/CBS from buying anymore broadcast systems, because it currently owns systems that reach 41% of the public. Prevents Fox/Newscorp (Rupert Murdoch) from owning the other half.

Local TV multiple ownership, aka "duopoly rule." Allows a broadcast company to own two TV stations in the same market only if at least one of those stations is ranked below the top 4 stations and there are at least eight independently owned-and-operating, full-power and noncommercial television stations in that market. (Practical effect: Viacom/CBS can own PAX as long as PAX remains a low ranked station in that market.)

Radio/TV Cross-Ownership restriction. Prevents one company from owning both a radio station and a television station in the same market. (Practical effect: Clear Channel cannot now own TV stations in markets where it owns radio stations. Disney/ABC cannot control radio and TV stations in the same market.)

The current restrictions are in place for valid reasons. Please do not let corporate greed entirely shape the media in America, as it can only be to the eventual detriment of free speech in America and elsewhere.

Peace,  
Diane Thompson, Voter  
Seattle, WA USA

---

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8.

**From:** cheyenne@d-web  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 25, 2003 8:42 PM  
**Subject:** stop deregulation

Dear Commisioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

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,

Cheyenne Vogel

**From:** Richard & Virginia Walters  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 26, 2003 12:18 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Richard & Virginia Walters (ginnyw@globalnetisp.net) writes:

We understand that on June 2nd the Federal Communications Commission will consider removing restrictions on cross-ownership of media, including TV, radio, newspapers and magazines. We are alarmed that the media will be increasingly controlled by a very few. We urge you to turn down such a change in restrictions.

Richard & Virginia Walters  
Shelburne, Vermont

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 64.30.14.46  
Remote IP address: 64.30.14.46

**From:** K. Peter Imig  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 26, 2003 1:11 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

K. Peter Imig (KImig@Hotmail.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I'm deeply concerned about the new media regulations. It is extremely important, that there is diverse sources of information available to the people in America. There is no point in having all these newspapers, radio and tv stations, if they are all owned by the same company, which may take positions and certainly has commercial interests. News must not be made, it needs to be reported in a neutral and fair fashion. With great dismay I'm seeing these basic rules of journalism broken especially in these times. What is happening to the right of free speech, right of information, if a government uses its influence on the media to suppress opponents. That is propaganda - dangerous as seen in the 3rd Reich. It is already happening too much today, with the change in regulations, it can only get worse. Please help to keep America free and informed. Do not allow these new regulations to go through.

Thank you.

K. Peter Imig

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 213.6.30.2  
Remote IP address: 213.6.30.2

**From:** Randle Ellington  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 26, 2003 7:04 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Randle Ellington (randie@groovy.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein, Thank you very much for holding the hearing here in the Bay Area this weekend. It is a shame that the word is not widely spread by the very media in question. Yet is encouraging to me that there are many who are taking this issue to heart. I will continue to stay focus to this issue in coming months to help to raise the visibility of this important issue. Thank you again

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.164.17.60  
Remote IP address: 68.164.17.60