

TV ... well CNN is Izvestial and FOX is Pravda.

Shame on you Mister Powell thinking that you are doing a service to the country by further concentrating the debate and stifling dissenting views. Yes, those who own the microphone control the message and it is time that you, and the rest of the FCC think of the good of the nation and surprise all of us by starting the reform needed to once again make our media the tool of a functioning democracy it should be. When the media becomes a megaphone for any party (the RW media has) we are one step away from a dictatorship of ideas.

It is so bad Sir, that these days I rarely listen to US Media, since quite frankly I cannot stand megaphones, and if they were megaphones for the other side I would be asking the same. I have taken to listening to British Media, Canadian, Australian, you get the picture. Every once in a while I do turn on US TV hoping that they have realized they have lost a good chunk of the viewership. You may not know this but Short Wave Radios have gone up in sales quite significantly ... you and the rest of the FCC should start wondering why.

Upton Sinclair said at one time that the job of the media was to make those in power neither comfortable or at ease. Our media no longer does that with the a particular section of the political spectrum, and when Al Jazeera starts lecturing us about a free and independent media (Yes they are as much propaganda as Fox, just another side of the same bloody coin) you should get worried.

Thanks for listening, and consider this Public Comment.

Sincerely,

Nadin Abbott
A very Concerned American

cc

US Senator Akaha
US Senator Inouye
US Congressman Abercrombie

CC: senator@akaka.senate.gov, neil.abercrombie@mail.house.gov..fcc.gov

From: Rick Salazar
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/29/03 1:00PM
Subject: decentralized media

Dear Chairman Powell,

Please appeal the recent Court of Appeals decision that overturned the television-cable cross-ownership rule and defend the 35 percent television ownership cap.

I am not willing to give up on trying to save a democratic, independent, diverse and decentralized media. The network news is especially troubling in its lack of coverage of diverse viewpoints and the kind of real news information US citizens need to self govern. It is just the same few canned news stories over and over....the same viewpoint over and over. If this trend continues with more media centralization of ownership, and the resulting loss of diversity, then our freedoms are in peril. (The corporations profits may be in peril too, as more and more people, like me, are beginning to turn off network news because of the problems I just sited.)

As Chairman of the FCC, your stewardship of the public's airways, and the public's trust, is needed to protect and promote the independence and diversity of our media.

Thank you.

Jenny Salazar

From: Rich12332@cs.com
To: Rich12332@cs.com, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 3/29/03 1:25PM
Subject: War

New York Times
March 25, 2003
Channels of Influence
By PAUL KRUGMAN

By and large, recent pro-war rallies haven't drawn nearly as many people as antiwar rallies, but they have certainly been vehement. One of the most striking took place after Natalie Maines, lead singer for the Dixie Chicks, criticized President Bush: a crowd gathered in Louisiana to watch a 33,000-pound tractor smash a collection of Dixie Chicks CD's, tapes and other paraphernalia. To those familiar with 20th-century European history it seemed eerily reminiscent of. . . . But as Sinclair Lewis said, it can't happen here.

Who has been organizing those pro-war rallies? The answer, it turns out, is that they are being promoted by key players in the radio industry - with close links to the Bush administration.

The CD-smashing rally was organized by KRMD, part of Cumulus Media, a radio chain that has banned the Dixie Chicks from its playlists. Most of the pro-war demonstrations around the country have, however, been organized by stations owned by Clear Channel Communications, a behemoth based in San Antonio that controls more than 1,200 stations and increasingly dominates the airwaves.

The company claims that the demonstrations, which go under the name Rally for America, reflect the initiative of individual stations. But this is unlikely: according to Eric Boehlert, who has written revelatory articles about Clear Channel in Salon, the company is notorious - and widely hated - for its iron-fisted centralized control.

Until now, complaints about Clear Channel have focused on its business practices. Critics say it uses its power to squeeze recording companies and artists and contributes to the growing blandness of broadcast music. But now the company appears to be using its clout to help one side in a political dispute that deeply divides the nation.

Why would a media company insert itself into politics this way? It could, of course, simply be a matter of personal conviction on the part of management. But there are also good reasons for Clear Channel - which became a giant only in the last few years, after the Telecommunications Act of 1996 removed many restrictions on media ownership - to curry favor with the ruling party. On one side, Clear Channel is feeling some heat: it is being sued over allegations that it threatens to curtail the airplay of artists who don't tour with its concert division, and there are even some politicians who want to roll back the deregulation that made the company's growth possible. On the other side, the Federal Communications Commission is considering further deregulation that would allow Clear Channel to expand even further,

particularly into television.

Or perhaps the quid pro quo is more narrowly focused. Experienced Bushologists let out a collective "Aha!" when Clear Channel was revealed to be behind the pro-war rallies, because the company's top management has a history with George W. Bush. The vice chairman of Clear Channel is Tom Hicks, whose name may be familiar to readers of this column. When Mr. Bush was governor of Texas, Mr. Hicks was chairman of the University of Texas Investment Management Company, called Utimco, and Clear Channel's chairman, Lowry Mays, was on its board. Under Mr. Hicks, Utimco placed much of the university's endowment under the management of companies with strong Republican Party or Bush family ties. In 1998 Mr. Hicks purchased the Texas Rangers in a deal that made Mr. Bush a multimillionaire.

There's something happening here. What it is ain't exactly clear, but a good guess is that we're now seeing the next stage in the evolution of a new American oligarchy. As Jonathan Chait has written in *The New Republic*, in the Bush administration "government and business have melded into one big `us.'" On almost every aspect of domestic policy, business interests rule: "Scores of midlevel appointees . . . now oversee industries for which they once worked." *We should have realized that this is a two-way street: if politicians are busy doing favors for businesses that support them, why shouldn't we expect businesses to reciprocate by doing favors for those politicians - by, for example, organizing "grass roots" rallies on their behalf?*

What makes it all possible, of course, is the absence of effective watchdogs. In the Clinton years the merest hint of impropriety quickly blew up into a huge scandal; these days, the scandalmongers are more likely to go after journalists who raise questions. Anyway, don't you know there's a war on?

Copyright 2003 The New York Times Company

From: H2OWise@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/29/03 11:56PM
Subject: Deregulation

Dear Mr. Powell, I feel the 1996 Telecommunications Act has done great harm to the diversity of viewpoints presented nationally as well as locally. When companies such as Clear Channel grow from 60 to over 1200 stations and centralized programming is instituted, the unique nature of each local community is sacrificed. Local interests are lost to a bland brand of programming that serves noone but the owners of the increasingly fewer and larger corporations now in control. Not only should we not further this trend, but we should work to reverse it. Thank you for considering my viewpoint. Hunter Ten Broeck
Albuquerque New Mexico

From: eric unger
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/30/03 3:15PM
Subject: local radio

good day,

i'm writing to express my belief in the power and importance of local radio. i think radio stations that are owned by people in the area with their intrests in that local area need to have right to be on the air protected. i get the impression that for a small radio station it is a constant battle to stay on the air. i believe that their rights should be protected and the importance of their existence should be understood and respected.

thanks for your time. eric unger

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Platinum - Watch CBS' NCAA March Madness, live on your desktop!

From: Mark Blanchard
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/31/03 11:49AM
Subject: Threats of violence by a local radio station

Dear Mr. Powell:

Why are local radio stations under the arm of giant media concerns allowed to get away with situations that took place on the campus of Louisiana State University this past weekend?

A station owned by Citadel Communications called for a last minute protest (KOOJ in Baton Rouge, LA) -- against a small group of students (mostly female) who were supporting our troops but protesting the current administrations handling of the war.

These young women were bombarded with threats, curses and a disk jockey that said "they deserve a bullet in the back of the head." We currently have a serial killer on the loose here in Baton Rouge killing young women at Louisiana State University. These same young women received abusive phone calls from this radio station and their listeners.

I was on campus on Saturday when this took place -- for other reasons with my daughter -- and the display that was allowed to take place by this radio station was horrible. Women being called whores and bitches -- all being egged on by a radio station -- was awful.

Paul Krugman's article in the New York Times on 3/25/03 certainly hit home for me about how large radio conglomerates like Clear Communications are being given a free hand at whatever they want -- and are used to punish those that have a different point of view. When I called his office and emailed the story in the front page of our local paper on Sunday - I was told that this seems to be a pattern forming throughout our country.

I have always supported and prayed for your Father. He is a good man. Now is a time when we need good men to speak out against events taken place that Gobbels would be proud of.

Sincerely,

Mark Blanchard

This message has been checked for all known viruses by the MessageLabs Virus Scanning Service for the Diocese of Baton Rouge. For further information visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/stats.asp>

From: Jon Marcus
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/31/03 1:20PM
Subject: Rules Relaxation

Dear Mr. Powell,

The state of news media reporting during and leading up to this conflict in Iraq should be evidence enough that allowing further consolidation of media is a horrible idea, and truly an unpatriotic disservice to the American people. Unfortunately I don't have any PAC backing me, like the corporate media does, and this is the very reason that YOU should be fighting for the people sir, and not for the select few with latent capitalistic agendas lurking behind their apparent journalistic ones.

The FCC's insistence on bowing to corporate media bullies over the last decade and more has had the effect of alienating the mainstream media from most of the well educated people's lives in this country. Further erosions in media integrity through conglomeration will only lead to a trickle down effect whereby less educated people will finally come to realize the fantastically shallow reporting of the major TV media through the rantings of people like me. Soon, the internet will be the only source left for any meaningful news, and there is little control over that medium. Thus, the corporate push to concentrate all forms of media in a few hands in the name of capitalism will have the effect of destroying the integrity and viability of the very goals of those corporations. Their capitalistic agendas will be destroyed by their neglect of their sworn apparent agendas, which are at total odds with each other.

Do not allow further restrictions on media ownership to be relaxed. Do your job and fight for the American people who are too busy trying to make a dollar to educate themselves on this crisis. Do your job and protect American values, please. After all, its our taxes that pay for all of this.

Sincerely,

Jon Marcus
Santa Barbara, CA

From: Pjdouglas1@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/31/03 4:11PM
Subject: Dear Mr. Powell,

We do not want media ownership concentrated in the hands of the few. That is very scary. We must have independent news. Think of your children and grandchildren. They must live in a land of liberty with responsibility.
Thank you,

P.J.Douglas
31775 Via Belardes
San Juan Capistrano
CA 92675

From: MT IV
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/1/03 5:38PM
Subject: You think this is OK???

Not to mention Clear Channel's censorship and condonement of running over protestors. Do your jobs or you'll be liable in big way.

Opposing groups use scare tactics
War supporters threaten protestors

By Lauren Wilbert, Staff Writer
April 01, 2003

Free speech in America has been fought for and protected since the beginning of the country's existence, and many court cases have developed in order to protect this constitutional right.

Some students, however, have experienced threatening responses and negative feedback from people who do not agree with their views about the war.

Saturday's anti-war protest by members from the Coalition for Alternatives to War on Iraq was interrupted by a group of bikers who used obscenity and violent threats toward the protestors.

The bikers were encouraged by Richard Condon, a local radio announcer from KOOJ FM, to meet the CAWI protestors.

Stacy Sauce, a mass communication junior and CAWI member, said the counter-protestors yelled at them and made the atmosphere uncomfortable for everyone there.

"The DJ told them to get drunk and bash the protestors," Sauce said. "I was with my friend and her two younger brothers, so we tried to stay out of the way."

She said the bikers even went so far as to rattle their engines during a speaker, so protestors could not hear the speeches.

Lee Abbott, an English senior, said it is an obligation in society to speak up when someone disagrees with something, and their peaceful protest was doing just that.

"I think it's a misunderstanding of what your freedoms are when you're protesting. And threatening lives and destroying unity are not a part of that," Abbott said.

He said the demonstrations from the bikers Saturday can intimidate anti-war protestors, but it would not discourage him from doing other protests.

"I'm sure it can scare people away, but when people have to resort to violence and violent remarks instead of data, it doesn't win the argument," Abbott said.

Shaun Treat, a speech communication professor, has a barrage of anti-war comics, articles and quotes on and around his office door. He has experienced firsthand the distaste of others who take a pro-war stance.

"My door has been vandalized, and I've had signs ripped off," Treat said. "I've gotten anonymous e-mails. They like the f-word."

He said counter-measures of profanity and hate mail are not effective persuasive strategies, and he encourages his students to be more committed to making dialogue instead of screaming matches.

Treat said there are points to both sides about the war, and people need to talk about it so others can form an honest opinion.

"By silencing those people who have a different view, it stops people who are impartial on making a decision about where they stand," Treat said. "We can't evaluate both sides unless you hear everyone."

He said those who are anti-war have a fear of physical harm from those who are pro-war, and many do not voice their views because of intimidation tactics like those used Saturday.

Caitilin Grabarek, an anthropology senior and CAWI member, said she has received threatening phone calls from Richard Condon and his listeners because of her anti-war views.

"I had this woman call me and ask me what I was going to do when Saddam came to nuke Baton Rouge," Grabarek said. "I just told her I thought he would be smart enough to know the Saints are in New Orleans."

Grabarek said violent protests toward others has a double effect because it can be intimidating, but it also gets people more involved and wanting to take action to protect their rights.

Craig Freeman, a lawyer and mass communication media law professor, said people have a constitutional right to freedom of speech.

"It gets tricky because people have the right to free speech, but people also have the right to oppose the protesters," Freeman said.

He said people have overstepped their boundaries when they use "fighting words," or language that is not protected under free speech rights.

"If I say, 'If you don't meet me in front of Johnston Hall at 3:40, I'm going to shoot you,' that's a conditional threat, and it is protected," Freeman said. "But if I stand right in front of you and say 'If you don't shut up, I'm going to shoot you,' that's an immediate threat; it isn't protected, so someone could get sued."

Hotmail - Absolut kostenfrei! Der weltweit grv_te E-Mail-Anbieter im Netz: Hier klicken

From: john melvin
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/3/03 1:59PM
Subject: The future of the media

Mr. Powell,

Forgive my sarcasm, but it seems that if the FCC is set up to regulate the communications, how then is it possible that we live in a world where mainstream media, print, television and radio have succumbed to toting the party line rather than reporting the truth?

News organizations have changed story content to better reflect the governments viewpoint (MSNBC for instance changed an online article within minutes of their editor's mistake at printing a less than favorable account of the administration's lack of Iraqi WMD evidence); Radio conglomerates actively and publicly sponsoring pro-war rallies; tv news stations refusing to fairly entertain opposing viewpoints; and general cooperation of the media to spread government propaganda.

I had the opportunity to speak with a french reporter recently in d.c., upon being asked what her opinion of the war was, she replied, I am a reporter, I am impartial. Unfortunately, I do not think the same could be said about CNN.

The future, sir, lies in your hands. Demand that there be less wide market ownership of radio stations, effectively giving control to more than half the content to one corporation, Clear Channel is the biggest culprit. Regulate that TV news either report the truth or shutdown. Insist that newsmedia not "hype" stories in order to boost the profit line. And above all, demand that the news media return to the hallmarks of responsible journalism and leave the armchair reporting to someone else.

I wish to thank you for your patience in hearing me out. It is my true hope that the FCC is not tainted by corporate sponsorship or political bullying to be able to stand up to this bastardization of what once was and should be a free press.

Thank you,

John Melvin
211 Quincy Shore Dr #1
Quincy, MA 02171

=====

John Melvin
617-312-4653

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Tax Center - File online, calculators, forms, and more
<http://tax.yahoo.com>

From: Doris Lefley
To: Doris Lefley
Date: 4/4/03 2:44PM
Subject: Re: fcc regulations

On Friday, April 4, 2003, at 01:40 PM, Doris Lefley wrote:

> Mr Powell I urgently request that you reconsider the policy of
> allowing media owner ship to be consolidated which will result in a
> limited information avaiable to the public . I am against docket
> #02-277. thank you dlefeley wilmette ll

CC: Mike Powell

From: MAQuigley@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/4/03 2:56PM
Subject: Oppose the Liberalization of Media Ownership Regulations

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am opposed to any proposed plan to liberalize rules regarding media ownership.

As the months leading up to the war in Iraq have painfully demonstrated, the media is already controlled by too few corporations whose vested interest in promoting the war, to benefit parent companies, or for ratings, has played a major role in leading our country into a war that I and many others feel would have been more strongly opposed and therefore prevented had Americans enjoyed the benefit of balanced and investigative reporting.

I urge you to keep this undeniable abuse of corporate media power in mind when voting. Many American and Iraqi soldiers and civilians have been needlessly killed or maimed and scarred for life in a large part because of the failure of the U.S. media to remain objective in the face of anticipated profits and ratings.

Sincerely,

Michelle Quigley

From: John B.
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/4/03 4:09PM
Subject: Peoples Airways

Mr. Powel, you tell those grubby Corporations keep thier filty hands off what belongs to the people of the United States. We the people will hold you responsible for any give away. Because we vote.

John Bakalik , WW2 combat Veteran , Mauston Wis.

53948

From: FLHchooch@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/4/03 8:57PM
Subject: Concerning FCC Restrictions

Mr. Powell,

It is my opinion as a voting member of this country that the FCC should side with the interests of the small broadcasters of this nation. It is appalling that the media is controlled by so few companies. Big money is corrupting the channels of communication to the people. How can reporters report what needs to be reported if it's against their own company's interests? Say no to lifting restrictions of ownership of our limited venues of communication. No to monopolization and lack of local ownership. More voices, not less. Thank you.

Greg Gilroy
New Jersey voter

From: David Pfund
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/4/03 9:03PM
Subject: Clear Channel Communications

Sir:

I've heard that the FCC is considering removing all restrictions on the number of radio and television stations and networks media conglomerates can own. I can't comment on the proposed rule change in general. All I know is that Clear Channel Communications does not deserve any greater access to the public airwaves in my community. I don't believe the rule change is in the public interest, if companies such as them will benefit from it.

Recently I heard, what is to me anyway, an incredibly offensive remark during a station break on their local affiliate here in Richland Washington. The remark was "...Turning Iraq into a parking lot, with plenty of handicapped parking. America Rocks!" They are not serving the interests of my home town by encouraging hatred, particularly in the audience of young people that tend to listen to their station, and I told them so.

With them being a distant and large corporation, I'm not sure I addressed my comments to the appropriate person at Clear Channel. I'm sure that their employees can't be bothered to respond to complaints from a tiny town in eastern Washington. That's the problem with your proposed rule change - these corporations have no local accountability.

David Pfund
Richland, WA

Begin forwarded message:

> From: "Pfund, David M" <david.pfund@pnl.gov>
> Date: Wed Apr 2, 2003 1:10:27 PM US/Pacific
> To: DianeDWarren@clearchannel.com
> Cc: dpfund@earthlink.net
> Subject: Your affiliate in Richland WA
>
> Ms. Warren:
>
> I read somewhere, I think it was in "The Art of War," that a wise man
> doesn't celebrate the defeat of an enemy, he weeps. Apparently there
> are no wisemen at Clear Channel Communications. I just listened to an
> appalling station break announcement on your station in Richland WA,
> 97.1 FM ("97 Rock"). The recording said "Turning Iraq into a parking
> lot, with plenty of handicapped parking. America Rocks!" I would
> have hoped that, no matter what our opinions are about the war and
> it's justification, that we could all agree that it is very
> unfortunate, to say the least, and that such remarks as I heard on
> your station are cruel and stupid.
>
> Perhaps it's inevitable that a nation takes on some of the habits of

- > its enemy in war. That seems to be what's happened in the past.
- > Still, it saddens me to hear Americans shrieking like middle eastern
- > militants.
- >
- > I'll never listen to your station here again, or any other Clear
- > Channel station.
- >
- > David Pfund
- > Richland, WA
- >
- >

From: ACROSHERE4@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/4/03 9:04PM
Subject: An opinion of the common citizen

Dear FCC Chairman Powell,

I know you have a heavy burden and I don't mean to add to that by disagreeing with what may be your stance on the issue of deregulation but I feel it necessary to voice my objection to further consolidation of the media.

I think you're stance, as I understand it, is based on the concept that further consolidation will strengthen the media for communities. I am sorry that I do not agree with that.

I don't see that in my community, Dallas, Texas. What I see is that a story gets a trial run on channel five or eight and then is altered the next day in the papers -- Fort Worth Star-Telegram and Dallas Morning News respectively. I see less and less news on the news. I don't just mean tacky stories during sweeps, I mean stories that belong on Entertainment Tonight if they belong on TV at all.

Someone's pushing a movie, a TV show, an album, what have you. That has a place on the morning shows what with their two hour coverage (three in the case of Today Show) but when I'm watching my nightly news, I don't need to know who's putting out what product. I need to know issues.

I'll give you one example. In Dallas, Texas, a number of Hispanics were arrested and convicted of drug possession. The FBI is now overseeing an investigation into how sheet rock resulted in drug convictions. The coverage of this issue has been minimal. Recently, a nearby community had a similar case, only in this instance it was African-Americans being falsely arrested. I find it really sad that The Dallas Morning News and the Fort Worth Star-Telegram gave the issue less coverage than the New York Times. New York, to Texas, is practically another world. It's kind of exotic for us native Texans. But I found out much more about that case from the NY Times than I did from either of our two daily papers. (Some would argue that we only have one daily paper -- The Dallas Morning News. Fort Worth is another city, yes. And there's a point to be made there as well. I buy both papers daily because of the fact that Dallas no longer has The Dallas Times Herald. We're one of the top ten cities in the country but we only have one daily. That goes to the problem with consolidation.)

On the radio, I don't hear local voices. I don't hear local issues. Competition in the market place would, I feel, lead the stations (radio & TV) to work harder at getting stories.

But the issue that bothers me the most is where is the small business owner in all of this? We used to be a nation that believed in the "little man." Look at what happened with the consolidation of farms in the eighties, the "little man" was driven out of that market. I'm all for a free market. I'm not for consolidation of the market.

We own the airwaves, we the people. We're not being served, I feel, with all these mergers and major buyouts.

I'm sure you've given serious consideration to this issue. I ask that you give further consideration to it for the sake of the people. More and more, it seems like we don't have a voice in what goes on. More and more, it seems like whoever can hire the lobbyists gets to frame the argument.

I know you were raised by a fine mother and father and I know decent values and belief in your fellow man were instilled in you early on. I ask that you consider the long range implications on our lives if the media is allowed to further consolidate.

Thank you and God bless.
-- Jake Whatley

From: Carole Wilson
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/4/03 10:45PM
Subject: complicity in war

Mr. Powell

If you further deregulate the media- increase this consolidation of ownership...already this war has been accomplished by the media emotionally manipulating us - some TO DEATH- not on behalf of freedom but on behalf of the likes of Haliburton.

If you continue this shift of shiftiness- trust me it WILL come out somehow.(this country may have been bamboozled but the rest of the planet was not- incase you didn't notice the byline on this script isn't Bush or even any of his puppetteers but Osama bin Laden)

I don't see how you can stand yourself or sleep at night knowing the media did this and you helped.

Carole Wilson
Austin, TX

"Our perceptions turn on our genes and turn off our genes and our perceptions can rewrite our genes," -Bruce Lipton, former researcher at the Stanford School of Medicine

From: Luise Landers
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/5/03 12:35AM
Subject: Airways Usage

Dear Chairman Powell,

This is to ask you and the other FCC Commissioners to restrict ownership of U.S. media by conglomerates. To maintain a democracy, citizens need the many viewpoints of individual users of the public airways. We do not want corporate monopoly ownership of our radio and TV broadcasts.

Yours,
Luise Landers
Redding CA 96002
shannon@awwwsome.com

From: Jill Waterhouse
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/5/03 12:44AM
Subject: Clear Channel

Hello,

I'm writing to plead with the FCC to please stop the monopoly of radio stations by Clear Channel Broadcasting.

A monopoly on anything is clearly not a good thing. Clear Channel is dangerous. I should know, I lived in the Florida Keys where Clear Channel has many stations. During a major storm two years ago, we had no idea a pipe had burst and we should not drink the water! There were no announcements over the radio, there couldn't be, there was no one there.

The refusal of Clear Channel to play the Dixie Chicks, their decision making process that affects many people across the nation in favor of what they believe is dangerous. For the record I don't even listen to the Chicks, but I bought the CD anyway.

A monopoly on stations across this country AND imposing their beliefs is not American. It is UnAmerican. America is supposed to be a democracy. Unfortunately that is becoming rare these days. Until the next election when we can change all this, and we will, I plead with the FCC to please, at least, put a stop to Clear Channel. Give the 'little guy' a chance.

Thank you,

Jilayne Waterhouse
Palm Coast, FL

From: Tom M
To: Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 4/5/03 1:44AM
Subject: Conglomerates

Dear Commissioner Powell and members:

I was very disturbed by a report by Bill Moyers on PBS regarding the Conglomerate ownership of Mass Media outlets.

Knowing that the "independent" voice is being squashed by Six "big money owners" who are now basically control the output of News and information in the USA. Of course, most of the viewers, readers and listeners have NO IDEA of the scope of this problem as the Conglomerates feel it is N:T IN THEIR BEST INTEREST to inform us.

Further, I am concerned about the LACK of personnel available at stations lest he same tragedy occur here thtat did in Minot, ND thanks to Clear Cahannel's "unmanned" station.

I'm not that old, but I DO remember that we used to Anti-Trust Laws in this country. I seem to remember a time when the owner of Newspapers could not also control the airwaves. I remember a time when SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY was the AIM of most Media Stations, with required News Breaks on AM, etc. I guess the legislation of 1996 threw out the "baby with the bath water.". All that seems to matter now is BOTTOM LINE.

To hear the Executive state they need MORE STATIONS to maintain their "current standard" is an utter laugh. They re producing "reality shows" at a FRACTION of what I consider "True" entertainment. So then need MORE STATIONS to distribute LOW COST PROGRAMMING , and produce GREATER Earnings? I don't see how that fulfills the need or mission statement of Serving a community. Perhaps you can explain this to me. And the same executive stated that they needed more Stations to maintain the same level of Sports Coverage. Perhaps this argument works for the feeble minded. As we learned in Business 101, it seems that ADVERTISING is what pays to keep "Free Television- Free." It doesn't take a Rocket Scientist to figure out the astronomical amounts paid of a 15-30 second as during a major event like Superbowl, etc. are PROFITABLE to the Owners. Face it, if it wasn't profitable, they Would Not Do IT; Would Not Carry Specific Programming, Would not vie to carry specific events. They sure aren't doing it pour the goodness of their hearts. In the Rush to make all this money, the losers are the AMERICAN PEOPLE who are given less variety in viewpoints.

As for the "trips" and other perks, I don't care about those AS LONG AS THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION REMEMBER WHO PAYS THEIR SALARIES, I refer to the TAXPAYERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

I urge you and the other members of the Commission to CHANGE the status quo and stop conglomerates like Disney, Time-Warner and etc. from maintaining more than 50% control of ANY Market area.

It's time to bring back the independence and Freedom of Speech we deserve. We are ENTITLED to different viewpoints. We don't need a "Democratic" Government with Media run by a few "Dictators." The NETWORKS and/or Station Owners must be MADE to support, without strings or subversion, PUBLIC TELEVISION and National Public Radio. If for No Other Reason, to provide viewers and listeners a CHOICE of viewpoint, not controlled by the Conglomerates.

Thank You for your time.

Respectfully,

Thomas P. Malatino.
Granbury, TX

2506 Neil Ct.
Granbury, TX 76048-6529

"Meddle not in the affairs of Wizards, for they are Subtle and quick to Anger!"

~~J. R. R. Tolkien

"Did you ever get the feeling that the story's too damn real, and in the Present Tense?"

~~ Jethro Tull

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.467 / Virus Database: 266 - Release Date: 4/1/03

CC: EDITOR