

02-277

From: BMo1068@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:21 AM
Subject: June 2 ruling

Dear Commissioner Powell

I urge you to hold more hearings on the proposed rulemaking set for June 2. The ruling to open radio/tv ownership will eliminate competition even more than it has already. I believe we need more owners/operators not less. We in the USA are not able to hear or see diverse opinions. I live in Nashville, Tennessee, where Clear Channel have FIVE radio stations! There is not a nickel's worth of difference in an one of these five stations.

That's my nickel's worth.

Bruce C. Mosher

From: A. Young
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:27 AM
Subject: Keep our free press free

To: Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear Commissioner:

I urge you to not relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect me and all the other American citizens from media monopolies. A free press protects us all and a monopolized press is not free.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total or total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a well known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. In particular many of these conglomerates have tried in the past to keep our common viewpoints off the air or edited by an editorial staff with political limitations. The local communities across the country should decide which viewpoints to allow on the air by simply switching the channel and promoting those advertisers who support the media outlet they support.

The American people deserve to hear more than one or two points of view on not just important issues, but any issue. Therefore, for the sake of our democratic republic and our many freedoms I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections, that for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country and consequently have helped ensure a healthy country.

Sincerely,

Andrew F. Young

Andrew F. Young, Esq. Intellectual Property Law
115 Orchid St., Floral Park, NY 11001
Phone/Fax: 516-775-0068; Cellular: 516-770-2248
Important Notice: This communication is privileged and confidential and is intended solely for the recipient or their agent.
Should this communication be received in error, please retain in confidence and contact the above for immediate retrieval.

From: A. John Bissonette
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:34 AM
Subject: June vote on media ownership

Dear Commissioner Powell:

After learning more about the proposed vote in June concerning the FCC changes in rules of media ownership, I am VERY concerned that there has been next to no public discussion of this issue. It seems to me that there is certainly the potential that many of our freedoms of speech as well as of reception of that speech would be sharply curtailed by the fewer voices that we hear. I believe that the fact that this issue has NOT been discussed in mainstream newspapers, magazines and TV is already indicative of the power the communications media has to control the discussion of issues that concern Americans.

I truly believe, sir, that we need a far-reaching investigation by the FCC and a truly PUBLIC discussion of the ramifications of these changes on our system of government as well as on our rights to freedom of speech. And, what's more, I believe that you are the guardian of those rights.

I do appeal to you to forego the planned vote and instead, open the doors wide for a truly public discussion of this issue.

Very truly yours,

Ann Bissonette
annieb1@surfglobal.net

From: carol laron
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:48 AM
Subject: June 2

Mr. Powell,

We are very upset that you are pushing the most sweeping changes to occur in telecommunications in recent memory without exhaustive public comment. We want diversity of thought and expression on the airwaves. This is our American right and heritage. If this initiative takes effect, only the rich will have expression because they will have the money to dominate local markets.

We want to listen to Rush Limbaugh AND Amy Goodman. We want to listen to Conservative Christians AND "shock jocks". We are alarmed that this administration is pushing through this change. We want DIVERSITY and this is not the way to guarantee it. The American public is unaware that their lives are about to change in fundamental ways. How dare you take this step without involving the public? WE ARE ANGRY AND DISGUSTED. You are a political appointee and are obviously acting on behalf of this administration. We are registered Republicans and we vote. We will remember this at the polls.

Sincerely,

Carol and Larry Larson
4648 Oyster Bay Road N.W.
Olympia, Washington 98502

Help STOP SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: Bob Vesely
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:57 AM
Subject: I opposed the proposed media ownership changes

Dear FCC Commissioners:

I would like to add my voice in opposition to the FCC's proposal of media ownership changes. I have been in broadcasting nearly 30 years and ever since the deregulation in 1996, the industry has gone downhill in reporting fairness, local ownership, and employee equity. Please don't loosen the regulations and consolidate the media any further. This is not about big corporate economics, its about freedom, diversity, and the opportunity for the public to be heard.

Please consider that the 1996 telecommunication changes were a failure and tighten the regulations in market and cross ownership, not ease them. In the last ten years it has become nearly impossible for local media owners to compete against the titans in broadcasting. Giving the small business person an opportunity to once again gain control of local media outlets would create jobs and give the citizens local reporting that has been lacking.

Some call the Communications act of 1934 antiquated, I don't believe that any more than the U.S. Constitution is worthless.

Sincerely,

Bob Vesely
Seattle, WA

CC: senator_murray@murray.senate.gov

From: bruce winters
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:10 AM
Subject: FCC broadcast ownership rules

May 3, 2003

The Honorab Jonathan S. Adelstein;

If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.

Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.

The big media corporations have in the past used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers.

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC- are precisely the same companies that have tried in the past to keep your viewpoints off the air.

Bruce Winters
59 Northumberland Dr.
Toms River, N.J.
08757

Help STOP SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: Tricia Clark
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:13 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Tricia Clark (froobee@bellsouth.net) writes:

I urge you keep the rules in place regarding media deregulation, and if anything, to strengthen not relax them. If we allow more concentrated ownership of the media, it will endanger the very democracy upon which this nation was founded.

Thank you.

Tricia Clark
Memphis, TN

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.34.170.168
Remote IP address: 67.34.170.168

From: Tqeagle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:23 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I do not feel any Origination should have control of any one item or items. That , in my book, creates a monopoly and should not be.

So, I urge you, please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules. I have also summated postcards to that effect.

Raymond W. Howell.

From: Stan C
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:31 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Chairman/Commissioner

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Stanley Coleman
Manhasset, New York 11030-1706

From: Tqeagle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:35 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I do not feel any Origination should have control of any one item or items. That , in my book, creates a monopoly and should not be.

So, I urge you, please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules. I have also summated postcards to that effect.

Raymond W. Howell.

From: Daniel Ethier
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:39 AM
Subject: June 2nd vote

I am writing to urge you to oppose increasing the number of stations that any single owner can have. I think this creates a dangerous situation where a small number of individuals can effectively control what news and information we see. This will limit the free exchange of ideas that is essential to a thriving democracy. There is much more than money at stake here, and I think the health of our democracy is much more important than the well being of Clear Channel or any other media conglomerate. We need less concentrated ownership, not more concentration. We need more diversity of ideas, not a single watered down point of view.

Please vote against increasing or eliminating these limits.

Thank you.

Daniel Ethier
1641 Fremont Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55106

From: Christel Cherry
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:41 AM
Subject: Keep the Media Free - Vote against Media consolidation

Please keep our media competition intact. The public owns the airwaves - not the media giants. Protect our freedom. True Democracy needs full reporting. Leave a legacy of Integrity not cowardliness.

Christel Cherry,
11634 C NE 70th PL
Kirkland, WA 98033

425-822-8751

From: Diane Sheehy
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:42 AM
Subject: June vote on ownership

Sir, I am writing in regard to the vote you have called for in June to rewrite the ownership rules, as I understand the challenge before your committee, allowing one person or group to control newspapers, radio and tv in one area, is this not a monopoly? we are already hearing the results on the radio with Clear Channel (I think it is called) I am aware we are now receiving information based on what party lines the radio or tv stations or behind. Why would you put even more control into the hands of a few?? Isn't your job to serve the public to their best interest? I am very concerned you will be swayed by the immense pressure from the lobbyists who have the money to come Washington .I ask you to remember-they are not the public- of course you know this ,I just want you to understand just because we,who are not within the "beltway" nor on any list really are concerned about what you are doing "within the beltway". Take more time to look and study the issues. Do not make policy in haste, we the people will have to live with your decisions, please make them wisely. Sincerely Diane Sheehy.Salt Lake City,Ut

From: Christel Cherry
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:46 AM
Subject: Vote AGAINST Media consolidation and deregulation

Please keep our media competition intact. The public owns the airwaves - not the media giants. Protect our freedom. True Democracy needs full reporting. Leave a legacy of Integrity not cowardliness.

Christel Cherry,
11634 C NE 70th PL
Kirkland, WA 98033

~~~~~  
Christel Cherry, MS  
CRC Resources  
coach@ChristelCherry.com  
Phone: 425-822-8751  
Creative Results Coaching for Thinking Professionals  
~~~~~

From: Diane Sheehy
To: Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:49 AM
Subject: june vote

Sir and Madame, I am writing in regard to the vote you have called for in June to rewrite the ownership rules, as I understand the challenge before your committee, allowing one person or group to control newspapers, radio and

tv in one area, is this not a monopoly? we are already hearing the results on the radio with Clear Channel (I think it is called) I am aware we are now receiving information based on what party lines the radio or tv stations are supporting .I would like to be able to hear alternative news and ideas without turning to the BBC . Why would you put even more control into the hands of a few?? Isn't your job to serve the public to their best interest? I am very concerned you will be swayed by the immense pressure

from the lobbyists who have the money to come Washington .I ask you to remember they are not the public- of course you know this ,I just want you to understand just because we,who are not within the "beltway" nor on any list really are concerned about what you are doing "within the beltway". Take more time to look and study the issues. Do not make policy in haste, we the people will have to live with your decisions, please make them wisely. Sincerely Diane Sheehy.Salt Lake City,Ut

From: carl smith
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:53 AM
Subject: Media Concentration

We object to the further concentration of media control. The public must be protected as to localism, competition and diversity of the media. Never should more than 35% control be under one corporation. The public must be served not the "bottom line" of an industry. The democracy must be preserved which means the government is of the people, by the people and for the people. Take more time for input meetings and do not make a quick decision in June. This is far to important to the country as a whole than to let only those in Washington decide. The American people deserve more respect than it seems you are giving them in this democratic government.

Carl and Joan Smith

From: Kathleen Newman
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:03 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Kathleen Newman (knewman@hoopcom.net) writes:

A fully functioning democracy depends on media sources with diverse voices and opinions as well as content relevant to local communities, It is inappropriate to make significant changes that could have a sweeping impact on how our society engages in public debate without first having a complete public airing of these changes. I strongly oppose these changes. Do you want a Rupert Murdoch deciding what you are going to see or read or hear? Please do not pass this..

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 205.179.224.131
Remote IP address: 205.179.224.131

From: Candice & David
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:11 PM
Subject: FCC

Dear Commissioner:

Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Sincerely, David Vohs
Port Townsend, Washington

CC: kjmweb%fcc.gov.kabernat@fcc.gov

From: John Chandler
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:14 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

I would live to voice my opinion on the up coming review by the FCC. I am very, very worried about the talks to let fewer and fewer companies take charge of the media. This could be the largest mistake taken by a government office. Imagine a time that one company owns 90% of all media outlets. The CEO has a negative point of view of the sitting Presidential administration, that has just asked for air time to talk about his agenda. That CEO turns him down and continues with his regular programing. This is not a service to the people. We, the people, own the air waves. The voice and news of the nation will be controlled by a few. That few will be able to shape and distort the news to fit the needs or there agendas. Please DO NOT change the current regulations.

Kindest regards, John Chandler

From: Rod Rose
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:31 PM
Subject: Monopoly media ownership

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country

Sincerely
Roderick S. Rose
137 Lookout Pass
Stormville, NY 12582

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

From: Wren Osborn
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:48 PM
Subject: Public hearings on proposed changes in monopolization of media

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am very concerned about your lack of diligence in informing the American public about possible changes that will result in more monopolization of TV media and monopolization of all media in select markets. I understand June 2 will be the date of decision making. Very few official hearings have been held.

I am letting you know I am against further monopolization of media.

Please remember the airwaves belong to the people and should be used to promote democracy not strangle it. Monopolization has many negative affects for democracy. It tends to limit controversy and the presentation of diversified views. Also the bottom line becomes more important than journalistic standards.

Sincerely,

Wren Osborn (Mrs.)
1151 Pine Drive
El Cajon, CA 92020
wrenosborn@cox.net
619-440-4179

From: Ray Hockedy
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:53 PM
Subject: No to Media Centralization

Mr. Adelstein:

I am writing you because of my concern about upcoming FCC action which may allow more centralization of media in geographic areas. This is clearly wrong and will lead of monopolies of ideas and a virtual censorship of thought in our great nation. Please do all in your power to assure that we maintain a wide spectrum of ownership and operation of the media licensed by the FCC. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Raymond S. Hockedy

From: Wren Osborn
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:54 PM
Subject: Lack of hearings and opposition to further monopolization of media ownership

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I am very concerned about the lack of diligence of the FCC in informing the American public about possible changes that will result in more monopolization of TV media and monopolization of all media in select markets. I understand June 2 will be the date of decision making. Very few official hearings have been held.

I am letting you know I am against further monopolization of media ownership.

Please remember the airwaves belong to the people and should be used to promote democracy not strangle it. Monopolization has many negative affects for democracy. It tends to limit controversy and the presentation of diversified views. Also the bottom line becomes more important than journalistic standards.

Sincerely,

Wren Osborn (Mrs.)
1151 Pine Drive
El Cajon, CA 92020
wrenosborn@cox.net
619-440-4179

From: PiroRN@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:57 PM
Subject: monopolization

Dear Mr. Powell, I've heard that there is to be a hearing or meeting of some sort in June regarding the control of our communication systems-Internet, radio, television, phone systems,etc.- by a few large companies. This distresses me, as we have moved in this direction it seems the quality of some of these systems has greatly deteriorated, especially television. I sincerely hope that you and your organization will be able to prevent this decline by limiting the amount of ownership and power of these large communication companies. Thank you. Jan Piro, 2111 Gold Rush Dr., Gold River, CA95670.

From: Sara Baldwin
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:58 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC changes

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the changes the FCCs is considering that would deregulate media ownership-limits in local markets.. This change would result in fewer media companies and thus a higher concentration of media control in the hands of a few large corporations.

I teach English as a Second Language at a community college in Seattle. One of my subjects is Citizenship. I teach new immigrants and refugee adults about our county and its democratic form of government. We study the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I tell my students that our democracy is based on a free press, and that a FREE press represents a wide variety of viewpoints. This includes a widely diverse LOCAL perspective. This Diversity of local perspectives would be lost if the critical safeguards that are designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership are ended under the FCC plans. Under these plans, there would be fewer owners of networks, TV and radio stations, and newspapers which would lessen the variety of viewpoints in our media.

I attended the FCC hearing at the University of Washington on March 7, 2003 and listened to the many people testifying about these proposed changes. It was clear from the audience reactions that most of them were very much against these proposals. However, it doesnt appear as if the audiences opinions are being taken into consideration even though most of them signed postcards and petitions opposing these changes. Why are opinions being solicited at such hearings if they are not being considered?

At this hearing, I learned many facts that support my opposition to these proposed changes, including the fact that after the last deregulation, Los Angeles ended up with NO locally owned TV stations or newspapers. Surely this is not helping the citizens of Los Angeles make informed decisions about their city, environment or the laws that govern them.

It is clear that we need MORE locally owned TV & radio stations and newspapers to protect and ensure our democracy in the United States. Thank you for considering my opinions in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Sara Baldwin
6317 Linden Ave. N
Seattle, WA 98103

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