

02-277

From: najib
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/3/03 8:35AM
Subject: <No Subject>

How's your adulterous relation with ClearChannel Lowry Mays? What evil fruit will it bear? We are not as dumb as you are a sell out.
End the illegal relation. Restore the airwaves to the American Public. Cut the CC monopoly. Do the right thing.

"Try the cage door once in a while"
Najib AbuDakhan
elboudn@email.uc.edu

RECEIVED

MAY 05 2003

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY

From: Laura Albrecht
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/7/03 1:56PM
Subject: Utility Company's sharing private info

Don't let the phone & utility companies share our personal information.
When a monopoly has information needed to provide service, it shouldn't be
allowed to profit from selling our personal information without our consent.
If WRITTEN consent is given, that is another albeit not current situation.

Thank you,

Laura Albrecht
Phone: 425-395-2226

RECEIVED
MAY 05 2003
COMMUNICATIONS

c2-277

From: Fogel, Jerise
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/31/03 6:49PM
Subject: Stop the Censorship of the Airwaves

EX-100-109-1477 FILED

Dear Mr. Powell,

The stations of the largest two companies in the U.S. currently get 42% of the radio audience of the U.S.

This is unacceptable as a status quo for our democracy. One of the groups, Clear Channel Communications, operates 1,214 radio stations! In some places it is virtually the only radio voice in town.

MAY 05 2003
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

In addition, these stations are interfering in public opinion in a blatant way. Clear Channel issued a list of recording artists not to be played on its stations, including Louis Armstrong! Cumulus Media, which owns 262 radio stations, stopped its 42 country-music stations from playing the Dixie Chicks. One of its stations in Louisiana bulldozed Dixie Chick CDs! This is not deference to listeners. This is the kind of frightening censorship that the Nazis practiced in their book-burnings.

I call upon you, as a Commissioner of the FCC, to put a halt to this abuse of our airwaves. Once, a single company could only own 7 radio stations. We should go back to that regulation, which was eliminated under Clinton, and protect the diversity of our airwaves. I call upon you in particular to halt support for the Telecommunications Act which will make even larger chunks of power available to Clear Channel and others.

Thank you, and I hope to hear from you on your stand on this issue.

Sincerely,

Jerise Fogel

From: RBroches@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/31/03 8:38PM
Subject: Please help

5/10/03 10:48:13 AM

Please help to re-open the people's airwaves. Saddam Hussein censors Iraqi radio and television. Before we "carry democracy" to Iraq, let's bring democracy to the United States!

Please help roll back the provisions of the Telecommunications Act that puts the power of telemedia in the hands of a relative handful of (usually ultra-conservative) owners. ie. Clear Channel Communications, Cumulus, and other such ownership groups.

Thank you for your help in making it possible for all citizens to be represented.

Renee Brochester, Providence, Rhode Island

MAY 05 2003

5/10/03 10:48:13 AM

From: Marydpoole@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, kabernet@fcc.gov, msopps@fcc.gov, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/1/03 11:04AM
Subject: Telecommunications

Please ensure that radio and television remain open to many voices. There should be no censorship by owners who control far too many outlets in most cities. The Telecommunications Act should be revised to reverse provisions that concentrate too much power in too few owners. Mary D. Poole, Albuquerque, New Mexico

EX-107-03-00000000

APR 1 2003

MAY 05 2003

APR 1 2003

745 DE 138
MS 05 200
APR 1 2003 4:10 PM
STOP THE CORPORATE GRAB OF THE MEDIA

From: CWA
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/1/03 2:10PM
Subject: Stop the Corporate Grab of the Media

Dear CWA e-Activist,

Today, six conglomerates control most of the media, and they want more. One company could control the TV station, newspaper, radio, cable, and Internet news in your town. Big business is pushing the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to drop all media ownership limits. The media conglomerates are quietly trying to change the rules without public involvement.

Click [here](#) to send an e-mail to tell the FCC to seek more public comment on changes to its media ownership rules.

If you would like to unsubscribe from this e-mail list or update your account information, click [here](http://www.unionvoice.org/cwa_action/smp.tcl?nkey=gx6bg2z7k6x) http://www.unionvoice.org/cwa_action/smp.tcl?nkey=gx6bg2z7k6x. If you would like to unsubscribe from ALL e-mail lists associated with the CWA e-Activist Network, you can respond to this email with "REMOVE" as the subject.

From: neubauer@uslink.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/1/03 4:18PM
Subject: n/a

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,

Richard A Neubauer
2238 Hingeley Road
Hibbing, Minnesota 55746

MAY 11 2005

From: Ira Skutch
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/1/03 6:21PM
Subject: Public airways

Chairman Powell:

I urge you to reconsider your crusade to end the regulation and the limits on broadcast ownership. If we continue this trend we will soon have a one-party press, emulating the fascist states of the thirties and the vicious enemies we are currently embroiled with. Surely you do not wish your legacy to be the death of the American democracy that has carried us forward for the past two centuries.

Sincerely, Ira Skutch
404 N. Maple Dr.
Beverly Hills CA 90210

4/1/03 6:21 PM

From: kduff@rddlaw.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/2/03 12:00PM
Subject: Fuzzy thinking clouds debate on media rules

From: Kevin Duff

Michael, I hope you are doing well. I thought you would be interested in this column from this morning's Chicago Tribune. --Kevin

Fuzzy thinking clouds debate on media rules

David Greising

April 2, 2003

Clear Channel Communications has caught a lot of heat lately, which isn't right. Clear Channel is actually providing a valuable public service.

Clear Channel shows us what happens when one media company owns more than 1,200 radio stations, multiple outlets in many cities and at least one station in all 50 states. This comes at a time when federal regulators may ease limits on ownership of television and cable stations as well as the cross-ownership of newspapers and TV stations in any given market.

FCC Chairman Michael Powell, who favors deregulation, plans to call for a vote June 2 on an array of concentration issues.

Commissioner Michael Copps, meanwhile, says we need more study, but means we need to keep most regulation intact. Copps will be in Chicago on Wednesday as part of his nationwide sampling of public opinion.

Clear Channel gives both sides something to think about.

There has been much talk about Clear Channel lately. That the radio network has crossed the line into political advocacy by sponsoring "Rally for America" demonstrations in 18 cities. That it has denied airplay to the Dixie Chicks musical group because one of the Chicks dissed President Bush. That it has a "Do Not Play" list targeted at politically controversial songs.

Trouble is, the real world isn't quite that clear.

Cumulus Media Inc. has banned the Dixie Chicks, not Clear Channel, though some Clear Channel stations won't air the group. The Do Not Play list remains a rumor that started on the Internet.

The "Rally for America" phenomenon in 18 cities has drawn at least 120,000 people. But the efforts of conservative Clear Channel radio personality Glenn Beck caused this at least as much as any perceived edict from corporate headquarters in San Antonio.

It's too bad all the hazy talk has sprung up. There are enough facts about Clear Channel to make the company a cause for concern.

Clear Channel's stations do have cookie-cutter formats. It has gutted news operations at many radio stations. It does lean on new artists to perform at Clear Channel-sponsored concerts in order to get airplay.

Clear Channel shouldn't be held responsible for what it doesn't do. But it should be assessed for what it does.

And, in the context of the changes the FCC is considering, Clear Channel should stand as an example of what happens with media concentration.

Powell and other deregulation advocates say over-the-air broadcasters need concentration so they can compete with cable and other pay services. They say growth of the Internet, cable and other media has made ownership limits obsolete.

Powell has sponsored at least 10 FCC studies to build his case. He is developing a new "diversity" test the FCC could use to measure whether a variety of views exist in any given market.

Commissioner Copps doesn't buy much of it. New media haven't added diversity, he says, because the same giants that own the airwaves own the most popular new media sites, too.

"Does more outlets really mean greater diversity?" Copps asks. "Or is it like having more electrical outlets in a room--more plugs, but the same current coming through?"

Copps wants more time for public hearings about media concentration. He complains that Powell hasn't shared information about how the diversity model would work.

More hearings might be nice, but they wouldn't be material.

Plenty of powerful parties on both sides have aired the key issues. Powell and the major media organizations have funded research that favors concentration, as have organizations like the Media Access Project, Consumers Union, and the Future of Music Coalition on the other side of the issue.

Powell failed the last time he tried to ram a vote through the commission. He lost 3-2 on a plan to regulate telephone rates in a way that would have favored large former Bell companies.

Now Powell is trying to push through a vote on media concentration. All the fretting about Clear Channel may be telling him there's a backlash building on this issue, too.

Contact dgreising@tribune.com.

Copyright (c) 2003, Chicago Tribune

Improved archives!

Searching [Chicagotribune.com](http://www.chicagotribune.com/archives) archives back to 1985 is cheaper and easier than ever. New prices for multiple articles can bring your cost down to as low as 30 cents an article:

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/archives>