

02-277

**From:** James B. Likowski  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 5:53 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

James B. Likowski (mulesear@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I greatly appreciate your strong stance and eloquent commentary regarding the impending FCC media ownership rules revision event, expected in early June 2003.

I have sent the following letter to the FCC ECF and to your fellow commissioners.

Thank you very much for your continuing efforts!

Jim Likowski  
P.O. Box 410  
Coloma, CA 95613

\*\*\*\*\*

May 4, 2003

Dear Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_,

I fully support FCC Commissioner Michael Copps' position in the debate regarding the upcoming Commission vote on media ownership rules. I encourage you to fully accommodate the views of Mr. Copps, without exception.

I have no admiration whatsoever for Chairman Powell's stubborn reluctance, to date, to provide Congress -- and the American public -- due time and detailed information with which to fully review and comment upon his impending FCC media ownership rules revision proposal. I believe this reluctance is, sadly, contrary to the core values of this nation, an abuse of power, and an insult to the American ideals of freedom of speech and democracy.

Sincerely,

Jim Likowski  
P.O. Box 410  
Coloma, CA 95613

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.119.29.30  
Remote IP address: 216.119.29.30

**From:** Scott F. Weiss  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:02 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Scott F. Weiss (chryses11@aol.com) writes:

Dear Sir:

I am extremely concerned about the possible further consolidation of the media. Your upcoming vote is critical to prevent this happening. Democracy as we know it cannot survive these inroads. History is watching your actions as well as we loyal Americans. Please display your considered wisdom in this regard and vote against the continued monopolization.

Sincerely,  
Scott F. Weiss

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 152.163.189.70  
Remote IP address: 152.163.189.70

**From:** Rcb339@cs.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:05 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership

Dear Jonathan S. Adelstein,

May 3, 2003

It has come to my attention that on June 2, 2003 sweeping reforms are going to occur which will affect media ownership in the U.S., thus allowing for greater consolidation of broadcasting outlets. I am writing to ask you not to support legislation which would allow increased monopolization of the media.

There must be government regulations on the number of broadcast outlets a corporation can own so as to stimulate competition within the market. Media broadcasting is not a commodity that can be subject to the free market. Deregulation will only hurt smaller companies by making it more difficult for them compete with those media conglomerates who will most likely be the winners in the effort to monopolize.

By not placing caps on media ownership a greater number of voices will not be heard. The current situation is dismal enough, which can be witnessed in the ignorance of public awareness with respect to this very issue and in the homogeneity of TV coverage of the Iraq War. A.M. radio is another atrocious example of the way differences in opinion has been stifled as a result of deregulatory legislation passed in 1996.

Diversity of opinion is critical for a democracy to be viable and allowing for competition within media broadcasting market is an extremely important means of obtaining that diversity. If one company is permitted to own more than one broadcasting outlet, surely variety of opinion will diminish.

The airwaves belong to the people. They should not be a commodity which can be bought on the the open market. Once more I urge you to respect the right of the people to ownership of the broadcast airwaves by maintaining current legislation regarding caps on ownership of media outlets.

Sincerely,

Richard Cabrera

**From:** Robert Theriot  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:34 PM  
**Subject:** media monopolies

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

Robert L. Theriot, 33 Texas Ave., Houma, LA 70360, 985-876-570

**From:** Rich12332@cs.com  
**To:** Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:37 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopolies Have Muzzled Dissent

[http://www.truthout.org/docs\\_03/050203e.shtml](http://www.truthout.org/docs_03/050203e.shtml)

## Media Monopolies Have Muzzled Dissent

By Ian Masters

Los Angeles Times

Thursday 1 May 2003

If information is the oxygen of democracy, the United States has just been gassed, not by weapons of mass destruction but by a weapon of mass distraction.

With George W. Bush basking in glorious ratings and Fox News climbing in the ratings, we may be moving toward a coronation instead of a reelection in 2004. It was, after all, Rupert Murdoch's unilateral anointment of Bush as the winner in the early hours of the morning after the undecided 2000 election that led Al Gore to foolishly concede, because he and the other networks believed what they saw on Fox Television.

Now the marriage between a government and its volunteer information ministry has been consecrated by the blessed victory of "Operation Iraqi Freedom," the geopolitical equivalent of an O.J. meets "Joe Millionaire" wrapped in the flag.

Totalitarian regimes don't tolerate any distinction between journalism and propaganda, but in most democracies it is unprecedented for the free press to abandon Joseph Pulitzer for the methods of Joseph Goebbels.

How did a born-again, family-values administration get in bed with a purveyor of misogyny and mayhem, trash and titillation? The common thread, for all the public piety, has to be the late Lee Atwater, who was friend, mentor and role model to George W., Karl Rove and Roger Ailes, the head hound in the Fox pound of junkyard attack-dog journalism.

This undemocratic confluence of politics and propaganda has long been in the making as corporate media have been incrementally empowered while public influence, input and "interest" have been eliminated.

The transformation of active citizens into passive consumers was enabled by the Federal Communications Commission under Ronald Reagan's Mark Fowler, who declared "the perception of broadcasters as community trustees should be replaced by a view of broadcasters as marketplace participants."

Welcome to America, Mr. Murdoch: You can buy the airwaves and, who knows, some day the presidency. TV's Fox could not get away with its shameless shilling for the White House if the Fairness Doctrine were still in place, and radio's Clear Channel monopoly would not be able to impose wall-to-wall Limbaugh, Hannity and Savage, etc., on the public if broadcasters were accountable to public opinion rather than the dictates of plutocrats.

How could it be that in the land of the free and the home of the brave Americans are afraid of opinions?

Where are the Tom Paines, the Mark Twains, the Menckens, the Ida Tarbells?

Dissent has not gone away; it has just been marginalized by monopolies and relegated to the interstices of the Internet.

But the hammer is about to drop on the Internet too. The head of the FCC, Michael Powell, wants to give away what's left of the store to the broadband cable and satellite providers and make them gatekeepers or tollbooths on the information highway.

It used to be that the Internet was accessed via a common carrier, the phone company, but as technology has moved forward, these new unregulated media monopolies have increasing control over the information pipeline. Without regulation, they have the ability to choose what content they provide.

Two FCC commissioners want to delay this hand-over and encourage public debate, but the public is largely unaware of what is at stake.

Obviously you can't expect the Limbaughs, O'Reillys and their bosses or their president in the White House to give them talking points on preserving diversity of opinion while there is a tax cut to sell.

So speak up, America: It's your country, they're your airwaves. Maybe you can pursue the American dream while you are asleep, but it will be too late to reclaim your country's freedom when you wake up.

Ian Masters is the host of "Background Briefing" on KPFF-FM (90.7) in Los Angeles.

(In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, this material is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes.)

(c) Copyright 2003 by TruthOut.org

**From:** Walter A  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:38 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules

Our newspaper and radio stations are already monopolies in my view. Please do not give these media giants any more rule changes to snuff out what few independent voices we have left.  
Thanks for consideration.

---

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

**From:** Robert Theriot  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:42 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopolies

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

Robert L. Theriot, 33 Texas Ave., Houma, LA 70360, 985-876-5750

**From:** Weldon P. Barker  
**To:** Mike Powell, hollings@senate.gov  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:52 PM  
**Subject:** Public Hearings!

Chairman Powell:

I write to express my alarm and great concern over your apparent intention to repeal the rule which restricts major media conglomerates from owning no more than 35% of the media outlets in any specific media market. Such a major change in FCC laws and regulations deserves a lengthy and detailed attempt to inform the American public of the potentially profound changes in their lives that will likely be wrought if such limits are removed. The citizens of this nation, as you are very well aware, are overwhelmingly unaware that such changes are even being considered and they deserve an opportunity to express their concerns and wishes on this matter.

But you seem to be intent on responding to the demands of the media moguls of this nation, who want a speedy, "under-the-radar" vote on this enormous change before the public becomes aware of what is being done, rather than on ensuring an open, honest and balanced national discussion of the issues involved in such a change. This is deeply threatening and troubling to me and most disappointing.

Please bear in mind that your highest obligation is to serve the PUBLIC INTEREST--the interests of all the American people, not just those of a handful of network and media barons, who will undoubtedly stifle the free dissemination of contrary, conflicting points of view. This likelihood is a frightening threat to the constitutional freedoms that Americans cherish, but foolishly take for granted.

Please let me know what you intend to do to ensure that free expression of unpopular, even radical, opinions does not become the victim of the single-minded, irresponsible pursuit of ever-greater corporate profits.

Weldon Barker  
Summerville, SC

**From:** The Ellis'  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:52 PM  
**Subject:** ownership of media outlets

Chairman Powell: I urge you not to make it easier for media conglomerates to own/control increasing amounts of the public information media. Hopefully you agree that the public owns the airwaves, if so, at least lets have more public hearing and debate on this crucial decision. David H. Ellis

**From:** James G. Hidden  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:53 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

James G. Hidden (garette@att.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

The possibility of greater media monopoly is of grave concern to me as it would signify a reduction in the number of independent voices to be heard and would therefore significantly impact the freedom we citizens of the U.S. enjoy.

I strongly urge you not to permit even more consolidation in the media than has already occurred. Please help to keep America truly free by preserving a competitive and open media environment.

Sincerely,

James G. Hidden  
Ogden Utah

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.81.161.109  
Remote IP address: 12.81.161.109

**From:** CCHenda@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 6:56 PM  
**Subject:** Concerned Citizen

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

A friend told me that the FCC (operates independent of Congress, etc.) is being pressured by major media companies to let them buy out the small media outlets in small towns and cities.

I am Concerned for a couple of reasons:

- If only a few major organizations own all the media outlets, then how is the population to get both sides of an issue? Under the current political situation, I view this as very dangerous surrender of a freedom.

- In time of local emergency, how are the local populations going to be notified? If you are operating, for instance, a radio station with canned programming which usually has no live broadcaster.

I am hoping that the Commissioners at the FCC are going to looking into this issue seriously and will make an educated decision when it comes to voting for or against this issue. I do not support this consolidation by the FCC. I know that the FCC is being pressured by major organizations, but the decision you make on this issue may mean the end of our democracy as we know it today.

It's in your hands. Please do the right thing.

Charles Hendershott

**From:** Joe Neff  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:01 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership Rules

I understand that the longstanding rules with regard to the number of media outlets that can be owned by any one party in a given local market are soon to be loosened or eliminated. How can this happen before the majority of Americans understand why it is in the "public interest"? This very issue has received little or no coverage in the popular national broadcast media or any local media. Too many important issues receive this kind of treatment and we citizens are provided only corporate propaganda. Since We the People are the rightful owners of the airwaves, it only stands to reason that We need a reasonable dialogue that convinces us that any rule change is indeed in the public interest and will not result in increased corporate control of the broadcast media. Should the latter occur it will be a great loss to our democracy.

Joseph Neff  
18515 13th AVE NE  
Poulsbo, WA 98370  
jnneff@earthlink.net

**CC:** kabernet@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jastide@fcc.gov

**From:** allegra  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:08 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership change

I understand that you are considering making sweeping changes in the law which will allow a few media giants to further consolidate ownership of radio stations and TV networks in this country. I am very concerned about this because I believe the airwaves belong to the people and consideration of the higher good for all people as regards use of the airwave should certainly supersede the need for big companies to consolidate everything in order to be more profitable. The quality of programs which presently exist is already so money oriented and of such poor quality that to cut out the few independent voices which remain would have a tremendous deleterious effect on the minds and understandings of the people of this country. I urge you to think about the future and the great need we have and will continue to have to make way for diversity in the media. That has been the strength of this country. Think about all of the children who are largely educated by television in their hours away from school and even in school. It is so important that people who are not solely motivated by money or the desire to produce just mass entertainment have an opportunity to use the air waves which rightfully belong to all of us. Thank you for your consideration. Allegra Ahlquist P.O. box 396 Dragoon, Arizona

**CC:** Liz Campbell

**From:** John H. LaGesse  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:09 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

John H. LaGesse (johnh11@hotmail.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to express my view that no changes should be made at your meeting on June 2 allowing for further concentration of the media into the hands of a few conglomerates. We must have free and unbiased information which would not occur if only a few large companies control the media in this country. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,  
John H. LaGesse

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 63.245.174.115  
Remote IP address: 63.245.174.115

**From:** peddoc07@hotmail.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:17 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

don shifrin  
2700 northup way  
bellevue, Washington 98004-1463

cc:  
Senator Patty Murray  
Representative Jennifer Dunn  
Senator Maria Cantwell

**From:** beth mmm  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:25 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership Rule Changes

Currently 3 large corporations control 80 percent of the media audience. They can (and do) refuse to air or print diverse opinions, certain songs/artists, ads that do not accord with their particular biases, and public input. As one company openly stated, "We are not in the business to air well-researched news." In fact, these companies are in business to make money for themselves and their stockholders. It is big business vs. community interests; it is public input vs. the bottom line.

The airwaves belong to the public, and the public needs to have its views expressed and to be made aware of the changes you are about to make. Restricted airways have removed or limited consumer choice, news from far distant locations, and community input. Our airwaves have been taken over by paid advertising in half-hour time slots.

Democracy depends on diversity of ideas and freedom of speech. We do not want to lose access to vital information and the free flow of ideas.

Do NOT weaken or eliminate rules that now control media mergers and acquisitions. Media monopoly will place severe restrictions on our valuable "marketplace of ideas."

Beth Malmgren  
10817 W. Amber Trail  
Sun City, AZ 85351-1046  
623-933-9426  
mam36@juno.com

**From:** William A. Thompson  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:31 PM  
**Subject:** DO NOT adopt proposed "broadcast ownership rule"

I would like to urge you not to support the proposed broadcast ownership rules because I feel that they will result in some media not allowing even the purchase of advertisements, the point of view of which they do not endorse.

Thank you.  
William A. Thompson

**From:** CFG1922@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:47 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership rules

The Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein, 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 for 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.

**From:** Amy Fuelleman  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:47 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Amy Fuelleman (fuel@terra.com.net) writes:

Re: the proposed media consolidation rules

The proposed media consolidation rules are anti-democratic. This may be the most important issue of our time. Our very democracy depends on a critical, free, multi-voiced media. When all the media is owned by a very few companies, a variety of voices will not be heard. There is already too much consolidation. Halt the impending June 2 vote and let the people debate openly, honestly this most crucial issue. Stop any further consolidation, bring back the Fairness Doctrine. Insist the media serve the public interest as required by law.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 208.170.95.12  
Remote IP address: 208.170.95.12

**From:** Chelacheelo@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:03 PM  
**Subject:** June 2nd deadline-

Dear Mr. Powell,

I'm requesting that you extend the upcoming deadline and offer much more opportunity for public discussion of this very important issue. Very few people even know about the potential changes this vote could make. The airwaves belong to the public and the public deserves to be advised about whats going on. The FCC should make every attempt to alert the public and let the public opinion about the idea of mass media consolidation be heard. Thank you for your time. Michele Benderra, A Concerned American.

**From:** Dave Berardinelli  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:17 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules

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 records in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to 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 ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,  
Mr. David P. Berardinelli  
Chelmsford, Massachusetts

**From:** Judy Casaroli  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:21 PM  
**Subject:** FCC vote on ownership rules

I am opposed to narrowing the ownership of the media.

The diversity of information and ideas and their widespread circulation are basis of a real democracy. Increasing consolidation in the ownership of news and opinion sources is contrary to full and open public discourse. Media ownership rules are essential to democracy. Multiple outlets with single owners give us only one voice.

I have seen what single ownership does in the local arena with opinion pieces in a news program. The opinions are not local and have no relevance locally. They are taped for broadcast nationally.

Please do not leave us with fewer and fewer voices in the media.

Judy Casaroli  
1721 Burnett Way  
Sacramento, CA 95818

**From:** Maxine Libros  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:31 PM  
**Subject:** June 2 vote

Dear Chairman Powell,

Many of us, ordinary Americans, are concerned and upset about the vote planned for June 2nd, which may lead to further amalgamations in the telecommunications sector.

We feel, inadequate information concerning the impact of this vote has been given to us. Please postpone the vote, and plan to disseminate more information so we can understand the implications of this vote more fully, and how it will impact us.

Sincerely yours,

Maxine Libros, M.A.  
3900 Ford Rd. #17-O  
Philadelphia, PA. 19131

**From:** Rich12332@cs.com  
**To:** Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:39 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Rule change

> Dear Media Corps member,  
>  
> This week's MoveOn Bulletin focuses on a rule change at the FCC that  
> could change the media landscape in drastic ways. Next week, we'll  
> begin an extensive campaign to fight media consolidation and make the  
> FCC do its duty. The bulletin below provides some good background for  
> that fight. I hope you enjoy it.

>  
> --Eli

>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> SHOWDOWN AT THE FCC  
> MoveOn Bulletin  
> Friday, May 2, 2003  
> Co-Editors: Don Hazen and Lakshmi Chaudry, AlterNet

>  
> Subscribe online at:  
> <http://www.moveon.org/moveonbulletin/>

>  
> You can unsubscribe at any time by clicking here:  
> <http://moveon.org/s?i=1336-648955-ZTGvhcf9CkBhv6OIctvkRw>

>  
> CONTENTS:  
> 1. Eli Pariser: Why Worry About Who Owns the Media?  
> 2. Jeff Chester: Showdown at the FCC  
> 3. Neil Hickey: The Gathering Storm Over Media Ownership  
> 4. Bill Moyers: Barry Diller Takes On Media Deregulation  
> 5. Danny Schechter: The Media, the War, and Our Right to Know  
> 6. Eric Boehlert: Clear Channel's Big Stinking Deregulation Mess  
> 7. Paul Schmelzer: The Death of Local News  
> 8. Caryl Rivers: Where Have All the Women Gone?  
> 9. About the Bulletin

>  
> -----  
>  
> WHY WORRY ABOUT WHO OWNS THE MEDIA?  
> MoveOn Bulletin Op-Ed  
> by Eli Pariser

>  
> It's like something out of a nightmare, but it really happened: At  
> 1:30 on a cold January night, a train containing hundreds of thousands  
> of gallons of toxic ammonia derails in Minot, North Dakota. Town  
> officials try to sound the emergency alert system, but it isn't  
> working. Desperate to warn townspeople about the poisonous white cloud  
> bearing down on them, the officials call their local radio stations.  
> But no one answers any of the phones for an hour and a half.  
> According to the New York Times, three hundred people are  
> hospitalized, some are partially blinded, and pets and livestock are  
> killed.

>

- > Where were Minot's DJs on January 18th, 2002? Where was the late night station crew? As it turns out, six of the seven local radio stations had recently been purchased by Clear Channel Communications, a radio giant with over 1,200 stations nationwide. Economies of scale dictated that most of the local staff be cut: Minot stations ran more or less on auto pilot, the programming largely dictated from further up the Clear Channel food chain. No one answered the phone because hardly anyone worked at the stations any more; the songs played in Minot were the same as those played on Clear Channel stations across the Midwest.
- >
- > Companies like Clear Channel argue that economies of scale allow them to cut costs while continuing to provide quality programming. But they do so at the expense of local coverage. It's not just about emergency warnings: media mergers are decreasing coverage of local political races, local small businesses, and local events. There are only a third as many owners of newspapers and TV stations as there were in the 1970s (about 600 now; over 1,500 then). It's harder and harder for Americans to find out what's going on in their own back yards.
- >
- > On June 2, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is considering relaxing or getting rid of rules to allow much more media concentration. While the actual rule changes are under wraps, they could allow enormous changes in the American media environment. For example, one company could be allowed to own ABC, CBS, and NBC. Almost certainly, media companies will be allowed to own newspapers and TV stations in the same town. We could be entering a new era of media megaliths.
- >
- > Do you want one or two big companies acting as gatekeepers and controlling your access to news and entertainment? Most of us don't. And the airwaves explicitly belong to us -- the American people. We allow media companies to use them in exchange for their assurance that they're serving the public interest, and it's the FCC's job to make sure that's so. For the future of American journalism, and for the preservation of a diverse and local media, we have to hold the FCC to its mission. Otherwise, Minot's nightmare may become our national reality.
- >
- > -----
- >
- > Interested in taking on the FCC and other media-related concerns? Join the MoveOn Media Corps, a group of over 29,000 committed Americans working for a fair and balanced media. You can sign up now at:
- > <http://www.moveon.org/mediacorps/>
- >
- > -----
- >
- > **SHOWDOWN AT THE FCC**
- > Jeffrey Chester and Don Hazen, AlterNet
- > Despite wide protests and the Clear Channel debacle, the FCC is about to award the nation's biggest media conglomerates a new give-away that will further concentrate media ownership in fewer hands. The impact on the American media landscape could be disastrous. Recent TV coverage

> of the Iraq war already illustrates that US media companies aren't  
> interested in providing a serious range of analysis and debate. This  
> overview describes what's at stake and offers an introduction to the  
> following articles.

> <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15796>

>

> -----

>

> **THE GATHERING STORM OVER MEDIA OWNERSHIP**

> Neil Hickey, Columbia Journalism Review

> CJR's editor-at-large explains just what is at stake in this fight  
> over media ownership. He provides an in-depth look at the issues, and  
> major players in a battle that is pitting journalists against their  
> bosses, breaking up old alliances, and gathering momentum as the day  
> of reckoning draws near. He traces the snowballing trend of media  
> consolidation and its implications for the future, revealing just how  
> the drive for profit is eroding diversity, local control, and more  
> importantly giving a few mega-corporations a monopoly over the  
> dissemination of news.

> <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15654>

>

> -----

>

> **BARRY DILLER TAKES ON MEDIA DEREGULATION**

> Bill Moyers, Now with Bill Moyers

> The founder of Fox Broadcasting and present CEO of USA Networks is an  
> unlikely but passionate opponent of plans to loosen media ownership  
> rules. In an interview with Bill Moyers, the media mogul explains how  
> deregulation creates corporations with "such overwhelming power in the  
> marketplace that everyone has to do essentially what they say."  
> Diller argues that government regulation is essential to prevent media  
> companies from controlling everything we see, read, and hear. As he  
> puts it, "Who else is gonna do it for us?"

> <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15768>

>

> -----

>

> **THE MEDIA, THE WAR, AND OUR RIGHT TO KNOW**

> Danny Schechter, MediaChannel.org

> Why did the media do such a poor job of reporting on the Iraq war? The  
> boosterism of news anchors, the suppression of antiwar views, and the  
> sanitized images of war that defined television coverage are not a  
> simple matter of bias or ineptitude, says media analyst Danny  
> Schechter. He draws attention to the connection between the decisions  
> made by journalists and the lobbying efforts of owners who will  
> profit immensely from the upcoming FCC decision in June.

> <http://www.mediachannel.org/views/dissector/moveon.shtml>

>

> -----

>

> **CLEAR CHANNEL'S BIG STINKING DEREGULATION MESS**

> Eric Boehlert, Salon

> Clear Channel, the radio and concert conglomerate, has been the  
> greatest beneficiary of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, which  
> stripped all ownership limits in the radio industry. The rapacious  
> company, led by Bush supporter Lowly Mays, has grown from 40 stations

- > to 1,225 since then, and now uses its power to routinely bully
- > advertisers and record companies, and more recently censor antiwar
- > artists. However, as Eric Boehlert points out, its "success" may be
- > the most powerful weapon in the arsenal of media activists. Clear
- > Channel's stranglehold on the radio industry is the best and clearest
- > example of the effects of rampant deregulation.
- > <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15281>
- >
- > -----
- >
- > **THE DEATH OF LOCAL NEWS**
- > Paul Schmelzer, AlterNet
- > Meet the Sinclair Broadcast Group, the "Clear Channel of local news."
- > Since 1991, the company has managed to acquire 62 television stations
- > or 24 percent of the national TV audience. The company's modus
- > operandi is the centralized production of homogenized, repackaged faux
- > "local" news. Its success offers an alarming glimpse of the
- > post-deregulation world in which all news may be produced in one giant
- > newsroom and from a single viewpoint -- which in Sinclair's case is
- > wholeheartedly conservative.
- > <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15718>.
- >
- > -----
- >
- > **WHERE HAVE ALL THE WOMEN GONE?**
- > Caryl Rivers, Women's Enews
- > Once the war on Iraq took center-stage in the headlines of newspapers
- > and magazines across the country, women writers became increasingly
- > rare in the media. In their place are mostly white men who write on a
- > narrow band of foreign policy issues, mostly recycling their views
- > over and over again. From the all-male line-ups in the op-ed pages of
- > the Washington Post and the New York Times to the dwindling female
- > bylines in the New Yorker and Atlantic Monthly, women's voices have
- > been caught in a "spiral of silence" that is unprecedented since the
- > pre-women's movement days.
- > <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15677>
- >
- > -----
- >
- > **ABOUT THE MOVEON BULLETIN AND MOVEON.ORG**
- > The MoveOn Bulletin is a free email bulletin providing information,
- > resources, news, and action ideas on important political issues. The
- > full text of the MoveOn Bulletin is online at
- > <http://www.moveon.org/moveonbulletin/>; you can subscribe to it at that
- > address. The MoveOn Bulletin is a project of MoveOn.org.
- >
- > MoveOn.org is an issue-oriented, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization
- > that gives people a voice in shaping the laws that affect their lives.
- > MoveOn.org engages people in the civic process, using the Internet to
- > democratically determine a non-partisan agenda, raising public
- > awareness of pressing issues, and coordinating grassroots advocacy
- > campaigns to encourage sound public policies. You can help decide the
- > direction of MoveOn.org by participating in the discussion forum at:
- > [http://www.actionforum.com/forum/index.html?forum\\_id=223](http://www.actionforum.com/forum/index.html?forum_id=223)
- >

