La Coquille
14115 Oakland Mills
San Antonio, Texas 78231-1635

May 13, 2003

Michael Powell, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

It has come to my attention that the FCC will vote on media ownership on June 2, 2003. I would not have known about this were it not for an e-mail from a friend. The press/media are apparently saying little because they are so controlled by corporations that would prefer that citizens not know this is happening.

I implore you, as a citizen in a democratic society that values freedom of the press, to do two things:

1) Postpone your vote so that more citizens can become aware of it and be given time to comment,

2) Vote against any and all expansion of corporate control of the press and media.

There are already too few companies that own too many media outlets. This as effectively silences the voice of a free press as would government control. The FCC must not betray the spirit and intent of our founding fathers who bequeathed to us a free press. Please oppose any expansion of ownership by companies; limit corporate control of the media as severely as possible.

If you believe in democracy and a free press, you will follow the dictates of this letter and of other similar requests I know you have received.

Yours sincerely,

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Loretta Van Coppenolle

Loretta Van Coppenolle
Concerned Citizen

5-10-03

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DON A. NUDI
240 POTTAWATAMIE
NEW LENOX IL 60451
PH. 815 485-9485
FAX 815-462-9537

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

DEAR SIR:

IF YOU VOTE TO RELAX THE BROADCAST OWNERSHIP RULES YOU MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR THE LARGE MEDIA NEWS CORPORATIONS TO GIVE AN ALMOST TOTAL ONE HANDED VIEW OF THE NEWS. OUR COUNTRY WAS FOUNDED ON FREE PRESS AND DIVERSE OPINIONS. RELAXING THOSE RULES WOULD PROBABLY END THAT. YOU HAVE A SACRED TRUST TO UPHOLD WHAT OUR FOUNDING FATHERS STARTED. KEEP HONORABLE IN FRONT OF YOUR NAME AND VOTE AGAINST RELAXING THOSE RULES.

SINCERELY

DON A. NUDI

EX PARTE OR

P.O. Box 382381
Birmingham, Ala 35238
May 10, 2003
Dear Mr. Martin
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules
The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Commissioner
FCC
445 12th St, SW
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

Please do **not** give approval to any request of the giant media conglomerates to gain control of the radio and television news content such that would prevent opposing views from being aired. I do not consider myself to be a 'politically correct' citizen and I believe I deserve the right and privilege to be heard.

I know we live in the world of 'big money' talks, however, I urge you to stand in the gap for little citizens as my self who are law abiding and God fearing people who cares about 'free speech'; I am concerned what the future holds from my children and grandchildren and others of this great nation should we lose this right of free expression in our national media.

I sincerely appreciate the work that you do and trust you will consider my request.

Regards,
Noah D. Leopard

Howell Mi

EX PARTE OR LATE

May 9, 2003

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

As a citizen of the Greatest Nation in the world I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to the rules of ownership.

Even now some Media slant their "news" reporting to present their point of view. If these people are allowed to own all the Radio, TV, and News print media in an Area or community, that is the only view the Public will recieve.

The prime example which comes to mind is the CBS 60 minutes report on how Alar was poisoning the Food supply. After it was proven scientifically that this was untrue, CBS never acknowledged that their report was erroneous.

Please in the interest of the public right to differing points of view, do not allow this Media Monopoly to happen

We now have laws on "Truth in Lending" and "Truth in Advertising", perhaps we need a set of "Truth in Reporting" rules.

It is within your power to provide the American Public with this right.

Thank you for your consideration and Service in this Area

Respectfully:

Joseph Nieisle

Howell Mi

EX PARTE OR LATE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 9, 2003

Dear Mr Adelstein

As a citizen of the Greatest Nation in the world I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to the rules of ownership.

Even now some Media slant their "news" reporting to present their point of view. If these people are allowed to own all the Radio, TV, and News print media in an Area or community, that is the only view the Public will recieve.

The prime example which comes to mind is the CBS 60 minutes report on how Alar was poisoning the Food supply. After it was proven scientifically that this was untrue, CBS never acknowledged that their report was erronious.

Please in the interest of the public right to differing points of view, do not allow this Media monopoly to happen

We now have laws on "Truth in Lending" and "Truth in Advertising", perhaps we need a set of "Truth in Reporting" rules.

It is within your power to provide the American Public with this right.

Thank you for your Consideration and Service in this Area

Respectfully:

Joseph Meisle

EX PARTE OR LATE

MEMBER

From The Desk of,

STEPHEN W. LOONEY

MEMBER

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

MAY 21 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

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.

Thank You for your time;

STEPHEN W. LOONEY

Dear Mr. Chairman,

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

5/9/03.

I urge you not 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 TV news + 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 + 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

Gail Caplan

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

The Honorable Michael K. Powell
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
445 12 th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Powell,

Please don't relax the broadcast ownerships rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. This is very important to all of Americans.

Thank you very much.

Daniel F. Hewitt
502 Anita Street 68
Chula Vista CA 91911

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Saturday, May 10, 2003

The Honorable Kevin J. Martin,
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
445 12 th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Martin,

Please don't relax the broadcast ownerships rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies, This is very important to all Americans.

Thank you very much.

Marjorie Hobzeff

Daniel F. Hewitt
502 Anita Street 68
Chula Vista CA 91911

MAY 9/03

Bonnie Crawford
207 Whitley Rd
Somerset Ky 42501

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Dear Mr Copps,

It has come to my attention that AOL Time Warner, Viacom and Disney among other media companies, have asked the FCC to make sweeping changes to the "Broadcast Ownership Rules".

Relaxing these rules would provide these already powerful companies with unlimited control of information, control of who gets to exercise freedom of speech, control of hearts and minds. Remember that the digital spectrum was given free of charge to these communication giants by the US Congress. What? you are surprised I knew about that? You should be. These very same media companies barely covered this give away in their news outlets. They didn't allow any strong voice to speak out against giving billions of dollars worth of the nation's property to these already wealthy companies.

This is only one example of the media controlling information and manipulating the "People" to further its own self interest and promoting the social/political agenda of its officers.

Please do your job and protect the interest of the "People". These companies have shown that they will abuse their power. Giving them more power to control free speech on a national and worldwide level would undermine the very foundation of the Constitution.

Sincerely Bonnie Crawford

PS. I haven't seen a single news report debating the pros + cons of changing the "Broadcast Ownership Rules". Have you?

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 15, 2003

Honorable Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Powell,

I urge you to not relax the restrictions on broadcast ownership that have been effective in protecting this nation and its citizens from media monopoly. With the real threat of media bias always before us the Commission needs to be diligent to keep avenues for communication of different viewpoints available to the population in general.

Thank you for your careful consideration of my concerns and for your service to this great nation.

Sincerely,

Leon A. Leonard
1712 Hodges Circle
Mansfield, GA 30055

c: Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Kevin J. Martin
Jonathan S. Adelstein
Michael J. Copps

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

MAY 21 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

May 15, 2003

Honorable Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Powell,

I urge you to not relax the restrictions on broadcast ownership that have been effective in protecting this nation and its citizens from media monopoly. With the real threat of media bias always before us the Commission needs to be diligent to keep avenues for communication of different viewpoints available to the population in general.

Thank you for your careful consideration of my concerns and for your service to this great nation.

Sincerely,

Leon A. Leonard
1712 Hodges Circle
Mansfield, GA 30055

c: Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Kevin J. Martin
Jonathan S. Adelstein
Michael J. Copps

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 15, 2003

Honorable Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Powell,

I urge you to not relax the restrictions on broadcast ownership that have been effective in protecting this nation and its citizens from media monopoly. With the real threat of media bias always before us the Commission needs to be diligent to keep avenues for communication of different viewpoints available to the population in general.

Thank you for your careful consideration of my concerns and for your service to this great nation.

Sincerely,

Léon A. Leonard
1712 Hodges Circle
Mansfield, GA 30055

c: Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Kevin J. Martin
Jonathan S. Adelstein
Michael J. Copps

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

MAY 21 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

May 15. 2003

Honorable Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Powell,

I urge you to not relax the restrictions on broadcast ownership that have been effective in protecting this nation and its citizens from media monopoly. With the real threat of media bias always before us the Commission needs to be diligent to keep avenues for communication of different viewpoints available to the population in general.

Thank you for your careful consideration of my concerns and for your service to this great nation.

Sincerely,

Leon A. Leonard
1712 Hodges Circle
Mansfield, GA 30055

c: Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Kevin J. Martin
Jonathan S. Adelstein
Michael J. Copps

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

MAY

Dear Mr. Deupree,

Please attach the rules are they are [illegible] TV - Radio stations [illegible] which the stations have no more than [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] consideration.

Rita J. Hanfield
8310 Broad Lane
Dayton OH 45402

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Linda Lakner
602 Highland St
Belvidere, Ill 61008
May 14, 2003

The Honorable Michael K Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington DC 20554

Dear Mr Powell:

It has come to my attention that you are being lobbied to relax the broadcast ~~[illegible]~~ ownership rules. I urge you not to relax these rules.

Please don't let the American citizens of this great to know what is going on in their own country.

The ~~media~~ media monopolies already decide what they will air. They have a way of spinning ~~stories~~ stories. If you think you are getting the whole picture, but you're not.

They already decide what topics they don't report on because they might have to give air time or print space to someone who disagrees with them.

This country is for all Americans not just the wealthy few who want to make decisions for the rest of the American Citizens, and have the

learning from their way. That is just what this country is about.

The American people, on the whole, U.S.A., deserve to hear more than one point of view. Please continue to the broadcast ownership rules that have protected this country and our freedoms for well more than the past.

Help the American citizens to keep our freedom, our democracy and our healthy political debate going strong.

Sincerely
Linda Kalmer

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Linda Lakner
602 Highland St
Belvidere, Ill 61008
May 14, 2003

The Honorable Kathleen Q Abernathy
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St. S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

I urge you to vote NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect the American Citizens against media monopolies.

The information we receive from the major networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC are so politically correct now, and they never will be anything that opposes their viewpoint and can you imagine how they will decide what is to be heard when the rules are swayed in their favor?

When the big networks find they are losing viewers they grudgingly are opposing their friends, but they do it in such a way that we know they are holding their message while they do it.

This country was built on freedom, that means freedom of speech also. Why should just a few broadcast owners be allowed to

decide what people should hear. I thought
we fought a war in another
country so these people could have right
to hear the truth. Please don't give
the media monopolies in this country
a free hand by relaxing the rules.
Television used to be an outlet
to find out what is going on in the
world and it used to have standards
we could be proud of. Now we have to
monitor constantly what we watch because
the FCC rules have already been relaxed
so much all that is on is smut.
I ask you to help this country stay
family oriented & voting to relax the broadcast
rules. Please don't let the media monopolies
run this country any more than they
already do. This includes the newspapers
too.

Sincerely
Linda Fikner

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Linda Palmer
602 Highland St.
Belvidere, Ill 61008
May 15, 2003

The Honorable Kevin J. Martin
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Martin

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

The news that is broadcast by the big three now is so biased it is ridiculous.

If you allow the proposed "broadcast ownership rules" to be adopted then the American Public will never hear the truth about anything. The news media and journalists will ~~decide~~ decide how this country is run and not the people.

We just fought a war in Iraq so the people there could decide how their country is to be run. Please don't let the United States have only a handful of people decide what the public should hear. Let the Public hear the whole

story and let us decide for ourselves what is best. The ~~[illegible]~~ news people already feel after superior to the common Public. If you give a handful of the headiest business this power the people in the middle of the country will never be heard from again, as the majority of the Broadcast cities are on the East or West Coast, and they don't think that the people on the rest of the state matter.

The big Conglomerates have used their Billions Repeatedly to keep opposing ~~[illegible]~~ viewpoints off the air. If they are given the Charge on the "Broadcast Ownership Rules" the common public will suffer as well as the whole Country as a whole.

Sincerely
Linda Sekmer

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

206 Cerrito Ave
Redwood City, Ca 94061
May 14, 2003

The Honorable Kevin J. Martin
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Martin:

I urge you ***not*** to relax the Broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizen from media monopolies.

These proposed changers 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,

Kevin J. Vitelli

Kevin J. Vitelli

5-10-03

DON A. NUDI
240 POTTAWATAMIE
New Lenox IL 60451
Ph 815-485-9485
FAX 815 462-9537

RECEIVED
MAY 21 2003
FCC-MAIL

Dear KATHEEN Q. ABERNATHY

IF YOU VOTE TO Relax THE Rules THAT PROTECT THE public FROM a one handed view OF THE News you do a great damage To Free press and Free Speech. THE BROADCAST ownership Rules protect THE public FROM giant media corporations having Total control OF THE News. OUR COUNTRY WAS Founded On Free Speech and diverse opinions are PART OF THAT. Keep HONORABLE IN FRONT OF YOUR Name and VOTE against Relaxing THE Rules

Sincerely

Don A. Nudi

P.S. You have a SACRED TRUST To uphold what OUR COUNTRY Stands FOR.

5-10-03

DON A. NUDI
240 POTTAWATAMIE
NEW LENOX IL 60451
PH 815-485-9485
FAX. 815-462-9537

MAY 2 1 2003

DEAR SIR:

Relaxing THE BROADCAST OWNERSHIP Rules would give big Media almost Total Control of THE airwaves. THIS COUNTRY WAS Founded on Diverse opinion and you have a Sacred TRUST To do every Thing you can To preserve it. Keep Honorable in FRONT OF YOUR name and Vote against Relaxing THose Rules.

Sincerely

Don A. Nudi

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Federal Communications Commission

As an American, I object strongly to the attempt by the FCC to file a proposal for relaxation of ownership rules for media organizations with five Commissioners whose only procedural rule for public address is accepting "public comment" for a thirty day period until June 2. It is an example of why the FCC has not operated in the "public interest" as it is required to under the CWA of 1934, but as a politically-appointed agency of an administration, or "consensus government" as Congress now calls it.

Permitting "public comment" without formal petitions, public hearings, or reasonable time-lines of six months or more does not offer adequate procedural, legal, temporal, or other route to have the public address the current state of megaconglomerates in media or thrash out issues in a search for truth which is the purpose of freedom of speech, press, news media, and other organizations.

It is particuarly disturbing when Congress recently held a hearing with Rupert Murdoch, who has been given special terms for foreign ownership of media in the United States twice in recent years – once this year when Chairman Powell acquiesced in his bid for foreign ownership of media, and when Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich sponsored FCC changes on his behalf. Not only does this demonstrate unreasonable bias towards a lobbyist prohibited for Congress, but it suggests that media regulation is controlled by special interest lobbies rather than an objective framework which should define issues about foreign ownership, foreign market penetration in the US or by the US abroad, and foreign influence over news, entertainment, and culture for tabloid-hate mongers.

While the FCC has announced that it expects to raise limits on audience-reach by media organizations from 35% to 45% and permit cross-ownership of media in large market areas, it offers no statistical grounds for this illusory market penetration figure. Beaming from New York, it is hard to imagine that ANC, CBS, or NBC have a "35%" market reach when they clearly not only have a 100% reach but a global reach, as do major networks such as Fox and CNN. With recent major, wall-to-wall coverage of a war in Iraq by these networks broadcast both by satellite and in segments world-wide, the illusory changes by the FCC about local or national market reach in the US seem naïve. Without addressing the impact of globalism on telecommunications, no responsible decision about the current excessive control over media market share,

penetration, corporate ownership, megaconglomerate ownership, or restraint of trade can be made.

The FCC's attempt to block public debate about media concentrations, which have escalated in a regulatory climate since the Reagen administration, and to put forth few or no objective facts about corporate ownership, licensing reviews, complaints, enforcement procedures, proceeds, stock market price, boards of directors, or tax rates on which to determine a new structure for further deregulation is an attempt to cause widespread public confusion about the purpose of regulation of the public airwaves, the role of licensing for those operating over the public airwaves, and the need for accountability about how all media organizations operate. When the FCC has refused to address complaints, petitions, or public grievances about everything from the V-chip on TV to filters on the Net for more than two decades, ended annual license reviews, and has a mass media bureau which does not enforce laws, preferring a 'hotline" for diversionary obstruction, it has no adequate record of complaints about media on which to base any decision at all. To add to that, a meagre "window of opportunity" for so-called public comment, not elevated to the status of legal definition, formal hearings, or due process procedures, does not adequately address objectively and realistically the major problems with radio, broadcasting, news, entertainment, video, and the internet the public faces today.

MEDIA

Much of United States policies about media have come from those least able to make them – politicians. Touting a general policy of a "free market" economy, Washington's officials have long attempted to sell the public on the dubious idea that media should be free to compete in the marketplace without regulation, and that the consumer will have low-cost, diverse, and fair news, entertainment, and communications as a result. Little could be farther from the truth. Like most organizations, media start-up companies garnering the only share of a new radio, broadcasting, or internet market have sought to maintain their 100% reach for decades, often through the sale of their corporate stock to corporations starting earlier which have gathered monopoly shares of motor cars or appliances.

It has long been debatable whether corporations which seek to operate over the public airwaves have any constitutional basis for selling private stock shares to individuals or other corporate entities, when the basis for media organizations operation has been designed for temporary licenses, fee-paid leasing of the airwaves, and public regulation of spectrum, communications, and content rules. Yet the FCC's failure to produce structural rules preventing private ownership of stocks in media organizations historically, has produced layer upon layer of corporate 'purchase' of media organizations by stock trades which have produced an ever larger pyramid structure of a few megconglomerate

communications 'owners' running large networks as if they were appliance, auto, or junk entertainment manufacturers. Today's major broadcasting networks, initially based in New York, now rely on advertising from a few megaconglomerate ad agencies in the same geographic area for their revenues, as the lack of structural control over stock take-overs, corporate mergers, and monopoly laws by public agencies in the US has continued. The result is a lack of free enterprise, new media organizations, and a debased sameness as such corporate fallacies turn American media –and its culture - into a wall-to-wall chain store.

The theory of 'ownership', stock market 'purchases', and direction of corporations by CEO's or Boards of Directors is fundamentally flawed. Not only does such a theory tend to make corporations tend to believe they are acting only for their own interest, but it denies the American public the necessary fees, tax revenues, and fines which its leasing of the public airwaves allows it. While Americans are made to rent or purchase real estate at high cost across the country, media organizations are offered carte blanche "use" of the airwaves for free, told their corporate and financial interests are all that count, and then told they need have no public regulation about what impact media has on any sector of society. While the US Congress touts "self-regulation" for media organizations which make violent, obscene, or abusive productions, and its members take trips, gifts, and deals from media lobbyists, the fundamental need to restructure the public airwaves for the purposes intended by the founding fathers remains.

America needs to relicense all media organizations, establish rates for annual leasing of the airwaves from the public which reflect a limited extent of market reach, sales, and proceeds for any media group, and divest all media conglomerates from corporate structures, sale of stocks, or maintenance of networks extending more than five hundred miles from point-to-point broadcast. This would allow the development of a "free market" concept in which consumer goods corporations could manage their own lower-cost inhouse advertising, pay lower costs for TV and radio advertising thereby charging back less to the consumer, and encourage new, independent, and diverse productions which are currently lacking in the egawatt moronic world of radio and TV. It is what the "natural" free market would produce if corporate lobbyists did not try to evade the halving of audience-share by hiking TV commercial rates to retain their unreasonable revenues and salaries. Or the FCC had given each network eighteen months to divest and operate on a single, subscription, cable TV channel – which would also be a 'natural' result of changing broadcast technologies in the past two decades.

What the US needs is something better than LCD entertainment, Disney theme park management of media, Viacom, Time Warner, or GE programming decisions, and photogeneity for news reporters over journalism qualifications. It

needs divestment of conglomerates, fair access for new media, and public standards which reflect public taste, decency, and morals instead of wall-to-wall junk programming. It needs public access to the FCC for complaints and enforcement, public access to radio, broadcasting, and other media for public speech and representation, and public regulation of an increasingly scam-oriented media producing substandard programs for goods, books, game, and fear hawkers. This would produce a basis for automatic liability laws, corporate libel insurance, diversity, and commercial-free broadcasting able to operate in the "public interest" not for the"vast wasteland of television" Fred Friendly sponsored.

Cross-ownership of Media

As the history of media has shown, the basis for "ownership" is a corporate structure designed primarily for seeking profits, expansion, and market share. This has given rise to the conglomerate direction of media by durable goods manufacturers and more recently junk entertainment producers. The illusion has been created that such media "owners" can purchase other media organizations if they have acquired profits, expertise, or interest from a media corporation without public regulation.

This has occurred with the internet revolution which has seen conglomerate media organizations hiring staff in order to command a large share of this communications market, purchasing instead of competing fairly with other kinds of communications on the Net. Habituated to its own control of the market, broadcasting increasingly 'advertises' its Net programming on all major television stations, 'advertising' other organizations do not receive, 'advertising' which is becoming offensive and interruptive, and which is antagonistic to the purpose of low-cost, internet communications for all. That constant "screen tags," advertising messages (even on public TV where they are prohibited by law), and special programming on the Net will eventually turn into a commercial venture like radio and broadcasting (or the ATM: free for five years to hook users, then subject to huge fees) has not induced a Congress or an FCC to produce preventive regulations for media or the Net. The illusion remains that "e-commerce" or private gain from the public airwaves is the major goal of media organizations, from which public officials receive kickbacks of personal, political, and economic rewards.

Cross-ownership has already become the "creeping" chain store of America. Newspaper chains have built up, newspapers have turned to radio and TV stations, private publishers continue to deny public regulation as "non-electronic" mediums now operating over the public airwaves, tabloids are sold in supermarkets for special 'advertising' exposure, and foreign 'ownership' or distribution reaches other 'markets' without public domestic or foreign law. "Local" newspapers are now often run by distant chain publishers not interested

in community- standards but production revenues. A glance at the press, radio, television, film, video, and internet mediums suggests that "self-regulation" for a "free enterprise" system has not worked and that distinguishing between the functions of a press independent of commercial goals and the entertainment industry is a critical necessity.

News today is in a state of "global glut." "Mass" news saturating the airwaves is an omnipresent, often violent, and debased phenomenon. Equipped with the camera, still or moving, today's multi-national reporters feel a compulsion to make visible those things which society has traditionally refrained from imposing on innocent bystanders. From up-close views of a war in Iraq, to the internal view of human organs during surgical procedures, to pictures of atrocities spread into every private and public place, TV news organizations and producers seem to believe that enough is never enough and desensitization from normal social standards is their basic purpose. Suggesting that they curtail "graphic video footage," in-your-face reporting, or mindless reporting of violent events is like telling a stuffed puppet to think. Reliant on the terms of a medium developed for the "lowest common denominator" audience they think public standards should not be imposed on TV news, the excessive numbers of news personnel or organizations cut, or accountability for their impact on public life reestablished. What they want is more of the same debased, mindless, sinecure, life-tenure world they have concocted for themselves – one where they political affiliations of reporters are not published, financial disclosures are not made annually, and political, party, public issue, or special interest propaganda is not publicly prosecuted.

To permit cross-ownership of newspapers, radio, or broadcasting in the United States which does not restrict the market reach, political goals, or commercial share of a news market would aggravate, rather than cure, the problems deregulation of media has caused. Limiting the kind, number, and revenues of cross-owners is a healthier way to encourage public accountability, multiple points of view, and community standards which vary widely in the United States. Providing for continuous right to access to a market by new newspapers, magazines, or video producers generation by generation is an important step for societies which run the risk of maintaining archaic practices which do not fulfill the needs of the public. That means keeping market share low, and establishing a mechanism for new competition in any medium, mechanisms which must reflect the changing technology of a society. As the history of Europe has shown, permitting the entrenchment of vested interests which deprive large groups of fair play has only resulted in wars, revolutions, and devastating destruction. It is far better to offer a democratic solution to the problems of twentieth century media now, than to wait until such devastation occurs in the United States.

State-Sponsored Communications

The 'power' of media has become a negative phenomenon in all parts of the world. Far from being 'open' to democratic principles or freedom of speech, it has become a rigged medium which has turned a "free press" into an instrument of terror, transmitting and 'transforming' information obtained from intelligence agencies about a "source" into fraudulent productions, and habituated to the e collective control of public communications by politicians for human trafficking. Granted majestic, if unconstitutional, 'rights' to copyright for derivative productions infringing persons, property, and events for telecommunications industries self-aggrandizement by the US and other nations, media organizations have come to believe that the "free flow of information" through the public airwaves subsidized by the tax payer is "free" material for which they do not have to contract, pay, or account to the general public.

Media organizations which have come to believe that they are above, outside of, and unaccountable for human trafficking, cannot report the facts of government abuse of intelligence because they are featherbedding with officials, and perceive themselves as the judge, jury, and executioners of society's general welfare, cultural norms, and social constructs are not organizations for whom regulations, 'ownership', or enforcement of laws should be relaxed. They are organizations requiring major structural reorganization and enforcement of standards. The era of 'free-for-all" media is over; in the twenty-first century media needs public supervision and restructuring from top to bottom.

Sincerely,

Anne Hiltner

Anne Hiltner

RECEIVED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAIL ROOM

[illegible] Communications Commission
[illegible] Street
Washington, D.C. 20554
May 14, 2003

Re: [illegible]

To [illegible]

I am opposed to [illegible] proposed most vehemently and [illegible] believe it is not in what is considered to be public interest [illegible] of 1934. When the [illegible] was [illegible] that [illegible] in a given market and real competition [illegible] I was employed at a O and O station belonging [illegible] which [illegible] during the period 1967 [illegible] 1973. With [illegible] radio news department employing 7 full [illegible] and 14 full time licensed engineers.

There is no chance for or the public to do anything to [illegible] the [illegible] corporations and the only thing [illegible] I see I can do is to continue to do as I have for [illegible] that I do not listen to any commercial radio [illegible] listen to PBS stations. [illegible] admit [illegible] watch FOOTBALL on commercial TV.

Thank you

[signature]

[illegible] Jr.

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 2 1 2003
FCC - MAIL ROOM

Subject: Broadcast ownership rules
Date: Friday, May 09, 2003 2:34 PM

Dear Mr.Copps:

I urge you not to relax 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 attempt 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,

Dale S. Yaney
Hemet, Ca. 92544 6668

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 2 1 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

[illegible]

[illegible]

Don A. Nudi
240 Pottawatamie
New Lenox IL 60451
Ph. 815-485-9485
Fax 815-462-9537

5-10-03

MAY 21 2003
FCC

Dear Sir:

Relaxing the Broadcast ownership Rules would give big media almost Total Control of the News. This Country was Founde on diverse opinions and "you" have a sacred Trust To do everything "you" can To preserve it. Keep honorable in Front of your Name and Vote against Relaxing those Rules.

Sincerely

Don A. Nudi

5-8-03
Mary Alice Kentucky

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Dear Mr. Powell,

For all of us out here, who have an opinion and want to be heard, the problem is how to do that. We can only speak through others - and that means joining a group, large or small, that represent our views. Representative democracy. It's the only way

Of course, some don't want those opposing their views to be heard. They seek to control the democratic process by blotting out the voices they don't like. And everyone depends on the electronic media to have anything heard by anyone. The media is finite and if it can be captured by someone, anyone, this provides a neat way to shut down the opposites. I don't say the "opposition" because those not heard dont oppose.

American media conglomerates have this tendency to stifle those they don't like politically. And the U.S. corporate media is largely leftist. So they don't like the NRA which takes a direct view about what the 2nd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution means. This view strongly contradicts the collectivist views of the left who think only the government should be armed. And you and I both know why the framers of the U.S. Constitution wanted to insure that the citizens

of the USA retained the right to individually own an bear firearms. Of course, there is no reason to form militias against government tyranny now. I don't think the US., or any State entity — or any governmental organization — means to oppress us. We have the best system of rule in the entire world. And, in my view, the arming of citizens against the tyrant is a latent responsibility. Only Waco of recent infamy causes one to pause. My firearms are used for sport shooting and defense of my family. And I know people, my own dear sister, for one, who are firm liberals and eschew firearms. Nothing wrong with that (and I've learned not to talk to Sis about it to much!). But Sis has her views broadcast by ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS and a host of radio stations CONSTANTLY. We live in a sea of leftist propaganda — and not only negative toward the 2nd Amendment. But ALL must be heard. Not only the left. Keep the airways open - open to everyone.

If you let these media collectives expand to buy up most - or many of the outlets available, they WILL SHUT DOWN THOSE THEY DON'T AGREE WITH. They've done it in the past. I'm just one citizen out here. You have the power and the responsibility to our democracy to keep the airways as open to all as is possible for them to be. Let all of us speak. More is at stake here than the monies gained by the media conglomerates.

With respect, I am -

Yours

Carlton L. Cantrell

of the U.S.A. retained the right to individually own and bear firearms. Of course, there is no reason to form militias against government tyranny now. I don't think the US., or any State entity — or any governmental organization — means to oppress us. We have the best system of rule in the entire world. And, in my view, the arming of citizens against the tyrant is a latent responsibility. Only Waco of recent infamy causes one to pause. My firearms are used for sport shooting and defense of my family. And I know people, my own dear Sister, for one, who are firm liberals and eschew firearms. Nothing wrong with that (and I've learned not to talk to Sis about it to much!) But Sis has her views broadcast by ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS and a host of radio stations CONSTANTLY. We live in a sea of leftist propaganda — and not only negative toward the 2nd Amendment. But ALL must be heard. Not only the left. Keep the airways open - open to everyone.

If you let these media collectives expand to buy up most - or many, of the outlets available, they WILL SHUT DOWN THOSE THEY DON'T AGREE WITH. They've done it in the past. I'm just one citizen out here. You have the power and the responsibility to our democracy to keep the airways as open to all as is possible for them to be. Let all of us speak. More is at stake here than the monies gained by the media conglomerates.

With respect, I am -

Yours

Carlton L. Cantrell

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 21 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 7, 2003
P.O. Box 297
Mary alice, Kentucky 40964-0297

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Mr. Martin,

Like many, probably most Americans I paid little attention to the media for most of my life. I was aware that the news was boringly similar no matter what entity broadcast it. Clearly it came from one "source" so to speak but that didn't bother me very much. I trusted the people giving out the news to be honest about matters happening about me.

Then I watched some Federal agencies and their employees, perform, before my disbelieving eyes, acts against U.S. citizens at a place the media called Waco. Shock, horror, disbelief – these describe part of what I felt. And real anger. I listened to the "news" on the networks. And right then and there I saw that those folks on the tube do not react to this horror show like I was. How can atrocities be described? These were not Boy Scouts not pitching their tent in the prescribed manner. The Federal government was killing – burning to death – a whole bunch of people right before my eyes on my T.V. Not Soviet Russia – not communist China – not anyplace known to be evil to me – but here in the USA. I wanted to know why. They never told us why. Then I began to ask who these "media" were. They didn't have my sense of morality. Not one word about the little kids who were destroyed there in Waco. I know damn well not one of these little kids was guilty of ANYTHING. Waco left me with an abiding sense of revulsion.

What I'm telling you is that the folks you allow to broadcast the "news" don't tell it like it is. And since then I've tried to find alternate sources for reports on the happenings in the world around me. I don't expect any of them to "tell it like it is", exactly – but I want to

→

hear more than the puke from ABC, CBS and NBC that I heard after Waco. I can filter out the lies and distortions IF YOU ALLOW MANY VOICES TO SPEAK.

How can I say it? Why do that, allow many to broadcast to us? Your agency is a product of the socialism of the 1930s, something I never even thought about before Waco stunned me into shocked awareness of the real world of the media. Do we even need you? But we have you and you control these people we simply must listen to for news. I'm no flaming revolutionary. I love the USA. - believe that. So why should you allow many news "voices" to speak to us.

Not one of them - or small, cohesive ideological set of them - must ever tell us the "news", or provide only their inverted version of "entertainment", or put on their circumscribed notion of what can be "advertized" - EVER.

At the moment, it's the ideological left that confounds us on every hand - bias beyond belief at times. But it's not their folly alone that threatens freedom in our Country. And I don't expect, even wish, that the left, or anyone else, should be excluded. The Christians had such a desert out there that they've built their own powerful voice on the air. Let them speak, as you have. Let everyone tell their version of the things of the moment - not just some hypergroup of the ideological left or anyone else.

And above all adhere to the profound and true ideology of the U.S. Constitution. Don't give some huge entity control of the media. Project ALL of the vital protections of the Constitution. NO MEDIA MONOPOLIES!

I'm a life member of the NRA and I learned of this problem through them. It's the 2nd Amendment that concerns the NRA - and me too! But the Constitution is a robust entity, all of which concerns me. You can help preserve its protections by letting everyone speak on the U.S. communications system - not just the media giants.

With respect, I am, Yours, Carlton L. Cartrell

hear more than the puke from ABC, CBS and NBC that I heard after Waco. I can filter out the lies and distortions IF YOU ALLOW MANY VOICES TO SPEAK.

How can I say it? Why do that, allow many to broadcast to us? Your agency is a product of the socialism of the 1930s, something I never even thought about before Waco stunned me into shocked awareness of the real world of the media. Do we even need you? But we have you and you control these people we simply must listen to for news. I'm no flaming revolutionary. I love the USA. - believe that. So why should you allow many news "voices" to speak to us.

Not one of them - or small, cohesive ideological set of them - must ever tell us the "news", or provide only their inverted version of "entertainment", or put on their circumscribed notion of what can be "advertized" - EVER.

At the moment, it's the ideological left that confounds us on every hand - bias beyond belief at times. But it's not their folly alone that threatens freedom in our Country. And I don't expect, even wish, that the left, or anyone else, should be excluded. The Christians had such a desert out there that they've built their own powerful voice on the air. Let them speak, as you have. Let everyone tell their version of the things of the moment - not just some hyper group of the ideological left or anyone else.

And above all adhere to the profound and true ideology of the U.S. Constitution. Don't give some huge entity control of the media. Project ALL of the vital protection of the Constitution. NO MEDIA MONOPOLIES!

I'm a life member of the NRA and I learned of this problem through them. It's the 2nd Amendment that concerns the NRA - and me too. But the Constitution is a robust entity, all of which concerns me. You can help preserve its protections by letting everyone speak on the U communications system - not just the media giants.

With respect I am yours Carthon Cantrell