RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Crown Sephira Productions
San Francisco, California

To: Mr. Michael Powell Chairman FCC
Re: Deregulation of Press/Media
Date: May 20, 2003

Confirmed
MAY 2 3 2003
Check with Sender

Greetings Mr. Powell:

Surely you are aware of the destructive effects of deregulation on radio. Clear Channel is threatening to be a monopoly in the radio world, and has been able to manipulate the music world in a huge way...to its own advantage, and based on its own interests, views and tastes.

Any more deregulation will only give the unscrupulous and greedy the opportunity to corner markets, drive out small, local, open, honest and democratic radio and television stations and conglomerates. The result will doubtless be more mindless and destructive programming like "Survivor" etc.

Surely you are familiar with the history of the disaster of deregulation in the Savings and Loan business. Surely you've noted the downfall of giants like Enron - whose greed killed them.

Please use your common sense and put two and two together, connect the dots and get that deregulation is, for the most part, simply an invitation to greedy and unscrupulous businesses to further ruin the economy in this nation and elsewhere.

In addition, the opportunity for media monopolies to control the thinking and opinions of citizens of the United States will be ever greater with deregulation. That is a direct attack on democracy.

Be honest with yourself, Mr. Powell. Leave your pride and your ideology and your politics alone and see things for the way they are. Put away these foolish ideas about deregulation of the media. Instead, begin to look at how to control Clear Channel. That would be useful.

Sincerely,

Lynn Feinerman
Independent Radio and Television Producer/director

CSP 14 Janet Way #149 Tiburon, California 94920 tel/fax 415 380 8009 dvashah@yahoo.com

3520 Glen Oak Drive
Eugene, OR 97405
May 20, 2003

Confirmed
MAY 3 0 2003
Distribution Center

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 2 8 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

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

Dear Mr. Powell:

I urge you not to further deregulate the communications industry. In 1996, supporters of the Telecom Act claimed that the bill would result in more choices, better quality, and more choices for consumers. None of those promises have come true. Instead, tremendous media concentration and increased foreign ownership of media companies in this country has resulted from this deregulation.

Increased consolidation among media outlets has resulted in fewer independent voices and less programming and news coverage devoted to local issues. This situation will, I believe, be made much worse if the Federal Communications Commission which you chair decides to lift or significantly loosen current media ownership limits. We have enough monopoly concentration: five conglomerates dominate the television stations, cable systems, Internet service providers, and program production companies. The situation in the newspaper industry is similarly troubling. Of some 1500 daily newspapers in the U.S., only 281 remain independent, and most of those are in small towns. The three largest publishers account for 25 percent of all daily newspaper circulation. And in radio, the top twenty-five radio ownership groups control 24.9 percent of the nation's commercial stations.

I want access to independent, local media that provides me with the news and information important to my life and the life of my community. Please use your authority to advocate fairly and responsibly for consumers' rights. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amanda Powell
Senior Instructor of Spanish
University of Oregon

SPECTED
MAY 28 2003
ROOM

John Huntley
P.O.Box 14463
Spokane, WA 99214
May 21, 2003

Chairman Michael Powell, et al
Federal Communication Commission
445 Twelfth Street SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Powell and Members:

This is to register my opposition to any further de-regulation of the communications industry. Since de-regulation began there is a clear tendency for media owners to use the public airways more and more for their own commercial purposes and less and less for public benefit.

A good example is radio news. I think at one time it was required that a certain portion of each hour be devoted to news or other public service. Now at the top of the hour we get about three minutes of news, with no elaboration, and often cut off in mid sentence for the beginning of a commercial.

The current proposal to allow one firm to own both newspapers and television stations in the same market is a very dangerous idea in a world where corporate power is merging with government. It would leave open immense possibilities for abuse in the form of concentrated power. I once lived in a country where such power was the norm, and at the flip of a switch, just like that, every radio station suddenly was broadcasting the same thing--what that government wanted their people to hear.

Thank you for considering my point of view which is that we need access to many points of view.

Yours truly,

John Huntley

May 20, 2003

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C.
Attention - Chairman Powell.

CONFIRMED
MAY 2003
Bureau/Division

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The news about the possibility of changing the present regulations of the FCC regarding ownership troubles me greatly.

I am concerned about too few people controlling the news and program offerings of our newspapers, TV and radio stations. I believe Americans should use their thinking powers & have the protected right to do so. — not be told what to believe.

I have been a Republican all my life but the actions and priorities of the present administration cause me to rethink my party loyalty & voting.

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,
Gordon W. Spency

2131-8th St. Dr. NW - Hickory, NC, 28601

P.S. Yours dear Father, our capable Secretary of State, is in my mind, one of the greatest public servants living. Thank God.

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 21, 03

Confirmed
MAY 27 2003
Correspondence Center

Dear Chairman Powell —

I strongly object to the FCC ruling that would allow huge media interests to own more media outlets.

Its seems like you are afraid to see this brought to broad public attention.

Yours —

JERRY RADEKE
24692 E. CLARK LK. RD.
NISSWA, MN.
56468

Confirmed

2003

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Distribution Center

Box 263
Worthington MA 01098
May 21 2003

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Dear Commissioner Martin:

I am strongly opposed to any proposed rules change to permit concentration of control of the media. The proposed rules changes should be made public and open for public comment for at least 60 days before any changes are considered. The media and airwaves belong to the American people and it is up to the people to decide how these should be controlled.

I urge you to take immediate action to ensure that the American public has an opportunity to evaluate the proposed changes and to state its opinion on the future of its airwaves.

I look forward to your response

Sincerely,

Helen Cruise

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

May 22, 2003

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Mr. Michael Powell, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 – 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Confirmed
MAY 30 2003
Distribution Center

Dear Mr. Powell:

We have become aware of proposed rule changes affecting increased concentration of media ownership. Interestingly, we did not find out about this in our local newspaper or radio or television news. We have not seen any coverage in the national television news or magazines that we read either. Why does this not shock me?

My hometown is now plagued with single ownership of its newspaper (with complete vertical integration), one television station, several radio stations as well as ownership of several other businesses and most of the downtown real estate. We never watch this television station's news because it mostly consists of ambulance chasing and other non-news events. Obviously, this news conglomerate has provided limited coverage of the owner's scandalous business ventures, which are currently being litigated.

How did we manage to become aware of changes currently being proposed? We watch public television. Unfortunately, more citizens should be watching. Then more citizens might become aware of how the current national government administration is systematically stealing the country from its citizens. This has been accomplished through the use of partial truths at best, to complete falsehoods that are repeated over and over with the pretense that repetition is equivalent to truth or any broadly accepted form of rational intelligence.

Our country's system of laws and regulations is based on the premise that anything is permissible unless is specifically prohibited. In Europe, the reverse is the case. You can only do the things that are specifically permitted by law. I thought we began with the assumption that your commission is suppose to be protecting the interests of the citizens from actions that society does not condone. The current concentration of media ownership has severally limited relevant news coverage with the very real threat of your administration's retribution. This retribution has already happened to numerous people in the entertainment industry as well as the legislative fiasco in Texas. It is interesting to note how little benevolence "a compassionate conservative" administration has.

At the very least we are asking that you perform your job, as it was conceived to protect the interests of the citizens of this country, rather than catering to the business interests of the few. Based upon the actions of the current administration, one can only guess how many years it will take to correct all the problems its has created. Unfortunately, some of these problems may not be correctable. If you proceed with your current misguided plans, you will help create problems that future generations will suffer with for decades. Please think about your actions - if you can.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. Sherfey
3519 South Chelsea Court
Spokane, Washington 99203

Karen L. Sherfey
3519 South Chelsea Court
Spokane, Washington 99203

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

April 30, 2003
6719 E. Malcomb Dr.
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Kathleen Abernathy, FCC Commissioner
445 12th St., SW
Washington D.C. 20554

Commission
MAY 30 2003
Distribution Center

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

re: relaxation of newspaper-broadcast cross ownership rules

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

I oppose the proposed deregulation of newspaper-broadcast cross ownership rules. Major media is already bad enough without making it worse.

Newspapers have already substituted entertainment for news and vice versa. This is due to the corporate profit motive. What kind of a citizenry is adequately informed by front-page "news" of Madonna and back-page news of Red China? Our electorate is wonderfully informed about sports and pitifully uninformed about political life -- like which obscure nation we are going to "liberate" next, or from whom will we get the funds to do it.

Newspapers already are a disaster. Why make them worse by making them adjuncts to television?

You are probably an intelligent person. You probably don't watch much television, except in your professional capacity. You probably know mainstream television is for the uninformed and the docile. You probably get your information through internet, books and special-purpose print media. Why impose the vacuousness of television upon newspapers by joining the two?

Our democracy has been injured by lack of communication within the electorate. Much of this is attributable to an increasingly concentrated corporate control of communications mediums.

I know corporations will make more money if they own more stations and more cross media. But corporations make this money with an asset that I own -- the airwaves. We citizens own these airwaves and the airwaves ought to be used first and foremost for our benefit. A citizen's hope is not primarily the economic benefit of corporations, but rather "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." A vigorous, multi-voice, citizen press begets liberty. Corporations are not citizens and do not aspire to this "hope."

Increased corporate control of the airwaves has melded news into entertainment while real news has fled to the internet. It has debased the visual medias ("what people want"). It has led to profit over public. You may consider the warning of James Madison regarding the challenge of republican government: "to controul one part of Society from invading the rights of another, and at the same time [be] sufficiently controlled itself." Corporate power in media is out of control.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Shoen

Michael L. Shoen, Citizen

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

109 Fawn Run
Alto, GA 30510
May 8, 2003

Confirmed

MAY 30 2003

Distribution Center

Mr. Michael Powell, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 - 12th St., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Proposed change in FCC regulations

Dear Mr. Powell:

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to any change in regulations limiting the media outlets that any one corporation is allowed to own in one area. Most people are completely dependent on television, radio, and, to a less extent, newspapers to inform them about what's going on in the community, nation, and world. Our representative democracy cannot exist unless there is an opportunity for the media to present a variety of views on a variety of topics. Mega-media conglomerates are gobbling up formerly independent newspapers, TV and radio stations at an alarming rate. Please don't hasten the process.

I've heard that you consider outdated the 1934 law regulating the FCC. True, we didn't have advanced technology, including television, back then. However, the need to preserve our democracy by allowing true freedom of the press and other media is just as strong now as it was then.

Sincerely,

Emily B. Calhoun

Emily B. Calhoun
cc: Senators Miller & Chambliss, Reptv. Norwood

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

MAY 28 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED &
MAY 2 8 2003
FCC -

May 13,2003

Confirmed
MAY 3 0 2003
Distribution Center

Federal Communication Commision

As a citizen of the United States, I am very concerned about the direction of your two year review of guidlines for media ownership. I do not endorse any change in the 1934 law that insures that the media has no cross ownership of media between newspapers and T.V. in our communities. I am also against any change in the percentage amounts that a media company can own in a designated market. These essential features of the 1934 media law was designed to insure that diversified ownership of media would gaurantee to the consumer that there would also be a diversified perspective on the issues of our day whether they be local ,national or international. These protections do not need to be modernized because these rules are essential to an educated populace. Our democratic princilples can only be protected by having an educated public that is informed by a multi-owned and vastly varied media. Please don't change the existing 1934 law.

Respectfully,

John de Neeve

John de Neeve

Kalispell, Montana

RECEIVED &
MAY 2 8 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 13,2003

Federal Communication Commision

Confirmed
MAY 3 0 2003
Distribution Center

As a citizen of the United States, I am very concerned about the direction of your two year review of guidlines for media ownership. I do not endorse any change in the 1934 law that insures that the media has no cross ownership of media between newspapers and T.V. in our communities. I am also against any change in the percentage amounts that a media company can own in a designated market. These essential features of the 1934 media law was designed to insure that diversified ownership of media would gaurantee to the consumer that there would also be a diversified perspective on the issues of our day whether they be local ,national or international. These protections do not need to be modernized because these rules are essential to an educated populace. Our democratic princilples can only be protected by having an educated public that is informed by a multi-owned and vastly varied media. Please don't change the existing 1934 law.

Respectfully,

John de Neeve

Kalispell, Montana

Sharon Kendrick
4521 Terra Granada Drive #5B
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

May 14, 2003

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Commissioner Michael Copps
445 12th Street SW
Washington, 20554

Confirmed
M 0 2003
Distribution Center

Re: Please Hear a Citizen's Voice on Media Diversity

Commissioner Copps:

I've been very alarmed at the trend we've already seen in recent years of the sources of news and public information via media being reduced in number, viewpoint, and variety. This not only reduces (and eventually eliminates) the free flow of information, the benefits of local competition and the power of a diverse marketplace which will virtually disappear, but gives control of so much that affects everyone to the powerful few with money. I am writing now to respectfully remind the members of the Federal Communications Commission that you are responsible for ensuring that the media "serve the public interest." I am concerned that if the FCC continues to relax regulations on media ownership, the victor will be big business--and the casualties will be the people of the U.S.

As a supporter of human rights, women's rights, and democracy, I am concerned that the current media merger free-for-all threatens to rob us all of the independent voices, views and ideas that nourish a pluralistic, democratic society and that help to assure an informed electorate and society. I'm a firm believe in the fact that the more diversity we hear, the better able we are to find a solid basis for our own beliefs and where we stand. This can only lead to improvement in life for all.

The media are more than just a business; they bring information to people that affects their lives. We cannot have a healthy democracy, and those who may be disadvantage have even fewer opportunities to pursue equal rights and make their own contribution as productive members of society, if unable to be informed on the issues. The media have a responsibility to serve the public interest and ensure that all voices are heard. I believe it is my job to speak out my concern and your job to promote this.

Please remember U.S. consumers and citizens when you review the remaining regulations. These regulations must be kept in place, and strengthened, not weakened. The few media giants already control far too much of our precious information resources.

Sincerely,

Sharon D. Kendrick

Sharon D. Kendrick

Mark D. Nedleman
2188 Maple Street, Apt. G
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
(714) 697-7730

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 7, 2003

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

Confirmed
MAY 30 2003
Distribution Center

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am writing to share palpable concern regarding your oversight over the Federal Communications Commission and the unhappy trend toward greenlighting further media consolidation in an age when our democracy depends on diversifying various media sources. This is truly a low point for the FCC and the public whose trust and expectation that the FCC serves their needs and interests are being severely betrayed and undermined.

I remember a quip you made to the effect that you were "waiting for the angel of public interest to show up and she didn't." While tongue in cheek, in a way the remark displayed a lot of truth in your intention to make the FCC more friendly to the commercial and corporate interests of media monopolies while diminishing public input and concerns regarding OUR tax-supported airwaves and broadcast signals.

Recently, it was brought to my intention that the FCC and the Bush administration would like to de-fund PBS and NPR. While I often feel that both of these public-interest organizations have "sold out" to commercial sponsorship, they remain among the last vestiges of any representation of public service broadcasting.

Additionally, despite initial promises to support micro-broadcasting and radio, the FCC seems far more interested in creating still larger media monoliths with have no interest whatsoever to serving the greater public good. Personally, I can't listen to mainstream radio or television. Not only are the offerings bland and homogenous, the viewpoints offered –on talk radio programs – offer no pretense of balance. In a way, market capitalism has yet again created media oligarchies reminiscent of state-controlled media found in the old Soviet Union! Yet, I hear the PR static bubbling over as to the amount of choice and competition exists in the current media climate. To that I say nonsense!

Mr. Powell, the media is a critical lynchpin in U.S. democracy. The continued "dumbing down" of radio, TV and newspapers and magazines at the expense of engendering a thoughtful and enlightened population has served to further erode American democracy that cherishes diversity of choice, opinions and life viewpoints. Once again, the media's pursuit of endless growth, increased advertising dollars and lowest common denominator-based programming have contributed toward our country's slide toward irrelevance and I believe this situation is unconscionable! Your response to this letter would be gratefully appreciated, sir. I anticipate hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Nedleman

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 13, 2003

Confirmed
MAY 30 2003
Distribution Center

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

"The foundation of a democracy is an informed electorate".

That foundation is being eroded by you and two members of your Commission who seem hell-bent on condoning and furthering the media industry merger of a handful of greed-driven, mega-giants, intent on stifling intellect, ideas and news.

One hour spent surveying the content of late night television in America, demonstrates the truly dysfunctional society that has been allowed to develop by a compliant and purely business oriented FCC. Public interest be damned! Turn to any foreign language channel and (without knowledge of a second language) it quickly becomes clear that real news is being aired - not the pabulum of murders, fires and robberies that has methodically been used to numb the minds of typical American viewers. Certainly this same phenomenon infects the press and radio across this land.

The planned June 2nd vote by the FCC to authorize sweeping changes to the U.S. news media must NOT be allowed to take place. This rules change could eventually allow our newspapers, radio stations, TV stations and cable provider to all be owned by one of these right-leaning giants and the resulting concentration of ownership will sound the death knell to our democracy. **Commissioner Abernathy you are clearly not working in the peoples' interest.**

Your job, Ms. Abernathy, is to guard against monopoly power. This unholy alliance of federal watchdog agencies, working hand in glove with the corrupting power of the media empires of AOL Time Warner, Viacom, News Corp (Fox), Disney and Hearst, lead us straight to a fascist society! - - -

Sincerely,

Max & Margot Bollock
2015 Belle Monti Ave.
Belmont, CA 94002
(650) 593-7753

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

MAY 2 8 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

P.O. Box 57
Laughlintown, PA 15655
8 May 2003

The Honorable Michael K. Powell
chairman
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

Confirmed

M 3 0 2003

Distribution Center

Dear Mr. Powell:

Ref: Allowing Media to combine into ~~[illegible]~~ conglomerates.

Many years ago in England Lord Action summed the situation up ~~the situation~~ very well "Power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely".

Giving the major media outlets the ability to form monoplies is to give them absolute power. They would gain complete control of politics and through that all actions of the government. This is intolerable!

We are allready far down the slippery slope in allowing the media to consolidate ownership of many radio and TV outlets. This should be reversed.

Thank you,

James Foster

James Foster

cc: The Honorable John P. Murtha.
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington DC 20515-0001

1112 Skyway Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401

May 11, 2003

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

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

Confirmed
MAY 30 2003
Distribution Center

Dear Commissioner Martin,

I am writing to urge you not to support the current proposals for relaxing the restrictions on ownership of multiple broadcast outlets in a market area.

In my opinion, the current level of domination by the large corporate owners of much of our broadcast media is already restricting the availability of divergent views too much. I know this first-hand from both my personal and professional experiences with subjects that have a "politically correct" position and other positions that are sometimes more technically or ethically correct. In those cases, information that is relevant, but that does not support the "politically correct" position is simply not broadcast or is overwhelmed with incessant repetition of only those facts that support the "politically correct" position. Fictional entertainment is too often selected or "deselected" on the basis of its "message" content relative to certain issues. Even paid advertising is sometimes refused because it contradicts the "message" chosen by the media owner.

This type of "corporate censorship" is very damaging to a democratic society that needs truly informed guidance by the voting public to make the system work properly. This was recognized by our founding fathers and established as one of the fundamental personal freedoms in our Constitution, in the "freedom of the press" clause of the First Amendment. But, our founding fathers could not foresee radio and television and the degree to which they would supplant the printed media of books, newspapers and pamphlets. Nor could they understand that federal regulation of the broadcast frequencies would be needed to prevent it all from becoming a useless gaggle of noise due to overlapping transmissions. So, it is necessary to preserve their principle by interpreting their intentions as we regulate the broadcast media. I think it is clear that our founding fathers would no more want all of the broadcast media to fall under the control of a single viewpoint or corporation than they would have wanted all of the paper or ink to be under the control of a single person. Today, we have anti-monopolistic regulations to prevent ownership of too many broadcast outlets just as we have anti-monopolistic laws to ensure that no other product or service is dominated by a single provider.

Changes in the broadcast ownership restrictions are not needed to ensure the viability of the broadcast industry or the availability of broadcast services to segments of the public. The proposed changes only serve to increase the profits of the largest media corporations. That would occur at the expense of making it even more financially prohibitive for a small entity to compete for broadcast frequencies to provide alternative voices. That cannot be good for our country.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Long

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

21 May, 2003
34692 E. Clark Lk Rd
PO Box 89
Nisswa, Mn 56468

Chairman Michael Powell
445 12th St SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Confirmed
MAY 30 2003
Document Center

Dear Chairman Powell,

My husband and I are opposed to any further concentration in the media industry. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 already went too far in deregulating the industry. There is less local control than is healthy for a democracy, and news channels are under the thumb of their large corporate sponsors.

We are asking you to disallow the pending rule making it possible for media conglomerates to own 1/3 more venues. It is shameful that you were not willing to bring this before the public in a more open and generous way. What do you have against public inquiry?

Sincerely,
Laura Radeke

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAY 28 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

May 21, 2003
6719 E. Malcomb Dr.
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253
480-922-9766

Michael Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW
Washington D.C. 20554
by U.S. Mail

Confirmed
MAY 30 2003
Distribution Center

re: media concentration proposals

Dear Commissioner Copps:

Thank you so much for your May 13, 2003 joint press release with Commissioner Adelstein calling for further public airing of media concentration proposals.

It is hard to believe, but heartening, that two commissioners have some regard for the citizen, rather than continuing on as donkeys for their corporate masters. **What can I do to help you?**

I have written you previously. It does not take a genius to know that the citizenry's communication within itself has been terribly injured by seizure of the airwaves by the big, bigger and biggest oligopolies. These oligopolies are increasingly in lockstep with the biggest human-rights abuser and lawless organization in the world -- our Government. You have heard this and more through the public hearings on these issues.

What I want to bring to your attention is the overall misdirection of the FCC.

Check out your Strategic Plan: It is not a plan to improve the citizenry's communication within itself or with others. It is an <u>economic</u> plan, to promote "investment", "restore stability", "highest and best use" and encourage "growth and rapid deployment". The plan's "promote competition" means "promote oligopoly". The latest proposal under this plan promotes economic concentration, not competition -- fewer, bigger corporations to compete cross-media with fewer, bigger "competitors".

You should be promoting dissemination of information to citizens, not the economic strength of the organizations that are supposed to do the disseminating. In communication, bigger does mean better.

Proof Of The Pudding: The unregulated internet is the best source for real news. The internet is the source the regulated media turn to when they do research. In other words, Adam Smith's free market laws apply to the dissemination of information as well as to the dissemination of more conventional "products". Totally unregulated, micro-cap internet sites have totally succeeded in disseminating information.

Well, not "totally," because the normal citizen doesn't have time to surf the internet on the many important issues. In the real world, the citizen relies on the evening television news or morning paper. It is these medias that the FCC is turning into mindless, obedient, oligopolistic, corporate dribble-drabble.

Look at the diversity and depth of information presented in the micro-cap web sites such as commondreams.org and counterpunch.com compared to the repetitive, Hollywood-propaganda drivel of the majors. Size sure didn't help the majors. It seems to corrupt them and convert news into entertainment. The majors are driven by economic, not public service, goals. If they could make money and if it were legal, they would present child porn 24/7. What they are doing now is worse -- they are choking the citizenry's ability to communicate within itself.

I stand with certain extraordinary citizens: Nancy Snow, Robert McChesney, Ian Boal, Ben Bagdikian and Matt Vidal. We stand with Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and Theodore Roosevelt. But this is not enough. We need commissioners who will work and think for the citizens and not the corporations.

McChesney says you have demonstrated "a degree of backbone rarely found". For this I am truely grateful. **What can I do to help?** McChesney says that you have attended all of the public hearings. **What can I do to help?**

This is your time on the center stage of real life. You can be a hero and an inspiration to your family and friends. Or you can be a stooge for the power elite. One does not becomes a hero the easy way. I know. I invite you to do your duty.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Shoen

Michael L. Shoen

cc: John McCain