

From: Barry Bitzer
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 22, 2003 11:20 PM
Subject: Opp 2 Oligopoly

The Honorable Michael J. Copps
Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Sir:

I understand youre in the comment period for broadcast ownership rules changes. So heres my two cents worth.

There are too few owners of the various broadcast media outlets in any given market as it stands. Any further relaxations of the rules limiting conglomeration are therefore *contra-indicated*.

The *electronic component* in particular of the 4th estate plays an enormous role in the democratic processes that constitute our republican form of government. In this context, even bigger is certainly not going to lead to better in any way, shape or form.

It would be a grave mistake to let the big syndicates own even larger portions of our information source universe. So please oppose the move, for the sake of fairness, *divergence*, access and accountability.

Sincerely,

J. Barry Bitzer
Box 2266
Corrales, NM 87048

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: Yapti Tasba
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 22, 2003 11:28 PM
Subject: monopolies

Please oppose any attempt to monopolize our airwaves by coporations who would limit the ability of varied viewpoints and opinions to be voiced. This is, after all, America, where all opionions are valued. Do not allow large companies to take advantage. The laws, as they stand are sufficient to protect the public's rights. A concerned citizen, Kurt WAtson

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

From: Brittmarie Janson Perez
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 12:02 AM
Subject: Copy of message to Chariman Powell

I am sending you a copy of the message I have sent to Cariman Powell and the other three Republican commissioners. Congratulations and thank you for your valiant efforts in behalf of freedom of expression.
BJP

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

Dear Mr. Powell:

It is my obligation as an American citizen to make every effort to protect freedom of expression in every respect.

Your refusal to allow extended public hearing of the planned June 2nd consideration of the Broadcast Ownership Biennial Review has obliged me to write this letter of formal protest.

The manner in which you have spoken publicly about the issue is, in my opinion, glib and immature. At no time have you convinced me that you understand the issues at stake or your responsibility to the American people.

Moreover, the three Republican commissioners-Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Kevin J. Martin and yourself--have given the impression that their actions are controlled by vested interests.

Last, your rush to approve lasting changes which may negatively affect the American people, your determination to do so behind closed doors, refusing to allow the issues at hand to be discussed broadly and openly, is not only suspicious, it is anti-democratic.

You should have made every effort to give transparency to the proceedings. Instead, your behavior has evoked a public scandal that will go down in history.
Shame on you!

Sincerely,
Brittmarie Janson Perez, Ph.D.

From: Jeremy Oswald
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 12:14 AM
Subject: Keep regulations in place

I am against the further lifting of regulations on the ownership of media markets.
Please keep the regulations in place. Radio is becoming to corporate and state and it will lower the
number of people providing information to our country.

Thank you,
Jeremy Oswald
PO Box 551
Washburn, WI 54891

jermy @surfmail.net

From: Earl Lewis French, Jr.
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 1:14 AM
Subject: Freedom First

The Honorable Michael K. Powell, Chairman, FCC
The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner
The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner
The Honorable Kevin J. Martin, Commissioner
The Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner

Is it true that on June 2, 2003, that you are considering voting on measures that could limit free speech by eliminating small independent stations that air views that are currently suppressed by liberal major media moguls?

While I would hope you vote responsibly and act always to protect the free speech rights of all American citizens and still protecting those same citizens from anarchy, I wholeheartedly support your policies and procedures that eliminate, suspend, close down, and prohibit licensing of any station in the USA or its territories that is subversive, foreign owned or funded, or acts criminally to promote terrorism of any kind, especially those who promote or advocate Muslims targeting Americans for murder as a religious act, or promotes or advocates the elimination of any freedoms guaranteed by our constitution to American citizens. Toward this end, I request you require every licensed station to ask their listeners periodically, such as, every four hours on one day each month to report any of these criminal broadcast activities to you for action.

If there is anything I can do as an individual citizen to assist you in this regard, please advise.

Sincerely

EARL L. FRENCH, JR.
elfjr@prodigy.net
208 Greenbank Avenue
Oroville, CA 95966

From: the Archonaut
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 4:05 AM
Subject: Diversity On the Airwaves Is Vital

Wouldn't it be better to *NOT* step all over everything America used to stand for? FCC once stood to protect public property: isn't deregulating it now just tacit approval of the erosion of American ideals?

Reject attempts by airwaves pirates to further consolidate their forces, and help to loosen their grip on the American psyche. The children are becoming monsters, and the adults are remaining children. Help stop it, please.

From: DieHard
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 5:55 AM
Subject: Rupert Murdoch

Mr. Murdoch stated, on Marketplace, in so many words, that the world would be better off if he were in charge of the media.

No doubt he was inspired by George W. Bush's often ignored statement that "this would be a hell of a lot easier if I was dictator."

Monopolies and "deregulation" MUST be ended, NOW, or we will all certainly be living in a dictatorship.

Dian Hardison

On Thursday 22 May 2003 07:05 pm, you wrote:

> Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation. I am happy to know
> that you are participating in the debate over this issue and hope that you
> will continue to do so in the weeks leading up to the June 2 vote and
> thereafter. We must come to grips with this issue because it is so important
> not only for the kinds of entertainment we get from our media, but also from
> the standpoint of what it means for the news and information that sustains our
> country's democratic dialogue. I hope you will talk about this issue with
> your friends, neighbors, local media and government officials. Again, thanks
> for getting in touch.
>
>

From: christopher
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 8:58 AM
Subject: Maintaining Objective Airwaves, Save us from 'Big Brother'

Our hope is you are wise and objective as were our Founding Fathers, and cannot be bought by Big Brother Corporate America. "He who has the gold makes the rules" is same as a ruling party which does not allow equal representation of government for and by the people. Gold rules and a government by corporation is where absolute power corrupts absolutely. As the Supreme Court has always upheld - even in apparently detrimental extremes trusting the truth will prevail as only through freedom of expression can the truth have opportunity to be spoken, heard and acted on, the invaluable Freedom of Speech cannot even be subject to risk of compromise. DO NOT LET MONOPLOPIES OF AIRWAVES OCCUR EVEN WITH PROMISES OR LAWS. IN FACT, WE NEED LAWS WHICH MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR OWNERS OF ANY BROADCASTING MEDIA TO SENSOR OPPOSING VIEWS OF ANY ITEM THEY PROMOTE, BUT MUST GIVE GRANT EQUAL QUALITY TIME TO OPPOSING VIEW WITH EQUAL FINANCIAL COMPENSATION.

So Damn Insane (Saddam Hussein), though extreme, is a prime example of gold rules and a government by corporation where absolute power corrupts absolutely.

From: William J. Gentry
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 11:41 AM
Subject: Avoid Monopolistic Policy

To Whom it may concern,

In the interest of free information for all. I would appreciate your opposition to the proposed changes in media ownership in the vote coming up on June 2nd, 2003. We are in a new age of communication where there are increasing opportunities and channels to communicate through. Its important to promote these. We already bear the affect of an oligopolistic situation via our air ways and this threat is fast approaching the cable and satellite system as well. We must oppose a constriction in the population of owners, by promoting new ones. Quite frankly I am no expert on you business, but I am a businessman with an economics degree from a well known university. When I say that regulating control and ownership, especially by appointed, NOT ELECTED, people, the course tends to be extremely biased if not outright corrupt.

Where as when all people have equal access to privilege and resources, more gets done for a lot more people. Their interests are addressed and peoples Freedoms are expressed.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read my message and I hope you have a Blessed day.

Bill Gentry

Chalmers Indiana

219-279-4095

From: Mary A. Neiswender
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 12:43 PM
Subject: Don't sell out the American public

Commissioners:

I've been in the media, newspapers and radio, for more than 30 years and I've seen its deterioration because of rulings by commissioners in the past. Now you are about to do the same thing--take the airwaves away from the people and give them to large corporations.

It's wrong.

In the Long Beach/Los Angeles, CA, area, as in other cities across the nation, independent newspapers have been slowly taken over by large conglomerates. In Long Beach, for instance, two independent newspapers were bought by one owner. He kept up a pretense of independence for a while, then consolidated the papers into one--a monopoly. And you know the problems that causes. A few years ago it was bought by a mini-Murdock, but just as biased and greedy, who continued to gobble up papers throughout the county. The news content is nil. The Long Beach paper (and I'm sure the others) no longer has reporters covering city government, police, courts, etc. Reporters have been told are not to be controversial or write anything that might anger an advertiser. The Public's right to know is no more.

The same is true in Los Angeles. When I entered the profession, there were ten newspapers. The Los Angeles Times--now owned by the Tribune Co. of Chicago--is the only newspaper in town. Another monopoly.

The L.A. airways (TV) is an example of some of your handiwork. Several corporations own two television channels. They are beginning to combine staffs, report the same stories on both channels, etc. Independent thinking disappears with corporate ownership. Fox News is an insult to every journalist I know. That truly is corporate control and it's expanding because of your actions..

There will always be biases; this we know. But journalism schools still teach, hopefully, that journalists must put aside their biases to bring the public factual news, with no skewered taint. That's not possible when owners make it clear what they want. The Public can turn off one news station, but with your new rules they'd have to turn off all news stations.

Please do not eliminate media ownership regulations. Even maintaining the 35 percent cap on national broadcast media ownership is too much: Three corporations can control all news.

Where is our great Trust-Buster Teddy Roosevelt when we need him. What we have are five commissioners with no backbone.

When future students study history, you will be remembered as killing the one thing that kept this nation great: A Free Press.

Mary Neiswender
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: B Selfridge
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 2:02 PM
Subject: COnsolidation

A decision on the Chairman's proposal to allow further consolidation should not be made hastily. This proposal needs much more public debate, and I support any effort to ensure the June 2 decision is delayed.

From: debrab@rolandus.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 2:12 PM
Subject: You already know.

By now, you already know why I am writing this e-mail. I want as diverse a media as possible. I am asking you to do the right thing. This may be a profit issue for corporations, but its not a democratic solution. It is not sound business and it is not free market capitalism either.

If you pass this initiative, there will come a time when you will regret it. I work in the music industry, and if you look at RCA, you see the battles they are involved in now, all as a result of their efforts to control the means of distribution. The masses will find a way around you and your regulations. And it will find a way that you will not like, and will spend fortunes trying to control. Once again, this is not sound business practice.

I'm asking you to think further than that and know that consolidation of the outlets is not the answer and will not benefit humanity. It is simply not the right thing to do. Will you value money or will you do what's right?

Debra A. Barbre
Market Development Manager
323-890-3700 ext 2336
www.rolandus.com

From: Gordon L. Smith
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 2:43 PM
Subject: Preserve Current Regulations

Dear Commissioner Copps:

Please do not further weaken the rules governing radio and television ownership. We need to protect diversity, competition, and local news programming. The airways belong to the citizens of the United States and should not be dominated by just a few giant multinational corporations.

It is very undemocratic to not publish the full proposed regulations. The discussion period should be extended by at least two months.

Sincerely, Gordon L. Smith
4556 Starling Way
Los Angeles, CA 90065

drop@ deltanet.com

From: Killian Jordan
To: Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 2:47 PM
Subject: concerned

Dear Members of the Commission

I'm a private citizen, deeply concerned about the proposed deregulation of media ownership. I fear it will have a constricting, deadening effect particularly on journalism.

I urge you to consider whether our country will hear more, broader, more diverse points of view if you were to leave some limits in place.

Do we want to say, as an example to the world, that only the richest few should control all access to media and to news?

Since President Bush has expressed his opposition to "bullying tactics," I hope you'll re-evaluate whether you want to encourage those tactics by allowing a few media barons to dictate all media content to our hundreds of millions of diverse citizens.

Thank you for your consideration.

Killian Jordan

--

From: Sue
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 4:34 PM
Subject: Keep the airwaves free

I am appalled at the threat to a free and open media - please do not approve media deregulation on June 2.
Susan Broidy
Ojai, CA

CC: KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: jlipps
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 9:04 PM
Subject: Consolidation

Dear Commissioner Copps:

I see where you are about to have a vote on the continued consolidation of media ownership. This cannot be a good thing for a country that values freedom of speech and opportunity. In fact, the number of original children's TV shows has decreased by half already, as this consolidation has progressed. Further consolidation will restrict viewpoints, force a focus on monetary return at ever larger levels programming be damned, and result in fewer viewing choices, as in the example above. I urge you to vote against allowing consolidation. We need multiple voices and programming styles in America, not fewer.

Jere H. Lipps
Oakland, California

From: David A. Baker
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 10:26 PM
Subject: FCC changes

Mr. Copps,

Please! do not support the changes that would allow media conglomerates to monopolize power of information. The more diverse, the better. Do your duty to protect the PUBLIC INTEREST! Listen to my plea, please!

Thank you,
David A. Baker

From: ayuwiler
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 10:34 PM
Subject: Concentration of airways.

Dear Commissioner Coops:

I urge you to preserve the little democracy left and vote AGAINST further concentration of the media in an fewer number of hands. A democracy depends on information. Do not, I beg you, further cut that flow despite the economic pressures to do so. Your grandchildren will live in this country too. It would be nice if you could help assure they live in a real democracy.

Arthur Yuwiler
20620 Clarendon St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 348-1027

From: Diane Reynolds
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 10:43 PM
Subject: Access to information is a cornerstone of our democracy!

Diane Reynolds
600 Barwood Park
Austin, TX 78759-6454

May 23, 2003

Commissioner Michael Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Copps:

It is my understanding that the Federal Communications Commission is considering possible changes to its media ownership rules. I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Allowing greater concentration and cross-ownership of media may have a profound impact on Americans' access to a wide range of news, information, programming and political commentary. To have a healthy democratic dialogue and participation on major issues, I believe it is important that we have access to a diversity of opinions and information, not a handful of options. Altering media ownership rules could seriously affect vigorous public debate and the marketplace of ideas. Rulemaking of this significance should therefore be open to public comment.

I also believe that, to stay democratic and free, we need to ensure diversity of opinion and the free exchange of ideas. It is imperative that there be the widest possible comment on any proposed rule so the Commission may fairly and impartially evaluate whether it will promote or hinder such diversity.

Once again, I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Sincerely,

Diane Reynolds

From: Tom
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 10:52 PM
Subject: delay ruling and keep or reduce 35%

Please delay decision on increasing % of ownership. 33% seems better than 35% when you do rule.

Thank you,

Tom Merrell
104 Holly Ln
Myrtle Beach, SC

From: Laura Borst
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 2:03 AM
Subject: In a democracy, the people need access to a variety of info

Laura Borst
10727 Holly Springs
Houston, TX 77042-1411

May 24, 2003

Commissioner Michael Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Copps:

It is my understanding that the Federal Communications Commission is considering possible changes to its media ownership rules. I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Allowing greater concentration and cross-ownership of media may have a profound impact on Americans' access to a wide range of news, information, programming and political commentary. To have a healthy democratic dialogue and participation on major issues, I believe it is important that we have access to a diversity of opinions and information, not a handful of options. Altering media ownership rules could seriously affect vigorous public debate and the marketplace of ideas. Rulemaking of this significance should therefore be open to public comment.

I also believe that, to stay democratic and free, we need to ensure diversity of opinion and the free exchange of ideas. It is imperative that there be the widest possible comment on any proposed rule so the Commission may fairly and impartially evaluate whether it will promote or hinder such diversity.

Once again, I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Sincerely,

Laura Borst

From: LBryant316@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 6:36 AM
Subject: NO DE-REGULATION FOR RADIO/TV

Please do not vote to de-regulate the radio/TV industry.

F.L. Bryant

From: Dennis & Stacy LaBare
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 6:39 AM
Subject: Consolidation...

Mr. Commissioner:

Please note my opposition recent industry efforts to further reduce diversity of ownership in the media. Consolidation by big holders will serve only to accumulate power in the hands of a few. They will no doubt use this power to reduce political discussion, etc. The public depends on its government to stop this sort of thing. Please do.

Thank you,

Dennis LaBare

From: Richard Chuk
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 8:46 AM
Subject: talking points

Dear Sir or Madam:

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

The proposed changes would allow giant media conglomerates near total control of news and information on television and radio in our communities across our great nation. Many of the corporations currently lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

As an American, I deserve to have the choice of more than a single opinion on important issues. For the sake of our Democracy, I not only urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections, but look at what would happen if these rules were tightened more. The results would be an even healthier political debate among the citizen of this great country.

Thank You

Richard D. Chuk II
Lombard, IL 60148

From: DSEDVD@cs.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 10:54 AM
Subject: Federal Communications Commission (FCC)

On June 2nd, the FCC will take its final vote on whether or not to change current "Broadcast Ownership Rules," and allow giant media conglomerates to grab an even bigger share of television and radio stations across our nation.

If these rule changes are adopted, it could give a tiny handful of anti-gun media executives the unchallenged power to keep NRA viewpoints off the T.V. and radio airwaves in thousands of communities across our nation -- small towns and big cities alike. The big media conglomerates have proved in the past that they WILL use their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air and these proposed rule changes would extend that power even further.

"Please vote against this change to the Broadcast Ownership rules on June 2nd. I have always thought that the television and radio media was a place for every one to voice their opinions equally without bias. The NRA members makes up over 4 million plus of your viewers and listeners. If you silence the 4 million NRA members then what good is the television and radio media to the general public? Do not silence the National Rifle Association. We do a great service to wildlife conservation, Home and personal protection education, Police, Military, and civilian personal safety training in the use of firearms. The NRA Eddy Eagle program teaches children to: Stop, Don't touch, Tell an adult, when confronted in finding a firearm and other firearm safety and prevention education. We are not the enemy that the media & the Clinton administration had displayed us to be. So vote against any ban against the NRA or any other organizations that supports the safe use of firearms for personal safety and hunting."

Steven E. Dowiat (NRA Benefactor Member)
Mesa, Arizona
Email: DSEDVD@cs.com

From: RDCCREAVES@aol.com
To: undisclosed-recipients, @fcc.gov
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 11:18 AM
Subject: Re: Broadcast Ownership Rules

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 pass 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,

Mr. Robert Reaves
Huntsville, Alabama 35811-8811

From: Bart Pass
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 11:41 AM
Subject: NO INTEGRITY

YOU HAVE NO INTEGRITY. YOU HAVE BEEN BOUGHT BY BIG MEDIA.

NO TO DE-REGULATION OF OWNERSHIP OF MEDIA.

From: Kyle Tappert
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 12:58 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

YOU MUST NOT ADOPT PROPOSED "BROADCAST OWNERSHIP RULES" THIS CAN ONLY LEAD TO REVOLT AT SOME POINT. YOU MUST NOT ATTEMPT TO LIMIT MY VOICE AND EXPAND OTHERS

"No free man shall be debarred the use of arms."-- Thomas Jefferson,The Virginia Constitution,1776

Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : <http://explorer.msn.com>

From: Will Fulton
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 1:09 PM
Subject: Don't Do It!

You are heading in exactly the opposite direction of that which you should be heading. The media is already concentrated in the hands of too few. No single entity should be allowed to own more than one newspaper or radio station or television station or internet provider, not just in one city, but anywhere.

You are about to further sabotage democracy. Your legacy will be notorious.

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

PAUL M. MROZINSKY
793 EAST MAIN STREET
WEATHERLY, PENNSYLVANIA 18255
(570) 427-8136 (Home)
(570) 262-4542 (Cell)
(253) 660-0416 (Facsimile)
pmmrozinsky@hazleton.net (email)

16 June, 2003

The Honorable Michael J. Copps
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
E-mail Address: mcopps@fcc.gov

Dear Mr. Copps:

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.

I listened intently Saturday morning to an ABC News article about radio stations in the northwest not reporting severe weather reports on air because as the owner in the southwest explained, that their broadcasting is for profit and not for public service. The programming was established well in advance of the need for the severe weather alert, which was not alterable at the local broadcast facility. If this is an indication of what is to come with the ownership and control of radio and television stations by "Absentee Landlords" who decide what we shall watch and listen to, why have FCC regulations to insure unbiased diversity in public media communication at all. Welcome to the twenty first-century version of Nazi Germany.

Respectfully,

Paul M. Mrozinsky

Paul M. Mrozinsky

Sir;

I cannot conceive how anyone would consider letting all the news or information media end up under the control of just a few individuals.

Why don't you just go ahead and make it Government controlled like Russia and some other countries.

Surely you are aware that we have virtually no news of any substance now. Fox and CNN and their so-called FAIR AND BALANCED are mostly B.S.

When I studied Journalism we were taught the 4 W's. Who – What – Where- When, but the above two have added a fifth "WHAT DO YOU THINK". This is not news.

In 1989 during the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska, Exxon was getting a lot of bad press-they solved there problem-they bought the Anchorage Daily paper that was doing the press and started writing their own version.

The Bureaucrats in D.C. (like you) cannot understand why changing the interest rate does not control the economy like it used to. Simply put-all the private banks have merged into mega-banks. No matter how low Uncle Sam drops the interest rate these banks set their own rate and just pocket the extra profit. They control the economy. There is no trickle down. Check it out.

I feel that if you proceed with the proposed changes to the media ownership rules-I will have to assume you are no longer an independent body and are just pulling the strings for total government control.

Fred Lentz
Kodiak, Alaska

From: Swartele1@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, kabernath@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, May 20, 2003 11:01 AM
Subject: No Subject

I urge you to retain current limits on media ownership. I am a native Ohioan but have lived in five different countries. I read of other countries' restrictions on the flow of information and opinion and their effects on citizens.

I believe that truth runs grave risk of being never unearthed or, if brought to light, reburied, if only a few can give voice to their version of events. If fewer and fewer people decide what is newsworthy or important--and continually divert our citizenry with a diet of 'bread and circuses'--our citizens may lose the means of calling to account the leaders and 'authorities' for their actions or inaction.

Our democracy is a living thing, that must be fed on as much truth-telling as we can cultivate; without that, our democracy may be a dying thing.

I urge you to persuade your colleagues at the FCC to retain current limits on media ownership.

Sincerely

yours,

Jeanne

Swartelé-Wood

From: William Jack
To: Michael Copps
Date: Tue, May 20, 2003 11:13 AM
Subject: Dishonesty in government -- Another violation of the public trust

What an odd subject heading! Well, How can citizens have much faith in government when huge broadcasting mega-business conglomerates control the access to information via purchasing the various broadcasting and news outlets of our region? The McCain-Findegold bill merely makes the voice of these destroyers of democracy more powerful and helps to quench dissent.

Shame on you if you vote to allow the megabroadcasters to further damage competition in the marketplace of ideas.

Rather, you should force the megabroadcasters out of the market. Demand that station owners have control of that which is broadcast and that station owners must reside in the state where the station operates.

In New Hampshire we are sick and tired of out of state interests "buying elections" and shoving the "California ethic" down our throats.

William H. Jack
65 Shaker Farm Road S
Marlborough, NH 03455

From: Carol Conway
To: Michael Copps
Date: Tue, May 20, 2003 3:40 PM
Subject: I am appalled

I am appalled that you as a member of the FCC would even consider allowing further consolidation of the National Broadcast channels and frequencies in the hands of fewer and fewer corporations. The FCC is supposed to represent the people's interest in free information, not the interests of corporate America, or the Republican party.

Be careful what you do. This country has already moved too far down the path to information suppression and secrecy. Too many more steps in that direction is guaranteed to destroy our democracy.

It is not sufficient to pat yourselves on the back and say that there are 200 cable channels and the Internet available. Many folks in this country do not use either, as both require financial resources to gain access. The public broadcast TV and radio stations, as well as the Newspapers must remain competitive? Isn't that supposed to be a central tenet of the Republican Party after all?

Carol Conway
Hayward, Ca.

From: user@domain.invalid
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 1:30 PM
Subject: No

Dear Sir;

I am against the proposed "deregulation" of the ownership restrictions on major media (TV, radio, newspapers and cable systems) in the United States. This would be the "McDonaldization" of the media. A single corporation such as Media Corp, Viacom, AOL/TimeWarner or Clear Channel, which already own hundreds if not thousands of media outlets, will now have almost no limit to how many TV stations they can own AND they will now be able to own newspapers and radio stations and cable systems in the same market.

This will kill diversity of opinion and homogenize what the American people see, hear and read - and will allow corporations to control content, limit debate and quash dissent, which is already a major problem with today's media. If telecom giants have their way, even the once-free Internet will be controlled by monopolies that can limit our access. If long-standing ownership safeguards are eliminated, our media will never be the same. The FCC, headed by Michael Powell, is poised to vote on June 2, 2003.

Please vote against this.

Alfredo A. Sadun, MD, PhD
Thornton Professor
USC School of Medicine

From: Canalraj@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 3:48 PM
Subject: (no subject)

PLEASE DO NOT ROLL BACK THE LONG ESTABLISHED RULES LIMITING MEDIA OWNERSHIP, A MOVE THAT WOULD MAKE THE MEDIA BEHEMOTHS MORE POWERFUL THAN EVER.

he FCC review is taking place with only scattered opposition and scarcely any public debate, thanks in part to a virtual news blackout by the media giants themselves.

First there were about 150 broadcasters or broadcast networks. This number has declined to the point that there are now six or seven TV ones. As to radio, " Clear Channel and Viacom together own stations with 42 percent of the nation's listeners. In Minot, N.D., according to a recent article in The New York Times, Clear Channel owns all six commercial stations and has reduced the total staff for news reporting to a single employee who mainly reads wire-service reports. Commercial radio effectively no longer exists in Minot as a local communications medium.

It seems to me that the vast majority of the electorate relies on the five or six o'clock TV news as their news source. The fewer the news sources the more likely will be the case that the electorate will be getting propaganda rather than nThank

Thank you,

Jean La Voie

From: Jerry Glass
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 24, 2003 4:17 PM
Subject: Hearings

Commissioner Copps:

The FCC should regard itself as a trustee for the public interest, and not exclusively as a conduit for narrow media industry benefits. Your commission should extend the period for public hearings on the overhaul of rules regarding media ownership. Extended public debate on this issue is in the spirit of our country's heritage of democratic values. I might add, that the public is extremely suspicious of your impartiality when commission members are given expense-paid trips courtesy of the media industry.

Very truly yours,

Jeremy M Glass

137 Barton Drive

Sudbury, MA 01776