From: Woodscelt@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:02 PM
Subject: against

Add our 2 voices to the opponents of the proposed rule changes.

Mr. and Mrs. Everett Woods
1566 Allendale
Saginaw MI 48603

woodscelt@aol.com

From: john_hall3@ix.netcom.com
To: mpowell@fxx.gov, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:03 PM
Subject: June 2, 2003 Rule change meeting

Gentlemen and Ladies,

Please postpone your vote on the rule changes pending at the June 2nd meeting. I feel that more public hearings must be held and more input must be reviewed. I have noticed that many programs now are affected, from a content standpoint, by the media ownership and I feel that if this rule is going to pass then there should to be some controls allowing media operations some isolation from media ownership. We need to have a free and open press. I feel that the news is now being managed, to some degree, by ownership. Unless that can be controlled your rule change will only make the situation worse.

Regards,

John Hall
650-207-2522
john_hall3@ix.netcom.com

From: Richard Fenton
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:10 PM
Subject: Hold the Line

Commissioner Abernathy:

Please oppose the pending move by the FCC to relax restrictions on the number of media outlets that can be owned by a single company. Such a move surely would reduce the diversity and objectivity of information and subvert the democratic process.

Richard Fenton
135 Spring Street
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
fenton@nycap rr.com

From: Eddie & Susan
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:12 PM
Subject: Regulatory Review - Against Changes

Ms. Abernathy,
This e-mail is to provide you input prior to your 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers. As a member of the public, I am against ralaxing the rules regarding current restrictions on media companies owning television and radio stations and newspapers in a given market.
Thanks for your consideration.
Eddie Gutierrez

From: JEANNE SPARKS
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:15 PM
Subject: PROTECT MEDIA DIVERSITY!

We need more diversity and competition in the media, not less. Please do not loosen the regulations.

Thank you,

Jeanne Sparks

P.O. Box 6437

Santa Maria, CA 93456

From: Walt/Agnes Hall
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:19 PM
Subject: Opposition to deregulation of media

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

This note is to ask you to vote against the proposal to relax FCC rules that prevent a few huge conglomerates from controlling the media. The current rules are our only shield against a few powerful media moguls' deciding what can be heard and seen by the American public. The proposal threatens our right to free speech and to public debate.

I urge you to consider the good of America and not just some special interest groups, no matter how wealthy or powerful.

Sincerely,
Agnes Hall

From: Bonnie and David Martin
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:23 PM
Subject: Ownership Restrictions Must Not Be Relaxed

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I am deeply concerned over the proposed relaxation of the FCC restrictions on media ownership limits. I believe that it is imperative that the public airwaves be distributed among as many different owners as possible in order to guarantee diversity of opinion in news and entertainment.

As the son of a former small town newspaper publisher, I have watched with dismay as independent media organizations across the country have been consolidated under the control of smaller and smaller numbers of corporations. As this consolidation has occurred, the local news and diversity of opinion that is critical for the successful functioning of civil society has given way to a homogenization of opinion and a rush towards the lowest common denominator.

I urge you to vote against any relaxation of the restrictions on corporate ownership of media outlets. The preservation of the public right to a variety of media sources far outweighs the desire of a few major corporations to increase their profit margins.

Sincerely,

David A. Martin, Ph.D
1893 S. 900 E.
Zionsville, IN 46077
bosada@iquest.net
(317)769-3130

From: Loyce Baker
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:24 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Loyce Baker (loyce1@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner: I have sent the below email to Chairman Powell. Please take it as if sent to you, in requesting that you DO NOT allow our right to know, along with the publicly owned airwaves be sold down the river when you meet tomorrow.
"Dear Chairman Powell: Having a father such as you do, hopefully, you will not enter into an arrangement which will limit the freedoms he has so nobly stood for throughout his life.
Our (the pubic) right to know will be severely limited should the Commission allow the likes of Clear Channel, Rupert Murdock, and the rest, to gobble up even more of the publics airwaves for such shabby corporate purposes.
Their desire to do so is immoral.
It is arrogant for so few people be able to make such a large decision without regard to what the American people have made very clear is not what they want.
It will be arrogant of you to lead the Commission to such a decision.
Do not think the public does not understand what is at risk in allowing this to happen.
Do not think the public will not hold you responsible for leading such a group to such a terrible decision, should you not be strong enough to do the right thing.
Remember, please
Moral principle does not ever change.
Remember who your father is. Remember who you are. Dont disappoint him or us."

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.22.32.200
Remote IP address: 69.22.32.200

From: mmbrubaker@sbcglobal.net
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:26 PM
Subject: June 2nd Commission Meeting - Biennial Regulatory Review

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,
I am writing to express my strong opinion that ownership of radio and/or TV stations which use public airways should be more restrictive not less, and encourage you to vote against any easing of restrictions.
Thank you for you consideration.
Mary Brubaker

From: Pat Johnson
To: Undisclosed.Recipients@server-1.visp.net
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:33 PM
Subject: NO to Media Consolidation!!!

I am very upset over the upcoming hearing regarding media consolidation. I wonder why we didn't hear about this on the news? Too busy talking about WMD's??
We need diversity in our media, investigative reporters that are able to report the real news. It is sad that you are making Americans go to other countries to get the real news as we sure are not getting it from our own. Media consolidation will make sure we are all "programmed" fitting the needs of our Corporate Administration.
This all takes me back to grade school and hearing about the terrible Communists that didn't even have freedom of speech or freedom of the press....do we?

From: Markmarv@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:36 PM
Subject: deregulation

I ask you NOT to vote for deregulation of media. Too much monopoly of sources endangers the freedom of press and our ability to receive and weigh information. Thank you. H. Mark Johnson Denver, CO

From: Pat Johnson
To: Undisclosed.Recipients@server-1.visp.net
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:37 PM
Subject: Media Consolidaiton, a bad idea:

NO to media consolidation!!!
We need diversity in our media, investigative reporters that are able to report the real news. It is sad that you are making Americans go to other countries to get the real news as we sure are not getting it from our own. Media consolidation will make sure we are all "programmed" fitting the needs of our Corporate Administration.
This all takes me back to grade school and hearing about the terrible Communists that didn't even have freedom of speech or freedom of the press. ..do we?

From: mitchrubin
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:39 PM
Subject: Vote no on the media deregulation bill

I strongly urge you to vote no on the upcoming media consolidation rules. The vast majority of Americans oppose this rule change. A positive vote will further allow a few media giants to have unprecedented control over television and newspapers, the communication mediums that most Americans get their news from

Sincerely,

Mitchell S. Rubin, Esq.

From: Michael O'Connor
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:43 PM
Subject: media consolidation

Please vote no on the plan deregulating media consolidation.

Michael O'Connor
N8871 1047th Street
River Falls, WI 54022

From: GeoG
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:51 PM
Subject: Please Oppose Media Ownership Changes

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

This E-mail is to ask that you vote in opposition to the relaxation of rules regarding the ownership and size of media companies.

Many of the proponents cite the growth of alternative, competing media outlets. However, I find that most such outlets are still in the development phase and do not focus on local issues.

It is the local forum where industry consolidation will be the most egregious, especially where there is a dominant newspaper (like the Arizona Republic.) Allowing a major newspaper chain to own TV and Radio stations in the same market, causes a concentration of news power that results in an unfair competitive advantage Such an advantage results in an ability to use that dominance to unduly influence local issues.

The Gannett Corporation has exhibited such dominance in the Phoenix marketplace. They own the major daily newspaper, a weekly newspaper, a network TV station and 3 or 4 highly rated radio stations. The Arizona Republic dominates daily print advertising volume and rates in an oligopolistic fashion. The presence of such rate and volume power is without control and presents the opportunity for intimidation and excess, especially in local affairs

Major market arena on the East and West coast may have enough competing channels to avoid undue dominance. However, in smaller markets such as Phoenix, Milwaukee, Green Bay, etc., that are more isolated, the threat of undue dominance is real.

Please vote against the relaxation of rules regarding media ownership..In time, conditions may change with the growth of media options. However, that time is not yet here.

Thank you for your attention,

George Garbell
Phoenix, AZ 85032
primavera@qwest.net

From: Sampsonsisters@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:52 PM
Subject: Mergers

Please stop media mergers!

From: yost
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:53 PM
Subject: Proposed broadcast rule changes.

Honorable Commissioners:
A couple of weeks ago I sent an e-mail to you regarding the proposed relaxation of the rules governing monopolizing of local broadcast outlets. Thank you Mr. Copps for your thoughtful reply.
Watching the national news tonight I was struck by the fact that most local markets have only 1/2 hour of national news. Some also only have 1/2 to 1 1/2 hours of local news. How can the citizens be informed if they only hear a short compilation of what is transpiring in the world?
(I know, there is a 24 hour news channel on cable, but most of us can't afford that even if we could get it.)
Perhaps the broadcast organizations would put on more news in exchange for being allowed more ownership in a local market? I doubt if the sponsors would balk, since they would still be getting the same amount of exposure. The only group who might suffer would be the ones who concoct those horrible "family" programs. The sponsors wouldn't be getting hit with boycotts, etc. by groups who object to such raunchy fare.
I have visited countries where the news is paramount; where they run a news program until there isn't any more news to tell.
This would stop those in the broadcast organizations who thrive on controlling what news people see and hear.
Thank you for considering my suggestion.
H.J. Yost
hpyost@gci.net

From: Skrieck@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:54 PM
Subject: fcc rule changes

Dear Mr. Chairman and Commissioners,

It is outrageous that you are pushing through these rule changes in media ownership regulations without due process and a period to receive public comment. You are entrusted with regulating OUR airwaves, yet are refusing to ask us what we think. Perhaps this is because you do not want to hear what we have to say?

Media monopolies will reduce the variety and diversity of voices in this country - which voices are a defining attribute of a healthy democracy, and our country in particular. Do NOT go ahead with this rush to give media moguls a helping hand.

sincerely,
Steve Krieckhaus
Manchester, MO.

From: /
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:56 PM
Subject: STOP POWELL !!! STOP CONGLOMERATES !!!

MICHAEL POWELL IS A VERY DANGEROUS MAN

AND, LIKE HIS FATHER, A LIAR

STOP HIM !!

HE SERVES CORPORATE MOGULS,
NOT AMERICAN CITIZENS

From: pathe miller
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:57 PM
Subject: media ownership

To Commissioner Powell and members of the Federal Communications Commission,

I am writing this letter to ask you to not proceed with the proposed rule changes to Broadcast Ownership. There are so many reasons to wait and evaluate the impact these changes will have. There is already too much consolidation in the media.

Nobody can refute the statistics and facts which show the amount of households the five large conglomerates already control. I was shocked when I learned of how few companies own the television and news I have available to me. I am concerned about the impact this will have on free speech and democracy.

I have followed closely the Senate hearings last week that pertained to the issue of media ownership. I watched a forum last week with Commissioners Adelstein and Copps. At this meeting were the spokespeople for dozens of organizations that represent thousands and thousands of concerned Americans. How can YOU ignore the thousands of letters you have received asking you to wait?

Mr. Powell, this morning you told George Stephanopolous that you had knew of many examples of having a newspaper and television station in the same city being beneficial to the local citizens. But I have heard Mr. Adelstein say several times that no study has been done to evaluate the impact on coverage that consolidation has had. Mr. Powell you always say that people "Can push that button, and change channels," but don't you admit that most of the cable and satellite channels are owned by the same five conglomerates? Even the true sources for information on the Internet are the same huge companies, that only care about profit.

I know that the two television stations here that are owned by conglomerates do not give the best possible local coverage. I have been delighted to watch a news station in Tulsa OK and one in Springfield MO because of the local activities they organize and the local investigations they conduct. The two stations in Fayetteville that are owned by conglomerates(Hearst-Argyle, and New York Times) have more commercials than they do news. The "HealthBeat at the end of each 5:00 or 10:00 news is a piped in report on some other state or usually about some quack diet, surgery, or miracle drug that is still in the research stage. I looked at the Center for Pub! lic Integrity's website and disc overed the owners of my local news stations. Surprisingly the two out-of-state channels with more investigations were independently owned.

Also on the Public Integrity's website they chronicle the numerous trips and meetings Commission members have had with these large media conglomerates. Why has there been no chance for public input? Why have you felt it necessary to hold only a couple of public hearings? Why do you not care that hundreds of members of Congress (that we elected) are asking you to wait? Why can you not analyze the impact this will have on local coverage and access.

I would like to point out several troubling impacts that consolidation has already had on news coverage. The ability of people to hear all the news, and all the issues is vital to a free democracy.

1. The total lack of coverage of this topic until this week.(except C-span and Bill Moyers NOW on PBS)

2. Commissioner Adelstein held meetings around the country and he could not get newspapers to cover the story or notify the public of the public meetings.

3. Rep. Bernie Sanders (I-VE) tried to hold a press conference on this issue...AND NO PRESS CAME (except a reporter from Roll Call)

4. The stance takn by all US media before and during the Iraq War which was entirely pro-president/ no dissent that did not allow for any other option but what the Pentagon said .

5. A US Representative from California who was denied the ability to place a PAID advertisement for a peace protest on a radio station--owned by Clear Channel.

There are many more examples of how the views expressed and available on the television and in all media are being homogenized and consolidated. This is a trend that will affect our democracy in ways that won't be investigated by any news organization (like lots of things that won't get covered). Please do not proceed with these rule changes. Please evaluate the impact consolidation has already had. AT LEAST analyze the impacts this will have on local coverage and the other aspects of the public airways that you are supposed to protect and regulate.

Thank You

Do you Yahoo!?
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

From: dave wolf
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:59 PM
Subject: against media consolidation

Dear Commissioners: As a U.S. citizen, I am very concerned at the intimidation of those who dissent from government policy. The consolidation of media that has already taken place is limiting our constitutional rights to be informed by a broad range of opinion. The upcoming set of new rules will make a bad situation even worse. The FCC should be guarding the rights of the citizens to be broadly informed, not serving as the facilitators of the likes of Rupert Murdock and the other powerful media magnates who are already limiting the debate in so many crucial areas. Please oppose the rampant consolidation that is taking place, and instead, reverse this trend and keep the airways free, as was intended by the first set of rules. As a Republican Secretary of Commerce said back in the 1920s, "These airwaves are to serve the public interest, the greater interest of the country." Not the interests of a few oligarchs. Please consider these comments before you vote on June 2. Thank you. --David Wolf, San Carlos, CA 94070

contact info:
home phone: 650-593-5675
home email: dave-wolf141@attbi.com
work phone: 415-732-3641
work email: dave.wolf@sf.ddb.com

From: /
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:57 PM
Subject: STOP POWELL !! STOP CONGLOMERATES !!

MICHAEL POWELL IS A VERY DANGEROUS MAN

AND, LIKE HIS FATHER, A LIAR

STOP HIM !!

HE SERVES CORPORATE MOGULS,
NOT AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. Copps - you are a true hero!! Thank you!!

From: Markmarv@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:37 PM
Subject: No Subject

Please vote NO on the attempt by big Media to get even bigger. Not a good idea in a country which needs as much varied news as possible. Than you, H. Mark Johnson

From: Eddie & Susan
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:13 PM
Subject: Regulatory Review - Against Changes

Mr. Copps,
This e-mail is to provide you input prior to your 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers. As a member of the public, I am against ralaxing the rules regarding current restrictions on media companies owning television and radio stations and newspapers in a given market.
Thanks for your consideration.

From: Richard Fenton
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:10 PM
Subject: Hold the Line

Commissioner Copps:

Please oppose the pending move by the FCC to relax restrictions on the number of media outlets that can be owned by a single company. Such a move surely would reduce the diversity and objectivity of information and subvert the democratic process.

Richard Fenton
135 Spring Street
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
fenton@nycap.rr.com

From: Amy Schulze
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:07 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Commissioners,

I think that changing the law so that a corporation or individual could control 45% of the nations video coverage instead of the present 35% is a danger to the nation's freedom.

I also think that a company or individual should not control the papers and television stations in the same town.

Thank you,

Ray and Jocele Schulze
1051 Green Oak Dr.
Early, Texas 76802

--- Ray Schulze--- Kenoanime@earthlink.net
--- EarthLink: The #1 provider of the Real Internet.

CC: Mike Powell, abernat@fcc.gov, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Woodscelt@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:02 PM
Subject: against

Add our 2 voices to the opponents of the proposed rule changes.

Mr. and Mrs. Everett Woods
1566 Allendale
Saginaw MI 48603

woodscelt@aol.com

From: Susan Ginsburg
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:00 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

The media companies are too big already and control what and how we know information. One has to seek out alternatives as things stand now. Don't make it worse. I have worked personally for one of the media tycoons, and I know personally they want to control what we know.

From: Archuleta
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:51 PM
Subject: FCC Ruling

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners,

Relaxing the media ownership rules is plain and simply wrong. As it is currently, there is not enough variety on the AM band. I can't imagine what it would be like with this very hateful point of view as we see on AM radio in every form of media. I can only think of two reasons for easing the rules. Number 1, $ as usual, even at the expense of our democracy. And number 2, almost as important to these same people as the first, political gain. If anything these rules should be reversed from the 1996 ruling.

I think it shameful, despicable and morally wrong to make this kind of change based on such shallow reasoning.

Sincerely,

Anthony Archuleta

From: DeanMont@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjweb@fcc.gov
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:38 PM
Subject: (no subject)

The concentration of opinion shaping media ownership into fewer hands that is an almost certain result of the proposed changes will be to the detriment of our democractic institutions.

I strongly urge you to vote against the proposals at hand.

Dean Montgomery
11647 River Oaks Trail
Austin, TX 78753

From: Stephen Young
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 10:05 PM
Subject: DON'T DO IT!

Dear Commissioner:

Please don't further limit free speech by allowing control of the public airwaves to go to fewer and fewer corporations; it would be the most Un-American thing you could do.

Signed,
Stephen G Young
Sarasota, Florida