

From: Marilyn A Coffman
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 3:53 PM
Subject: Monopolies

SUNSHINE PERIOD 02-277

Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you to leave the ownership of radio and TV alone. As a radio talk show listener and a watcher of local TV (I can't afford cable or satellite), I don't get that much variety now.

You don't realize there are a lot of us out here who don't have access to cable and satellite but we do very much depend on the airwaves for news and entertainment. Don't limit us by a decision that does not need to be made.

There is not that much variety as it is now with the media mostly liberal. At least allow some variety in the liberal reporting.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Marilyn A. Coffman

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Alan
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 3:57 PM
Subject: No Deregulation

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ms. Abernathy:

Do not move to further deregulate the media. Too few owners already control too many news outlets. With no real diversity of viewpoint presented to the American public, we can not have the informed citizenry vital to sustain a healthy democratic government. Deregulation further endangers everything the founding fathers worked to create.

Do not cast any vote to deregulate without first releasing details of proposed ownership restriction changes and a formal period of public review and comment on them.

To do otherwise would be undemocratic and un-patriotic, and a disservice to this great nation.

Be a patriotic American and respect the American citizenry and the wisdom of our founding fathers over a few rich conglomerates.

Sincerely,

Alan Bair

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

From: Janet Feldman
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:01 PM
Subject: Rule Changes

JUN 16 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Michael Powell and FCC Commissioners,

I am writing to request that the vote being held about rule changes for media consolidation be delayed to allow more public and Congressional debate on the topic. In my view, it is very dangerous to allow so much consolidation, and especially to do so without full debate about the rule changes and the issues this brings up for the democratic process, for true freedom of speech and of the press, and for an intelligent and informed citizenry (let alone for others around the globe, since the US media is so powerful and has such a global reach). The concentration of power and information in fewer and fewer hands not only smacks of totalitarianism, but also of oligarchy, and is decidedly undemocratic. I urge you to open these changes up to the full light of day in terms of debate and input, let alone understanding and consensus, and I thank you for your time and consideration of this vital matter. We have just fought a war partly on the premise of bringing democracy to a country ruled by a dictator; it would be a sad post-script if we allow a few companies and individuals in our own country, who already have far too much of the same kind of power, influence, and wealth as Saddam Hussein once had, to do here exactly what our troops fought and died to stop in Iraq. The conflict of interest is too great; the temptation to manipulate, even without meaning to consciously, too strong. The destruction of firewalls in the financial field has caused grave problems for many people of late; these were created in the first place by the concentration of economic power which led to the Great Depression, and should never have been dismantled. Please do not let this happen in terms of freedom of speech and of the press; there is far too much at stake for us all, not only for millions of us here in the US but for billions of people everywhere. Thank you and all best wishes,
Janet Feldman, 6 Echo Drive, Barrington, RI, 02806

SUNSHINE PERIOD**RECEIVED**

From: Michelle Roberts
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:05 PM
Subject: Media Deregulation

JUN 16 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Now is a very frightening time for Americans like myself. I am not talking about terrorist threats or color-coded alerts. Much more horrifying than the prospect of violence or death is the prospect of us losing our beloved democracy.

By allowing corporations to own more and more media outlets, we are establishing a society that is poorly informed. If you've watched Fox News recently, you'll understand what I'm talking about. This country is based upon the notion of having an informed electorate. If the entire media is owned by only a few large corporations, the quality of news that Americans will receive will suffer greatly.

If anything we need to be MORE strict about how much of the media one corporation can own. Flipping through news channels its the same story, over and over and over again. In order to maintain a working democracy we need to see all sides of an issue. Not just the side that a few businessmen decide is best. To keep news diverse we must have diverse media ownership.

This country is quickly becoming one large corporation. Please, do what is best for America and American democracy, not what is best for Viacom and other media-controlling corporations. Please, vote against media deregulation on June 2nd.

Sincerely,

Michelle Roberts

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

From: TAllen4470@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:08 PM
Subject: FCC Vote

RECEIVED
SUNSHINE PERIOD JUN 16 2003

*Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary*

Dear Chairman Powell:

The upcoming vote is an outrage! Do you envision that this will help the public or just the few large media corporations that contribute heavily to election campaigns? This will effectively allow a few of these large entities to own the airwaves and by doing so own what the public thinks and feels. I think over the past two years the American people have surrendered enough of their ability to think for themselves. They have also surrendered their right to question their government because they would be labeled as unpatriotic and un-American.

Do certain political parties have such a fear of what they would like to convince the public is the "liberal media" that they would actually circumvent freedom of speech by allowing a few large corporations to control what information the public receives?

Please, before you do this consider what effect it will have on future generations. I have three children, I am trying to raise them to think for themselves. Which in today's society is a challenge. They have been raised to appreciate and respect the fact that they have a voice and it is their responsibility to use that voice. To stand up for what they believe in, to exercise the rights and responsibilities that come with being an American citizen. Won't it be a sad day when they realize that they may have a voice, but unless they embrace certain beliefs, views, or political leanings sanctioned by one or two large entities it will never be heard.

Respectfully,

Teresa Allen

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

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Scott Small
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kimweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:28 PM
Subject: Please do not relax market dominance restrictions

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

The homogenization of the media that occurs as the market is dominated by a small number of players is not in the public interest. Relatively low restrictions are needed on market share to encourage the specialization that will best serve the American public interest. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

The detail and diversity needed in news sources for a populace to make informed decisions is degraded by lowest common denominator reportage, feel-good pabulum, and relatively noncontroversial programming. This style of programming is unfortunately rewarded when the number of players in a market is few and the incentive to grow market share is the overarching drive. Rather than focus on serving individual customers well, the market at that scale rewards being least offensive to the greatest number of people. From a microeconomic perspective, the broadcasters are making the strongest decisions to reward their investors. But their customers are not well-served. A sad side effect is that an increasing number of Americans are looking to foreign news sources for the depth and variety of programming that they desire as individuals. Extended, this presents its own risks. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

The economic advantages to market dominance are significant. There are distinct areas where economy of scale issues can provide great enough competitive advantage to the larger players that smaller broadcasters are effectively barred from entry to the market. At the point where new entries to the market are shut out, monopolistic abuse is a real risk. Where the number of resulting players is low and the microeconomic incentive toward homogenization is high, overt collusion between market players need not occur, convergence will occur nonetheless, and the consumer will not be the beneficiary of the shift. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

American GDP growth and wealth creation over the last fifty years has been driven to a significant degree by an innovative edge that the US has held over other nations. That innovation comes in part by individuals being motivated to develop "disruptive" technologies that dramatically alter the course of an industry in a way that frequently penalizes the previous market leaders as a secondary effect. In a media market where the players are large and few, the media will be less likely to adequately communicate the emergence of disruptive technologies - advertising by the dominant preexisting firms will be the media source of revenues, and an economic incentive to each media company will be present to prevent risk to that revenue stream. This censorship, whether overt at the control of the advertisers or passive will deter some percentage of innovators from establishing ventures that could generate wealth. If the rate of innovation and its reward is diminished even slightly, the long term economic and technological competitiveness of the US will be reduced. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

Please do not relax the media market dominance restrictions.

Cordially,
Scott Small

From: H2OWise@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:28 PM
Subject: Deregulation

Dear Commisioner Abernathy, I'm joining the overwhelming number of people who are speaking out against the proposed deregulation of the media. Please do your sworn duty to look out for the public's interests and at least make sure these measures are brought into the light of public discourse. Sincerely
Hunter Ten Broeck

From: Sandra Rudy
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Mike Powell, kjarveb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein, Senator Bingaman, Udall: Tom, White House: President
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:29 PM
Subject: FCC regulations change

Dear FCC commisioner:

I urge you not to vote June 2 on changes to the FCC regulations. Decisions this important need thorough debate and discussion. Those of us who live in rural America are finding that our choices of media have decreased considerably and it is very difficult to find varying points of view. Our choices of media, particulary the news, have become very one-sided. Narrowing ownership of our media has the potential for only making things worse.

I urge you to postpone your vote and listen to the American people rather than American (and multinational) corporations.

Sincerely,
Sandra Rudy
Alcalde, New Mexico

--- Sandra Rudy
--- ssrudy@earthlink.net

From: MontanaFilmRanch
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:32 PM
Subject: do not relax media rules

Before you vote on June 2nd to loosen media ownership rules, please take a moment to consider what effect such a move will have on program content.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

Further deregulation will not mean greater opportunity for competition. Rather, it will mean the opposite: More control of the airwaves by the few, with even less accountability to the market than they demonstrate today.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. Please do not relax the media ownership rules.

Sincerely,

Andreas Langley
Producer

CC: Kathleen Abernathy

From: sam steel
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:35 PM
Subject: Protect the People's Air Waves

To: Kathleen Abernathy, Member of the FCC ... You are a very fortunate woman but you have a lot at stake on Monday June 2, 2003! You will be selling out your country, the Public's Trust in the Office you hold, the American People's Air Waves, by allowing a few large corporations to benefit from your involvement with BIG BUSINESS! By reducing the rules and pushing through a vote on secret proposals, you will allow the People's Air Waves to sold out, weaken and you will not protect this country's democracy! SHAME ON YOU if you are so RECKLESS and ARROGANT! I will never vote republican again ... if in fact you allow this tragedy to happen under your watch.

From a sad citizen, Sam Steel, Columbus, Ohio

Add photos to your messages with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: bob clark
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:40 PM
Subject: Monday - Please Vote No

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,
Please vote NO to expanding and consolidating ownership of news sources. News must come from many independent sources - not concentrated with few. Wire services provide limited views already - same version of news story on every channel - same pictures, same opinions. Limiting news to even fewer will make controlled and biased reporting even more ubiquitous. Please Vote No.

Respectfully yours,
Frances Clark

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: John & Lorna Aylard
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:42 PM
Subject: Media ownership

Kathleen Abernathy, as a caring grandmother I urge you to NOT relax media ownership rules! Thank You!
Lorna M. Aylard

From: Johnmena1@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:05 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Please do not permit monopoly ownership of news media in the same market. The public does not start to determine the truth in news reporting until being exposed to differing versions of the same story, and that will only happen when differing interests-differing owners are involved.

John P. Gilson
7955 Pebble Brook Ct.
Springfield, VA 22153
(703) 455-7310
johnmena1@aol.com

From: Pauly
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:05 PM
Subject: Media ownership rules

Dear Commisioners,

As a member of the general public I wish to express in the stronest terms my Opposition to allowing large Media Corporations to buy up any more news companies than they already have.

It is my firm belief that to do so would severely undermine the ability of the people to recieve fair and even minded coverage of world events as presented by the Media.

It is also my firm belief that even now the major news agencies of the world have a slant and agenda that is biased towards the Liberal point of view. And to allow them any more access to purchasing even more news or broadcast companies would restrict the publics access to Both sides of any particular issue.

It is obvious that by the mear lack of public information on this subject that only a select few broadcast companies have been forthcoming with the fact that this was happening at all. I applaud KRON "Young Broadcasting" for there recent broadcast of this fact and I hope that more of the public will vent there frustration and views on this all important issue.

Again I implore you to NOT vote to allow the Media Mega Giants any more power to gobble up what should be known as a Free Press in this country.

Respectfully, Paul T. Posz
California

From: Jim Converse
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:05 PM
Subject: My opinion, media competition

Let competition be free.....if someone can afford to buy a media outlet, let 'em buy the outlet. I'm tired of synthetic competition.

Jim Converse
Shawnee Mission KS USA

From: marcos tovar
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:06 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

I am utterly appalled to hear about the FCC's continuing attempts to ease media ownership caps while further relaxing media rules and regulations. My poise as an adversary to the new rules, shared by many Americans, stems from the FCC's ongoing dejection of their fundamental responsibilities. It is my understanding that the FCC is supposed to regulate the airwaves in view of public interest. After all, the airwaves belong to the people, and the FCC should act as the buffer between the people, the government, and the media itself. However, the FCC and Michael Powell seem to interpret public interest as being a responsibility to the media corporations that wish to devour a greater percentage of the market than they already own. In essence, if the FCC gets its way, the new rules set forth will eliminate diversity in the media entirely while giving way too much power to the few people that currently controls our media.

The most disconcerting consequence that will result with the passage of the broadcast ownership Biennial Review is the deterioration of diverse sources of information. I am a firm believer of information being passed, and I genuinely believe that Diversity in the media is enormously important to our democracy. If the FCC is successful in its attempt to undercut this diversity, the new rules will do a disservice to all Americans. As citizens and consumers, Americans should have choices in the music they hear and the television programs they watch while also having access to several different points of view not 5 points of view broadcasted through 1000s of outlets. All Americans can appreciate the importance of having multiple sources of diverse information. The government and the FCC's primary responsibility should be fostering this diversity of expression; consequently, the FCC's new rules are likely to undermine it by allowing one company to own several stations that transmit the same message.

Equally disturbing, as it is now, five or six media companies control 75 to 80 percent of Americans' media consumption. The current rules state that one company can not own more than 35% of the market as far as the number of stations owned; however, technically speaking mainstream media companies do own more than 35% of the market because in some areas they control as much as 80% of the listening/viewing audience. If the rules were to be further relaxed and corporations were able to purchase and consolidate more, then these same companies would be able to manipulate an even greater percentage of that audience. This means that just a few companies will control everything we see and hear which will essentially allow them to mold entirely public concern as well as public interest. Now thats disturbing!

I am quite certain that I am not the only American that's suspect of these efforts to change. In my case however, suspicion is more welcome than the uninformed sleep-walk toward further consolidation that will leave the powerful American media in the hands of a few powerful men. In Michael Powell's case, he is only interested in seeing huge corporations increase profits versus seeing smaller companies owned by individuals prosper. Media ownership rules are intended to protect and advance the values of diversity, localism and competition and should remain unabated.

Thank you for your time,
Marcos Tovar

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: Michel Campbell
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:06 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

As a citizen concerned that FCC rules should continue to protect the Public Interest, especially the Public's right to receive information from the widest possible range of press and media sources, I am writing to urge you and the other Commissioners as strongly as I can to vote NO to the proposed sweeping changes scheduled for a vote on June 2 which would further relax media ownership rules, allowing even concentration of ownership of media in particular localities than already exists.

I believe this would be bad for the Public Interest, because there are already many communities where almost all the broadcast media come from two or three big corporations operating from afar, and the proposed changes are sure to make things worse, both directly, by allowing bigger sections and more kinds of media in a local market to belong to one owner, and indirectly (and perhaps even more unfortunately in the long term) because the new round of mergers and takeovers almost sure to follow such a change will eliminate many of the smaller and medium-sized media companies that still survive under current rules, leaving little choice at community level of sources for either information or entertainment from the outside world.

There is also another danger in further concentration of media, which has received little or no attention. Since terrorism has become a possibility always to be reckoned with, and especially the possibility of sabotage by hackers to the computerized control systems by which large entities operate, it is now the case that every further concentration of control, communications control in particular, increases vulnerability to terrorism by increasing the scope of what a successful terrorist hit could take out. At this juncture we should be decreasing, not increasing, the concentration of communications networks, in order to make our communications structure as little vulnerable to malicious attacks as may be possible.

Amy Louise Campbell (registered voter in Spokane Co.,WA)

(writing from a relative's e-mail address)

From: Kenneth Jefferson Cottrell
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:09 PM
Subject: I'm deeply concerned about your latest initiatives

Sirs and madam:

I'm writing in the hopes that I can influence you to stop any further dismantling of and exceptions from the laws currently in place that encourage diverse and wide ownership of the media in the United States. My concerns are these:

1. While I have no intention of telling other people what to think or read, it is important to me that I have access to a wide variety of opinions and sources of information. This is essential for a healthy democracy.
2. I think that it is in the best interests of the country that we DISCOURAGE the trend toward consolidation of these important resources so that their policy is not set by a few corporate giants (who will not be inclined to report on their own legal and ethical transgressions).
3. To those of those companies that say that the business environment has changed such that it's harder to make a profit in broadcast and print media, I say that, as a worker in the high-tech sector, my job is in growing danger. But we have to adapt to changing conditions or else find another source of income. They are not guaranteed a profit.
4. In my lifetime (I'm turning 54 this month), I've seen a rapid homogenization of our culture. The regional charm of dress, cuisine, music, dialect, etc. that has made our national fabric so rich is becoming gentrified. These initiatives under consideration would further encourage that trend.
5. Waivers that have been granted in the last decade have allowed for the foreign ownership of a major network in the United States (Fox) and the emergence of a broadcasting powerhouse that has more political agenda than public interest at heart (Clear Channel). *We've already gone too far.*

This is one of the most important issues in our country today and I hope you think long and hard before you further dismantle those safeguards that prevent exactly what you seem to be so eager to achieve. Thanks for your attention.

Kenneth Jefferson Cottrell
1903 Utopia Court
Austin, Texas 78723-1937

From: Steve Probst
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:47 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Do not change the ownership rules for media companies. Diverse ownership is vital to getting good unbiased news coverage.

Steve Probst
405 Stuntz Ave.
Ashland, WI 54806

From: James Allen
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:47 PM
Subject: /vote no on deregulation

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I doubt very much that most of you will actually read the many e-mail that you are bound to receive on this historic vote you are about to make. As a member of the media for the last 25 years I believe that your minds are already set on how you are going to vote, but what I have witnessed in California in the last decade does not give me any confidence whatsoever that deregulation of the air waves is going to benefit the people of this country any more than deregulating the power companies or the savings and loan industries has done. Both created unforeseen crises that back fired on the public. There is a proper place for free market competition but not with the public assets or the public infrastructure.

You are beholden to preserve the public trust of the air waves and to protect it for all of the people not for the benefit of a few wealthy corporations who will only grow more politically powerful with the continued slide into deregulation and monopolistic ownership.
James Preston Allen, Publisher Random Lengths News, Los Angeles CA.

From: Bobby White
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:47 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,
I used to work for a foreign media conglomerate called the Fuji Sankei Media Group of Japan, a company consisting of TV broadcasting, print, and radio, in the early eighties specifically because anti-trust laws precluded American media companies from such formations and I wanted experience in the upcoming era of new media. As a result, I a voting American, can attest and report to you from experience, that the new media ownership law you're pushing for the first week of June '03 will in fact pull our public away from being fully and efficiently informed. The Constution empowers a free press for the purposes of "an informed public", so your decisions have to prioritize that.

I feel that you are working for the interests of President Bush's cronies rather than the public interest. That you've strayed from your responsibility and are concerned about issues that are for the Commerce Commission.

Sincerely,

Bobby White
8530 Holloway Dr. #108
West Hollywood, CA 90069

(310) 652-0981

CC: senator@boxer.senate.gov, senator@feinstein.senate.gov

From: Frank P. Papp
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:48 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner,

I wish to voice my opposition to the new proposed broadcast ownership rules. I believe the new rules, which will allow the existing media to be owned by a few, will prevent a diversity of opinions to be presented to the public. This country thrives on diversity which is necessary to preserve our freedom. I urge your vote against the new broadcast ownership rules.

Thank you for taking the time to read my message.

Sincerely,
Frank P. Papp
3339 Rhett Butler Place
Charlotte, NC 28270

From: Naomi L Quenk
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:48 PM
Subject: Media diversity

Please do not vote to relax the rules on media diversity. The prospect of even further narrowing of access to diverse points of view is very frightening. I believe it greatly threatens our democracy.

Thank you.

Naomi I. Quenk
1824 Lafayette NE
Albuquerque, NM 87106

From: DONGENEGIB@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:47 PM
Subject: Vote against consolidation

Please vote against consolidation of media. The airwaves are public.

Donald C. Gibbs, MD
and Gene A. Gibbs
12839 Tar Flower Drive
Tampa, Florida 33626
813-814-7751
813-814-7751 Fax
813-334-8619 Cell