

From: Stacy Robinson
To: Kathleen Abernathy; kqa@fcc.gov; mathew.brill@verizon.net; Matthew Brill
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:16 PM
Subject: Separate Statement and Testimony

Attached is a revised copy of the Separate Statement (primarily cleaning up any factual issues or making sure it is consistent with the Order) Also attached is draft of the Testimony for the Senate Hearing. I will be in on Saturday and Sunday, so please e-mail me any changes. Happy Reading!

Non-Public
For Internal Use Only

CC: Jennifer Manner

From: Larry Flowers
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:17 PM
Subject: F C C Vote

To F C C

Please help keep this country free and open by voting NOT to allow any business to own all the media outlets in a particular area. The fact that there has been little or no coverage of the upcoming vote speaks boatloads about the current state of "fair and balanced reporting" Your vote to allow exclusive ownership in an area will pay back the lobbyist that have entertained you Your vote to allow freedom to continue will be looking out for the public interest

You can always tell those lobbyist there was too much heat this time and that you will try to pass it next year They won't cut you off as long as you can do them some good Do me some good! Vote no to big business and yes to the people

Thanks for
your consideration in this matter,

Larry Flowers

STOP MORE SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: Frank Macek
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:17 PM
Subject: Opposed to FCC Guideline Relaxations

I am very much opposed to giving Clear Channel Communications and big media companies further opportunity to ruin the media industry with the proposed ownership changes.

1996 was the year radio ended Let 2003 not be the year that TV did the same

Maybe you should try working in the industry to appreciate it's bad for the employees and bad for the viewer/listener

I VOTE NO! Please do the same.

Frank Macek

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: Fish
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8.20 PM
Subject: Ownership

Vote No! Don't let big business rule ALL the airwaves!

Thanks
dave fisher

From: Topaz
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 23 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Please know that I am appalled at the actions of the FCC regarding new ownership rules

Not a move that will endear me to the Republican Party I write not because I have been asked to do so, but simply because I think this is against all common sense if we are to retain any semblance of diversity of opinion

John B Wolff
Ann Arbor, Michigan

From: Ethan ,Elly & Chaim
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:24 PM
Subject: proposed changes

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

We are writing to express our strong disagreement with the proposed rules changes that the FCC is considering adopting.

Communication is vital to our nation. The proposed changes will increase the ability of a small number of powerful media companies to control the TV, radio and the press. The proposed changes will result in even more consolidation of media and broadcast corporations. This is not in the best interest of our nation.

I urge you to vote down this ill-founded proposal.

Sincerely,
Elly and Chaim Adelman

From: Norton W Bell
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8.25 PM
Subject: ownership of radio stations

Please oppose changes that would allow increased ownership of local stations by one owner.
Norton & Ann Bell
1805 Cowper St.
Palo Alto, CA 94301

From: Thomas Urbanik
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8.30 PM
Subject: Opposed to media ownership changes

Commisioners,

As a concerned citizen, I would like to express my opposition to proposed changes that would result in further concentration of media ownership. This is NOT serving the public as you are charged to do. Please do not be a party to even more erosion of Democracy, suppression of debate, and elevation of the American Oligarchy that is leading this country on a self-destructive path for the short-term benefit of a few Thank you

Thomas Urbanik
105 Camino Teresa
Santa Fe, NM 87505

From: W Lee Schexnaider
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 33 PM
Subject: Against Deregulation Proposal

Hello,

My name is W Lee Schexnaider I am a former journalist and currently a software tester in Houston, Texas

I would like to formally voice my opposition to the deregulation proposal to be voted on Monday I would like to discuss the individual elements of the proposal However, because the commission has not released such an important proposal to the public, I am unable to do so.

As a reporter, I saw first hand the effects of media concentration in the newspaper industry. Though, the newspaper concentrations was due to economic forces, the public airwaves are different.

Those airways are held in trust by the federal government for the American people. Consolidation in that industry threatens the very fabric of our democracy and republic

An example, I grew up listening to KTRH AM 740 in Houston It was one of the two competing radio news stations in the city, the other was KPRC Although KPRC changed to a talk show format a number of years ago, both stations are now owned by Clear Channel. KTRH is a "clear channel" station in the sense it has a high power output and can be received in much of Texas as well as Mexico

I have watch the news department in this station cut and transformed into a shadow of its former self It's broadcast time is more and more being take up with syndicated talk program that serve no local interest whatsoever.

This is just one example, there are others all over the country

Please do not approve the deregulation proposal

W Lee Schexnaider
Houston, Texas

Free 20MB Web Site Hosting and Personalized E-mail Service!
Get It Now At Doteasy.com <http://www.doteasy.com/et/>

From: J Metolius
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:37 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Please do not vote to loosen the media ownership restrictions

I want to hear many different viewpoints, not just that of big business

Thank you,
JM

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

From: Raphael Sperry
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:37 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am shocked and outraged by your heavy-handed attempts to steamroller through proposed rule changes on media ownership against the public interest. You seem to think that despite, thousands of public comments, of which an astonishing 97 percent are opposed to your deregulation plan, you can still ignore the public voice. The consolidation you propose allowing will weaken access to the airwaves for all but the wealthiest corporations and their allies, denying the majority of Americans any diversity of voices in a media space that is already heavily controlled by a small minority.

The FCC exists to regulate the airwaves as a public resource. You have refused to make your proposed rule changes public, you have attempted to ignore public concern about the changes, and you have shown nothing but contempt for us. You could at least have the decency, after a bipartisan group of US Senators urged you to delay your vote on the rules, to listen to them. Please start listening to the public and don't allow even fewer corporations to control our media.

Regards,
Raphael Sperry
San Francisco, CA

cc
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy kabernat@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps mcopps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin kjmweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein jadelste@fcc.gov

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

From: Joe Lucadamo
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 37 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Deregulation - Vote No

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to you today to express my opposition to the proposed easing of media ownership regulations slated for the Monday, June 2 FCC commissioners meeting. I believe that the proposed changes will only further the monopolization of the media in America--with the exception of the Internet, the majority of America's news is generated by organizations controlled by a select few media giants

This consolidation of the news world is extremely detrimental to the American public; the American people deserve to have access to news that is unbiased and as objective as reasonably possible. The fact that many Americans have looked overseas for their news of late to get a better picture of what is actually happening in the world is truly sad. I never thought it would be necessary for me to rely on the BBC, the guardian, and the Australian press for a clearer picture of world events. I blame those changes in news consumption on the growing monopolization of the media market, when most of my news comes from the few

I implore you to vote no for the loosening of media ownership rules, and make it easier to maintain a free and independent press--independent of government control and independent of the growing corporate stranglehold of financial censorship.

Sincerely,

Joseph P. Lucadamo
www.jlucadamo.com
contact@jlucadamo.com

From: Lesley Segedy
To: FCC FCCINFO, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, KM KJMWEB
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:38 PM
Subject: HEARING on New Regulations

Hello FCC --

I understand that there will be a meeting on June 2nd. to consider adoption of newly poposed FCC regulations and guidelines concerning ownership of media

As a United State citizen, and a "user" of all forms of media, I am shocked and yes, saddened, to hear that there will be no opportunity for public input on this matter. On the radio I hear that there are members of both congressional houses who are also questioning this decision.

Why is this ?

Since we are the ones forced to pay for the "entertainment", be it, television, radio, or newspaper, we should also have a chance to express our concerns regarding the ownership and authoring bodies. We want to maintain a balanced reporting of issues, so we are not hearing just one side interpreted by different people in different media venues in the same area.

We should be seeeking a wider variety of opinions, not fewer

Please allow the hearing to be continued, and open your committee to the viewpoints of your constituents who are your employers !

If this is not the correct address for this message, please pass it on ASAP ! Thank you, Cheers, Peace --

--

Lesley Segedy
LIBRARY
California Academy of Sciences
Golden Gate Park
San Francisco
CA 94118-4599
U S A
PH. 415-750-7124 / FAX: 415-750-7106
lsegedy@calacademy.org
<http://www.calacademy.org>

From: annieandmike oreilly
To: KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:41 PM
Subject: fcc RULE CHANGE

Dear FCC official,

I trust that you will not let the rules change so that big media monopolies can get even bigger. The American public deserves unbiased news and that will not happen if you change the rules. During the beginning of the recent war on Iraq, I, along with so many others, chose not to listen or view the news because it was so biased. In order to get the real news it is becoming apparent that we will have to listen to *foreign news*. Please don't take the last dear vestiges of our rights given to us by our constitution away from us. A rule change in favor of monopolies would be a huge disaster.

Thank you
Annie O'Reilly

From: Charles Measner
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:44 PM
Subject: Please do not allow increased media consolidation

I am strongly against changing the rules to allow greater consolidation by media outlets. We need more independence in our media coverage, not less. It is damaging to our country to allow even as much consolidation as has already occurred. To allow more would be a travesty. If I am to make informed decisions about my country, I do not need my access to information limited to just a few viewpoints. This country was founded on independence and the right to make our own decisions.

And speaking of the right of the people to make decisions about their own governance, why are you limiting the public's access to detailed information on this vote? Maybe I see why you don't see anything wrong with limiting access to independent sources of information. Is it because you believe that the public is not capable of making good decisions about the rules that govern them? For my part as a concerned and active citizen, I will be seeking information on how the chairman and commissioners are appointed to see who I need to write to to get things changed. The FCC works for the people. When it stops listening to the people, it is no longer working for the people and needs to be changed, starting at the top.

From: Jerry Policoff
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 44 PM
Subject: Delay the media consolidation vote

I am writing to beseech you to delay the scheduled June 2nd FCC vote on media consolidation

It is profoundly disturbing that an issue this important, and with such far-reaching implications is scheduled for a vote after only one public meeting to debate the issue. Public opinion, and even the will of the Congress would seem to make a compelling case for delaying this vote so that a true public debate of this issue may take place

Not only does the proposed increase of the ownership cap to 45% of the U.S. population threaten to create a media dominated by a few monolithic media voices, but the failure to amend current rules that give only a 50% weight to UHF television stations makes that an even greater threat. In today's world of 70% plus cable penetration and tomorrow's HDTV world in which most distinctions will disappear, it makes little sense to preserve this archaic distinction which could technically allow one company to own television stations covering 90% of the Country. Mr. Powell, you have often spoken of how today's rules were written in a different time and need to be brought up-to-date. How then can you preserve this UHF rule which reflects a television reality that ceased to exist twenty years ago?

This issue requires a debate and public input

Sincerely,

Jerry Policoff

home phone (316) 685-5413

home fax. (316) 685-5414

cell phone (620) 591-0200

address

2931 N. Gouverneur St /# 208

Wichita, Kansas 67226

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

From: Karen Johnson
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:48 PM
Subject: Monday's vote on rule changes

Dear Commissioner,

I want to express my opposition to relaxing the rules to allow broadcast networks to buy more television stations and to allow newspapers to buy television stations in the same city. I fear the erosion of the rights of all citizens to hear a diversity of opinion. I read my local newspaper and do not want to hear the same information and opinion on the local television stations. I enjoy hearing a variety of viewpoints.

I live in a small suburb of Kansas City where one corporation owns 8 radio stations. In order to reach its profit goals, it dismantled an historic FM classical radio station, relegating it to AM which has no stereo capability and adding a plethora of commercials. This is just one example of what a corporate owner will/can do in disregard of the public's interest (there were many pleas from the community against this action) in pursuit of financial gain.

The airwaves are public and should be regulated to reflect the public interest which is to allow for an expression of a wide range of opinion, not the opinions of a handful of corporations.

I am not affiliated with any particular interest group, and, for the record, I am a registered Republican.

I would appreciate your vote against this change.

Sincerely,
Karen I Johnson
4950 Adams
Westwood, KS 66205-1957

From: BRumbarger
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8.48 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Please allow local stations determine what is appropriate for local viewers/listeners, etc. Let those in New York or LA or other "big" cities stew in their own juice and leave the rest of us alone .. Betty Rumbarger
ansonbetty@mindspring.com

From: Ben Koral
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:49 PM
Subject: The relaxation of restrictions

I only recently heard of the vote that will be made on whether or not to relax the restrictions on the consolidation of media ownership. Firstly I have to say that I'm stunned at the lack of coverage that I've seen on this topic. No one I know has even heard of this. Second I strongly urge you NOT to vote in favor of this motion. These rules are some of the only things keeping media moguls from having complete control over what information the public sees and hears.

Please do not vote in favor of this.

Thank you
-Ben Koral

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail>

From: Kent Kammerer
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:49 PM
Subject: Ownership rules

Do not change existing ownership rules FCC exists to protect the
public interest not corporations

From: robert@grcmc.org
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:52 PM
Subject: "No To Deregulation"

I say "No To Deregulation"

From: Donald Bilyeu
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 53 PM
Subject: June 2 meeting on cross-ownership of broadcast stations and newspapers

Chairman Powell: If you and the FCC members allow the media conglomerates to control even more of the airways and news publications, then our democratic process, which depends on the free exchange of ideas, will be seriously compromised. I urge you not to adopt the proposed changes put forth for this meeting, and to encourage further public comment and discussion of these issues, which have been virtually ignored by many of the very same media that stand to benefit most from any easing of restrictions. Thank you for your attention. Barbara Bilyeu, Lenox MA

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

From: Raesok@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:57 PM
Subject: DeRegulation

I am strongly AGAINST further deregulation. Pay attention to the Will of the general population. They do NOT want further deregulation!!

Rita Sokolow
Los Angeles, CA

From: Todd Schaefer & Kathy Allen
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:01 PM
Subject: FCC hearing/regs on ownership 6/2/03

To the Commissioners

I am writing to ask that you NOT relax regulations on broadcast ownership and allow even more consolidation, mergers, monopolization, etc , of our PUBLIC-OWNED AIRWAVES and remember that you are to regulate in the public interest

It is not in our interest to have a few, giant media corporations control our communication and information system. The "free market" in economic terms does NOT lead to a "marketplace of ideas" since we know that laissez-faire economics leads to monopolies or oligopolies.

Cross-ownership of media outlets (radio/TV/print) should also be banned. I grew up in central IA, and remember that the Register & Tribune co , which owned the Des Moines Register, also owned KRNT radio and TV, and yet was required (rightly so) to sell one of its media holdings so as to not monopolize and dominate news and information in that area BTW, the RnT is now owned by Gannett, the giant corp. that makes USA Today, and has suffered in quality as a result, meaning the people of Iowa are now more poorly informed at the expense of profits

As a professor of political science and scholar of political communication, I am well aware of the dangers to our democracy of having only a few companies control our communication system The dangers of privately-controlled monopolies of information are equally if not more great than having single gov't owned media like Communist China

As an alternative, why not encourage MULTIPLE PUBLIC OWNERSHIP of TV stations? Why do we only have 1 PBS, and not 2, 3, 4, each competing? There are also several other ideas the FCC could pursue. I support free TV time for candidates, like other democracies like Great Britain, and other pro-active measures.

If you want information showing why these are bad ideas, and limits on media ownership are good ones, see Ben Bagdikian, "The Media Monopoly" (latest ed.) or Robert Entman, "Democracy without Citizens: Media and the Decay of American Politics," (Oxford U Press, 1989) In particular, Prof. Entman shows in his study of media after FCC got rid of the "fairness doctrine" in the 1980s under Reagan, under the idea of "free economic market = free idea market" that broadcast deregulation FAILED to broaden the range of ideas offered to the public, and may in fact have had the opposite effect.

Sincerely,
Todd M Schaefer
(Assoc Prof of Political Science, Central Washington U. -- but writing from home as an independent, AMERICAN CITIZEN)

Ellensburg, WA USA 98926