

Office of the Commissioners Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20544 February 22, 2008

Re: Report on Broadcast Localism and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 04-233

Dear Commissioners:

I would like to voice my opposition to the above-referenced report. Instead of "addressing the needs of their local communities," I believe the ultimate results of the conclusions inferred in the report will no doubt result in regulations that will unnecessarily poison the burgeoning diversity in broadcasting.

I am a former talk show host and frequent guest on talk radio and public affairs television programs. I am also a syndicated columnist. It is my concern that the imposition of content-based broadcast goals and standards will do nothing more than scare owners into restricting programming that can in any way be deemed controversial. This would result in the curtailing or outright cancellation of some of today's most popular programming. It would also have a detrimental effect on overall political discourse.

It would be coercive for the federal government to impose content guidelines on one segment of the current broadcast medium. Today, there are more than enough venues for people to obtain news, commentary and information that matches their personal tastes and needs. To do so would be a step back and a loss of freedom.

Sincerely,

Mychal Massie Chairman



Office of the Commissioners Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20544 February 22, 2008

Re: Report on Broadcast Localism and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 04-233

Dear Commissioners:

As a former broadcaster and someone who frequently appears on talk radio and public affairs programming, I am opposed to new regulations that would lead to the imposition of anything resembling the defunct Fairness Doctrine.

The report referenced above has the stated goal of creating regulations on broadcasting content to make programming more attentive to local interests. What appears to be overlooked is the tremendous increase in broadcast diversity that occurred after the Fairness Doctrine's regulations were set aside by the FCC in 1987. The number of talk radio stations have expanded more than twenty-fold since the 1980s. Additionally, technological innovations such as the Internet have made access to information easier in even the most remote locations across the globe.

It certainly cannot be said that there is a lack of access to information — local or otherwise — in 2008.

To set new guidelines for content would take us back to an era that former NBC "Meet the Press" host Bill Monroe called "timid, don't-rock-the-boat coverage." It might force owners to curtail successful talk radio and public affairs formats at the peril of their bottom lines. In short, it would have a devastating impact on the broadcasting industry.

Please disregard policy proposals that would turn back the clock on the progress broadcasting has made over the past 20 years. When access to information is at an all-time high, it should not be the role of a free and open government to stifle free speech.

Down L. Boull

Sincerely,

Deneen Borelli

Fellow



Office of the Commissioners Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20544 February 22, 2008

Re: Report on Broadcast Localism and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 04-233

Dear Commissioners:

The last thing this nation needs is more regulation on broadcasting. The proposals discussed in the aforementioned report would do just that.

I have appeared on radio as both a host and guest. As a host, I took it upon myself to try to balance the needs and demands of my listeners for local and newsworthy issues — as do the many hosts I have worked with over the years as a guest.

I firmly believe in the old rule of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Radio show hosts should be able to converse freely on a wide range of topics free of government and the political influence of those who may not agree with a particular host, format or guests.

I have always felt that even if I don't completely agree with a program, those who do still have the right to be heard. Freedom of speech is one of our most treasured rights as Americans.

Localism rules could be a slippery slope into a new Fairness Doctrine. What we explicitly do not need in this day and age is a broadcasting industry constantly fearing sanction by the government because they are controversial. I feel that is exactly what would happen if new rules related to content are enacted. At a time when people can go onto the Internet and find blogs, video and commentary of all political nature, broadcasters cannot be muzzled and be expected to remain competitive.

As a veteran who dedicated myself to defending the freedoms given to us in the U.S. Constitution, it would be abhorrent to me to discover that my government is limiting basic rights such as freedom of speech.

Sincerely,

Kevin Martin

National Advisory Council

Brotherhood Organization of a New Destiny REBUILDING THE FAMILY BY REBUILDING THE MAN

February 22, 2008

Office of the Commissioners Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20544

Re: Report on Broadcast Localism and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 04-233

Dear Commissioners:

As a broadcaster, social and community activist and man of faith, I ask that the FCC abandon any attempt to re-regulate the media in the manner once dominated by the now-abandoned Fairness Doctrine.

The referenced report has the ability to re-impose such discriminatory rules on a currently vibrant and diverse broadcast medium. One could argue that the explosion of the talk radio market, of which I am a part, is reason enough to not impose chilling restrictions on currently acceptable content. To create a situation in which people could have broadcast personnel, owners and management sanctioned or worse based on on-air discussions of gender, race, sexuality and faith — among other things — is at cross-purposes with both business sense and the spirit of free discourse on which our nation is based.

It would be in the best interests of the American people to set aside any discussion of enacting regulations that limits the freedom of broadcasters. These proposed rules on localism are just the sort of thing that have no relevance in our modern society.

Sincerely,

Reverend Jesse Lee Peterson

National Advisory Council, Project 21

P.O. Box 35090 Los Angeles, CA 90035 T 323.782.1980 T 800.411.BOND F 323.782.0122 www.bondinfo.org bond@bondinfo.org

Board of Directors

Rev. Jesse Lee Peterson President/C.E.O.

Malcom Jones Senior Vice President

Kerr Johnson Secretary/Treasurer

Kent E. Seton, Esq.

General Counsel Francisco Martinez

Director of Finance

Directors of Special Programs

Martin Francis BOND Home for Boys

Ermias Alemaychu Director of Public Relations

William A. Barton Production Engineer

Patrick Rooney Director of Development

Douglas Massey Network Administrator

Clinton Robinson
After School
Character-Building Program

Advisory Board

Professor Walter E. Williams Economist

Donnis Prager

Author/Radio Host

Sean Hannity Radio/TV Host

Rick Roberts Radio Host

Forrest Stewart

Coach/Sports Advisor
John Santner
President & CEO of

Cal-Pacific Business Machines Richard Bryant Businessman

Baron Baptiste Founder of

Baptiste Power Yoga Institute

Jim Watson Chairman & CEO of Reflex Security, Inc.

William Reineman Past President of Pacific Palisades Rosary Club



Office of the Commissioners Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20544 February 22, 2008

Re: Report on Broadcast Localism and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 04-233

Dear Commissioners:

I am the pastor of the Bible Church of Ypsilanti, Michigan and a talk show host on the Michigan radio stations WDTK and WLQV. Out of fear of losing my religious and political freedoms as a broadcaster, I am opposed to any new regulations that could affect currently-accepted broadcast content.

The stated intention of the above-mentioned report is to foster diversity and create more attentive local programming. I am concerned, however, that the imposition of any means of content regulation in this hyper-sensitive era will actually create a devastating net loss in programming diversity. In particular, I am concerned that complaints about religious content and the need to include opposing viewpoints will cause broadcast outlet owners to cancel and shy away from any new faith-based programming.

New content rules of this sort would also destroy the intent of faith-based programming and suppress public interest in it. All of this would lead to the destruction of a vital ministerial outlet that I currently consider a valuable public service.

In this high-tech information age, there is no need to fear that information related to political and social viewpoints is being improperly curtailed. For the government to step in to mandate discourse would not only be unconstitutional when it pertains to religion, but it would ignore the many places in which people can find the information and solace that they need — be it through radio, broadcast and cable television, the Internet and publications.

Sincerely,

Levon Yulle

Elder Levon Yuille, Ph.D. National Advisory Council



Office of the Commissioners Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20544 February 22, 2008

Re: Report on Broadcast Localism and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 04-233

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to you in opposition to the recently released *Report on Broadcast Localism*. As both a veteran of the civil rights movement and a current broadcaster for KFI in Los Angeles, I am concerned about the ability of the regulations implied in the report will turn back the clock on broadcast diversity.

Instead of fostering more responsive local programming, the suppositions of this report would essentially foster the reinstatement of the Fairness Doctrine. Struck down by the FCC in 1987, this removal of content-monitoring regulation allowed for an explosion in the talk radio business of which I am a part. In 1980, there were a mere 75 "talk radio" format stations nationwide. Today, there are approximately 1,800. By imposing new standards, owners who fear reprisals that could put them out of business will become averse to the free-form talk format that made the business so popular.

In our hyper-sensitive modern society, the fear of complaints relating to gender, religion, sexuality and politics will undoubtedly lead to a decrease in the breadth of the talk radio format and chill broadcast freedom in all regulated venues.

In a society with a 24-hour news cycle fed by radio, television, newspapers and the Internet — among other things — there is no lack of outlets for information. To impose fresh regulation on broadcasters now is both unnecessary and dangerous to the rights and liberties of broadcaster and the general public.

x / V

National Advisory Council



Office of the Commissioners Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20544 February 22, 2008

Re: Report on Broadcast Localism and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 04-233

Dear Commissioners:

I am an Internet broadcaster. It is my passion to disseminate my views out to the American people and the world through video and print postings to my own web site and those of like-minded organizations. My ability to get my views across in this manner is reason enough for commissioners to cease any thoughts about renewing restrictions on content in the realm of broadcast media.

Your recent report on localism, I believe, would be a backdoor imposition of many of the content restrictions associated with the highly unpopular and rightly abandoned Fairness Doctrine. While these rules would not adhere to my work, I have been a guest of "old school" broadcasters and do not want them to feel in any way limited in what they can speak about and highlight because they are afraid of government-imposed punishment. To set up rules allegedly linked to local needs would do exactly that. It would return broadcasting into the sleepy medium it was over a generation ago when broadcasters avoided controversy to the degree that vibrant and engaging talk radio and political commentary was a rarity.

If I were a cynical person, I'd support these proposals because it would drive interest toward me from those starved for unadulterated and unfettered commentary. However, I am also a great fan of the free market — both of economics and ideas. As a patriot, I would not want to see any American deprived of their right to free speech. That is why I oppose this rulemaking.

Sincerely,

Bob Parks

National Advisory Council