

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** William Dols <gpere@aol.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Thu, Dec 28, 2000 4:46 PM  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Tristani's Homepage

William Dols (gpere@aol.com) writes:

I am 73 years old and a small shareholder of AOL stock. I am puzzled by the delay of you and your fellow commissioners in okaying the merger, after almost a year of analysis. It is one of the few hopes for the economy

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 152.163.197.208  
Remote IP address: 152.163.197.208

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <BHarr31313@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Thu, Dec 28, 2000 5:08 PM  
**Subject:** aol/timewarner approval

please approve the merger between above before year end, as it will be dramatic cost savings to both parties.

FTC has approved.....nothing to be gained by postponing approval, except showing your agency power.

there are millions of dollars being lost in 401k's, as most portfolio's hold aol.....

thank you very much for you very urgent attention to this matter!

bill harrison

**CC:** <BHarr31313@aol.com>

**RECEIVED**  
JAN - 8 2001  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <BIJOM@aol.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <bkennard@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Thu, Dec 28, 2000 5:14 PM  
**Subject:** AOL/TWX Merger

FCC Commissioners,

The constantly escalating conditions being placed on the America Online/TimeWarner merger are at best attacking a problem that doesn't exist and at worst are bordering on the extortionate -- especially where Instant Messaging software is concerned.

Neither company on its own represents anything near a monopoly in the Internet distribution or content arena. Their combination would do nothing to threaten the competitive landscape; for all anyone knows, this merger could be another Daimler-Chrysler combination where the possible synergies are less than they initially appeared.

More importantly, if Instant messaging is THE sticking point as far as the FCC is concerned and as reported by the press, then related objections to the merger are even more misguided. IM is a technology that a private network like AOL has every right to shield from non-AOL subscribers, who have access to comparable messaging services from MSN and others. Those competing services are, in fact, gaining instant messaging subscribers at a rapid rate. To treat AOL's version of this technology as if it were the cure for cancer is ludicrous and reveals the FCC's failure to understand the marketplace and the rapid evolution of technology.

The Internet is as open as it has to be through open email standards and the efforts of organizations such as the World Wide Web Consortium. There is clearly room for more private communications technology innovations such as IM that will invariably come in a variety of flavors, don't threaten Internet access, and which are not necessarily compatible.

Nor do ALL competing instant messaging offerings have to be completely open to everyone.

We do, after all, have virtual private networks (VPNs) with security features that are implemented over the Internet and used by industry to protect the privacy of transmitted business information and to help maintain competitive advantages. AOL's ICQ and IM are merely the non-business analogs to that; they provide a service differentiator that the company has paid mightily to establish. To expect AOL to open those services to rivals without adequate compensation is nothing short of confiscatory when it comes to private intellectual property and establishes a harmful precedent.

I would strongly urge the FCC to drop what I can only describe as a wrong-headed shakedown of what are, given their joint history, two non-predatory companies (certainly compared to Microsoft) and approve the AOL/Time-Warner merger immediately.

Respectfully,  
William Manning  
Boston, MA

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

617 569 3233

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <PFanc14235@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Thu, Dec 28, 2000 10:16 PM  
**Subject:** AOL DECISION TIME

Honorable Commissioners:

In good faith and hope for a first rate company, I invested in AOL because of their foresight in trying to combine their technology with content rich Time-Warner. This, in my estimation, should be good for everyone.

My understanding is that, even after 11 months, some of you still are troubled by AOL's Instant Messaging system and other proprietary innovations.

The last time I looked this is the USA, where our history is founded on invention and innovation. Does this not still exist? IM's are valuable to the company...BUT THEY INVENTED THEM. As a business woman, I find it reprehensible that I would not feel safe in doing anything innovative or proprietary. Don't be a party to belittling and stifling companies yet to come.

Respectfully,

Susanna Fordson  
Norman, OK 73034

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ORIGINAL

**From:** <Grecer@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 9:08 AM  
**Subject:** Aol's monopoly on Instant Messaging

Letting Aol have a monopoly on Instant Messaging makes about as much sense as bring ATT back and giving them a monopoly on local telephone service!!!!

RECEIVED

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** "Patel, Piyush (CORP, GEIC)" <Piyush.Patel@corporate.ge.com>  
**To:** "bkennard@fcc.gov" <bkennard@fcc.gov>, "sness@fcc.gov" <sness@fcc.gov>, "hfurchtg@fcc.gov" <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, "mpowell@fcc.gov" <mpowell@fcc.gov>, "gtristan@fcc.gov" <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 9:56 AM  
**Subject:** AOL Merger

Respected Sir.

I would like to complain about the merger that you are dragging it more than it should be. I have invested in this company before few years and because of this drag this stock has fallen to its bottom. Please try to finish the merger as soon as possible. Also because of this delay it will cost lot of money to the company because of which stock will fall more and more people will loose there hard worked money. I would suggest to ok the merger as soon as possible and finish it up. Its almost a year.

Thank You for your cooperation

Piyush Patel

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ORIGINAL

**From:** Tim Daly <tjdaly@itn-tv.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 10:21 AM  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Tristani's Homepage

Tim Daly (tjdaly@itn-tv.com) writes:

If you regulate AOL-TW instant messaging, please be fair and make sure that all of my windows applications are compatible with UNIX and Linux. I find the competitors of AOL and TW are complete hypocrites in asking the FCC to regulate these matters.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 207.204.185.76  
Remote IP address: 207.204.185.76

RECEIVED

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <Glen.Silverman@nstarch.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 10:22 AM  
**Subject:** Resend : AOL/TimeWarner... prior email interrupted during send; disregardit

Resend: Earlier email

Thank you for providing me this opportunity to share a concern....  
I'll try to come to my point as quickly as possible...

In truth, I am an AOL shareholder; Also a Juno shareholder; Also a  
shareholder  
of ExciteAhome, and Prodigy.....

I am also a longtime subscriber to Prodigy.... i think 7 years...

My concern centers moreso with AOL (less so with Time...) and their  
current practice of  
sending AOL setup CDs in the mail with regularity accompanied with  
offers  
of free internet use if i become a subscriber... Probably no-big-deal  
til'  
recently.. To this point i've resisted.. Til now i felt no  
temptation... But now...

AOL has raised the ante... In this recent mailing, an install CD  
offering 800 free hours of  
internet use if i become a subscriber.. EIGHT HUNDRED free hours if  
i subscribe..  
Nearly impossible to refuse.....

Entirely too tempting.... I love Prodigy... But how do I or any other  
Prodigy, Juno, or  
Excite subscriber say no to this offer.... I feel loyal to Prodigy...  
Service is good.... Access  
is good... I'm happy with them... But...

This brings me to my point.... I think this is an unfair practice...  
How do these 2nd and  
third tier ISPs endure this onslaught. If i am tempted, everyone will  
be tempted....  
AOL perhaps can afford to do this... These other guys cant.... How in  
reasons-name do these  
guys compete with AOL .... I receive their offerings too too often...

I would ask you to consider, if reasonable, some merger pre-condition to  
prevent, or limit this  
practice going forward.... I fear however, damage to these other  
companies has already been  
exactd, vis-a-vis, had the desired effect.... Unsure if this can be  
undone or mitigated to some  
extent....

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ORIGINAL

In the spirit of trying my best to be objective about this, i thought i  
I would just go ahead  
and pass you the baton.

This 800 lb gorilla is offering 800 free hours.... With a zeal to be  
number one, you expect professional  
football teams to maintain a killer instinct the entire game... All 4  
quarters.... When the game ends everyone  
regains civility.... In this particular business the game seems  
neverending, i fear, til only one player  
remains standing.

I believe AOL is not ill-intended.... They simply play hard... I  
respect that.... But every once in a while  
there are offsides; unintentional holding; intentional grounding... As  
the officials, you guys are the only  
ones that can throw the flag...

Will AOL know they've stepped over the line. Are there guidelines.. AOL  
stands alone head and shoulders  
above their nearest competition. When is enough, enough... Are there  
other tier one ISPs? Can there ever be?  
Has AOL gone too far...

This i think is why you guys exist. Why the DOJ exists.... Your charters  
similar on these matters as challenging  
as they must be, require you to maintain a level playing field to the  
best of your ability... I wish you well.

My Sincerest Regards...  
Respectfully  
Glen Silverman

**IMPORTANT NOTICE:**

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged, and is for the  
intended recipient only. Access, disclosure, copying, distribution, or  
reliance on any of it by anyone else is prohibited and may be a criminal  
offence. Please delete if obtained in error and email confirmation to the  
sender.

CC: <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>

ORIGINAL

**From:** Jim Dalzell <jimmydalzell@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 10:33 AM  
**Subject:** Aol-Twx merger

Please let the market work without any constraints  
from the government.

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Photos - Share your holiday photos online!  
<http://photos.yahoo.com/>

RECEIVED

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <TKDPGS@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 10:56 AM  
**Subject:** re:AOL

Dear Commissioners:

There are 3 million stockholders of AOL and untold numbers of Time-Warner stockholders in addition to people who work for these companies who are awaiting a FAIR decision on the merger. It has been approved in Europe and by the FTC and yet it would seem that the special competitive interests of Microsoft, AT & T, and Disney outrank anyone. Gates, who once said to AOL, "I will buy you or I will bury you", doesn't seem to have to do it at all when he has you people to do it for him.

I am an AOL subscriber as well who pays for the right to use the service and I didn't pay to be subjected to access by Microsoft or anyone else through the IM system. I do not understand why the merger of two different companies (unlike ExxonMobile and many others that could be named) requires so many hoops to be jumped through which punish and diminish the value of the company to the benefit of their competitors. It sounds like the inmates run the asylum from where I and over 3 million other people see it. Get it together... As far as a partisan issue, I'm a democrat and I really disgusted with the anti-business sentiment that is going on up there. Thank you for your time. You've had plenty of time yourselves to deal with this issue, pass it and stop allowing the big monied, special interests of the competitors decide this for you. They are not objective and are extremely competitive and their howling is designed for their benefit alone, not to even the playing field.

I can be civil and yet be angry at the way this whole mess has been mishandled. Do the right thing and approve this deal before you mess it up and its shareholders and its employees and the business itself irrevocably.

Sincerely,

Paula Stafford

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Darin Boville <darinb@aol.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 10:58 AM  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Tristani's Homepage

Darin Boville (darinb@aol.com) writes:

Can AOL censor its message boards? Does this impact the upcoming decision on the merger? I am part of an online community of fine art photographers on one of AOL's boards and they've decided to move us to a "hobby" area and are now enforcing strict "on topic" rules. Problem is, their idea of what is "on topic" is extremely narrow--more to do with f/stops and camera brands than the creative process. They are destroying the community that we have developed and which has received important outside recognition (e.g. we were written up in the Wall Street Journal). What can be done? I know that their board is "private property" but are they really free to do whatever they want? We've tried to contact the "censors" and Steve Case but no progress. All we get are statements of AOL policy and hints that if we don't start following their new rules that "further action" will be taken. I've been on AOL since the beginning in the late 1980's and I'm a stockholder! Who do I turn to?  
--Darin (darinb@aol.com)

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 129.6.206.108  
Remote IP address: 129.6.206.108

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Kim P. Kornegay <Skibums808@aol.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 11:15 AM  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Tristani's Homepage

Kim P. Kornegay (Skibums808@aol.com) writes:

I think it is ridiculous that the FCC still has not approved the AOL/TWX merger. Moving this decision into 2001 causes further unnecessary delay and needless costs to both companies. It is very disturbing to me as a taxpaying citizen that my government is so inefficient. If I ran my business like this, I would be out of business.

Sincerely, Kim P. Kornegay, DMD.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 152.163.206.199  
Remote IP address: 152.163.206.199

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 8 2001**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Jürgen Dess <mail@jdess.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 12:27 PM  
**Subject:** Vote on AOL

Dear Sir,

I am an investor in AOL and I can not understand, why the FCC is not able to vote on this merger. You have had almost a year to make up your mind. This is unbelievable for me.

Best Regards  
Jürgen Dess

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ORIGINAL

**From:** <RonEKeary@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 1:02 PM  
**Subject:** Please Approve the AOL Time Warner Merger

Dear Mr. Kennard,

Please approve the AOL Time Warner merger with no further stipulations. The pressure from other companies to open up AOL's instant messenger is unwarranted. The fact is, ICQ which was not always owned by AOL was able to grow and flourish in spite of competition from AOL's instant messenger. If these other companies come up with some dynamic ideas, their own products could also prosper. This is America and we shouldn't punish companies for being successful. Having the freedom to achieve success with innovative ideas is what this country is all about.

Thanks in advance,  
Ronald E. Keary

**CC:** <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>

RECEIVED

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**From:** <Sismjm@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 2:29 PM  
**Subject:** AOL

ORIGINAL

Please approve the AOL-TWX immediately, its the right thing to do.

RECEIVED

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** auplater <auplater@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 3:32 PM  
**Subject:** America Online - Time Warner Impasse

You folks need to move past all of the rhetoric and lobbying efforts, leave the Beltway for awhile, and approve this merger without further contests.

Your lack of progress on this is affecting the whole economy, as you seem to be taking a Luddite approach to progress and enhanced service to the information world. If you are so concerned about monopolistic policies, why not address the Health Care Financing Administrations stranglehold on free enterprise in the health profession? Quit being part of this problem, rather than part of the solution. If free enterprise is in jeopardy in one segment of the country, why doesn't the same argument apply to, for instance, health care.

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <TKDPGS@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 3:53 PM  
**Subject:** FTC & FCC running businesses now

Dear Commissioners:

It would seem the FTC has set a precedence for overseeing and running private businesses now. This is wrong policy and wrong for the FCC to continue in the spirit of the FTC. If you folks in government wanted to run a business, you should have started one on your own not take over an existing one like AOL and run it into the ground with mindless hoops to jump through. By the way, no one believes you are rolling over to AOL/Time Warner by any means, the perception is that you are pandering to Microsoft, Disney and AT & T at AOL's expense. It is a shameful way to handle free enterprise and an abuse of power. Sincerely,

Paula Stafford

Business Week: January 8, 2001  
 News: Analysis & Commentary

Commentary: Who Will Watch AOL's Watchdog?  
 The FTC trustee will have fingers in every pie

The Federal Trade Commission may have approved the blockbuster merger of new- and old-media giants America Online Inc. and Time Warner Inc. last month, but behind the scenes the commissioners clearly had their doubts. Historically, they have often O.K.'d such megadeals, but require that overlapping businesses be sold off. In this case, no divestiture made sense, so their only choice--short of blocking the deal outright in court--was to impose a set of requirements that comes uncomfortably close to direct regulation of the company. "There's an awful lot of policing in this document," says Commissioner Moselle Thompson. "And we don't normally do that." Indeed, this month the FTC will take the rare step of appointing a "monitor trustee" to oversee the company for the next five years. The trustee's mission: to ensure that AOL Time Warner's cable network and interactive television services allow competition. To enforce that, the new AOL czar will have carte blanche to hire as many "consultants, accountants, attorneys, and other representatives...as are reasonably necessary"--all on AOL Time Warner's tab.

TOO MUCH POWER? The unprecedented arrangement is meant to ensure that the combined company doesn't get too dominant, but it carries with it plenty of risk. The biggest: that an all-powerful bureaucrat will stymie AOL Time Warner's business.

Much of the policing will deal with the nitty-gritty of ensuring "open access" to the company's cable wires. Basically, it's meant to give competing Internet service providers the same access that AOL and Time Warner's cable operation Road Runner has. The problem? There are currently thousands of ISPs, many of which would like to be part of AOL Time Warner's high-speed Internet network. Each time the company wants to turn one down, the monitor

trustee will have to determine whether it has a legitimate right to do so.

RECEIVED

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

Equally tricky decisions will be rendered on AOL Time Warner's interactive television service, which provides Internet access through a TV. The main fear is that the company will find a way to provide connections to Time Warner sites that are a little bit faster and more seamless than those to rival sites. Garnering more eyeballs, alone, is likely to let AOL increase advertising rates. But to discern and combat such shenanigans, the monitor trustee

will need a crash technical education to determine if the company is doing anything to "discriminate" against rival programming.

Meanwhile, the monitor trustee will have fingers in every aspect of the merged company. The trustee will be able to pore over arcane contract details to decide whether AOL Time Warner truly is negotiating with competitors in "good faith"--or when a decision not to grant access is justified for technical reasons. He'll even have to get involved in some pricing decisions. "It'll be like the song by Sting," says the FTC's Thompson: "Every breath you take, every move you make, I'll be watching you."

That's an awful lot of responsibility--one reason the FTC's trustbusting colleagues at the Justice Dept. considered creating a similar position in the Microsoft case, but rejected it as unwieldy. The closest comparison may well be Harold H. Greene, the federal judge who all but ran the telecommunications industry for 11 years following the breakup of AT&T Corp. in 1984. His interventionist approach--which was criticized at the time as cumbersome and bureaucratic--is now widely viewed as something to be avoided.

Still, the risks aren't all one way. Alternatively, the new czar could end up fairly impotent. Agencies such as the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Communications Commission have been accused of falling captive to their industries, in part because they spend all their time listening to the arguments of industry executives.

Most worrisome to some FTC watchers is that the appointment will create a precedent for monitoring emerging industries. In fact, Chairman Robert Pitofsky argues that complicated merger deals involving monitor trustees are a necessary evil of the New Economy. The reason: Thanks to proprietary technologies, such industries are more prone to monopoly and are harder to evaluate than traditional industries. That view may not carry much weight much longer, however. President-elect George W. Bush is expected to eventually appoint commissions less likely to favor such trustbusting oversight. The FTC's latest monitor trustee Business Week: January 8, 2001

News: Analysis & Commentary

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <Jblawrence2001@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>, <sness@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Dec 29, 2000 6:41 PM  
**Subject:** How Many FCC members does it take to...

Screw in a light bulb? Good question. Definitely the five commissioners we are presently so fortunate to have, could'nt do it! The FCC is quickly becoming the biggest laughing stock of all the government agencies. Including the postal service!

In the course of nearly an entire year, the commission has been unable to render a reasonable decision on the AOL/TWX merger. From looking at the commisssioners bio's, I know you all read above the 3rd grade level. So I can only conclude the FCC suffers from severe lazyness. If you can't or don't want to do your job, step aside and stop holding back hard working Americans and their ingenuity!

Sincerely,  
James Lawrence  
Duke class of '94

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** JALAL MERCHANT <JAL11111@aol.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Sat, Dec 30, 2000 5:09 AM  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Tristani's Homepage

JALAL MERCHANT (JAL11111@aol.com) writes:

Subj: FOR GOD SAKE ;PLEASE DO NOT DEALY AOL MERGER. To: FSS DIRECTORS. SOS URGENT.

Date: 12/28/00 11:58:50 PM Arabian Standard Time

From: JAL11111

To: fccinfo@fcc.gov

I am loosing my life time savings and daily this stock value is drifting. Please, DO NOT delay any further and the company will have to spend unnecessary money to transfer accounts from 2000 to 2001.

As it is everything is down, this is my only life saving money left. I have lost every thing in this crash. Please if you want them to marry then let them to do so at the right time. Generations to come will NOT FORGIVE you. Americans have great hope on you.

GOD BLESS YOU !!!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 152.163.207.181  
Remote IP address: 152.163.207.181

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 8 2001**

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <Coolboarder78806@aol.com>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Sat, Dec 30, 2000 8:16 PM  
**Subject:** aol merger

pls approve this merger at once. you have looked at this deal for 1 year..your delay has cost shareholders billions in lost marketcap. pls do what is right and lets get this done

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** <EAleccia@aol.com>  
**To:** <bkennard@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Sat, Dec 30, 2000 9:15 PM  
**Subject:** aol merger

dear mr.kennard,

please expedite review of the aol-time warner merger. this review has been ongoing since january 10,2000. it appears the fcc has a seperate agenda for delaying the merger of two vertical companies in two seperate industries. it also appears the fcc is merely placating to special interest groups and corporations with power ie: att & microsoft. moreover, the challenges to aol's instant messaging is without merit,offensive and outright shameful. this is america built on demoracy and capitolism. aol invented instant messanging yet they must open up there communications lines to allow access to others! aol does not derive an income from IM yet the fcc is attempting to regulate it. the ftc undertook a very thorough review of the merger securing substantial concessions from aol & time warner. the fcc should have been ready to vote on merger approval immediately thereafter. this undo delay reinforces the public sentiment that government should not interfere with american business. lastly, i am disappointed in your position regarding open access to cable lines. my recollection was you felt the fcc should not get involved (att buyout of media one). now suddenly all this scrutiny on aol & time warner. the only conclusion one can reach is that the review is purely political which is sad. i am an aol shareholder yet i am never surprised at the latest tactics utilized by both the ftc and fcc. i apologize if this e-mail offends you in any way. i am merely expressing my frustration over a process which lacks credibility and good faith. best wishes to you and your family in the new year. james p. aleccia@aol.com

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**CC:** <sness@fcc.gov>, <hfurchtg@fcc.gov>, <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <gtristan@fcc.gov>

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** FNicholas <faithann@bignet.net>  
**To:** <gtristan@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** Sun, Dec 31, 2000 11:36 AM  
**Subject:** Aol

Aol spent much time, money and effort to develop their instant messaging and now ATT, Microsoft, etc. come with their hands out whining that they want a share of it! Why didn't they invest the time and expense to develop their own systems and really promote them? It's not fair to work on something for your company and then have to give it away to companies that expect a free handout! You twiddled your thumbs for most of the year when you could have been working on this merger; you caused great expense and taxes on this merger because you stalled and wouldn't okay it before the end of the year. And the ones you hurt most of all are us, the small investors. Let the market take care of this item; let these lazy companies negotiate with AOL themselves and not get a free handout from you. LEAVE INSTANT MESSAGING ALONE!! Faith Nicholas, Michigan

**RECEIVED**

JAN - 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY