The National Association of Broadcasters has submitted a single 120 page document in apparent attempt to answer the over one thousand individual voices which over the past weeks and months have decried the arrogant attempt on the part of broadcasters to create a de facto monopoly and eliminate both smaller voices and diversity of programming. The document is so transparent up and self-serving as to be rejected on the face of it, but there are a number of statements in the document that cry out to be refuted.

Statement:
The Commission Has A Clear Duty To Reevaluate The Broadcast Ownership Rules To Ensure They Still Serve The Public Interest In Today's Competitive Media Marketplace.
Response:
The duty of the commission is to evaluate their rules in the light of whether or not the public is being served. All businesses are competitive. That is the problem of people in business. It is the duty of the commission to stand up for people who have no one else to defend them. This is certainly not the case of broadcasters, as is witnessed by the document submitted by the NAB.

Statement:
The Diversity, as well as the Economic, Benefits of Consolidation Have Long Been Recognized by the Commission and Other Commentators.
Response:
Economic benefits to whom? Surely not the people who are the audiences of these media. I do a lot of reading, and have found no one who agrees with this statement who does not get a paycheck from a media conglomerate. Are the broadcasters claiming they are not making a profit? How much is enough? What are they doing to earn the money they are making? Are they serving the public? How do the individual incomes of the management of the National association of broadcasters compare to the income of common people they claim to serve?

Statement:
A Case-by-Case Approach Is Practically Untenable.
Response:
Funniest thing. Most of us have to do stuff that is very difficult every day.
We call it a job. We do it to pay the bills. Get over it.

Statement:
Today's Local Media Markets Clearly Offer Diverse Programming to Consumers
Response:
Interesting point of view. You obviously don't live in Detroit, the town where I live, where we lost a classical radio station and there is now one TV station that just decided they weren't going to be doing news at all anymore. Seems it was just too much trouble. That's REALLY diverse.
(Oh, by the way, Jerry Springer and Howard Stern are both doing FINE, thank you very much, but you must know that. THEY'RE EVERYWHERE.) I can't get local News, but I can watch Howard Stern Ogle women's breasts EVERY DAY.

Statement:
Increasing Substitutability among Media Outlets Should Further Allay Diversity-Related Concerns.
Response:
Substitutability? WHATEVER that means in English, I know thousands of people in Detroit who haven't had any concrete reason to have their "concerns allayed."

Statement:
The Commission Has No Legal or Policy Basis for Cutting Back on the Levels of Local Radio Consolidation Permitted by Congress.
Response:
If that's true, we need to be fixing that in Congress, but the basis for the cutting back for the present is merely the rights of the American people to control the airwaves that they (NOT the broadcasters,) own.

PLEASE look past the cynical double talk of the NAB's document of January 2, 2003.

Davis Gloff
76 Amherst
Pleasant Ridge MI, 48069-1206
davisgloff@hotmail.com
http://www.gloff.net