Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

Frankly a move like this on Sinclair's part shows the dangers to us in allowing the concentration of medial ownership. If Sinclair was one station in one market their decisions would not have a nationwide effect. As presently configured one decision is being made for a great many markets by one entitly. With power comes responsibility, and as Sinclair uses the public airwaves, which are a limited resource, for free, and since you are charged with supervising airwaves users, I am appealing to you to prevent their misuse of the airways in this instance; and then in the longer run to do something to break up the larger airwave media holdings
such as Sinclair and Clear Channel.

Thank you,