

I am on the fence about voting for John Kerry, but feel that 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 to our democracy.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. I do not find airing a smear campaign of much benefit to viewers.

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.

Why doesn't Sinclair consider sponsoring and airing town hall meetings where the issues can be defined by the public? This is a much needed alternative to the usual way of doing business where a few powerful individuals narrowly define the scope of the discussion for the public.

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.