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.

Additionally I would like to point out how much more offensive I feel this is than the fiasco over Janet Jacksons breast or Howard Sterns radio indecency. Using media ownership and public airwaves to push a piece of political propoganda immediately before elections is repulsive, inappropriate and highly offensive. It

is also a mockery of campaign finance rules, since the airtime used would sell for enormous sums which many nations could not afford. Thank you.