I am very concerned about Sinclair Broadcasting's decision forceing their stations to broadcast an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election. This is an example of the dangers of of what can happen with media consolidation, effectively creating a monopoly forcing one side or issue on viewers. Yes, I realize viewers have other channel choices, but the power of abuse is nevertheless the same.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. This does not serve the public interest but does allow one-sided vitriol to prevail. (In contrast, PBS recently aired on Frontline, a program about Bush and Kerry juxtaposing them at various stages in their careers, without comment. This does serve the public interest because it allows thinking Americans to gain non-biased information and form their own conclusions.)

When large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what they believe will be good for their coffers and less of what we need for our democracy. We need balanced information, facts we can use locally and nationally to be able to exercise our vote intelligently, not by being muddied up by emotionalism.

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 just a returned postcard. Thank you.