

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.

I'll add my own personal comments as well.

It is well known that Sinclair is owned and managed by people with a far right-wing ideology. They are taking full advantage of the fact that they own 62 television stations to push forward their own far-right point of view without also airing the opposing point of view on an equal terms. In fact, they are not giving any air time at all to the opposition. It is my understanding that this is a blatant violation FCC rules, is it not? I agree with the canned statement above, this is exactly the kind of thing that all of us feared would happen with the elimination of the ownership limits. This is media consolidation at work. This is not good for anybody. Certainly not good for our nation as a whole.

Please, please, get on Sinclair's behinds and remind them that they still operate under the public airwaves charter and are required to give equal airtime to both sides of a presidential election. Heck, if they are going to air "Stolen Honor," a clearly biased, one-sided attack on John Kerry, why not require them to also air "Fahrenheit 911," an equally biased, one-sided attack on President Bush? Seems only fair to me.