Dear FCC Commissioners:

I'm going to tell you something that you already know, that the way ownership of broadcast licenses is structured determines the content, since licensees are free to make editorial decisions about their programming, and they will make them according to their interests and opinions. Freedom of speech and press are good thing, but the structure of media ownership, and the increasing consolidation that has been allowed, even pushed by the FCC, are not. It has resulted in a legal right of press freedom that cannot be exercised in fact. "Freedom" has become censorship. The issue is not regulation versus deregulation, but in whose interest regulation (the government's power to allocate licenses) occurs.

Everything about the rules of licensure virtually guarantees that the broadcast media will be dominated by the agenda of big business, because you have created a system that insures that they will overwhelmingly be the license holders. Because of this, tens of millions of us have been robbed of the right to meaningfully enter the public debate in the broadcast media, if our vision for America contradicts the agenda of entrenched business interests. We have been relegated to the Internet, and our freedom to speak there is now being attacked by bandwidth providers who are seeking the right to control the content there, as well.

The corporations you have licensed to broadcast have a variety of other interests, such as armaments manufacture, oil, and banking. Commentators with views that these business interests find threatening are not allowed a platform, in spite of the millions of us who share, or would like to hear, these views given equal time. Studies of experts and advocates on news programs conducted by Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR) have proven the overwhelming, pro-corporate, pro-war, pro-nuclear, pro-WTO, pro-Republican bias there.

The tiny non-commercial band is disproportionately dominated by religious broadcasters from the Christian Right, far in excess of their presence in our population but in proportion to their financial resources. I'm sick of turning on the radio and not

finding the important issues I care about given extensive and serious consideration. I stopped watching TV years ago.

The media corporations' claims that they are merely responding to "market forces" and "giving people what they want" are inaccurate. That is like saying that a prison cafeteria gives the inmates what they want, just because they eat what's served rather than not at all. Those licensees' goals are to derive profits through advertising revenues. Guess what? I have no interest in seeing or hearing advertising messages. In fact, I pay to support non-commercial radio stations that I must access over the Internet, because they are so few and far between, just to hear programming I find useful.

Though it is beyond the scope of this comment period, the decision to allocate the public airwaves overwhelmingly to commercial broadcasting was a big mistake that was made years ago. The media corporations complain that they need consolidation in order to exercise economies of scale for profitability. I don't care about their profitability. I really resent that the FCC, and the government, have placed their profitability over our right to speak, and hear and see democratic debate and ideological diversity.

As you know from the public response in favor of LPFM, there are tens of thousands of people who want to broadcast, and who could broadcast, on a shoestring and are motivated by civic goals, not profitability. Technological advances have made it possible to create radio and TV programming on a home computer, but programming is useless if it can't reach out to an audience. This country is in crisis and people with real solutions are not allowed to address a mass audience. De-facto media censorship caused by license allocation policies is a major contributor to our inability to effectively address local, national and international problems, because the same people that own the media licenses have created the problems.

Your system of allocating licenses is one long conflict of interest. Not only must further consolidation not be permitted, it must be rolled back. I propose:

1) No corporation holding a broadcast license may have interests in any other business.
2) No licensee may have more than one radio or TV license in any market.
3) No licensee may have more than 10 broadcast licenses total.
4) Fifty percent of licensees in any market must be locally owned.
5) Not for profit broadcasters shall have preference for license throughout the whole band, and to prevent these from being gobbled by up cash-rich church groups, the FCC shall have a process allowing people in a community to challenge license allocation, to allow a level-playing field for other groups and individuals.

I would expect the broadcast industry to retort that rules such as those I've proposed above would lead to loss of jobs. The fact is that the consolidation that the FCC and Congress have enacted has already decimated jobs in broadcasting. Clear Channels' 1200 plus radio stations are mostly operated by remote control, as Commissioner Adelstein and the residents of Minot, ND are tragically aware. More local owners would result in an increase in jobs, even if the owners were the only ones working there. More importantly, they would result in frequencies being licensed to people who give a damn that there is a local emergency that needs its broadcast outlets to serve the people in their time of need with very site specific, lifesaving information.

BBC viewers in UK were able to turn on their televisions and see an interesting documentary series, "The Century of Self" about the history of the public relations industry in America, and how business leaders and the politicians they supported decided that the American people could not be trusted with democracy, and must be directed toward mindless consumerism. It told how psychologists were employed to develop advertising and PR campaigns to equate products with happiness, and to market consumer choice as freedom. Though this documentary was mostly about America, it was not seen here except in a few independent movie theaters, and can now be viewed on the Internet. It wasn't on any American television screens. No, we get "video news releases" from the PR industry in the service of business interests instead, and news reports that might as well be video news releases even when they aren't. No wonder media

conglomerates are pushing to eliminate both Net neutrality and public access on cable; propaganda must be total so that ignorance can be universal. Shut up and shop! Too broke to shop? You don't matter!

Striking teachers and their supporters in Oaxaca, Mexico recently seized a dozen radio stations in order to tell the truth about their corrupt government. Is that what we have to do to tell the truth about ours? I'm not so naïve to believe that my little letter could change the views of Chairman Martin and his allies; they know whom they work for. I just wanted you to know that I know, too. And that I don't care about Janet Jackson's nipple or four-letter words; the obscenity in media is in its transmission of unchallenged lies and unreported truths.

Sincerely,

Lyn Gerry
Watkins Glen, NY