

(this is a continuation of my comments from my previous letter, which was accidentally sent before I finished it)

We have two other newspapers in town, one a daily that is run with a decided conservative slant, and the other a weekly that, while it poses as an "alternative" newspaper, is edited by an admitted and unrepentant Republican, and, like the Tennessean, it is owned out of town--by Rupert Murdoch, I think. I may be wrong about that. But when that paper was independent, it used to publish "the ten most censored stories of the year" every year when it came out, and it doesn't do that any more. Then ten most censored stories are censored here.

The closest thing we have to a left-wing, radical, countercultural, whatever you want to call it newspaper in this town is an Independent Media website, and from what I hear of changes coming to the internet, the same kind of consolidation that Clear Channel seeks is already coming to the internet, which will make it harder to use as an alternative, popular, low-cost communications medium. That, however, is outside the scope of this hearing.

I have not commented on the television stations in this town because I do not own a television and rarely watch it. When I do watch it, I soon become aware that I have better things to do.

So, as I think you can tell, I am firmly against loosening the rules about media ownership. In fact, I think media outlets should be locally owned, and would like to suggest terminating the charters of all non-local media companies on the grounds that they have violated the public trust and acted against the public interest.

thank you very much