

Mr. Lamb -

Freedom of speech includes freedom to dissent or Consent - disagree or agree.
Are you concerned the "Crime Act" seems to have ignored that truth? Has the
"Crime Act" expanded the definition of terrorism to now include "political
dissent"? I agree with some radio people in Baltimore - that Act seems
to construct greatly freedoms of those who don't agree with those who passed it!
And those who sought it. (I suppose the NO votes on the "Crime Act" were
votes of "political dissent"? Will they be prosecuted? Please - let's debate
or discuss it before the 50,000 police hit the streets



Mr. Lamb

A Shekel Commentary ©1994
by

ALL RIGHTS
RESERVED

Because WNEP-TV, New York Times television here, showed some heavy handed management last Fall under Elden Hale, Junior, they need to be rebuked lest it be continued.

(Public criticism of media often diminishes their abuses of the public.)

Last Fall, in negotiations with Adams Cable, Carbondale, WNEP-TV revealed hypocrisy at the management level. They privately sought what they publicly faulted. That seems clearly...hypocrisy! In those negotiations, WNEP-TV asked to be the only provider of ABC-TV programming on the Adams lineup, talking "non-duplication" of ABC programs in making the request. Adams balked with excellent reason and severed Channel 16 from their lineup, a loss of 16,000 Adams subscribers. WNEP-TV faced a drop in audience ratings and a loss of advertising revenue. Hale took his problem with Adams public with a half page advertisement in the Sunday Times (Scranton). Hale erred badly! In the advertised message to Scranton Times readers, WNEP-TV addressed Adams Cable subscribers faulting Adams Cable for having a "monopoly," (the sole, the only, the exclusive cable company in an area largely rural.) But Channel 16, Big Media bullying Little Business, publicly faulted Adams for having a "monopoly" after asking Adams in private for "non-duplication" of ABC programming on the Adams lineup! Think of that: Elden Hale, Junior, general managing WNEP-TV, a division of the New York Times Company, privately sought what he publicly faulted. Hypocrisy! Hypocrisy at Channel 16! Channel 16 loves --- is my guess --- monopolies of sorts when they are the holders of them! WNEP-TV is the only, the sole, the exclusive provider of ABC-TV programming on Verto Cable TV in Scranton! WNEP-TV, 16, has the only, the sole, the exclusive live drawing of the prime time Pennsylvania Lottery drawing --- but they faulted Adams Cable, Carbondale, for having a "monopoly" in an area largely rural after asking for non-duplication! Big Business, Manhattan rooted, heavy handing Little Business, in Carbondale, Pa!

16 hypocrisy in the big yellow and black square! They claim to serve the community but frankly I think they shirk it...while vacuuming advertising money here for the New York Times Company, headquartered in Manhattan. (There's a lot of media here out-of-state owned sending money out of this area as trash rolls in from New York and New Jersey.) Out of state owners of media here don't fish our streams, hunt our forests, school their children here, shop our stores, eat in our restaurants, or church here --- unless they do so on visit. They don't see trash arrive here or money depart! It is a reasonable question, I believe: Does 16 serve or shirk us?

On my three visits to city councils in Scranton and Wilkes-Barre since last September, I haven't once seen Channel 16 present. Not once! Yet one night when they reported not a word about Scranton Council business, they did give time in their 11 PM news for a report about Michael Jackson on tour in Moscow, showing him in what many would agree was a vulgar demonstration by Jackson. (Some tuned in for Scranton Council news but were offended instead by Jackson promoted by Channel 16! They thought Jackson on tour was news and Scranton business something less!) 16 hypocrisy, claiming to serve, but I think they shirk us. Who will patronize the advertisers sponsoring 16 hypocrisy, WNEP-TV News, rooted with Arthur Sulzberger at the New York Times in Manhattan?

May I mention television editorials? There are certainly many subjects on which to present editorials that would be helpful to communities by promoting discussion about the problems in them. Some may wish to discuss the price of ice cream cones in a nation having 98 million cattle, or the \$4.35 minimum wage that makes it hard for some to buy them. Others may want to propose an end to out of state trash coming in, but students aware of left wing media policies may want to ask if our government and the television networks agree with Time magazine that New Hampshire people should be punished, their legislators voting rejection of the Dr. King holiday? (Punishment for voting, or did Time advise punishment because the vote was no? Voting is foundational to democracy, whether the vote yes or no. Time likes choosing on Dr. King questions but doesn't want Americans choosing. Hypocrites! Another Manhattan media outfit.)

Editorials. They give citizens small use of public airwaves but the broadcasters blocking that small use are censoring opinion in the community from challenging theirs --- and --- from reaching other citizens. That seems a blatant attempt by that media to subjugate public opinion unto theirs. Goebbels and Mussolini did so! Both of them came to an end!

- OVER -

Mr Lamb - Is the television industry attempting to choose and control community concerns when it blocks viewer editorials - even on such problems as the minimum wage?

Punishment for voting NO Dr. King holiday? That sounds like radical, left wing, far out Manhattan media opinion. We have constitutional reason to expect government officials oathed to support, oathed to defend our constitution, to sharply rebuke those attacking it. If they don't, we have to consider the possibility our government considers Dr. King greater than our constitution and want us following a dream. (Has the left wing media sacrificed our right to know on an altar to Dr. King?)

What is the thinking, the opinion of New York Times television here, WNEP-TV on that question? Please ask them. Do they believe New Hampshire people should be punished because the Dr. King holiday was there rejected --- or do they think that bold attack on our constitutional right to vote --- free from the threat of punishment --- should be swept under a rug? That would be censorship. Let's discuss it instead and avoid enslavement to big left wing media who want us admiring him because they do!

The leadership of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Scranton has heavy handed laity with a big assist from New York Times television, WNEP-TV. That must be reported to prevent it repeated.

Soon after New York Times television here, WNEP-TV, televised the first of ABC-TV's NYPD Blue, people appeared outside the television station protesting the program's content. A letter appeared in "The Metro" sharply critical of WNEP-TV General Manager Elden Hale for allowing the program's telecast, the letter signed by "Theresa Sandrowicz, Citizens Against Offensive Programming." An advertisement appeared in a prominent Scranton paper soliciting protest of the program and the sponsors of it! Mrs. Sandrowicz told me she went to the Chancery building to seek help from Diocese officials in her protest of the program. She told me they did not respond, but said she received some support from within the congregation she attends. (I scanned the first two editions of "The Catholic Light" paper after the first NYPD Blue program was shown and saw no criticism of it; no appeal to help muster a protest of it.)

Soon after the advertisement was published asking a protest of the program's sponsors, disaster occurred. A Diocese of Scranton commercial, the "Bishop's Annual Appeal," was televised within an NYPD Blue program. Some Roman Catholic laity were trying to protest the program's sponsors but soon after they began --- the Diocese became one! That is what I describe as leadership heavy handing laity. I believe that to constitute callous disregard of laity that was demonstrating sincere and needed opposition to a program so very offensive in its launching that 57 ABC-TV stations refused to televise it, Broadcasting and Cable reporting a KOVR-TV poll following the first one disclosing 44% of those who saw it "felt it should not be shown," (Broadcasting and Cable, September 27, 1993). KOVR-TV is in Sacramento. I address Elden Hale, Junior, then General Manager of New York Times television, WNEP-TV: Your indiscreet role in that matter --- allowing Diocese officials to advertise within, to be a sponsor of a program controversial to millions, offensive to many, and angering to still others including some in the television industry --- discloses something very insensitive about New York Times television, WNEP-TV. Using the public airwaves and operating on a government license, they were a part, a major factor as Roman Catholic leadership here heavy handed laity. Channel 16 has repeatedly given us reason to ask, do they serve --- or shirk us?

Would we be better off if Channel 16 were locally owned? How can Fox 38 carry WNEP-TV news knowing these things? And how can WVIA-TV, channel 44, allow Mr. Hale to hold there a position on a WVIA-TV Board of Directors? I urge that board with this commentary, remove Mr. Hale from that Board or be associated with his performance at New York Times television, WNEP-TV: He privately sought what he publicly faulted. WVIA-TV, Public Television, has enough problems without retaining him. Moreover, there are some in Northeast Pennsylvania who would like that Board position and from it, challenge Public TV here --- compete, compete, compete against the commercial stations here so extensively out of state influenced!

TV Guile!

How does one describe what one sees, hears, and suffers when turning on television and someone showing what seems some insanity is talking about stopping it? A hard right to the head from Evander Holyfield would probably hurt you less!

If the television industry would take individual letters of protest and criticism seriously, commentary such as this would not need to be public. But, because too many in television have pigeon-holed complaints, I urge people agreeing with this commentary to share it with others and seek changes of attitudes by those in the television industry.

April 24, 1994

Scranton, Pa.