I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates. The cable ownership cap is a crucial element of our democratic media, and it should not be weakened.

By attempting to alter the horizontal ownership limit allowed cable operators, in favor of the corporations, to allow them more than a 30 percent share of nationwide cable, DBS and other MVPD subscribers is extremely dangerous. We, the citizens of the United States, have aready seen a software monopoly buy out the government after breaking the law. Any further inside deals with media corporations, and both the government and the mass media will warrant less respect and more skepticism from the public.

At a time of crisis, the dangers of such an overwhelming concentration in mass media and it's manipulation are more glaring than ever. The changes underway will make U.S. media even less diverse, more commercial and less accountable to the public. People are already tuning out by the masses. The proposed change will most likely accelerate that process no matter how much money is spent on bandwagon and glittering advertisement gimmics. TV will soon be on its last leg no matter how much doctoring is done. The same thing has happened to audio media already. No matter how many new gimmics they came up with for tape decks, CDs eventually replaced tapes. TV will soon be replaced and tampering with it's integrity any more than it has already been tampered with is not a sound strategic choice. Also, in many markets, newspapers have enough problems of their own without being stradled by the homogeny of television's content and creative management. A far greater amount of citizens will ! not be benefited by less account able and less diverse media, which in some cases in medium-size cities will be TOTAL MEDIA MONOPOLIES. For example, in Lexington, KY you have one major local newspaper and a handfull of local news stations. If a corporation were able to own both a TV station and a newspaper in Lexington, it would give entirely too much slant on the news heard in Lexington. In even smallers cities (which mke up the bulk of the nation), with only one of each, who will serve as the "media watchdog" when a corporation decides to blatantly disregard ethics and morality all together? The system of checks and balances was created for a reason. Just because somebody has alot of power and money does NOT mean that he or she is particularly trustable. The proposed changes would leave everything up to faith in the CORPORATIONS (soul-less imaginary "entities"). It would not be wise to change the old safe-guards. Thank you for your time.