

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.

I agree wholeheartedly in the theory of "survival of the fittest" in the market and otherwise. However, it is morally wrong to allow a few mega media conglomerates to change the laws of this country for their benefit, in this case and otherwise.

In this scenario, the few would eventually be able to control 100% of the market- stamping out (by making illegal) any alternative.

I would not be pleased to pay 85\$ a month, for 150+ channels (as I do currently) and only have the choice between Disney Channel #1-4, or the Happy Consumer News channel, where I would listen to self-censoring journalists spew corporate, military and government propaganda.

Oh wait! I guess I already am paying 85\$ per month for this pleasure... I forgot.

However, the internet should damn well be left alone in this regard.

Another frightening thought is that an independant journalist (not working for mega media) could be persecuted under the Patriot Act, for merely offering an alternative news source.

If this is to be, let's drop the Orwellian label and just call ourselves the United Corporations of America, a totalitarian country, where every MegaCorp has its vote counted.

I suppose that might be too much to ask.