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.

Have you heard of "synergy," Mr. Powell? Synergy is the corporate media strategy intending to streamline the vast number of media holdings across an entire media conglomerate. Synergy is an interview on Nightline with the pets.com sock puppet passing for journalism. (I'll leave research on the sock puppet's pedigree up to you.) Synergy is content sharing and cross-ownership among news media. Synergy is cross-promotion, and democratic diversity is the sacrifice. MORE channels, as you put it, does not diversity make, especially when each channel obediently, synergistically sets out to promote other profitable interests of its parent company. Democracy is largely communicated through media, print and broadcast. Your efforts to concentrate the number of media owners is a pointed and deliberate attempt to privilege profit over public interest. How can you dare argue that loosening restrictions invigorates competition considering the number of media mergers, acquisitions and ! buy-outs directly resulting from the 1996 Telecommunications Act? You argue to overhaul ownership caps simply because they are old. The Constitution is pretty damn old. Shall we throwm that out as well? The American people are not as stupid as you and your friends in the government think.