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.

Diversity in media should never be measured in terms of commercial competitiveness, but rather in terms of how well outlets serve the diverse economic, ethnic and social strata of a community.

Locally owned radio and TV stations always server a community better than networked or nationally syndicated programming. National programming can never fine tune itself to the specific needs of widely varied communities.

Broadcast TV, far from having become marginalized by the availability of other outlets, still carries tremendous power to influence citizens. To claim that such supposed diminishment of broadcast TV justifies cross-ownership is absurd, and a deliberate manipulation.

To claim, as the FCC has, that ownership limits may no longer be necessary to promote diversity of expression in the media is simply without factual basis. Media as it now exists is already mind-numbingly homogenous, and this can only increase through further consolidation of media ownership.

Consolidation of ownership has severely reduced the quality of local, national and international reporting. When a huge corporation owns a media outlet, it's tendency is to give news viewpoints and slantings that favor the agenda of that corporation. Such concentrated media outlets have shown little capability to server in a "watchdog" function over private and public interests.

If the so-called explosion in outlets, as Michael Powell would have it, has brought about an increase in media owned or controlled by persons of color and women, then that certainly is not evident to me. Even if that is the case, those women and persons of color are clearly not creating programming germaine to those same groups.

I see absolutely no evidence that cable TV has created any increase in program diversity. To the contrary, it is astounding how so many stations can have so little variation in programming between one another.

Contrary to the suggestion of the FCC, commonly owned media certainly do not have "stronger incentives to provide diverse formats, programs, and content". This is window dressing that has no basis in either fact or experience.

It is hard to fathom how the FCC could claim that there is an "ever increasing number of alternative providers of delivered video programming". The only delivered video programming that seems to be available anwhere involves violence, sex, or inane comedy.

It is absurd to suggest, as the FCC has, that every web site and cable channel available should be counted equally toward determining the scope of diversity. What really counts are the most powerful and dominant outlets, for it is they who have the capacity to reach the lion's share of consumers.