I am a former radio program director and currently a music critic. I feel that limits on broadcast ownership of multiple stations are critical and helpful in a number of ways. First, diversity is important. It is critical that Americans have access to a fair and balanced broadcast sources. See United States v. Carolene Products Co, 304 U.S. 144, 152 FN 4 (noting that "restraints upon the dissemination of information" are of constitutional concern). I add to that a quote from musical archivist Alan Lomax: "We now have cultural machines so powerful that one singer can reach everybody in the world, and make all the other singers feel inferior because they're not like him. Once that gets started, he gets backed by so much cash and so much power that he becomes a monstrous invader from outer space, crushing life out of all the other human possibilities." Chris Grier, "Salt of the Earth" The Wire 224, Oct. 2002 at 24. Second, the effect of consolidation of media ownership is to enhance censorship (or editorial) qualities. Corporations generally are unwilling to criticize their own interests. With few owners, this is a problem. The investment into a particular existing formats provides no incentive for innovative programming. Third, most programming formats differ only in name. In other words, the claimed difference between many programming formats is a sham. Lastly, I personally feel that diversity in programming has seen a marked decrease in variety over the past 5-7 years (which is not to say that diversity was sufficient 7 years ago). It saddens me that I must resort to European periodicals to find information on current arts; however, European publications, understandably, do not have sufficient coverage of arts in America. Therefore, I urge strict limits on ownership of multiple broadcast outlets. [this is a corrected version of my earlier submission]