

From: <aj@sulli.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:01 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Andrew Sullivan
ADDRESS: 562 Lyon Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping.

The studios are DEAD WRONG on this issue. It is CRITICAL that the right to record signals at home, digital or analog, be preserved; this is basic FAIR USE that has been protected under copyright law.

The Agency needs to follow the Betamax precedent and preserve consumers' rights in this case. The rights of millions of consumers are more important, and stronger, than the onerous claims of the studios for control of their films and their marginal profits from repeated viewing.

Thank you for your consideration of this critical issue.

Best regards,
Andrew Sullivan

From: <b-teutsch@northwestern.edu>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:02 PM
Subject: Do not restrict time shifting

FROM:

NAME: Brian Teutsch
ADDRESS: 1926 Sherman Ave Apt 2N
Evanston, IL 60201

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

Do not allow the FCC to restrict the ability of consumers to freely record television broadcasts for unlimited later viewing.

Thank you,
Brian Teutsch

From: <tdphette@glaci.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:43 PM
Subject: Proposed Copy Protection in VCRs

FROM:

NAME: Thad Phetteplace
ADDRESS: 1324A N. 59th St.
Milwaukee, WI 53208

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

The MPAA and other major copyright holders are proposing that VCRs and other similar recording devices should contain built in copy protection to stop the copying of digital programs. This is an extremely bad idea, and furthermore, would be a major gutting of our rights as consumers. Time shifting of programs has long been considered an acceptable practice. It falls well within the boundaries of fair use of copyrighted material. Because of my work schedule, I personally must time shift most of the programs I watch. This includes the occasional pay per view event, the same type of program the MPAA would like to prevent from being copied. If this copy prevention technology goes into effect, I would be unable to watch many of favorite sporting events.

Please do not let the MPAA strip away our rights as consumers. Already, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act has been used by the MPAA to give them a court sanctioned monopoly on DVD viewing technology. Even more insidious, It has allowed them to implement region coding of DVD movies, permitting the MPAA to engage in price fixing and market manipulation on a global scale.

I trust you will take the correct course, and stop this erosion of our rights.

From: <arifyn@crosswinds.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:46 PM
Subject: the future of home video recording

FROM:

NAME: Andrew Waser
ADDRESS: 6317 Stair Rd
Lafayette, IN 47905

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I am urging you to please NOT support the MPAA and other copyright groups in their push for universal digital copyright protection. Imposing restrictions on what and when consumers can record television shows is a serious hindrance to honest Americans, and does little to stop the illegal copying of such shows (as is proven by the rampant bootlegging of DVDs in asia, even though they contain digital copyright protection). In addition, forcing manufacturers of VCRs and similar recording equipment to comply with a digital encryption standard would greatly damage competition and sales in the home video market.

Please don't allow such an unreasonable standard to exist!

Sincerely,

Andrew Waser

From: <gbd@andrew.cmu.edu>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:50 PM
Subject: rights and the MPAA

FROM:

NAME: George Davis
ADDRESS: 105 Mark Ct.
Vestal, NY 13850

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

As a young student of computer science, I am very interested in the decisions being made now in the courts regarding the extent of intellectual property. Agencies like yours are setting precedents as to what my rights will be, both as a consumer and a creator of intellectual property.

For this reason, the MPAA's recent efforts to require copy protection mechanisms on all home recording equipment frighten me. It seems that they are placing the burden on the consumer to pay for a system that will allow broadcasters ultimate control of where and how their content is played.

Their desire for such a system is understandable -- it allows them to continue the use of an established revenue model that has proved very effective to date.

But in a competitive market like ours, it's the job of a business to adapt its services to suit the needs of the customer. Instead, they are trying to use you, the FCC, to adjust the rights of the customer by limiting fair-use recordings and driving electronics expenses up by unwieldy technological schemes to minimize avoidance of these limitations. I don't want to live in a society where I'm constantly asked to observe and even pay for increasingly Orwellian measures organizations like the MPAA take to adapt me, the consumer, to their business model.

This is good capitalism in reverse. The MPAA is using its weight as a content provider to pull strings in the distribution industry, and its the consumer getting burned.

Thank you for your consideration,

George Davis

From: <ncrypted@swbell.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:51 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Michael Walker
ADDRESS: 11701 Metric Blvd, Apt. 1223
Austin, TX 78758

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping.

Large media companies in the United States have decided that they think they can steal the rights of the people. Not a wholesale property grab, but a slow erosion. It would be alarmist in this case to state that this individual measure is undermining the First Amendment to the Constitution. When taken into consideration with all the other "Licensing Law" garbage that has occurred over the last 5 years, however, I can say in all honesty that I do not feel that my rights are being protected by the Federal Government. Especially by the actions of the FCC Commissioner's agents.

There is a clearly established precedent that the FCC has no legal right to violate. That is the precedent of "Fair Use". To violate this is to breach the trust placed in you by the people of the United States.

Furthermore, I would like to state that broadcast media types are are being controlled by a handful of companies now. From inception, to creation, to delivery, we have a VERY few number of companies in control of the so-called "media landscape". Their control of the public forum has reached beyond the maximum extent that it SHOULD be ALLOWED.

The decision made over the coming weeks affects every individual American citizen, if not directly today then in the future, and should not be taken lightly.

Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. Suitable legal defenses exist in the court system to allow these companies to target and take action against people who take advantage of Fair Use for commercial re-broadcast or sale. The Commission has a moral imperative respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service!

In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

A concerned citizen,
Michael J Walker

From: <dean@ties.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:58 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Dean SantamariaCapetanelis
ADDRESS: 196 lafayette st 3r
salem, MA 01970

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

This sort of thing has got to stop.

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

thankyou
Dean SantamariaCapetanelis

From: <rweiler@perfectsense.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:00 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Robert Weiler
ADDRESS: 1329 Taylor St. #2
San Francisco, CA 94108

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. My understanding is that the MPAA has submitted testimony to the effect that unless the current right of consumers to record broadcast material is curtailed, they will lose substantial amounts of money. Since consumers currently enjoy the right to record broadcast material, and the businesses represented by the MPAA are making record profits, this argument is surely false. Sinec I know that the MPAA has given false testimony i this instance, and have also given false testimony in the recent DVD/DeCSS case, and also given false testimony in Congress regarding the DMCA w/r/t 'fair use' of copyrighted material, you will understand my skepticism at their claim that 'most broadcast material will not be copy protected'. I hope that in this instance, you will choose preserve the rights of the voters, and not the narrow self interest of the MPAA.

Sincerely yours,
Robert Weiler

From: <bill@wnybusiness.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:00 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: William Paris
ADDRESS: 31 Baxter Street
Buffalo, NY 14207

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency MUST protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals.

The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service. In short, I've had it up to here with the MPAA and will join the fight for consumer protections.

I hope you see this matter as I see it..

Sincerely,
William S. Paris

From: <wesleymorgan@home.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:01 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Wesley Morgan
ADDRESS: 1409 Roper Mountain Road, Apt 139
Greenville, SC 29615

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

More thoughts besides the canned answer above... The MPAA is apparently in the beginnings of a massive campaign to prevent what they call "illegal copying" of works. The DeCSS court case is of course the most well-known example, and now this? The RIAA threatening the same sort of things with music. Are we headed to a future where VCRs and portable stereos have credit card readers so everyone gets their "cut" every single time something is listened or viewed? This all boils down to (in bureaucratic terms) the socialization of media. Sure, I understand that artists have a right to be paid for their work. I don't necessarily think that they should be paid perpetually (does a carpenter get paid every time you walk into your house? The electrician when you turn on the lights?), but there has to be a point when fair use is being denied. I am not one of the fools who thinks it is a conspiracy to keep CD/VHS/DVD prices "up" and that they should have fallen because of technological advancement. I understand that the revenue model of these media giants is based on the \$15 CD or \$20 DVD, and lowering these prices to what some claim they should be would drive them out of business. However I cannot help but feel that the future of media is becoming more and more bleak with every law passed. The all-mighty dollar will certainly play an enormous role in this battle -- something with media companies have plenty of, how else could hollywood keep churning out movies that lose money hand over fist -- but I feel no one will benefit from these laws except Big Media. As a consumer, I am truly worried.

Sincerely,

From: <ken.graham@quest.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:04 PM
Subject: Home Recording of Digital Television Programs

FROM:

NAME: ken graham
ADDRESS: 8001 Irvine Center Drive
Irvine, CA 92618

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

The Supreme Court has declared and defined "FAIR USE".

The MPAA wants to redefine "FAIR USE" to be only what they desire, abridging my rights so as to make them disappear. This is not just my opinion. I would suggest that you actually read what they propose for yourself, and not rely on others to digest it for you.

With the cellular phone companies clear success with the FCC, it is reasonable for the MPAA to assume that they can be successful with you as well. (Rather than have the cellular phone companies actually address the problem of security for their broadcast transmissions, they used the FCC to abridge consumer rights. The result made listening to their broadcast signals illegal. This is why the MPAA believes they can use you to abscond with our rights too).

Sincerely,

Ken Graham

From: <im14u2c@primenet.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:07 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Joseph Zbiciak
ADDRESS: 8515 Grapevine Hwy #1509
North Richland Hills, TX 76180

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

I understand that you may be receiving several "form letters" on this subject that say substantially the same thing. Please read this through -- this is not one of those form letters.

Apparently, Hollywood studios apparently that home recording is theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. This is at odds with the original definition of Copyright, which provides a limited monopoly on reproduction of works to the copyright holder. The notion of Copyright is an artificial right, not an entitlement or natural right, that was introduced in the Constitution with many limitations. Historically, the doctrine of Fair Use has defined the limits of this monopoly so that Copyright serves its intended purpose -- to compensate artists so that they can continue to produce, and so in the long run enrich the public domain to society's benefit.

Recent years (particularly with the passage of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, as well as several copyright-extension acts) have seen Copyright pervert from a subtle incentive for artists to produce via a reward structure into a full-blown monopoly granted to owners of artistic works that permits them to control every aspect of how

that work is sold, viewed, copied, distributed, reused, or disposed of. Instead of enriching the public domain by compensating artists so that they can continue to produce, copyright effectively locks artistic works to the owners of that "property" and out of the public domain, limiting how, when, and where that "property" may be viewed. These limitations also inhibit actions that were previously protected under the doctrine of Fair Use.

The bulk of our culture is defined and shaped by artistic works. The vast majority of these works are protected under copyrights held by major conglomerates and NOT held by the original artists. The end result is that our culture is now being defined by major corporations rather than the people within the culture itself. The further erosion of Fair Use only strengthens the grasp of corporations over what used to be the public domain.

The Supreme Court recognized this threat in the now-famous BetaMax case. They recognized that home-taping constitutes Fair Use, and that individuals may tape programs for later private viewing. The protection that applies to today's analog TV broadcasts should be extended to tomorrow's digital TV broadcasts without hesitation. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's position on this matter, and recognize that taping from a DTV broadcast is not fundamentally different than taping from any other broadcast. That is, home taping of programs for non-commercial use is NOT theft of service, but rather constitutes Fair Use. The Commission should work to protect the consumer's rights in this regards.

Thank you for reading my views.

Best Regards,

--Joseph Zbiciak

From: Wayne Steele <wsteele@nimble.com>
To: "bkennard@fcc.gov" <bkennard@fcc.gov>
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 10:14 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

Dear Chairman:

I have recently become aware of the "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" under Docket #00-67, and wish to communicate my thoughts on Section III paragraph 20 to the commission.

Whenever a party is compelled to license a particular technology in order manufacture compatible equipment, it causes many people (including myself) to become very suspicious. Special scrutiny must be given to clauses not obviously necessary to the licensing process.

So called "Copy Protection" is one of these.

Copyright holders may wish to protect copyrighted content from consumer misuse. Whether this is desirable public policy or not, the capability of a VCR (or other receiver) to record content is clearly unrelated to "system security and conditional access", as allowed under current regulations.

Any such system of recording prohibition must receive scrutiny to ensure that a consumer's "fair use" rights of archiving, time-shifting, and space-shifting are preserved; that scholarly and educational use is not harmed; and future access to the content (such as if no longer profitable or if it enters the public domain) is ensured.

This is an enormously controversial issue, and is more appropriate to a full round of rule making, public hearings, etc., than for an unrelated technology license to attempt to sneak in a resolution.

For this reason, I urge you to forbid any such licensing clauses at this time.

Thank you,

Wayne Steele

CC: "sness@fcc.gov" <sness@fcc.gov>, "hfurchtgott-r...

From: Stephen Dowdy <dowdy@cs.colorado.edu>
To: DC.GWIA("Bkennard@FCC.gov")
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 2:05 AM
Subject: PP Docket.No. 00-67

Dear Mr Kennard, etal:

Count me in the "Opposed" column on the present push to disallow home recording.

In PP Docket No. 00-67, the FCC should enforce its regulations to protect consumers rights to record and view DTV signals.

The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service!

Especially in today's high-paced world, it is absurd to suggest that someone taping an airing for viewing at their convenience should be restricted from doing so. In my opinion such actions will only end up in massive boycotts of (video/cable/distribution) industry greed-mongers who are unable to see that alienating their intended audience through oppression will only work against their goals.

Thank you for your consideration,
--stephen

--

Stephen Dowdy - Systems Administrator - CS Dept - Univ of Colorado at Boulder
dowdy@cs.colorado.edu -- <http://www.cs.colorado.edu/~dowdy/signature.html>

CC: DC.CMGI(info),DC.GWIA("Sness@FCC.gov","Mpowell@FCC...

From: <combe@techwood.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:35 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Benjamin Combee
ADDRESS: 12212 Brigadoon Lane #106
Austin, TX 78727

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

In your future proceedings, you will decide on the suggestion by the MPAA that digital media recording systems have required rights management systems that could prevent the recording of television programming, even for established "fair use" rights such as time shifting. I would urge strong caution in following the recommendations of the content industry which would remove significant rights from the users of digital media systems. You should uphold the current rights that media viewers have, and not let the industries bully around home recording equipment manufacturers.

Thanks,

Benjamin Combee
Lead Software Architect
Veriprise Wireless

From: <kgelner@bigfoot.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:35 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Kendall Gelner
ADDRESS: 1218 S. Flower Circle #C
Lakewood, CO 80232

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I have just read that the FCC will soon be reviewing the topic of VCR's and digital cable systems.

My concern is that by not allowing time-shifting (the ability to record a program and watch it later), you take away many benefits:

Without recording, a person with a learning disability would not be able to replay parts of a broadcast in order to understand it in detail.

Without the ability to record programs, you punish Americans who are forced to work late shifts due to job requirements.

Without the ability to record you take away the ability of someone to use a portion of the broadcast later for fair use - what if slanderous remarks are broadcast, but the person targeted is unable to record the broadcast to determine if there is legal liability? How would complaints be lodged with the FCC without material to back them up? It could have a chilling effect on reporting broadcast content violations or lead to inaccurate complaints.

In short, this is a form of censorship where broadcasters get to decide later what should be censored from historical record in terms of what was broadcast. I do not think any broadcaster should have that degree of power.

Sincerley,

Kendall Helmstetter Gelner
1218 S. Flower Circle #C
Lakewood, CO 80232
(303) 980-9731

From: <payet@usa.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:36 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Tomas Payet
ADDRESS: 151 Duboce Avenue - 3
San Francisco, CA 94103

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

This is just plain *wrong*. The MPAA is trying SO hard to take advantage of the digital age to take away our rights to record and archive our own media.

We need to beware reasoning like "We want to make sure that [the device] has the ability to provide copy protection, but it doesn't mean all product running into the box won't be able to be copied" -- this kind of vague, "honor system"-based lingo doesn't limit what they can later decide to do with the technology. Once it is in place, they can do whatever they want with it.

Honestly, the MPAA frightens me.

Thank you for reading my views.

From: <cwilliam@decisionone.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:37 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Christopher Williams
ADDRESS: 932 Iroquois Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55119

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I wholeheartedly believe these points are valid, and wish to make them known to you:

If I buy a Pay-Per-View event, I am paying for the rights to watch that movie/event. I am not paying for 2 hours of television time; I am buying a license, and that license should entitle me to watch it whenever I want.

Fair Use remains vital to consumer welfare in the digital age. Consumers should continue to be able to engage in time-shifting, place-shifting, and other private, noncommercial rendering of lawfully obtained music and video content.

Products and services with substantial non-infringing uses, including those that enable fair use activities by consumers, should continue to be legal.

Home recording practices have nothing to do with commercial retransmission of signals, unauthorized commercial reproduction of content, or other acts of "piracy." Home recording and piracy should not be confused.

Any technical constraints imposed on products or consumers by law, license or regulation should be narrowly tailored and construed, should not hinder technological innovation, and may be justified only to the extent that they foster the availability of content to consumers.

I believe The Commission should not approve any license that implements the unprecedented copy control power that comes with digital encryption without also approving balanced "recording rules" that protect consumers' reasonable and customary practices.

Sincerely,

Christopher Williams

From: <karl@karl.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:38 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Karl J Smith
ADDRESS: 12525 SW Foothill Drive
Portland, OR 97225

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

Quite frankly, I'm fed up with corporate greed trampling my rights to fair use. It's bad enough that we have things like the Digital Millenium Copyright Act in force, with the corresponding result that I can't watch my legally purchased DVDs on my legally purchased computer running Linux.

This is quickly becoming one of the most important issues I'm considering for the fall elections.

Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,
Karl J. Smith
karl@karl.com

From: <akin@pobox.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:38 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Allen Akin
ADDRESS: 784 Palo Alto Ave
Palo Alto, CA 94301

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

With regard to home recording from digital cable: While technology will soon give us the ability to impose strict controls on consumers' use of copyrighted material, I feel strongly that such controls should not erode the privileges that citizens already enjoy. There is no compelling ethical argument that time-shifting or review of broadcast material constitutes theft, and no compelling commercial argument that content providers require greatly increased government-sponsored coercive powers over their customers. This has been acknowledged in past court decisions, and I urge you to reaffirm it.

Best regards,
Allen Akin

From: <ung42@my-deja.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:40 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Bill Ung
ADDRESS: 6600 Warner Ave. #236
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

If you ask me, the RIAA and MPAA are getting *way* to big for their britches. You *know* they'd love to sell me a CD or DVD and then *charge* me for each and every time I listen to the CD, or view the DVD.

Personally, I'm tired of the RIAA/MPAA automatically assuming that everyone and their brother is a thief and that the mere possibility that someone can make a copy means that same person will be spinning off hundreds if not thousands of copies for all their friends and neighbors, or strangers on the street...

Fact is, "fair use" needs to be upheld and to do anything else will cripple the American people and their right to use technology. Do you really want to see all the rest of the world march ahead of us in terms of technology just because the big money-grubbers of the USA can't fill their pockets fast enough?

To uphold this "copy protection" B.S. is ludicrous. You'll never stop the professional pirates (the *real* criminals) and you'll only piss off the American public. Furthermore, if we have to buy our video equipment from overseas just to get a VCR that will let us use it the way we want, WE DAMN WELL WILL, and the ultimate losers will be American businesses and American workers.

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,
Bill Ung <ung42@my-deja.com>

From: <rgoodwin@early.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:41 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Richard Goodwin
ADDRESS: 2763 Mansway Drive
Oak Hill, VA 20171

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

One aspect I feel very strong about that has not been articulated. Being a technical person, I see too many instances where people and organizations apply technology simply because they can. The reasoning is often just that - because they can. In this case, certain industry representatives are creating a lot of smoke in hopes that someone will believe there's a fire.

If I am expected or required to convert to HDTV in 2006, I refuse to accept less rights and/or abilities than I have now. I pay for the service and should have a say in how I want to use/access it. Without such rights, I will migrate to newer technologies which will make some of the industry's work irrelevant - I'll watch German TV or whatever is available at the time via the Internet since I will be able to. I am willing to pay for services - as long as I have SOME- SAY in what is made available to me.

Thank you for reading my views.

Your constituent.

Richard Goodwin

From: <heymann@colorado.edu>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:41 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: William Heymann
ADDRESS: 1030 Adams Circle #218
Boulder, CO 80303

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

I often hook up my VCR to digital cable in order to record shows when I am not around so that I can watch them later. This seems to be the use for which the technology was designed. I have paid for the service and don't see the difference between me sitting in front of the TV and watching it at the time or watching it later.

Sincerely,
William Heymann

From: <hsf@knightweb.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:44 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Howard Fear
ADDRESS: 12238 W. 70th Ave.
Arvada, CO 80004

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Frankly, the MPAA madness must be stopped.

Thank You,
Howard Fear

From: <ima_macuser@mailexcite.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:46 PM
Subject: Message From a Concerned Citizen

FROM:

NAME: Dustin Graham
ADDRESS: PO Box 2349
Socorro, NM 88260

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I am a "freshman" college student, and I have not studied law or learned the fine details of copyright laws, but I am a consumer. I strongly believe that the restrictions the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) wants placed on the devices used to play and record digital broadcasts go beyond what copyright laws allow, and extend into infringing "fair use" of copyrighted material.

I understand that the MPAA wants to build restrictions into new HDTV consumer electronics that allow them to specify a television program or purchased movie cannot be recorded. First, this would make current HDTV devices incompatible with current devices. This hurts consumers by forcing them to buy a new player or television to view new films or programs. The companies that manufacture and broadcast programming are not going to make their products backward compatible with the old equipment, and the consumer could not view anything new unless they purchased another player. What of the consumers who have made a large investment in their current system? If the MPAA's suggested restrictions become law, no one would want their system, and they might not be able to afford a new one. They would be limited to watching old media over and over again.

Second, once a consumer pays for material, they own their copy. If a consumer pays for cable service, they should have free use of the signal they receive. The MPAA would like to take this signal away from them. When a consumer buys a book, they can read, it write in it, rip out pages they don't like, and always come back to read it again. Were the MPAA a literary organization and their films books, they would want consumers to be able to read the book once, and pay for the book another time should they want to read it again. The consumer would be unable to write notes, modify, or any other procedure which falls under fair use of a book.

Copy machines are not restricted to only copying allowed books or pictures. Anyone can legally buy an unrestricted cassette deck or VCR. You can do whatever you want with a CD or floppy disk. Why should digital television be any different?

Please consider how passing the MPAA's requests into law would be a great injustice to the consumer, and go against fair use.

Sincerely,

From: <jkhoffman@carolina.rr.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:48 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Jeff Hoffman
ADDRESS: 2913 Patten Hill Dr.
Matthews, NC 28105

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. "We want to make sure that [the device] has the ability to provide copy protection, but it doesn't mean all product running into the box won't be able to be copied." I trust the MPAA's members to respect consumers' rights in such an "honor system" about as far as I can throw them. This country is about the freedom of the people, "We the people", not the interests of mega-corporations.

Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,

Jeff K. Hoffman

From: <noss@east.la.asu.edu>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:48 PM
Subject: Future VCR Copy Protection

FROM:

NAME: Dale Noss
ADDRESS: 14603 N Fairlynn Drive
Fountain Hills, AZ 85268

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I program computers for a living and feel I have a good grasp of technological issues in general. As such, I have kept abreast of many of the recent developments surrounding the intellectual property front: Napster, DeCSS and the MPAA. I do NOT support the theft or illegal use of intellectual property. However, I am also not eager to have my "fair use" rights trampled and rolled back to pre-1980s levels because of MPAA induced paranoia. The courts have upheld the my right to record analog TV broadcasts for my own use. I do NOT want to lose that right! This Greek drama of clueless, aging media dinosaurs attempting to control the Net would also be comedic, if it wasn't hurting so many people in the process. The MPAA MUST embrace and adapt to the Net. They MUST develop more effective/useful methods to distribute content -- or die. Instead, they spend fortunes on lawsuits & lobbying which in the long run are futile attempts to maintain some kind of second rate status quo which the Net shattered years ago.

All I need is "ftp" to distribute digital content. Will we ban that next? Will we also outlaw the Phillips TiVo device? If I provide a link to an "illegal" website, am I a criminal? What is happening to my right of free speech?! I have shaken my head in amazement at some VERY stupid laws dealing with encryption technology over the years (e.g. exporting a paper copy of a cryptography book is fine, but copy the contents to disk and you are breaking the law.) , but these recent court rulings involving the MPAA leave me (pun intended) speechless. Enough already. Let us PROTECT intellectual property while realistically assessing the capabilities of the technology already available to ALL in the CURRENT century. Reactionary efforts to roll back my consumer rights must end now.

Sincerely,

Dale Noss

From: <ericbr@oz.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:48 PM
Subject: Copy Protection of Digital Signals

FROM:

NAME: Eric Brown
ADDRESS: 98 Union St #513
seattle, WA 98101

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

I believe that it is very important that home recording is allowed; to do otherwise makes a mockery of the fair use doctrine.

I hope that the FCC and the courts will continue to enable viewers to record and view television signals, in whatever medium they arrive at the television set.

Sincerely,

Eric Brown