

From: <tm1_spam@yahoo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:49 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Thomas Michaud
ADDRESS: 1780 Cinnamon Circle
Orlando, FL 32707

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. While I respect and appreciate MPAA views, I do not believe and will not respect the desire of the MPAA to override the interests of the common man.

Currently, the common person has the ability to record to tape shows and events that they wish to watch (the Betamax case). I can not respect MPAA issues unless they offer a method of preserving the issues that were brought up in the MPAA case.

I do not support the stealing from others as it impairs upon their rights. I can't support the MPAA claim because it impairs upon the rights of the consumer.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Michaud

From: <benb@basit.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:50 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Benedict Bridgwater
ADDRESS: 107 Stadley Rough Road
Danbury, CT 06811

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 the MPAA is using the advent of digital technology to try to take away the existing consumer right to record shows for private use.

Making a distinction between analog and digital broadcasts makes no sense from a technical point of view, since analog broadcasts can still be digitized by the consumer (as is done by devices like Tivo and ReplayTV) and "perfect" copies made.

As a software developer there is a well known adage "if it can be heard/seen it can be stored", which refers to the fact that whatever encryption is used on a signal it ultimately has to be decoded to be heard/seen, and can always be intercepted after that point (often in a hardware device driver) and stored. Not only is attempting to take away consumer rights unfair, but ultimately the attempt will prove futile anyway, as the MPAA's naive belief in the security of DVD encryption has proved.

Sincerely,

Ben Bridgwater

From: <fearl@airmail.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:52 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Frank Earl
ADDRESS: 1536 Fuqua Dr.
Flower Mound, TX 75028

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.

This is at least somewhat at odds with the Supreme Court ruling in the case Sony v. Universal Studios 464 U.S. 417. In that decision, the justices found that, "noncommercial home use recording of material broadcast over the public airwaves was a fair use of copyrighted works and did not constitute copyright infringement. It emphasized the fact that the material was broadcast free to the public at large, the noncommercial character of the use, and the private character of the activity conducted entirely within the home."

The Cable companies and the MPAA would indicate at this point that the content in question differs because it's broadcast to subscribers. I would point out that they are broadcasting the content to people that paid for the privilege to watch the content. To the best of my knowlege, there is no contract provisions with any Cable service (or with the MPAA, for that matter) that restrict the specific time at which I choose to watch content provided to me or any other consumer when I have paid to the Cable companies and through them the members of the MPAA to be allowed to watch the same. If there are provisions, then they need to be spelled out up-front and in bold text on the contract. Failing a contract, the provisions laid out by Sony vs. Universal hold, barring legislation or a Supreme Court decision finding that the situation is, in fact, different than the one held with Sony vs. Universal- regardless of whether or not the system is analog or digital in nature. With this in mind, it is not reasonable for the FCC to allow or require any sort of governing technology to limit home recording of any content as there is already Supreme Court precedent that is largely similar enough to be applicable in this case.

In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding- and to uphold the already in place decisions of

the Supreme Court in this matter.

Sincerely,
Frank C. Earl

From: <aardvark@vcn.bc.ca>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:54 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Hugh Brown
ADDRESS: 307-1221 Burnaby St
Vancouver, BC Canada

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!

I would like to point out that, although I live in Canada, your decision will certainly affect me. The United States of America is still the world's largest producer of entertainment, and one of the largest consumers of things like VCRs and TVs. The industries involved will be loathe to make an expensive exception for a "smaller market" like Canada. You may not have asked for it, but you do have the power to affect the rights of people far beyond the borders of your nation.

In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding -- not just at home, but abroad. Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,
Hugh Brown

From: <markcwitt@hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:01 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Mark Witt
ADDRESS: 18821 May Ave.
Homewood, IL 60430

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I am writing to urge the Commission to vote in favor of citizens' rights as consumers. Specifically, our rights to record television and movies for private, non-commercial use in our homes, as defined in the Supreme Court Betamax decision.

I feel that DTV signals should not be treated any differently than analog TV signals. For the MPAA and other copyright holders to suggest that citizens will become pirates once DTV broadcasts are widely available is both ludicrous and malicious. Please uphold citizens' rights to record and view DTV signals through digital cable as they see fit. Thank you for your time and consideration of my opinion.

Best regards,

Mark Witt

From: <bryan_w_taylor@yahoo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:03 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Bryan Taylor
ADDRESS: 145 Schreiner Place
San Antonio, TX 78212

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.

I'm actually annoyed that this is even something that the FCC would try to decide. Leave the market alone. If people want feature challenged TV's they'll buy them. When people don't buy them, you can conclude that people didn't want them.

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

I'm tired of listening to Jack Valenti and the MPAA whine about the bogus threat of theft as it's profits soar. Frankly, the studios abuse of consumers is so bad that I am almost ready to say that copyright is counterproductive.

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

From: <timbu@timbu.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:03 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Tim Burlowski
ADDRESS: 5512 East Bavarian Pass
Fridley, MN 55432

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.

This is a critical decision in the electronic age. It will shape the discussion regarding copyright and the battle between behemoths like Sony and consumers like me.

sincerlely,

tim burlowski
Sept 5, 2000

From: <david@davidlong.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:05 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: David Long
ADDRESS: 63 Fairview Ave
New Providence, NJ 07974

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I am writing in regard to the upcoming review by the FCC on home recording of digital TV signals. In my view, the fact that content is being delivered digitally should not be used as an excuse to place new limits on consumer recording. Private recordings for purposes such as time-shifting should remain unrestricted. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

David E. Long

From: <michaelarick@yahoo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:05 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Michael Arick
ADDRESS: 401 Heller Drive, #62
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

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.

Sincerely,
Michael Arick

p.s. This is important! Imagine a world where you have to be home at the time to watch the State-Of-The-Union address or the Presidential debates. These are events that matter to many people, myself included. I work long hours, and can't always be home to watch when an event is first broadcast. Please protect my right to watch the event when I get home.

From: <magic176@yahoo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:07 PM
Subject: Move to Limit Recording from TV

FROM:

NAME: Justin Flowers
ADDRESS: Colony Manor Drive
Rochester, NY 14623

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

As a concerned citizen I felt the need to express my feelings on the MPAA's assault on consumer rights. For years people have been taping movies from tv, after losing the same case with betamax they were silent, until now. It seems to me that it's a little too late, the technology's already firmly entrenched. To prevent people from taping certain shows, at least in a way that isn't easily circumvented, the current tv's and vcr's would need to be updated or replaced. I don't think the MPAA is going to volunteer to replace or upgrade everyones tv and vcr, so the burden falls to the consumer. Is this right? Should the consumer pay for a company's slow response to technology? What about the low income family that just managed to scrape up enough money to buy a tv for the family for christmas? If the MPAA gets it way that tv is useless to them. Also if the consumer must pay think of all the revenue that generates for whoever creates this new technology. Anyway you look at this the consumer loses, either through lose of funds or through lose of rights. I hope the FCC realizes just how much potential for loss there is in this case and upholds the rights of the citizens.

Sincerely,
Justin Flowers

From: <vslashg@hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:08 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67 (not the form letter)

FROM:

NAME: Greg Falcon
ADDRESS: 3201 Duval Rd #917
Austin, TX 78759

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I just read about the recent decision the FCC will have to make regarding protections against digital recording built into VCRs and digital television systems.

This is a scary move by the MPAA and others, and I urge the Commission to strongly consider the rights of consumers in this matter. The Supreme Court has already decided that recording programming for the purposes of time-shifting is fair use. If this copy protection is implemented, boxes like TiVo or ReplayTV would no longer be able to do this; you would be imposing a restrictions on Constitutionally protected Fair Use.

The fact is, it's already trivial to make a high-quality recording off of television with a SVHS VCR. Yet video sales continue to be a succesful source of revenue for movie companies. Please do not allow the movie industry's fear of how they could possibly be hurt by new technology persuade you to limit the Constitutional rights of home television viewers.

Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions.

Sincerely,
Greg Falcon

From: <jeremiah@dechow.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:09 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Jeremiah Johnson
ADDRESS: 102 W. Cherry
Herrin, IL 62948

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.

I believe that once a service or media containing something I've paid for arrives in my home, that I should have the right to copy, duplicate and destroy that service or media for my own personal uses. I will not distribute anything I'm asked not to, but I deserve the freedom to maintain copies of all media I've paid for, provided they are for my own personal use. I believe the MPAA is trying to dictate use of service even after it has been paid for by the consumer, and I strongly disagree with that position.

Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,
Jeremiah Johnson

From: <lloyd@lloydslounge.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2000 6:10 PM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Doug McInnes
ADDRESS: 970 1/2 Hilgard Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90024

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.

This reminds me of the Right to Read story:
<http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/right-to-read.html>
Scary stuff, but this is the way we're heading.

Sincerely,
Doug McInnes

From: <jlimpert@acm.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 2:27 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: John Limpert
ADDRESS: 9951 Good Luck Road, Apt. T2
Lanham-Seabrook, MD 20706

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

The world of television broadcasting and transmission is inexorably moving to digital encoding. It may not always be a smooth or speedy journey, but it will happen. Some powerful organizations view this as a threat and an opportunity. The threat being mass copyright infringement and the opportunity being the ability to achieve control over use of copyrighted content via technical means instead of by law or regulation. We have already seen the precursors, such as DIVX and DVD, that gut the fair use and first sale doctrines of copyright law. Now they wish to extend this control to the public airwaves and cable television systems.

So-called digital rights management systems are a technical kludge, doomed to failure, and a preemption of consumers' rights under the law. The proponents of these systems are fighting a losing battle. That doesn't mean that they can't cause large amounts of damage to the public interest in the process.

The Internet owes much of its success to open standards, freely published, that anyone could implement, without restrictive licensing agreements and cartels designed to restrain trade and competition. This is in contrast to the world of the MPAA, which must stay awake at night, worrying that someone, somewhere, is using their content in an unauthorized manner and not paying for the privilege.

The economy and the public interest are best served by open standards for digital video, free of encryption and digital rights management systems. Anything else will result in the proliferation of closed and non-competitive systems that treat the end-user as the enemy and make the fair use provisions of copyright law a dead letter.

Sincerely, John A. Limpert

From: <btsresume@NOSPAM.hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 2:50 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Brendan Smith
ADDRESS: 1418-3 Hunakai St.
Honolulu, HI 96816

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

You can thank the MPAA/RIAA for the death of DATs and mini-discs. The MPAA and its ilk, the RIAA, has helped prevent mass-consumer markets from appearing for all new digital recordable formats, except for MP3, though they're working on that one as well. They helped to prevent both DAT and mini-discs from successfully entering the consumer markets the entire last decade, helping to destroy what could have been a major economic infusion into the economy due to the appearance of new markets (read: Schumpeterian destruction), as well as significant new rights for smaller content creators and consumers. Are you going to let the MPAA create another digital dead-end around the now emerging digital video formats as well?

Take a look at Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. It says:

"To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

Without providing specific names, this statement charges Congress with the duty of enacting Copyright and Patent laws. The Constitutional purpose of these laws is to promote the Progress of Science and the useful Arts. Any law which is deemed to inhibit the progress of science and the arts would be unConstitutional.

One could argue that fair use of artistic works is necessary to promote the arts, as artistic works are influenced by other works and prohibitions on the playback of those works effectively removes them from the public's eye and thus diminishes progress.

Copyright law was intended to protect the author of copyrighted works. Instead members of the MPAA are using it to boost the profits of distribution companies at the expense of consumers. Its the government's job to stop this.

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!

I don't understand why the FCC could take away a right given to "We, The People" by the Supreme Court (time/space shifting). Please explain that one!

The problem isn't whether copy protection *can* be built into these devices, it's whether the MPAA can strong arm manufacturers into forcing them to do so.

In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

Your Constituent,
Brendan Smith

From: <jebediah@knac.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 2:55 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Jim Demonte
ADDRESS: 6930 Commerce Bld #7
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

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. Additionally I find there would be little or no point to television if I could not choose when to watch the shows I want. I would rather slit my wrists then submit to this tomfoolery. Thank you for reading my views.

With Concern
Jim DeMonte

From: <gunhed@earthlink.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 3:03 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Steve Chaney
ADDRESS: PO Box 81-1086
Los Angeles, CA 90081

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.

Proper action in this case would mean ruling on this case in the same manner the Supreme Court did in the Betamax case.

Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,
Steve Chaney

From: <fv@epitools.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 3:24 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Fred Viles
ADDRESS: 1854 Half Pence Way
San Jose, CA 95132

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 or other digital sources will be allowed.

Hollywood industry groups apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. I believe that this is not the case, rather that non-commercial home recording for time-shifting purposes represents a "fair use" of copyrighted material. Further, the ability to time-shift TV viewing is very important to the viewing public, so much so that restricting home recording would be an unreasonably high price to pay for a highly debatable increase in the difficulty of commercial piracy.

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.

Fred Viles

From: <nstenz@lowtech.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 3:25 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Nicholas Stenz
ADDRESS: W2175 Hwy. 149
Mount Calvary, WI 53057

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

(You will probably be reading many messages identical to this one, so I will just say you don't have to read this message completely; just know that my opinion is the same and I have no better wording than this message.)

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,

Nicholas Stenz
nstenz@lowtech.net

From: <simulacrum25@hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 3:55 AM
Subject: MPAA and media control

FROM:

NAME: Alan Bellanger
ADDRESS: 3840 Ballantrae Rd. #8
Eagan, MN 55122

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

This evening I read yet another outrage committed by the MPAA. With digital television soon coming via cable TV, they would like to limit the consumers ability to record shows with a VCR? This make no sense to me what so ever.

The show is on a television channel that I pay for in the first place. That should mean that I can watch it, record it, watch it again, record it if I'm at work, whatever I want.

It's not as if I'm recording the show so that I can re-broadcast over another television channel. I'm recording the show for my own benefit, whether it be if I'm at work, or if I want to watch it again. That's my choice, I already paid to receive the channel.

The MPAA is trying to defend their copyrights on these shows? Give me a break! Protect them from what? Loss of profit?!? The MPAA already is one of the biggest richest media conglomerates in the world.

Please make the right choice, and deny the MPAA this action. Please stand up for the consumer, and show that you were elected by the people, and you are going to stand by them, not the media controlling empire.

From: <lvirden@yahoo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 5:46 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Larry Virden
ADDRESS: 674 Falls Place
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I have been reading how your Commission will soon be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. The articles that I have read are reporting Hollywood studios claims that home recording is the same as theft of service and a threat of loss of profits to the copyright holder and that this thus justifies restricting home taping. It was always my understanding that your agency would protect consumers' rights to record and view television signals, which are a natural resource regulated by your agency and NOT an automatic right for copyright holders to use. 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, ruling against any additional restrictions against taping. Additional restrictions would prevent consumers from being able to time shift. Since currently all broadcast material is copywritten, this should be sufficient protection for the copyright holder.

Thank you for reading my views.

I appreciate your time.

Sincerely

Larry W. Virden

From: <firemote@hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 6:59 AM
Subject: A plea for a sane judgement for us consumers and home television recording.

FROM:

NAME: Chris Warner
ADDRESS: 8800 SW 114 Terrace
Miami, FL 33176

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

Just a simple request, please let us consumers be able to tape for obviously non-archival purposes (limitations of the media, of course, even on devices such as the tivo.) This is *entirely* for personal use, and is not a vehicle for piracy.

Sincerely,

Chris Warner

From: <merlin47129@yahoo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 12:14 AM
Subject: Home Recording Rights Coalition

FROM:

NAME: Jeffrey Brady
ADDRESS: 7511 Cane Run Rd #77
Louisville, KY 40258

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I am deeply disturbed that the recent trends by the the audio and video recording industry to limit my rights as an American Consumer. The whole idea of the "digital revolution" is to give people more freedom and choice, I am seeing quite the opposite.

I understand that there should be laws to prevent people or companies from copying and distributing copyrighted works for profit. However I fail to see the harm in being able to record a television show or event for viewing in my own home when it is convenient to me. What is the difference if the signal that I am recording is in analog or digital format? I understand that there is a great difference in picture and sound quality, but that is what we the consumer expect.

I ask of you to take careful thought in this matter as I believe that this will be a defining moment in the "digital rights" of the American public.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jeffrey Brady

From: <kelliot@gte.net>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 12:16 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Ken Elliott
ADDRESS: 2735 Queens Way
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

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 quality home recording from legitimate digital cable subscribers 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 my consumers' right to record and view DTV signals that I pay for.

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

I legitimately pay for my service and want the highest quality broadcasting. The video quality is poor with existing NTSC.

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

Sincerely yours,
Ken Elliott

From: <chasm@mac.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 1:03 AM
Subject: MPAA wants to further restrict home VCR recording

FROM:

NAME: Charles Martin
ADDRESS: 210 Magnolia Road #103
Maitland, FL 32751

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

As a consumer of electronic equipment and services, I write to you to complain that I am just about up to HERE with the continuing efforts of know-nothing industry busybodies to restrict my rights to enjoy the labours of the stations you license.

I oppose ANY further restriction on home videotaping, in a nutshell.

What I can't understand is the point of this new proposal? Is there anything wrong with the copyright laws as they stand now? Do we have a horribly widespread mass copying and redistribution of recorded-off-television shows now that I and the rest of the public are completely unaware of?

There are plenty of other things the FCC *ought* to be doing (such as making it FAR easier and faster for community/public/college radion stations to get competitive wattage/frequencies) rather than wasting your time with this nonsense. When will these "little Hitlers" get it through their heads that a HUGE majority of consumers do (and see) nothing wrong in their time-shifting or archival copies of beloved television shows?

Thank you for your attention,
Charles Martin

From: <lgarfiel@students.depaul.edu>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 1:55 AM
Subject: Hard-Wired MPAA Copy Protection, NO

FROM:

NAME: Larry Garfield
ADDRESS: 1419 Main St.
Evanston, IL 60202

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

It is my understanding that the MPAA has requested that all video recording and decoding devices (cable boxes, VCRs, etc.) be required to include electronic hardware to automatically refuse to record broadcast programs with a given copyprotection code attached. This is a gross violation of Fair Use, common sense, and self-interest, and I strongly urge you to decline any such request.

The MPAA's claim is quite familiar. They claim that to not restrict copying in this fashion would present an unacceptable risk to their revenues, to which they are entitled as copyright holders. Yet this question has been brought up time and time again, and every time they have been proven wrong. In the early 1980s, the MPAA sought to stifle analog VCRs on the grounds that such devices would cut into box office revenues and allow people to pirate movies easily. Their quest was turned down that time, clearly establishing a precedent against such actions. Yet, box office sales have risen steadily in the past 20 years, and the movie studios have made millions of dollars off of the licensing of movies to VHS cassettes. They have, in fact, benefited from the unfettered release of broadcast media, without encumbering technological attempts to micro-manage its useage, while the public has benefited from the freedom to archive their own material as they see fit.

The same can be seen in the music industry. The RIAA is seeking to block the downloading of music from the Internet, on the grounds that it hurts sales and profits. Yet in 1999, the companies that make up the RIAA posted a net increase in profits in the double-digits. Clearly again, the unencumbered useage of Intellectual Property has in no way hurt the corporations in question, but has in fact benefited them as much as if not more than the public.

Were such mandatory copy-protection mechanisms required, it it would also be an unfair ruling against equipment makers, who would be therefore required to spend the extra cost to so equip all of their devices, when they themselves are in no way hurt or helped by it. The same holds true for broadcasters, who would be required to equip their equipment to transmit said copyprotection stamp. Why should they be penalized to protect a third party, who it has been shown does not need such protection in the first place, and in fact benefits from not having it?

It is not the place of a cartel (the MPAA), legally recognized or not, to require that other companies protect their Intellectual Property for them, especially in the face of significant evidence that such protection is unnecessary. Nor is it their place to deny consumers their rights of Fair Use, which includes recording programs for later viewing and the archiving of material for their own personal use. Such rights have been upheld before, and have been shown historically to be to the benefit of all concerned; copyright holders, equipment manufacturers, broadcasters, and consumers.

I strongly urge you to refuse any such mechanisms, as they have been shown to be unnecessary and in violation of the rights of other companies, of consumers, and of the right of Fair Use.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Garfield
Registered Voter
Illinois, 9th Congressional District

From: <benjammin56@hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 2:06 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Ben Wahlquist
ADDRESS: 2411 Scorpius
Garland, TX 75044

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. In short...I am 100% against this government intrusion. Thank you for reading my views.