

The thought of yet more copy protection schemes on multimedia is foolish and unfair to the standard user. The end customer will bare the brunt of the cost for a feature that is not needed, that will limit the fair-use of media, and will not stop a determined IP thief to start with! The computer industry has a perfect record that this "Arms Race" is never ending, and only makes things more burdensome to both the producers as well as the consumers.

The copy protection scheme for DVD's has already been broken, and is not beyond the means of those who are determined to get the code (which has been made illegal) to copy them in the first place. The cable system is also another perfect example of copy protection gone awry, and the arms race never ends. Adding anything to a system that is not needed for functional value to the end-user will only serve to make the end-user (the one paying for the service, either directly or by getting stuck having to watch commercials that sponsor the program) less likely to use such a mess, as it becomes a nuisance at best, even when things work "correctly" and the worst-case scenario ends up being that neither the producer or the consumer gains anything when the system fails, and doesn't deliver the product as intended. I have personal experience with this in the realm of computer software that has copy protection built-in: it failed, and I found myself with a worthless piece of software that I could not use, even though I had legally purchased the rights to use it. This was NOT some video game, but an expensive software development tool. Guess how much that software has been used since then? Guess how many people I told about it in glowing terms?

Copy protection will always be broken by those who have an interest in illicitly profiting from the works of others, while it will hamper the honest average user from enjoying things in terms of fair-use. I, for one, also find it a slippery slope proposition, since if people can disallow me from the usage of some other media, what is to stop them from moving on until I have to ask permission to use my computer (which I bought outright) to create my own content, without having to pay others for that "privilege"? Indeed, they have already created Write Once CD's that you pay extra for the usage of recording audio files, in the guise of "oh, we have to give the IP owners royalties for the music that might be copied on to these CD's!" and pass that on to the consumer. I am NOT one of those consumers that makes copies of something and gives it away (debatable in terms of fair-use) or tries to sell it to others (no longer fair-use) when it is IP that is not my own. However I DO create my own IP, and I know I have the legal and moral right to do with it as I please, and yet the RIAA and the powers-that-be in the media world want to make money off of MY IP as a result of charging the "IP Tax" on each Write Once.

I will not support the election of any official that bends over to Big Business that screws the honest consumer. If products are released that contain copy protection technology, I will avoid purchasing it as long as possible, and will boycott media (broadcast and otherwise) that prohibits me from fair-use, which has always been a part of copyright law in the past, and should always be a part of it forever. otherwise, nobody will gain from a very limited distribution of IP, which would hopefully be of use to consumers in terms of it being worthwhile to consume, and producers would no longer have a large base of consumers to spread the costs in order

to make it feasible (read: profitable) to create IP in the future.  
Removing "Fair-Use" capacity from a product or technology will  
effectively put us back in The Dark Ages, where nothing progresses.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Thompson