I would like to state my complete objection to the inclusion of monitoring and crippling technology to consumer electronics and general purpose computing equipment that this proposal would bring about. I am a software developer and designer. I make my living for myself and my family by the use of general purpose computing equipment to produce innovated and advanced applications for use on these pieces of equipment. In more than 15 years in the industry, I have yet to see a technical proposal for these sort of "copy-protection" or "digital managment" systems that did not produce the following negative goals: First, the crippling and destabilization of the system in question for the purposes of innovative development of new computer software technology AND for general home computer usage. If I have to fight with the hardware of the systems that I use to develop software about what kind of data that I can store on them, how can I be expected to innovate? The motion! picture and television industry seem to have convienently forgotten that they both make heavy use of open source software (Film-Gimp, etc), developed by innovative people working on unencumbered computers, to create an ever-increasing percentage of their post-production and special effects. This sort of work that they are directly benefiting from, without cost to them, would NOT have been possible with encumbered computer equipment to use in the development and testing of these applications. Secondly, I have also never seen a proposal that takes into account that once you allow this sort of control to be established and embedded in the computing hardware available to the general population, there is nothing to prevent the supervisory body of that control to begin extending it beyond its original scope of intentions. Suddenly, computer users may find that they can no longer view or create material (video, audio, or textual) that is not "approved" by the supervisory body.!

For example, if someone decides that it is no longer appropr!
iate for people to view, research and create material about human rights violations, then with this mechanism in place, the rights of people to find this sort of information or document these sorts of abuse can be taken away from them, without their consent. Do we really wish to put that sort of timebomb into the computing infrstructure that runs more and more of our day to day lives, the industry and economy of our entire country? I don't believe that we do. The standard retort that I hear already is: "We can be trusted, there will be rules and oversight". Sorry, I've seen too much abuse of power, even with rules and oversight, and this proposal represents a significant amount of power being placed into hands that only have corporate and profit interests in mind, not the freedoms and rights of citizens of this and the other countries around the world. What if the control of these sorts of systems are compromised and become accessible to terrorist organizations? If !
individual people are using these tools to commit crimes, then they should be responsible for the consequences. The fact that this can exist is the price that companies and individuals pay to operate within this free country and the companies have benefitted from it greatly. To now say that those same freedoms and rights should be taken away from the individual citizens that build, run, support and make up this country is hyprocrisy of the highest order. Please reconsider the rammifications of this sort of ruling. What would happen to the billions of general purpose computers currently available in the world? Would they become illegal? Who will pay for the equipment that I would need to replace it? How would you recycle or eliminate the waste from disposing of so many units and the environmental impacts that it could have? Common sense says that if broadcasters want me to watch their shows that I can't always do it at the time that they broadcast it. I have to make!

a living after all. Private viewing in my own home at a late!
r time poses no threat to their profits or copyrights. "But, you fast forward through our commercials", they cry out. Sure, I do, but I'm still watching. If an advertisement goes by that I am interested in, I stop and go back to watch

it, so they and their advertisers still get their message out. What about this is so disasterous, especially weighted against the potential mis-use of invasive "rights-management" systems?