

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of foner-fcc-02-230@media.mit.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:47 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Leonard Foner
<CONTACT-EMAIL> foner-fcc-02-230@media.mit.edu
<ADDRESS1> 28 Cottage Ave
<CITY> Somerville
<STATE> MA
<ZIP> 02144
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I am writing to express my strong opposition to NPR #02-230. Congress has already explicitly rejected the so-called "broadcast flag", correctly citing the infringement on consumers' fair-use rights, as upheld in the Betamax case, and the potential damage to a huge range of both fielded and yet-to-be-invented devices.

The FCC should -not- propose, suggest, mandate, or otherwise be facilitating the imposition of the "broadcast flag" or any other anti-time-shifting or anti-copying technologies, since NOT ONE has yet been shown not to infringe on rights granted by both the Constitution and SCOTUS to engage in fair-use timeshifting of broadcast video. The video and audio cartels have been bleating about fair use---and trying to kill new technologies that enable timeshifting---ever since audiocassettes (not to mention player piano rolls), and the issue should have been put to rest by Betamax. To see the FCC complicit in denying rights because the MPAA and the RIAA are still, after a century of examples, trying to kill new technologies is reprehensible and not what the FCC should be trying to accomplish. (If the MPAA had its way, we would not have videotapes today, and their shortsightedness would have cost -their own industry- billions of dollars in videotape sale and rental revenue. They can't even figure out what's good for their -own-businesses---why should they be allowed to pressure the FCC to do ill-considered rulemaking which is -already- clearly anti-consumer?)

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of cmaeda@alum.mit.edu
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 5:23 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/29/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Chris Maeda

<CONTACT-EMAIL> cmaeda@alum.mit.edu

<ADDRESS1> 215 S Broadway 241

<CITY> Salem

<STATE> NH

<ZIP> 03079

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The nationwide transition to DTV is not being held up by a lack of content. If digital movies were broadcast over HDTV today, nobody would watch them.

The real problem is that HDTV sets are still about 5x-10x the cost of regular TV sets. Who can afford a \$2000 television in a down economy? However, the prices are starting to drop rapidly and I expect that HDTV sets will be available for under \$500 within the next two to three years. Once that happens we will see widespread adoption of HDTV.

Given this situation, there is no valid argument for mandating a content control flag on digital TV broadcasts.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of D.Nash@alumni.utexas.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:47 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Donald L. Nash
<CONTACT-EMAIL> D.Nash@alumni.utexas.net
<ADDRESS1> 6420 Steer Trail
<CITY> Austin
<STATE> TX
<ZIP> 78749
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> To whom it may concern,

I am writing to protest the Proposed Rulemaking #02-230, the HTDV "Broadcast Flag". While I appreciate the motion picture industry's desire to avoid wholesale piracy of its work, the implications of the broadcast flag go far beyond that and allow Hollywood to infringe upon the fair use rights of the public. Copyright is suppose to be a delicate balance between the rights of the creator of a work and the rights of the users of that work, but the broadcast flag tips that balance too far in favor of the content creators by denying legitimate forms of fair use to the users. With laws like the Digital Millennium Copyright Act on the books, the balance is already tipped heavily in favor of the content creators. Please do not make this imbalance worse by enacting this misguided idea.

Hollywood has a history of opposing any technology that threatens their existing business model, for example the now-infamous attempt to quash the VCR over twenty years ago and their threat to withhold their movies from color TV thirty years earlier. New technology always endangers old business models, but it also makes new business models possible. How much money would Hollywood not be making now if they weren't licensing their movies for color TV broadcast, or if the video rental market didn't exist? The recent success of Apple Computer's new iTunes Music Store is a more recent testament to this, especially considering that its strongest competition, underground file sharing, allows people to get the same high-quality digital content without paying for it. The lesson here is clear: people will pay for high-quality digital content if it is reasonably priced, easy to acquire, and doesn't have unreasonable strings attached. It should not be the job of the FCC to protect ! an aging business model against the inevitable advancement of technology.

Further, Hollywood is using the federal government's strong desire to promote the wide scale adoption of HDTV to extort the broadcast flag as a concession to them before they release their movies in HDTV format. I use the word "extort" deliberately: Hollywood is telling the FCC, "If you don't give us what we want then we won't help you do what you need to do." This brazen attempt at extortion is reason enough to deny them. Further, it has not been established that getting Hollywood movies released for HDTV will substantively promote more rapid adoption of HDTV. Hollywood was releasing movies on LaserDisc for quite some time, but that technology never caught on because it was too expensive. The same is true of HDTV, at least for the moment. Although prices have come down significantly, HDTV sets are still very much high end luxury items. And while set-top adapters to standard TV are not too expensive, they don't offer the consumer anything other than the ability to watch what they're already watching on standard TV. Until prices come down, the availability of Hollywood movies will probably not make a large difference in HDTV penetration. Therefore Hollywood's attempt to trade its movies in exchange for the broadcast flag will help Hollywood without helping the FCC. Finally, Hollywood has made threats like this before: threatening not to release its movies to color TV in the 1950s, and then threatening not to release them to prerecorded videos in the 1980s. In both cases, their bluffs were called and they folded. There is simply too much money to be made for them to do otherwise.

Perhaps the most odious aspect of the broadcast flag proposal is the fact that it would

invest Hollywood with the ability to authorize or withhold authorization from new HDTV devices. This delegates lawmaking authority to a private industry, and that is simply not how things should be done in a democratic republic. The technology industry should not be shackled to the whims of Hollywood.

Please keep this in mind while making your decision: The federal government is ultimately responsible to the people, not to a small corporate elite. Hollywood doesn't vote to put people in office, the people do. What's best for Hollywood is not more important than what's best for the people. And Congress' desire to retire the analog broadcast spectrum and auction it is likewise not more important than the people's rights. Please don't so get carried away by the desire to get HDTV fully fielded that you lose sight of your primary responsibility: doing what's right for the people. While widespread deployment of HDTV will certainly benefit the people, it isn't worth sacrificing our rights for. Remember that the first three words of the U.S. Constitution are, "We the people," not "We the corporations."

Thank you for your time.

Donald L. Nash

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of bmeacham01@netscape.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 6:45 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Bill Meacham
<CONTACT-EMAIL> bmeacham01@netscape.net
<ADDRESS1> PO Bcx 585244
<CITY> Austin
<STATE> TX
<ZIP> 78768
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> I urge you to NOT require a broadcast flag in digital TV transmissions. The government should stay out of the market!

The idea of the broadcast flag is to implement universal content control and abolish the right of free citizens to own effective tools for employing digital content in useful ways. Hollywood and content producers must not be allowed to determine the rights of the public to use flexible information technology.

Free citizens are not mere consumers; they are not a separate group from so-called "professionals." The stakeholders in a truly just information policy in a free society are the public, not those who would reserve special rights to control public uses of information technology.

Stephanie Kost

From: ny_transplant@lycos.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:45 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/31/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Paul Winkler
<CONTACT-EMAIL> ny_transplant@lycos.com
<ADDRESS1> 662 E 21st St
<CITY> Brooklyn
<STATE> NY
<ZIP> 11226
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The proposed Broadcast Flag for digital television would be utterly ineffective in its purported aim - prevention of piracy. Pirates will simply continue to do what they already do: re-record the analog output of a digital device. No broadcast flag can prevent such abuse.

Worse, it would be a disaster for innovation in the consumer electronics market. Innovations in the set-top-box area (such as Tivo and Moviestream) would be subject to hollywood's approval and restrictions on a case-by-case basis. Furthermore, the open-source software phenomenon which is a vital part of our business infrastructure would be legally blocked from having anything to do with digital television.

Hollywood made the same arguments when the VCR was introduced, and fought in court to keep the VCR off the market. They lost in the Supreme Court, and now the VCR accounts for a large percentage of their revenue.

Please put the consumer first and don't be bullied by Hollywood's dubious arguments.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of pbarrett@sun.science.wayne.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:45 AM
Tc: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Paul Barrett
<CONTACT-EMAIL> pbarrett@sun.science.wayne.edu
<ADDRESS1> 10 ALEXANDER DR APT 628
<CITY> ASHEVILLE
<STATE> NC
<ZIP> 28801-3749
<PHONE> 828-250-9881
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to inform you of my opposition to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking #02-230. It is wrong to mandate a plan that would only allow "professionals" to have fully-functional devices for processing digital broadcast materials. The so-called broadcast flag rule would abolish the right of free citizens to own effective tools for employing digital content in useful ways. Hollywood and content producers must not be allowed to determine the rights of the public to use flexible information technology. The stakeholders in a truly just information policy in a free society are the public, not those who would reserve special rights to control public uses of information technology.

Sincerely,
Paul T. Barrett

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of bird@alum.mit.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:45 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> David Alt
<CONTACT-EMAIL> bird@alum.mit.edu
<ADDRESS1> 3865 17th St.
<CITY> San Francisco
<STATE> CA
<ZIP> 94114-2007
<PHONE> 415 552 3806
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Don't steal public property and give it to a cartel of thieves.

The public, and not Hollywood, should be able to control their own television sets, computer, and the programming that appears over the public airwaves.

No on the mandatory "broadcast flag".

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of lsp@lee-parks.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:44 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/29/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Lee Parks

<CONTACT-EMAIL> lsp@lee-parks.com

<ADDRESS1> 30 Swarthmore Rd.

<CITY> Scarsdale

<STATE> NY

<ZIP> 10583

<PHONE> 914-722-1068

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The broadcast flag proposal is a profoundly bad idea and continues the mistaken diversion of copyright law begun by the DMCA. If the proponents of the flag had their way, there would be no VCRs, no Tivo's, no writeable CDs or any other technological innovation. The existing content distributors want to impermissibly restrict my fair use rights in violation of the Constitution.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of mikeraffety@earthlink.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:44 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Michael V. Raffety
<CONTACT-EMAIL> mikeraffety@earthlink.net
<ADDRESS1> 2195 Cimarron Way
<CITY> Addison
<STATE> IL
<ZIP> 60101
<PHONE> 630-261-1888
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> In the ongoing fight with old world content industries, the most essential rights and interests in a free society are those of the public. Free citizens are not mere consumers; they are not a separate group from so-called "professionals." The stakeholders in a truly just information policy in a free society are the public; not those who would reserve special rights to control public uses of information technology.

Stop the broadcast flag -- preserve the right of free citizens to own effective tools for employing digital content in useful ways.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of helios@jenwa.org
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:44 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/29/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Chad Brown

<CONTACT-EMAIL> helios@jenwa.org

<ADDRESS1> 91 Sidney Street

Apt. #1015

<CITY> Cambridge

<STATE> MA

<ZIP> 02139

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The Broadcast flag serves only the interests of large corporations at the expense of technological innovation, open markets, and the common citizen.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of uricchio@mit.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:44 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> William Uricchio
<CONTACT-EMAIL> uricchio@mit.edu
<ADDRESS1> 1 Fitchburg St
<CITY> Somerville
<STATE> MA
<ZIP> 02143
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> I am a professor, teaching media studies at MIT.

The 'Broadcast Flag' seriously threatens my ability as a teacher to illustrate my classes on contemporary media. Media literacy, it seems to me, is vital for the future of our democracy.

The 'Broadcast Flag' also potentially interferes with my ability as a citizen and consumer to 'time shift' on my own terms, or to shift viewing platforms (to record at one location for playback at another).

Finally, the proposed 'Broadcast flag' must be seen in light of earlier fears introduced by the video tape recorder. Jack Valenti and his colleagues sought to introduce repressive measures, fearing product loss through this new technology. The FCC did nothing, and ultimately the motion picture industry made a fortune with the new technology. The panic is back, the urge to repress technology is back, and the interests of the few against the many are back.

I strongly urge the FCC to reject the Broadcast Flag, and to permit unrestricted domestic, non-commercial recording of digital television.

Thank you.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of K Fenster@Earthlink.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:44 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Kurt D Fenstermacher
<CONTACT-EMAIL> K Fenster@Earthlink.net
<ADDRESS1> 94 E Brookdale Way
<CITY> Oro Valley
<STATE> AZ
<ZIP> 85737
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The marketplace has proven to be a better arbiter of many issues than government regulation, and the broadcast flag is another instance where unneeded regulation will only cloud the issue. If the industry believes it is valuable to have a broadcast flag, let the industry subsidize the purchase of sets with the flag enabled. The role of the FCC is to ensure a level playing field in telecommunications, not to favor one side over another.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jr@ratwerks.com
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 12:12 AM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> James B Robinson

<CONTACT-EMAIL> jr@ratwerks.com

<ADDRESS1> 1255 33rd Ave

<CITY> San Francisco

<STATE> CA

<ZIP> 94122

<PHONE> 415/722-3745

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The Commission's proposal to regulate digital broadcast content through the "ATSC flag," as proposed by the BPDG, is technologically infeasible, commits the Commission to an extension of its jurisdiction to include regulation of software for all general purpose computers, which lies beyond the Commission's current statutory authority, and impermissibly interferes with the public's First Amendment rights to communicate technical information without limitation by government.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of hr@ratwerks.com
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 12:40 AM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Heather Robinson

<CONTACT-EMAIL> hr@ratwerks.com

<ADDRESS1> 1255 33rd Ave

<CITY> San Francisco

<STATE> CA

<ZIP> 94122

<PHONE> 415.860.4283

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The Commission's proposal to regulate digital broadcast content through the "ATSC flag," as proposed by the BPDG, is technologically infeasible, commits the Commission to an extension of its jurisdiction to include regulation of software for all general purpose computers, which lies beyond the Commission's current statutory authority, and impermissibly interferes with the public's First Amendment rights to communicate technical information without limitation by government.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of davoratles@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:43 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Davor Atles
<CONTACT-EMAIL> davoratles@yahoo.com
<ADDRESS1> 667 10th Street
<CITY> Oakland
<STATE> CA
<ZIP> 94607
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> The cost of the broadcast flag is so high that it can not be calculated. The loss to our society by forcing only crippled digital equipment (computers etc) on the United States public is so large that it can not be assigned a number. How many creative works will never happen, how many great scientific and engineering discoveries will never happen simply because the FCC is looking at "cost of parts" and not the true cost to society.

Other Comments:

The FCC has no business getting into Digital Restriction Management. The mandate of the FCC is to provide proper management of the airwaves as a public trust. To that end the FCC needs to act on behalf of the majority of the American public, and not on behalf of industry groups.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of groverf@jmu.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:43 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Ralph Grove

<CONTACT-EMAIL> groverf@jmu.edu

<ADDRESS1> 2921 Broadford Terrace

<CITY> Richmond

<STATE> VA

<ZIP> 23233

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The "broadcast flag" proposal would weaken consumer rights and the freedom of scientists and software developers. Consumers should have the right to make copies, to develop software for their own computers and to control their personal electronic devices without the FCC and broadcast industry limiting their choices. Software developers should have the freedom to experiment with new services and devices without risking criminal prosecution. Scientists and educators should have the right to experiment and discuss their work without the risk of prosecution and without artificial limitations.

The "broadcast flag" proposal is a bad idea, and is not in the best interests of the people of this country.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of hwh6k@earthlink.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:42 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Henry Huang
<CONTACT-EMAIL> hwh6k@earthlink.net
<ADDRESS1> 1800 Jefferson Park Avenue, #59
<CITY> Charlottesville
<STATE> VA
<ZIP> 22903
<PHONE> 434-984-3116
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> I am writing to oppose the effort to add a "broadcast flag" to digital TV signals.

Regardless of the issues Hollywood has raised (and piracy IS a legitimate issue), the fact of the matter is that the "broadcast flag" is nothing more than an effort to legislate severe limits on innovation and "fair use" through technological means. Fair Use is pointless in practice if the technologies through which content is delivered do not allow it. Moreover, no one special interest group -- Hollywood or anyone else -- should be allowed to dictate the terms by which future, potentially innovative technologies should or shouldn't be used. Ultimately, this is an issue that needs to be decided by elected officials directly beholden to the public -- and not rich media interests beholden to no one.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of patandda@earthlink.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:42 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Patrick and Darleen Clements

<CONTACT-EMAIL> patandda@earthlink.net

<ADDRESS1> 6549 California Ave. SW #8

<CITY> Seattle

<STATE> WA

<ZIP> 98136

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> We are opposed to the proposed "broadcast flag." Let's not put control of content in commercial hands. The division between "professionals" and consumers is arbitrary and means that the future of media innovation is put firmly in the hands of large companies. Consumers will be held hostage to the slow-moving profit-motivated media companies. Consumers must be free to innovate.

The broadcast flag would interfere with consumers' ability to send DTV content across networks, such as home digital networks connecting digital set top boxes, digital recorders, digital servers and digital display devices. The devices must all be certified by the media-producing cartel, which means that small third-party innovation will be stifled.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of carlk@msn.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:42 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Dr. Carl Kadie

<CONTACT-EMAIL> carlk@msn.com

<ADDRESS1> 15937 NE 1st St

<CITY> Bellevue

<STATE> WA

<ZIP> 98008

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I oppose the "broadcast flag". Technology makes TV more useful to me. The broadcast flag would make it less useful.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of DSBacker@newstudio.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:42 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> D. Stanley Backer
<CONTACT-EMAIL> DSBacker@newstudio.com
<ADDRESS1> 47 Page Road
<CITY> Newton
<STATE> MA
<ZIP> 02460
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> To the FCC: I strongly object to the adoption of any "broadcast flag" technology regulation, and I urge you to oppose it. As a tax-payer, voter, and legitimate consumer of broadcast materials, I believe it is a poorly thought out proposal, and one that would have significantly negative consequences.

I believe that the established principle of "fair use" would be hindered by such regulation, and it would likely force consumers to buy unneeded new equipment. It would also unfairly affect small manufacturers. Most of all, it is probably not an effective deterrent to the distribution of materials on the internet. If the goal is to address that issue, I believe you have an obligation to consider other means that are fair and do not penalize consumers.

Thank you for your attention.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jkennedy@csuchico.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:42 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> John Kennedy
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jkennedy@csuchico.edu
<ADDRESS1> 1856 Devonshire Dr.
<CITY> Chico
<STATE> CA
<ZIP> 95928
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> While the MPAA isn't as bad as the RIAA (yet), the broadcast flag is a big step in the wrong direction. It would restrict what we can do today for no good reason. It has a chilling effect on innovation. It doesn't even solve the problem, and the problem it is attempting to solve really doesn't exist today.

Today, I could care less about broadcast TV because it is basically infested with commercials and has little content that I want. When I want to watch movies, I get them off the satellite a long time before I see the edited, stripped down pan-n-scan versions we see on broadcast TV.

I think that once this flag exists, pretty soon it'll be turned on all the time except maybe during the commercials. The people who say that they need the broadcast flag can perish or adapt, and I don't particularly care which.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jmtrnka@nottingham.org
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:42 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Jenny Trnka
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jmtrnka@nottingham.org
<ADDRESS1> 129 Percival St. NW
<CITY> Olympia
<STATE> WA
<ZIP> 98502
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Please do not go through with the "Broadcast Flag." Technology should not be limited to "professionals" The airwaves and TV- waves-- are the peoples- lets allow them to use its technology to the fullest.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of noah_gibbs@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:42 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Noah Gibbs

<CONTACT-EMAIL> noah_gibbs@yahoo.com

<ADDRESS1> 43167 Newport Dr

<CITY> Fremont

<STATE> CA

<ZIP> 94538

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> As an Open Source user and programmer, I believe that it should be legal to write software for the Fair Use (in the legal sense) of software, and to modify the appliances I use on a daily basis. The Broadcast Flag is meant specifically to frustrate those interests. It is against my interests as a consumer, as a citizen, and as a supporter of freedom in the United States, and the only thing it offers in return is a chance for the members of the MPAA to make more profits. By supporting the Broadcast Flag, you are failing in your duty to the American people, myself included.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of bholroyd@mindspring.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:41 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Elizabeth Holroyd
<CONTACT-EMAIL> bholroyd@mindspring.com
<ADDRESS1> 8920 Orange Grove Road
<CITY> Chapel Hill
<STATE> NC
<ZIP> 27516
<PHONE> (919) 933-6922
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Public Officials,

Freedom of speech is worthless in this day and age if the only tool allowed to the speaker is his or her own unaided, unaugmented voice. It took unfettered use of the printing press to bring about the Reformation, as the (oppression-gearred) church leaders of the day were slow to recognize how many more people could read Luther's 99 questions once copies flew from Guttenberg's press.

Today's battle is between old world content industries and the free society that nurtured that very same group. I agree with others closely watching the development digital "broadcast flag" issue, that the most essential rights and interests in a free society are those of the public and that the tools members of the society and public use for speech - our First Amendment - should not be allocated to a class of actors who set themselves above the rest of the public, with the aid of a government bureaucracy.

"Free citizens," say the concerned watchers, "are not mere consumers; they are not a separate group from so-called 'professionals.'" The stakeholders in a truly just information policy in a free society are the public, not those who would reserve special rights to control public uses of information technology."

As a voting, concerned citizen of this free country, I say: Repent! Do not give -even more- to those who already have so much; do not take from those of us who already have such stifled voices. Refuse to cater to the wealthy special interests, act instead in the interests of the people who pay your wages, who justly expect you to protect our interests rather than those of the wealthy and already privileged, those with all the voice-enhancing tools at their command.

Thank you for listening.
E. Holroyd