

Stephanie Kost

From: Jonathan Rubin [JRubinUS@att.net]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 10:40 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: MB Docket No. 02-230, "Broadcast Flag"



Letter to FCC from
ConsGrps 10...

Attached please find a copy of a letter from four consumer-interest organizations directed this date to Chairman Powell regarding the above-referenced proceeding.

Respectfully,
Jonathan Rubin, Research Fellow
American Antitrust Institute
Washington, D.C.
JRubin@antitrustinstitute.org
202-415-0616

Stephanie Kost

From: Jason Cluggish [j_cluggish@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 7:44 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 31, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jason Cluggish
14 6th St
Medford, MA 02155
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: fcc@chwalisz.org
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 10:22 PM
To: fcc@prd7.wynn.com
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> David Chwalisz
<CONTACT-EMAIL> fcc@chwalisz.org
<ADDRESS1> 894 Pleasant St
<CITY> Woodstock
<STATE> IL
<ZIP> 60098
<PHONE> 815 337 7429
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> I am opposed to the use of the broadcast flag. Any law that will make my computer, that I plan to have for at least 10 more years, obsolete is not welcome. For people with limited means, a computer upgrade is impossible. And fair use, already an accepted part of copyright law, is already in danger. Regulating the hardware chain is not the answer -- it will remove any incentive for the development of new products and drop the US, already behind the world in the deployment of wireless services, to the bottom of the innovation chain.

As far as I am concerned, the media companies should be worried about improving the quality of this vast wasteland of broadcast and cable media and less about how they can slowly kill the consumer rights of fair use and a "general purpose" computer.

Stephanie Kost

From: Vance Osborne [murex@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 10:19 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

We know what you are up to, it is all very obvious. You can not control beauty and love and freedom. No bars or cage will hold it. You are powerless before love and freedom and justice and beauty. We are holding all the cards, the universe has fated the good peaceful humans to rule. We come peacefully to your table. Join love, join beauty, join free freedom, join humanity.

Sincerely,

Vance Osborne
4041 Louetta Rd
Spring, TX 77388
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Damian Mills [damianjmills@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 8:40 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Damian Mills
507 Mifflin St.
Huntingdon, PA 16652
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Brian Stough [brianstough@netscape.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 7:54 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Brian Stough
1030A Whaley St.
Oceanside, CA 92054
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Harshdeep Jawanda [harshdeep@jawanda.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 6:14 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Harshdeep Jawanda
408 Maple St SE Apt 36
Albuquerque, NM 87106
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Jason Kulas [jasond22@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:42 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television.

As a result of the mis-guided DMCA, consumer rights and fair use have already been trampled, I am loathe to see the trend continued.

As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

Digital televisions are already extremely expensive, heaping additional costs onto them will keep many people out of them even longer.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jason Kulas
493 Madison Rd
Durham, CT 06422
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of bird@alum.mit.edu
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:23 PM
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: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:22 PM
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: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:22 PM
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 brdcst@angelina.cs.tcu.edu
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 9:43 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/29/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> J. Richard Rinewalt
<CONTACT-EMAIL> brdcst@angelina.cs.tcu.edu
<ADDRESS1> 3216 Odessa Ave
<CITY> Fort Worth
<STATE> TX
<ZIP> 76109
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> The broadcast flag proposal is seriously flawed and should be rejected. It prohibits open source and hinders competition. It would inhibit lawful uses of broadcast programming and yet not be effective in addressing copyright infringement. It would also open another path for invasion of our privacy.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of mikeraffety@earthlink.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 10:01 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
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: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:22 PM
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 K Fenster@Earthlink.net
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:22 PM
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 uricchio@mit.edu
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:21 PM
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 uricchio@mit.edu
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 11:02 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
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 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: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:19 PM
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: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:19 PM
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 patandda@earthlink.net
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:19 PM
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 hwh6k@earthlink.net
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:19 PM
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 carlk@msn.com
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:19 PM
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 hwh6k@earthlink.net
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 10:42 AM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
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> 434-984-3115
<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.