

02-230

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Thursday, October 23 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Lucas Pate  
20531 Myers RD  
Athens, AL 35614

**RECEIVED**

OCT 28 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

02-230

EX PARTE (OR LATE FILED)

Thursday, October 23 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Pandu Rao  
3251 Bloomfield Lane  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326

**RECEIVED**

OCT 28 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

02-230

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

OCT 28 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Thursday, October 23 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

David Roush  
1028 N. Clay Ave.  
Springfield, MO 65802

02-230

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

OCT 28 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Thursday, October 23 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I am opposed to adoption of the "broadcast flag". I am an early adopter and my equipment investmant would be compromised.

I doubt that Hollywood would be glad to reimburse me for the the approximate \$8500 investment in equipment which would be obsoleted!

I am not alone; there are nearly 5 million early adopters with equipment which does not have broadcast flag capability.

If the broadcst flag is adopted, as an equipment requirement, its use must be delayed for at least 15 years.

Sincerely,

H. A. Blackstead  
16225 Oak Hill Blvd  
Granger, IN 46530

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

02-230

Thursday, October 23 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Chris Walsh  
11363 Pyramid Peak Ct, Alta Loma  
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91737

October 19, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Anand Thakur  
18665 Midway Rd  
Apt. 1413  
Dallas, TX 75287  
USA

October 19, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Greg Hard  
24 Essex St  
Weymouth, MA 02188  
USA

October 19, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Nancy Ayles  
7646 5th St  
Pasadena, MD 21122  
USA

October 19, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Theodore Borreson  
1210 N Cherokee Ave  
#222  
Los Angeles, CA 90038  
USA

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Kurt Congdon  
886 Cherry Creek Dr  
Grayslake, IL 60030

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Jim Martin  
16235 SW 138 PLACE  
Miami, FL 33177

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Patrick Helwig  
335 N 8th St. #603  
Lincoln, NE 68508

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Anne Uys  
3774 W 5th St.  
Fort Worth, TX 76107

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Timothy Burris  
7527 Honnen Dr. S.  
Indianapolis, IN 46256

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

K. C. Wong  
558 Gail Ave.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

October 11, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am largely confused by the Federal Communications Commission's pending foray into copyright enforcement. The broadcast flag cannot be construed, at any level, as being pro-consumer or in any way of benefit to the average user of broadcast material. It also belies any true understanding of market forces, and the history of content distribution technologies. I hope you will see your way to eliminating this threat to consumer rights and allowing the individual viewer to decide what he or she is willing to accept.

Since the advent of recordable media, the public has roundly REJECTED any form of copy protection. This applies to both entertainment and computer software, which are often distributed using the same technology. The problem with copy protection is this: any system that provides a level of control sufficient to satisfy the RIAA, MPAA and their ilk, invariably causes too many problems for legitimate consumers, who frequently perceive such "protection" as an equipment malfunction. Please keep firmly in mind that these are the very people that the content producers are counting on to buy their products! This is a Catch-22 that cannot be solved by a simple mandate.

Legitimate consumers bitterly resent this presumption of criminality, and the loss of control over their own property. That is why computer software is rarely copy protected anymore: the software vendors have found that such protection LOSES CUSTOMERS! Witness the recent formal apology from Intuit, Inc. over the product activation requirements of their TurboTax software. I am not alone in telling you this: the first time my digital video recorder tries to tell me that I can't make a copy of a movie to watch on the VCR in my bedroom, I will return that useless machine and get my money back. Either that, or I will find a way to copy it anyway. Current copyright law still grants me the right to do so, if I can, and as a software engineer with twenty years experience, there's a good chance that I will.

In spite of what the media companies may have told you, the VAST majority of consumers purchase their products legally and honestly. That is why those very same companies have been able to stay in the black for as long as they have. Luddites all, they are once again crying "foul", as they did with the audio cassette, the video cassette and the recordable CD. I might add that, when the legal system and the courts refused to grant them the power to destroy those technologies, they actually managed to use them to turn a profit.

Please ... do not grant a major cartel such as the MPAA the power to kill a potentially valuable technology like HDTV. Give the market a chance to accept HDTV before you risk the inevitable consumer backlash. Remember that the content companies and their representative organizations would be perfectly happy to see HDTV fall miserably, if it would maintain their current business structure and profit margins. They see absolutely no benefit to an improved television system, unless they can completely control and monopolize it to further their own ends.

After all, where is it written that the Federal Government should guarantee any organization or business a never-ending revenue stream? Allow them to compete for their market share just like every other corporation must. And if HDTV falls on the first go-round ... so be it. The free market will have spoken.

Sincerely,

James Karaganis  
225 Prairie Ave  
Highwood, IL 60040  
USA

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Laurel LaFayette  
1655 Centerview Dr, Apt 1817  
Duluth, GA 30096

October 11, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Trevor Roy  
218 N Plum St  
Lancaster, PA 17602  
USA

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

William H. Terry  
3650 Ashford Dunwoody 9D  
Atlanta, GA 30319

October 11, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Matthew Kindy  
1386 Hyde Park Drive  
Port Orange, FL 32128  
USA

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Mary Mastenbrook  
1015 Brighton Ct.  
Schaumburg, IL 60193

October 11, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Dan Renner  
9107 Falcon Greens Drive  
Village Of Lakewood, IL 60014  
USA

October 11, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

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,

Patrick McFarland  
298 State Street  
APT #9  
Ellsworth, ME 04605  
USA

Tuesday, October 21 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

John F. Coughlan  
1200 Coral Lane  
Englewood, FL 34224