

The concept of a copy-protection flag that would prohibit users from fully utilizing their equipment plainly flies in the face of fair use. It doesn't make sense to punish every consumer because the entertainment industry can't continue to generate revenue the way that have been doing so for the past 60 years. It is the job of the entertainment industry to find ways to remain competitive despite technology's evolution; not hamper the progress of technology to prevent difficult changes in marketing or perhaps the death of a large industry.

In short, the proposed systems would provide only temporary and limited protection from piracy, which will inevitably circumvent any measures meant to control freely available content. The cost of this temporary insulation from reality will be the fair-use rights of every American citizen who wishes to record a historic newscast, a favorite movie, or the Super Bowl.

In the end, it is hard to imagine how the ordinary use of recorded products would interfere with the profits of the entertainment industry - indeed, 99% of people wouldn't possess the technical sophistication to illegally distribute copyrighted material.

I have heard that a major concern in this case is the speed with which an American television program might spread to foreign markets. It seems that the television industry likely is in possession of technology to disseminate television content even more rapidly to far-flung points of the globe. If a home user with a DSL connection can send "American Idol" to a japanese friend in a day and a half, then I am confident in the Industry's ability to do it in a minute and a half.

I am urging to FCC to recognize that the proposed "Content Protection" paradigm doesn't really protect content reliably and comes at the unacceptable cost of Individual Fair Use Rights.