

04-207

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** Wiladean & James Davis [jimdavismin@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 04, 2007 6:48 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Please protect America's families

Wiladean & James Davis  
 7861 Morgan Co. Hwy.  
 Sunbright, TN 37872-2849

March 4, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
 Federal Communications Commission  
 445 12th Street, SW  
 Washington, DC 20554

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Wiladean & James Davis

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
 List ABCDE

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Amie DiNardo [amie.terese@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 07, 2007 8:26 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Amie DiNardo (amie.terese@gmail.com) writes:

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** Amy Brinkerhoff [thehoff6@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2007 1:14 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Please protect America's families

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Amy Brinkerhoff  
553 E. White Ridge Dr.  
St. George, UT 84790-6640

February 21, 2007

Kevin Martin  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Kevin Martin:

I do not subscribe to cable because I am unable to control the content that flows into my household. In the past I have found the airing of content that is offensive and harmful to any who happen to come across it.

For some, the benefit of having cable come into their home is worth the risk and I am disgusted to learn that they are being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with their cable subscription.

In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home and choose that option by not subscribing to cable. But for those who do subscribe it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force them to pay for this content with their monthly cable subscription. The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights? Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Amy Brinkerhoff  
673-3812

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** Bradley Wege [ciel4@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 01, 2007 3:51 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Please support Cable Choice

Bradley Wege  
11606 Mapleview Dr.  
Silver Spring, MD 20902-2327

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 1, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription.

In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog.

It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice.

Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch.

It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family.

The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Bradley Sky Wege  
2404835364

04-207

**SandraLyn Bailey**

**From:** Brian Keck [bgkeck@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 10, 2007 10:47 AM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** Nip/Tuck proves the need for Cable Choice

Brian Keck  
613 North Chestnut Street  
Palmyra, PA 17078-1107

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 10, 2007

Michael Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Michael Copps:

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?  
Give us cable choice. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Brian Keck

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** Carla Depcik [Depcika@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 03, 2007 11:54 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Carla Depcik (Depcika@yahoo.com) writes:

I cannot watch tv without captioning. It should continue captioning all tv programs.....

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Conrad & Marjorie Blau [blau@chorus.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2007 5:05 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** America demands Cable Choice

Conrad & Marjorie Blau  
5975 Cherokee Valley Pass  
Waunakee, WI 53597-9695

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 6, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Conrad & Margie Blau  
6088492863

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** DANIEL BREAD [BLUEAIRPLANE84@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 11:40 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

DANIEL BREAD (BLUEAIRPLANE84@aol.com) writes:

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Dawn Hoberg [dawn\_195703@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 03, 2007 8:51 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Dawn Hoberg (dawn\_195703@yahoo.com) writes:

1. I am angry and I am protest the FCC's approved to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Dene L Scott [denelscott@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2007 6:08 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Dene L Scott (denelscott@yahoo.com) writes:

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** dheller@webformixair.com  
**Sent:** Friday, February 02, 2007 1:02 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Senate Testimony

Dear Butthead Martin;

You stated in your testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee this week that most people only watch about two dozen or so channels when subscribing to cable television service and an ala-carte service should be dictated instead.

I am a satellite subscriber and guess what? I get close to 200 channels but I also watch only 20 or 25 regularly. Why aren't you attacking them regarding an ala-carte service????????????????????

D Heller  
Sisters Oregon

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Douglas Jones [moohill@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 01, 2007 10:03 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** America demands Cable Choice

Douglas Jones  
142 Autumn Lane  
Kingston, TN 37763-4202

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

March 1, 2007

**MAR 13 2007**

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

Why is television treated so differently than most other businesses in America? Why, in order to receive American Movie Classics, The History Channel and a few other channels that really have value to me - I must also fund a multitude of channels that are offending and useless to me?

Most businesses in America run a risk of failure and collapse. Television channels seem to be free to attempt to brainwash us and our children with their brainless nonsensical filth and we are forced to pay for all of it - if we want a few good channels.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering citizens the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Douglas Jones  
865-376-8585

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Gary & Doris Burleson [dorisfortson@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2007 8:44 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Please protect America's families

Gary & Doris Burleson  
6023 Crystal Drive #64  
Columbus, GA 31907-8055

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 20, 2007

Kevin Martin  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Kevin Martin:

It is revolting that we are forced pay for scenes showing depraved behavior on some of the networks' programs with our cable subscription.

Why do we have to pay to view infomercials, paid programming and shopping networks? This junk takes up entirely too much viewing "real estate".

The solution is easy - however, Congress does nothing but appease the cable industry. What happened to consumers' rights? Give us individual channel choice! Offer people the right to choose channels they want, and pay only for those channels. Empower consumers and force producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own garbage. This is the only fair solution. Why should we be forced to pay for programming which insults intelligence and assaults our values? All this just to gain access to a few channels suitable for family viewing.

Sincerely,

Gary & Doris Burleson  
(706) 569-9572

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Harry Hydreos [railcowboy@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2007 10:42 AM  
**To:** Robert McDowell  
**Subject:** Forced programming by cable company

I would like to know why the fcc does not regulate the cable companies forced programming. We should be able to choose what programs we want. Not a package with 60 or so channels we won't watch and pay for programs like Sci Fi Channel only to find out that they have paid programming after a certain hour. I thought that paid tv was suppose to be commercial free? What happened to that idea. Most every one that I know agrees that we should be able to choose individual programs that we want.

example:

if I want Sci Fi, I have to purchase a program , I cannot purchase an individual channel.

Harry Hydreos  
railcowboy@yahoo.com

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Harry Hydreos [railcowboy@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2007 10:41 AM  
**To:** dtaylor@tateweb  
**Subject:** forced programming by cable companys

Why are we forced to subscribe to forced programming?, and why the fcc does not regulate the cable companies forced programming. We should be able to choose what programs we want. Not a package with 60 or so channels we won't watch and pay for programs like Sci Fi Channel only to find out that they have paid programming after a certain hour. I thought that paid tv was suppose to be commercial free? What happened to that idea. Most every one that I know agrees that we should be able to choose individual programs that we want.

example:

if I want Sci Fi, I have to purchase a program , I cannot purchase an individual channel.  
Harry Hydreos  
railcowboy@yahoo.com

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** James Byrne [jimyeboy@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 8:32 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

James Byrne (jimyeboy@aol.com) writes:

I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements. The FCC must reverse their decision and support the deaf and hard of hearing customers. Please support closed caption on all TV programs.

Mr. Martin, my name is James W Byrne Jr. and I am the only hearing child of James and Carmela Byrne. I know first hand how closed caption affects the lives of people. Please do not take away the quality of life for my mother, father, and deaf sister. Along with their friends and families. Make this world a positive place to live. Help us. ( I say us because I too am affected by the quality of life of my family even though I can hear.

Sincerely,  
James W. Byrne Jr.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Jeff Vehrs [ajvehrs@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 1:20 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Jeff Vehrs (ajvehrs@yahoo.com) writes:

1. I am UPSET and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

64-207

**From:** Jennifer Jones [crzymormongal@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2007 1:19 PM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** Please protect America's families

Jennifer Jones  
1149W 1230S  
Orem, UT 84058-2276

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

February 21, 2007

**MAR 13 2007**

Michael Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Michael Copps:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own launch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Jones

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Jerry Clark [Jerry007\_99@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 11:41 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Jerry Clark (Jerry007\_99@yahoo.com) writes:

What is up with waiving closed captioning requirements for TV shows? It sounds like you don't care about deaf/hard-of-hearing Americans. Do you think we enjoy watching the shows which we have no idea what they're saying? Think about it, make yourself deaf for a day and see if you can understand what the TV characters are saying. Believe me, it's not fun when you don't know what's going on. Closed captioning is our livelihood. Absolutely, DO NOT eliminate, waive, exempt, or lax the CC requirements!!!!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Joe Raabe [JRaabe1099@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 4:45 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Joe Raabe (JRaabe1099@comcast.net) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir:

I certainly support your stand on ala-carte pricing of cable.

We bought a new HDTV. Went to Comcast to sign up for 'HDTV' service (box), found that I had to upgrade to another level of digital service to get my five over-the-air local stations AND then had to be raised yet another service level to get the cable stations that broadcast in HDTV.

Bottom line--I have to pay \$5 for the service box, another \$10 for first level, then an additional \$10 to get the cable HDTV. Now I get HDTV, but I also have access to about 25 cable stations that I have no use for, BUT I pay for!

This is a crime--no wonder Comcast makes so much money.

Demand that have just a HDTV service without all the extra stuff they are forcing down our throats.

PLEASE HELP THE AMERICAN CONSUMER--COMCAST (and other large cable) companies are stealing money from us!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** John Johnson [pjj10@juno.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 04, 2007 12:36 AM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Help protect my family

John Johnson  
6449 Birchview Drive North  
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068-3538

February 4, 2007

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own launch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

John Johnson

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Jose Luis Quinones [LATINOBABYBOOP@YAHOO.COM]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 11:37 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Jose Luis Quinones (LATINOBABYBOOP@YAHOO.COM) writes:

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

04-207

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** JOWY [LATINOBB71@AOL.COM]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 11:37 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

JOWY (LATINOBB71@AOL.COM) writes:

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Kent Davis [mac4kent@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 01, 2007 9:55 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Kent Davis (mac4kent@gmail.com) writes:

I already getting angry because you FCC cutting Closed Caption. That is not fair hearing already have hear by speak on the T.V. whole hearing same as deaf and hard of hearing watch on the closed caption please. Hearing whole hear by ear from speak. Lot deaf people really angry have no closed caption because they don't understand what talk about on the T.V. without text closed caption.

I am angry and I protest the FCC's approve to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions!

Why?

I cannot watch TV program that are no captioned.

FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard-of-hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Letitia Stull [dfurrow@triad.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2007 8:46 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Nip/Tuck proves the need for Cable Choice

Letitia Stull  
3735 Welcome Arcadia Rd  
Lexington, NC 27295-6414

FILED/ACCEPTED

February 13, 2007

MAR 13 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Letitia Stull  
336-775-4968