

Docket#04-207. vlj

Cable choices

9/10/2007 10:13:17 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to pulsar1@grandecom.net.

pulsar1@grandecom.net wrote on 9/8/2007 10:12:21 AM :

John Hutson
635 Blakeley Dr.
San Antonio, TX 78209-5549

September 8, 2007

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

Dear Kevin Martin:

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,

John Hutson
210-824-0107

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 18 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd _____
LBI:ABC/DE

9/28/2007 8:52:56 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to rhale002@tampabay.rr.com.

rhale002@tampabay.rr.com wrote on 9/27/2007 10:15:29 PM :

Commissioner Copps,

I am writing to you in regards to your statement today. You said "that the parts of the public record that you looked at so far have not shown you it is in the publics interest". I fail to understand how you can say that. Outside of the National Broadcasting Association, and its members, I believe both the public and the consumers have said that they want the merger. However, before I go further, I must tell you that I do own some shares of SIRIUS, and have owned them on and off before this merger discussion. Because I own stock in the company I get alerts on all the public information that is either for or against the merger. And judging from that, I am hard pressed to see where the public is saying no I don't want this deal. Yes, I want to pay more for satellite service for a bunch of programs I don't want. I myself do not subscribe to either service as a user. Why? Because I don't want it? NO! Because it cost too much. Currently they both charge \$12.95/mo, and that is because I am paying for a lot more service than I want. Plus a lot of high priced stars that I don't want to listen to in the first place. However, after the merger I, and the rest of the public, will be able to choose their channels at \$6.95/mo. And what if they offered a discount for quarterly, semi-annual, or annual payments in advance? Why is that important? Because I live in a semi-rural area. At best I can only get 10 channels over the air I might listen too, but have to program them on my home and car radio by how clear they come in. So at best 6 channels to choose from. That is of course if I stand still. If I am driving around, or if aircraft come by they get better or worse, or I lose them altogether, and have to search for new ones. In addition for that price, as best that I understand from the proceedings I would get 50 channels to listen too. And I would be able to get them at home, and while I drove around the state, or the country for that matter. Never having to re-program my radio again.

As another point of interest let me mention TV. My parents bought our first TV in 1947. At that time there was only 3 tv channels, and they broadcast only in black and white, and only several hours a day. In 1961 we got our first color tv. Again only several hours of color tv, and the rest of the day black and white. Since we lived across the river from NYC, our reception was ok on the main channels. The rest, as they were added, were of poorer quality. 20 miles inland even the 3 majors were not as good, even with two people holding onto the antenna, plus tin foil. In 1976 cable started coming to the inland communities. While all I could do is watch reruns of comedy show I saw, my co-workers were telling me about the movies they were watching on cable. Sure I could rent the VHS movies for a high cost, after membership fees, and I did because I had no other choice. Yet they were watching them much cheaper, just later than when the video came out. Then as cable became more available it competed with movie rentals, and now they are competing back and I see them before they are on cable, and as many as I want. My point here is time does not stand still. What kind of TV reception due you get with rabbit ears today, on regular or HD TV that most people would prefer today compared to cable? Little or none I suspect. So why would you think most people would be better severed if we rolled time back to just over the air reception? And that is what you are doing when you say that SIRIUS an XM merger is not beneficial to the public. To us it doesn't matter if there is only one satellite provider, it is a choice we don't have now at a nominal cost. And if they merge they will over time consolidate their bandwidth. Why? because once people start choosing what they want to listen too, as oppose to a package they will eliminate the lower rated channels to cut cost. Also, they will find out exactly how many people want to pay for these high priced shock jocks they hired, and the prices will adjust accordingly. I doubt that they want to be bandwidth hogs to avoid competition. I believe over time they will adjust to what their customers want, and free up extra bandwidth that they don't need as well. And if at some point in the future they raise rates that the public doesn't feel it doesn't deserve, then the pubic has a choice, they can say cancel my account. It's that easy.

The bottom line here is, as a consumer I need an alternative choice to conventional radio no matter what its format, and not at the current prices.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Hale