EXHIBIT "1"

BEGBATES = LW DE 1263224 **ENDBATES** = LW DE 1263227 BATESATTCH CUSTODIAN = Catillaz, Kathryn

DOCTYPE **AUTHOR** TO FROM

Adam Fisk <adamfisk@gmail.com>; Serguel Osokine <Serguel.Osokine@efi.com>

CC

BCC SUBJECT TITLE CREATEDATE = 00/00/0000 DATERCVD = 00/00/0000 = 00/00/0000 DATESENT DOCEXT = htm OCRPATH OCR

RE: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Wu on YouTube From: Serguei Osokine <osokin@osokin.com>

From: Serguel Osokine <osokin@osokin.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2006 1:52 AM

To: Adam Fisk <adamfisk@gmail.com>; Serguel Osokine <Serguei.Osokine@efi.com>
Cc: David Barrett <obarrett@quinthar.com>; Mark Cuban <Mark.Cuban@dallasmavs.com>; Fred von Lohmann <pho@vonlohmann.com>; Pho List <pho@onehouse.com>
Subject: RE: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Wu on YouTube

On Friday, October 27, 2006 Adam Fisk wrote:
> Why is Mark going on and on about YouTube? Because he thinks it
> crosses a line beyond which tolerance for infringement is overall
> detrimental (maybe not how he would put it =). I disagree with him
> there, but I do think the p2p companies generally cross that line.
> Sure, it's the users sharing the infringing material, but the
> programs are designed to maximize that infringement,

> programs are designed to maximize that infringement,

Not sure about Mark, but in P2P, there is no line. Whatever you call the line is actually determined by the latest position of the rights owners - the same people who killed Napster because they did not understand what Gnutella was, and then resurrected Napster when Gnutella, eDonkey, and Kazaa were in full swing, and now are fighting these netweorks instead of trying to use their potential.

I'm sorry, but I cannot seriously consider any lines drawn by these people as something worthy of respect. They have no clue where they are drawing tham, and where these lines will be tomorrow. One simply cannot plan a coherent technology development policy on the basis of such arbitrary restrictions. Especially when these "lines" are artificial and self-destructive even for the content owners - they'd be probably better off without any lines, accepting the file-sharing landscape as a given. It is not going away any time soon, so they might as well figure out how to monetize it instead.

And what you call "designed to maximize that infringement", I'd rather call "decent user interface". It is not like someone is sitting and thinking how to maximize infringement, really. User interface programmers tend to think in terms of user satisfaction, and if the programs end up being convenient for something, it simply means that this is what the users want. If I'd work for RiAA, I'd actually think about how it could satisfy these needs, too - not how to alienate the maximum possible number of music listeners in the shortest possible

But as you can probably guess, I do not work for RIAA...

Best wishes -S.Osokine.

> EXHIBIT 2-15-06

February 12, 2008 11:07 pm

Page 1

28 Oct 2006.

——Original Message—
From: Adam Fisk [mailto:adamfisk@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 8:48 PM
To: Serguei Osokine Cc: David Barrett; Mark Cuban; Fred von Lohmann; Pho List Subject: Re: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Wu on YouTube

Hi Serguei- We should certainly have that beer one of these days. You ever make it to New York?

- Hopefully they will see the > wisdom of licensing sooner or later, but it does not mean that > in the meantime writing P2P code should be Illegal.

I'm certainly not saying that. Heck, I'd be a wanted man!

1

6:

(:

- Writing code
 > should never be illegal, in my opinion. Just as writing equations,
 > writing poetry, making films, or making speeches. It is up to the
 > society how to deal with the content that is created this way. Even

- > though First Amendment does not formally apply, on the average the > societies that permit free innovation tend to be significantly better > off than the ones that don't.

I agree with the spirit of what you're saying. I do think there have to be limits, though, and I think copyright infringement is one of the cases where there should be limits. Why is Mark going on and on about YouTube? Because he thinks it crosses a line beyond which tolerance for infringement is overall detrimental (maybe not how he would put it =). I disagree with him there, but I do think the p2p companies generally cross that line. Sure, it's the users sharing the infringing material, but the programs are designed to maximize that infringement.

Sure. But their money was safe enough to invest into Skype > development and get some positive ROI, which would be impossible > in the US. Remember how the Skype founders refused to even set the foot on the American soil while talking to eBay? Think you
 guys could create Skype yourself at LimeWire, if only you'd have
 this idea earlier, and would work harder and smarter on Gnutella?

> Think again.

I disagree with you there. I remember a lunch conversation at LimeWire just redisagree with you there. Tremented a variety content conversation at intervitor just after Skype was released. I've klicked myself for years for not saying "hey, we should do the same thing." If we had decided to do that, I see absolutely no reason we could not have done so. We had zero legal costs and had more than enough cash and skills to make it happen.

What I'm saying, I guess, is that there would be no > Skype without Kazaa. Whereas if you'd have your say, you'd shut down > Kazaa for what you'd call its "devotion to infringement" years ago, > and we'd have no Skype as a result.

That might be true. I think they could have just written Skype off the bat, but, granted, Kazaa was largely an R&D project that made Skype possible. I think we've all done the R&D, and we can make a lot more possible.

We really should have that beer sometime.

-Adam

On 10/27/06, Serguei Osokine < Serguei. Osokine@efi.com > wrote: > On Friday, October 27, 2006 Adam Fisk wrote: >> Do you think any technology should be illegal? What I'm thinking about nuclear and nano technology and its > proliferation is an irrelevant quesiton is this context - though > I'll gladly talk to you about this over beer some day :-) But this is not a nuclear technlogy. Not by a long shot. >> Did you consider Napster a legal service, for example? Back then, you mean? I did not care. Actually I do not care > even now. I learned about Napster just about when I learned about > Gnutelfa, and since the latter clearly could not be shut down by > any means, the former was of interest for me only as an IQ test > for the labels - would they be able to figure out that keeping it > around would be better for them than shutting it down or not? They > did not pass the test, of course. Legality of Npaster was something > to be decided between Napspter and record labels - I had no opinion > about that, because in my view, the file-sharing techology cannot be > legal or illegal by itself. If the labels license the content, then it all becomes legal. > The labels did not license the content - and Napster was shut down. > The technology stays the same, which means that the legality of it Is something determined by the actions of record labels, and not
 by the technology itself. How could I know whether Napster was legal
 or not, before the labels made their move and the courts had their > say? So at the time I did not even think about it - how could I > predict what the labels would do? Ditto for distributed networks - It is up to the content owners to make them legal by licensing, or illegal by refusing to license.
 How would I know what will they do? Hopefully they will see the
 wisdom of licensing sooner or later, but it does not mean that
 in the meantime writing P2P code should be itlegal. Writing code
 should never be Itlegal, in my opinion. Just as writing equations, > writing poetry, making films, or making speeches. It is up to the > society how to deal with the content that is created this way. Even > though First Amendment does not formally apply, on the average the > societies that permit free innovation tend to be significantly better > off than the ones that don't. >> I don't buy the offshore thing for a second, by the way. Kazaa >> made more money early on because it was a better program. Period. Sure. But their money was safe enough to invest into Skype Stire. But their money was sare enough to invest into skype
 development and get some positive ROI, which would be impossible
 in the US, Remember how the Skype founders refused to even set
 the foot on the American soil while talking to eBay? Think you
 guys could create Skype yourself at LimeWire, if only you'd have
 this idea earlier, and would work harder and smarter on Gnutella?

>> Every other major p2p company was based in the US, and I don't >> think Kazaa was ultimately the biggest financial success.

I'm not sure. Until you said that, I had an impression that
 Kazaa was the company (or at least the network) that made more money

> Think again.

0

(:

```
> than anyone else, but you may be right, of course. The point here is

    nat anyone else, but you may be right, or course. The point here is
    not how much money did they make, but whether they could leverage
    this money and their knowledge of Kazaa network - which they clearly
    could and did. What I'm saying, I guess, is that there would be no
    Skype without Kazea. Whereas if you'd have your say, you'd shut down
    Kazaa for what you'd call its "devotion to infringement" years ago,
    and we'd have no Skype as a result.

>> There's so much room to innovate with p2p outside of infringement
>> that it's mind boggling there hasn't been more.
          Any idea how to make it in a profitable way? :-)
         Best wishes -
          S.Osokine.
          27 Oct 2006.
> —Original Message—
> From: Adam Fisk [ mailto:adamfisk@gmall.com ]
> Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 7:19 PM
> To: Serguei Osokina
   Cc: David Barrett; Mark Cuban; Fred von Lohmann; Pho List
> Subject: Re: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Wu on YouTube
> I don't see any line a company should not cross in your worldvlew. Do you
> think any technology should be illegal? I'm all for free innovation, but

    laws exist for reasons. Guns have gun control, software has copyrights,
    patents etc etc. Did you consider Napster a legal service, for example?

> I don't buy the offshore thing for a second, by the way. Kazaa made more > money early on because it was a better program. Period. It took us about
 > year at LimeWire to catch up to them, with help from people like you. I
 > think we ultimately surpassed them on pretty much all levels, but they
 > us for awhile. Every other major p2p company was based in the US, and I
 > don't think Kazaa was ultimately the biggest financial success.
 > I agree the underlying technology for LimeWire and Skype are similar. The
 > point is that one makes all of its money off of infringing content while
 > the
 > other does not. You think that's all great in the spirit of
 > innovation. 1
 > think they should be as innovative with their businesses as they are with
 > their technology, like Skype. You say they make money from the same
 > source,
 > I guess the technology. I think that's ridiculous. There's so much room
 > innovate with p2p outside of infringement that it's mind boggling there
 > hasn't been more. One of the reasons there hasn't been more is that
 > everyone's been writing code to share mp3s.
 > I also have no reason to think Kazaa spent any less money on legal
  > expenses
 > than anyone else. They certainly spent more than we did at LimeWire.
  >-Adam

    On 10/27/D6, Serguel Osokine <Serguel.Osokine@efi.com> wrote;
    On Friday, October 27, 2006 Adam Fisk wrote;
```

11

(:

>> Skype has made more money than all the other p2p companies combined>> (educated guess, and i'm not talking about the eBay sale), and its>> unequivocally non-infringing.

Skype itself - yes. But its technology is a direct offspring
 of the Kazaa network technology. I wouldn't even be surprised to
 find the shared code.

And the reason Skype could be created at all was that first,
the Kazaa team had money to perfect and play with the file-sharing
technology (I don't like the work "infringing", since It is not their
fault that their users are infringing - it is the fault of the content
owners, who falled to license content to these users). This money
came from the activity that you frown upon, by the way.

> And second, this money was offsore, so it could be applied to
> the future (Skype) R&D and did not have to go into the legal expenses
> at once. Sure, both these conditions - starting from the mature P2P
> technology and funding - also had to be applied to the reasonable
> future development idea (VoIP), but that is expected. No one makes
> money creating useless things. As usual, selecting the right idea
> is partly (or even mostly) luck.

> So I wouldn't say that Skype was any exception. They just
> applied their technology to the right idea - partly because they
> could afford this, being offshore and all. I'll grant you that the
> decision to move Into VoIP was a smart one. But Skype money comes
> from exactly the same source as LimeWire or Morpheus money (heck,
> at some point what later became Skype and Morpheus were one network).
> In a certain sense, Skype and LimeWire are mirror images.

> > Just as the entertainment industry never adapted well to the new >> technology, I don't think the p2p companies ever adapted well to >> the new technology (the technology they were creating!). Except >> Skype,

> They did not exactly adapt. They had an idea that made sense > and means to pursue it. If other companies did not have such an idea > or did not have means, in my book it does not mean that they are less > worthy of protection in what they are doing. Even if they have had > bad business sense and missed some opportinities, it is not a good > enough reason to say that they should not be protected legally.

> The freedom to innovate should not be awarded only to those who
> make good business calls. It is a universal right. To have a healthy
> innovation ecosystem, you should have multiple P2P companies, most
> of which would be doing the same thing over and over again (just like
> multiple Internet pet food stores in the nineties), some will do some
novel things, even fewer will make novel things that make sense, and
> just a few - will create some revolutionary new technology like Skype.

If you'll start crushing companies that - in your view - are > not innovating, pretty soon you won't have any P2P companies at all. > Incidentally, this is more or less what is happening in the US now. > Eilmination is done for the other reasons, but the net effect is the > same. I do not think it is a coincidence that the most intersting > novel derivative of P2P technology - Skype - was created by someone > who was relatively free from this pressure.

They could have failed to create anything new, of course - many > offshore companies did. But the dice fell their way, while *all* P2P > companies of the richest country in the world were out of luck. Do you > really think it is a coincidence?

Best wishes -

```
S.Osokine.
>
         27 Oct 2008.
> ----Original Message---
> From: Adam Fisk [ mailto:adamfisk@gmatl.com ]
> Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 12:45 PM
> To: Serguel Osokine
> Co: David Barrett; Mark Cuban; Fred von Lohmann; Pho List
> Subject: Re: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Wu on YouTube
        Well, that's not exactly true for me. Almost true - but with
> one small, though important, twist. I always believed in the wide
> potential of this technology without giving any special thought as
> to whether it would be infringing or not.
> I think that's where our difference lies. I don't see massive
> infringement
> intringement
> as an interesting "potential of this technology". Its certainly the most
> prevalent use of the technology, and I think that's too bad. I happen to
> think there's a far larger business opportunity in non-infringing uses
> than

    in infringing ones. Look at the balance sheets of the p2p
    companies. None

> of them made much money in the scheme of things, with one exception -
> Skype.
Skype has made more money than all the other p2p companies combined 
> (educated
> guess, and I'm not talking about the eBay sale), and its unequivocally > non-infringing.
> i'm not defending the entertainment industry here, but I don't think it's > accurate to paint the p2p companies as the poor victims of the
> industry heavyweights. Just as the entertainment industry never adapted
flsw <
> to the new technology, I don't think the p2p companies ever adapted well
> to
> the new technology (the technology they were creating!). Except Skype.
> To me, the squabbles with the entertainment industry have always been a
> distraction to realizing where we can go with the p2p knowledge we
> have. I
> mean that from a business model perspective, from a technology
> perspective,
> from a legal perspective, and from a cultural perspective. We can do
> better.
>
> -Adam
```

IMAGELNK VOLID

; ;

C.

= LW DE 1263224

= PROD8

```
CIDCTYPS NTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD NTML 3.2//EN">
CIDCTYPS NTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD NTML 3.2//EN">
CIDCTYPS NTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD NTML 3.2//EN">
CHEAD
CHEAD
CHEAD
CHEAD
MALE—"Consensor" CONTENT—"MS Exchange Server version 6.5.7036.0">
CITILIDARS: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Mu on YouTube</TITLID
CINCIPRE: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Mu on YouTube</TITLID
CIDCTED Width—"100">
CIDCTED WIDTH—
CIDCTED
     <!-- Converted from text/plain format -->
 <P><FORT SIZE=190n Friday, October 17, 2006 Adam Figk Werster GRD-191: May is Mark going on and on about YouTube?enhapp Recause he thinks iteRM 1915 courses a line beyond which telerence for infringement is overall GRD-1915 coursely detrimental craybe not how he would put it = 1.5mbsp; I disagree with himcRD-1915 the put it to think the pgc companies generally urose that line-2RD-1915 sure, it's the users sharing the infringing material, but the GRD-1915 programs are designed to maximize that infringement. GRD-1915 coursely a program are designed to maximize that infringement. GRD-1915 coursely are about Mark but in 270 there is no line (for programs).</p>

AND STATE THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE
 CRD

Anhapyl's sorry, but I cannot seriously consider say lines drawn by GRD
these pooplo as something worthy of respect. They have no clue whore GRD
they are drawing then, and where these lines will be tenerrow, One-GRD
simply counct plan a coherent technology davelogment policy on the GRD
sain of such artificary restrictions. Expectally when these equotilizes equotilizes are artificial and self-destructive even for the content owners—GRD
they do be probably better off whichhout my land sceeping the discovery
file-sharing landscape as a given. It is not going skey say time SRD
spon, so they might as well figure out how to monstime in material GRD
GRD.
Card and a most separate of most require out how to monetize it instead. CRP shipping what you call squotidesigned to morimize that infringementsquots, I'ddRP rether call squotidesent user interfacesquots. It is not like someone is sitting-CRP and thinking how to maximize infringement, really. User interface-CRP programmers tend to think in terms of user satisfaction, and if the-CRP programmers being convenient for something, it mingly seems that CRP this is what the users want. If I'd work for RIAA, I'd actually think-CRP about how it could satisfy these needs, too - not how to alienate the-CRP maximum possible number of music listeners in the shortest possible-CRP CRP.
     subspirit as you can probably quest, I do not work for RIAA...<BR>
      enbapiBost wishes -CBR>
     CRPD
---Original Mansage---CBPD
From: Adam Fink [<A HREF="mailto:rodamfisk8gmail.com">mailto:rodamfisk8gmail.com</a>(A)
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 8:48 PMCNP
FOR Second OsokinsedDe
Or David Berrett; Mark Cuben; Fred von Lohann; Pho List<BRD
Subject: Net Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim Wu on KouTubechPD
GRD
GRD</pre>
     NI Serguar-enbop; Re should cortainly have that beer one of these days. Embop; You ever CBRD make it to New York? CBRD
     Hopefelly they will see the CRD for which of licensing scenes or later, but it does not mean that CRD capt in the meantime writing FCP code should be illegal. CRD CRD
        CRP)
I'm cortainly not saying that contap; Hack, I'd be a wanted manifest)
      CRED

I agree with the spirit of what you're saying subsp. I do think there have to be CRED

limits, though, and I think copyright infringement is one of the case where CRED

there should be limits, subsp. May is Nork going on and on about VolveTrobaps SecurateRED

the thinks it crosses a line beyond which tolerance for infringement is CRED

overall dottimental (maybe not how be would put it =), subsp. I disagree with himcRED

there, but I do think the pap companies generally cross that line subsp. Sure, CRED

it's the users sharing the infininging material, but the programs are CRED

CRED
           cato
anbapy Embapy Embapy Embapy Embapy Embapy Embapy Sure. But their money was safe enough to invest into Skype(BR)
```

0

```
ight development and get some positive ROI, which would be impossible CRP-
ight in the US. Remomber how the Skypo founders refused to even sot CRP-
ight the foot on the American soil while talking to emay? Think yourders-
ight the foot on the American soil while talking to emay? Think yourders-
ight this could create Skype yourself at LimeWire, it only you'd have CRP-
ight this idea marlier, and would work harder and smorter on Gnutellar(RP-
ight Think again. CRP-
CRP-
CRP-
CRP-
CRP-
Think again. CRP-
Think you there, which again the same thing. CRP-
Think again. CRP-
Think again. CRP-
Think again. CRP-
Think you there. Think again. Think you there again again.
Think you there you the same thing. CRP-
Think you for the you for the your for your for the your for your for the your for
      CHRO Tim saying, I guess, is that there would be notBRO that I'm saying, I guess, is that there would be notBRO solve without Korna. Whereas if you'd have your say, you'd shut downGRO four Kazas for what you'd call its squoredevotion to infribgementaquor; years ego, GRO four and we'd have no Skypo as a result. GRO
      That might be true. Enhaps I think they could have just written Skype off the bat, <erb
but, granted, Kazaa was largely an Resmpid project that made Skype possible. Enhaps IKER>
think we've all done the Resmpid, and we can make a lot more possible. <erb>
      We really should have that beer sometime. < 3R>
      -Adaptero
      On 10/27/05, Serguei Gookine Slt:Serguei.Oookine@efi.comsqt: wrote:<ER>
        eqtr-RB Friday, October 27, 2006 Adam Fisk wrote;<BR>
eqtr (B fyt: Do you think any technology should be illegal?<BR>
eptr-RB
      det-dBD
detschapsinbsp;anbsp;anbsp;anbsp;anbsp;anbsp;anbsp; What I'm thinking about nuclear and name technology and its<BD
dets proliferation is an irrelevant quesiton is this context - thoughCRD
dets I'il gladly talk to you about this ever beer some day :-><BD
          egisenbapsenbapsenbapsenbapsenbapsenbapsenbapsenbapsenbapsenbapsen But this is not a nuclear techniogy. Not by a long shot. <BR
  egtr-CRA 

septreRA 

        agt: agt: Did you consider Mapster a logal service, for example? (22)
  egt. CRD alregal by itsaif. CRD sale-snaring tachology cannot be CRD spt. CRD spt. chapp; snbsp; snb
sqt: say? So at the time I did not even think shoun it - how could I GETO
dtp: predict what the labels would dorGEND
dtp: predict what the labels would dorGEND
dtp: case.

dt
             aggress?

Egt; fgt; Thure's so much room to innovate with p2p outside of infringement@P>

Egt; fgt; that it's mind hoggling there hasn't been more.<ER>

Egt-GBC
```

(

(

(.

```
egt; enbsp; enbsp: enbsp; enbsp; enbsp; enbsp; enbsp; enbsp; enbsp; Any idea how to make it in a profitable way? ;--)<BR>
     Agus and Co Et Agus a
       4gt:<BR>
    agtress

GSt ----Original Message----GRN

GGt From: Adam Pink [GA HARF-Wallto:odomfinkSgmail.com">pailto:odomfinkSgmail.com"/>>|SRN

GGt Stat: Fridny, October 27, 2006 7:19 MGRN

GGt Tor Sergual CankinaGRN

GGt Gor Savid Borrett; Merk Cuben; Fred von Lobenn; Pho LibtoR

GGT Subject: Re: Phot Slate: Prof. Tim Wu on YouTube(SRN

GGT/SRN)
    eggr:an-
eggr: I don't see any line a company should not cross in your worldview.enhap; Do youksRo-
eggr: think any technology should be illegal?enhap; I'm all for free innovation, huksRo-
eggr: loss exist for reasons. Shipp; Ghas have gan control, software has copyright, GRO-
eggr; patents ate etc.enhap; Did you consider Hapster a legal service, for example?eRo-
     age: CBR>

sgt: I don't buy the offshore thing for a second, by the way.snbep; Maxea made noiceCBR>
sgt: accept early on because it was a better program.snbsp; Pariod.4mbsp; It took us aboutcBR>
sgt: acSR>
                          acBR>
year at limsWire to catch up to them, with help from people like you.anhap: ICBD think we ultimately surpassed thrm on protty much ell levels, but they SRD
     egg: nest-cap.

egg: dest-cap.

egg: don't think Kazee was ultimately the biggest financial nucress.<28>
  SQT-CRP)

SQT: I agree the underlying technology for Linewire and Skype ore similar. Subep; The CRP

Agt; point is that one makes all of its money off of infringing content while CRP

SQT: other does not. Subsp; You think that's all great in the spirit of CRP

SQT: Annowation. Subsp; ICRP

SQT: think thay should be an innovative with their businesses as they are with CRP

SQT: think thay should be an innovative with their businesses as they are with CRP

SQT: think thay should be an innovative with their businesses as they are with CRP

SQT: think CRP.
     spor tourse with p2p outside of infringement that it's mind boggling thateGRN (ggt; innovate with p2p outside of infringement that it's mind boggling thateGRN (ggt; averyone's bean writing code to share mp3s.cBN) for the feathful tours of the feath-cBN and the feath-cBN (ggt; averyone's bean writing code to share mp3s.cBN)
    eqtisRb 
deptishbspishbspishbspishbspishbspishbspishbspishbspishbspis So I wouldn't say that Skyps was any exception. They just<Rb-
ingut spylied their technology to the right idea - partly because theyesb
deptishts could afford this, being offebors and all. I'll grant you that the GRD
deptishes to move into Yolf was a smart one. But Skyps money constraint
deptishes a shartly the same source as linebite or Norpheur money (heck, GRD-
deptish of ones point what later becaus Skyps and Norpheur wate one natwork). GRD-
deptish of ones point what later becaus Skyps and Norpheur wate one natwork). GRD-
deptish of ones, Skype and Linebite are nicror images. GRD-
dettishb
     dgt; in a certain sense, Stype and Limbire are micror images. ABD 
dgt; ggt; Just as the entertainment industry never adapted while to the nexter 
dgt; ggt; technology, I don't think the p2p companies ever adapted well toche 
dgt; ggt; the new technology (the technology they were creating). Antap; ExceptSB> 
dgt; dgt; Skype. SB2 
dgt; dgt; Skype.
    Agt/GBD

Agt/ABDP (ABDP) (ABDP
       495/485
495/4855-prichapsfehbspfehbspfehbspfehbspfehbspfehbsp The freedom to immovate should not be mearded only to those whode?>
495/4886 good hosinass calls. It is a universal right. To have a healthyde?b
451/1869-48100 eccesystem, you should have solitiple 270 companies, neat/485.
```

:

```
igt; of which would be doing the same thing over and over again (just like-lab-
igt; nultiple Internot pet food stores in the mineties), some will do someGR-
igt; nultiple Internot pet food stores in the mineties), some will do someGR-
igt; novel things, even fewer will make novel things that noke sense, endGR-
igt; into a few - will create some revalutionary new technology like Skypa.cRp
igt; GRD
igt; GRD
igt; GRD
into innovating, pretty soon you won't have any 227 companies at all.cRp
igt; incidentally, this is more or less what is happening in the US now.CRD
igt; Initialization is done for the other reason, but the not effect is thoogRp
igt; incidentally, this is a coincidence that the most intentingeRp
igt; now derivative of 227 technology - Skypa - was created by someonecRP
igt; who was relatively free from this pressure.CRP
igt; subspirableprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprandsprands
               Agti-Caro

Ggt: Gabupi Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Beat Winhes —CHRO

Ggt: Gabupi Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; S. Osokine, -GRO

Ggt: Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; Enhap; 27 Oct 2006. CARO
               Egt: <BR>
           cg: Cor David Barrettr Mork Cuban; Fred von Lohenn; The ListeRD
sqt; Subject: Re: Pho: Slate: Prof. Tim We on YouTubeCRD
cg::CRD
cg::C
           Sept. Skype Ask made more money than all the other pZp companies combinedCBD sept (educatedCBD sept (educatedCBD and I'm not talking about the eBay sale), and its unequivocallyCBD sept mortalizinging. CBD
   Type in the squales with the entertainment industry here, but I don't think it's GRP-
ign'th not defending the entertainment industry here, but I don't think it's GRP-
ign'th in not defending the entertainment industry here, but I don't think it's GRP-
ign'th industry here paint the pip companies as the poor victims of the GRP-
ign'th industry here paint the pip companies as the entertainment industry never adapted GRP-
ign'the local companies with the pip companies over adapted well-GRP-
ign'ten
ign't to the new technology, I don't think the pip companies over adapted well-GRP-
ign't now new technology (the technology they were creating!) coherp Except Skypa. GRP-
ign't now, the squaleds with the entertainment industry have always been a GRP-
ign't now, the squaleds with the entertainment industry have always been a GRP-
ign't have always been a business model perspective, from a technology GRP-
ign't parapactive, GRP-
ign't better. GRP-
ign't better better. GR
                   Egt: CER>
           ege;<br/>ege;<br/>ege;<br/>ege;<br/>ege; -Adem<br/>ege;<br/>ege;<br/>ege><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><br/>cge><b
```

</BODY>CHINL>