

Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-01/msg04321.html>

- *From:* John Miles <jmiles@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 24 Jan 2006 13:07:00 -0800
-

In article <593dt1dj95v59q03f4migqgv88b5cdg7i@xxxxxxx>, jjlarkin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx says...

> How? Are you suggesting that, say, it will be mandatory to sell CD
> players and PC sound chips that will play *only* watermarked CDs?

It's not a question of playing or copying the content; it's a question of how content is used. Copyright law was never intended to allow an author to dictate terms of use, only terms of distribution. The legal terms and assumptions that frame this whole debate are being fabricated on the fly.

>I don't think that will happen, for a lot of reasons.

The problem is, because content-distribution standards are seen as natural monopolies, there won't be anything but watermarked, DRM-encumbered standards on the market.

If the CD were introduced today, it would be carefully designed to ensure that it couldn't be ripped to your hard disk or transferred to an iPod-like device. That's fine --- the hardware companies should be free to introduce any goofy constraints they like. They should be free to discover that their monopoly isn't as "natural" as they thought.

But this time, they're one step ahead of us. That monopoly, natural or otherwise, is being given the force of law. If this law passes, and you try to sell general-purpose broadband data-acquisition hardware, someone from the government will stick a gun in your back and force you to withdraw your product. So... why not just mail your Form 1040 to Sony and cut out the middleman?

--- jm

<http://www.qsl.net/ke5fx>

Note: My E-mail address has been altered to avoid spam

- **Follow-Ups:**
 - ◆ **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
 - ◇ From: Joerg

- **References:**
 - ◆ **Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
 - ◇ From: Winfield Hill
 - ◆ **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
 - ◇ From: John Larkin
 - ◆ **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
 - ◇ From: cs_posting
 - ◆ **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
 - ◇ From: John Larkin
 - ◆ **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
 - ◇ From: John Miles
 - ◆ **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
 - ◇ From: John Larkin

- Prev by Date: **Re: So many files, so few files.**
- Next by Date: **Re: Parts Storage**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
- Next by thread: **Re: Analog Hole Bill Would Require Secret Tech No One Can Examine**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**