

Name: Edwin Wiles

Regarding:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Office

37 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. RM 2011-7]

Exemption to Prohibition on  
Circumvention of Copyright Protection  
Systems for Access Control  
Technologies

Categories: 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 A B & C. That is, literary works, electronic devices of all sorts, and wireless communications using those devices.

1 & 2)

SUMMARY: Public domain books do not need DRM, and using DRM to prevent access in a necessary manner is unacceptable.

Books in the public domain have no need or reason for DRM to prevent them from being used wherever or however the person holding a copy wishes. While I am against DRM on e-books in general, putting it on public domain works is egregious.

I am against DRM on non-public domain e-books because it makes it difficult if not impossible to read a book that I have legitimately purchased on any electronic device otherwise capable of presenting it in a form suitable to my needs.

The fact that this same DRM can be used to restrict access to certain classes of individuals is simply unacceptable.

4 & 5)

SUMMARY: I have purchased an electronic device, and for whatever reason, I am not satisfied with any part of the vendor's software. In that case, I own the device, and should be free to install any other legally obtained software of any sort on that device, regardless of the wishes of the vendor. It is, after all, my property not theirs.

I support 'jailbreaking' on any electronic device of any nature. Although, what I really want is for vendors to stop locking them down in the first place.

I am both a user, and a developer of software.

I presently own an Android based phone, and will eventually own computers using the new UEFI boot system.

My phone is running version 2.2 of Android, and it is highly unlikely that either the vendor, or the phone service provider, will ever upgrade the phone. I should be free to upgrade my device to either a later version of Android, or to any customized version such as Cyanogen.

If I am unable to do so, my phone will remain vulnerable to whatever security issues are in the version of software currently on the phone. I would also be denied the ability to use enhanced software that neither the vendor, nor the official Android developers, are ever likely to include.

For future computers, MicroSoft has already published notice that they will require hardware vendors to institute portions of the UEFI that will make it difficult, if not impossible, for enthusiasts to install other operating systems. This is completely unacceptable as I find MicroSoft's operating systems to be totally inferior to my preferred operating system on a wide variety of points. Should the MicroSoft requirements go through, I need to be free to break those restrictions to continue using my preferred operating system on the hardware that I legally own.

6 A B & C)

SUMMARY: No vendor of an electronic device capable of wireless communications of any form should have the right to tell me that I cannot use my device on any other legally accessed network that the device is physically capable of communicating with.

It is my opinion that such restrictions are an attempt to monopolize the owner's communications, thus reducing competition and raising prices.

It is also not right that I should be forced to effectively throw away an expensive electronic device simply because I wish to change communications vendors.

The vendors all use the same few standardized wireless technologies, and the devices that work on one such technology are physically capable of operating on any compatible network. The only reason that I cannot move the device to the new network is that the software has been written so that I cannot, without taking measures that would be extreme for any non-technical person.

This is highly anti-competitive.