

Comment from Ching Shih

Anti-theft technology used for the purpose of directly protecting the intellectual property rights, in my personal view, is the essence of the DMCA.

Broader interpretation of the "application of the anti-theft technology" in all aspects of the regular commercial or business activities like OEM or remanufacturing, in my personal view, should be considered as the "apparatus to facilitating the undue monopoly".

Any short term benefit for a specific business, by applying the MDCA on using any "smart technology" such as automobile after-market products, razor blade supplies, printer ink/toner supplies, LPG tanks, or hard-code the automobile electronic lock only good for the "first-hand" owner, would only remove the consumer/end-user from the selection/decision process (buying old or new.) This would only harm the US competitiveness, hurt the consumers/economy, and cause more environmental unfriendly products (e.g., photo-sensitive Selenium/Cadmium laser drum) be prematurely disposed in the landfills.

Thus I believe a clarification of the scope on the DMCA is required.