HEINONLINE

Citation: 5 William H. Manz Federal Copyright Law The Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th E1207 1999

Content downloaded/printed from HeinOnline (http://heinonline.org) Sat Apr 13 14:11:28 2013

-- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at http://heinonline.org/HOL/License

-- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

In the mid-1960s Oscar Jr. joined the National Lawyer's Guild voting rights promotion in Mississippi for two consecutive summers, participating in civil rights marches. He also participated in civil rights protests in Detroit.

THE WIPO COPYRIGHT TREATIES IMPLEMENTATION ACT

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1998

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a copy of correspondence between myself and Congressmen BOUCHER and CAMPBELL on the WIPO Copyright Treaties Implementation Act.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 16, 1998.

Hon. TOM CAMPBELL,
U.S. Representative for the 15th District of California, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICK BOUCHER,
U.S. Representative for the 9th District of Virginia, Washington, DC.

DEAR TOM AND RICK: Thank you for visiting with me in my office recently regarding H.R. 2281, the "WIPO Copyright Treaties Implementation Act." I appreciate the concerns you expressed with respect to H.R. 2281 as it was reported from the House Committee on the Judiciary.

I expressed to you that I would consider your thoughts and respond to you in detail, and am pleased to do so in this letter.

I believe that many of your concerns, which are enumerated in your substitute bill, H.R. 3048, have been addressed already in a reasonable manner in amendments to the bill adopted by the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property and the Committee on the Judiciary in the House and by the Committee on the Judiciary and on the floor in the Senate (regarding the Senate companion bill, S. 2037). Others have been addressed in legislative history in House Report 105-551 (Part I) which accompanies the bill, as well as in Senate Report 105-190, which accompanies the Senate companion bill. Still others may be addressed as the House Committee on Commerce exercises its sequential jurisdiction over limited portions of the bill and as I work with interested members on developing a manager's amendment to be considered by the whole House. I anticipate including many of the amendments made by the Senate in the manager's amendment, along with other provisions. I anticipate that a conference will be necessary to reconcile the House and Senate versions of the bills.

While I am unable to support the specific provisions of H.R. 3048, for reasons I will explain in this letter, I am willing to work with you in the coming weeks to address additional concerns regarding the impact of this legislation on the application of the "fair use" doctrine in the digital environment and on the consumer electronics industry. I wish to stress, however, that I believe the bill, as amended by the House and Senate thus far, and explained by both the House and the Senate Judiciary Committee reports, already addresses these issues in several constructive ways.

I believe it is important, in order to recognize properly the efforts undertaken by the Congress and the Administration to address the concerns of the consumer electronics and fair use communities, to review the history of H.R. 2281 and to evaluate all of the provisions that have been either added to or deleted from the bill since its development leading to introduction in this Congress. As I am sure you will appreciate, I am sensitive to your concerns and have worked diligently with members and all parties involved to create a balanced and fair proposal that will result in the enactment of legislation this Congress.

In February, 1993, the Administration formed the Information Infrastructure Task Force to implement Administration policies regarding the emergence of the Internet and other digital technologies. This task force formed a Working Group on Intellectual Property Rights to investigate and report on the effect of this new technology on copyright and other rights and to recommend any changes in law or policy. The working group held a public hearing in November, 1993, at which 30 witnesses testified. These witnesses represented the views of copyright owners, libraries and archives, educators, and other interested parties. The working group also solicited written comments and received over 70 statements during a public comment period. Based on oral and written testimony, the working group released a "Green Paper" on July 7, 1994. After releasing the Green Paper, the working group again heard testimony from the public through four days of hearings held around the country. More than 1,500 pages of written testimony were filed during a four-month comment period by more than 150 individuals and organizations.

In March, 1995, then-Chairman Carlos Moorhead solicited informal comments from parties who had submitted testimony regarding the Green Paper, including library and university groups, and computer and electronics groups, in order to work effectively with the Administration on jointly developing any proposed updates to U.S. copyright law that might be necessary in light of emerging technologies.

In summer, 1995, the working group released a "White Paper" based on the oral and written testimony it has received after releasing the Green Paper. The White Paper contained legislative recommendations which were developed from public comment in conjunction with consultation between the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, the Copyright Office and the Administration.

In September, 1995, Chairman Moorhead in the House and Chairman Hatch in the Senate introduced legislation which embodied the recommendations contained in the White Paper and held a joint hearing on November 15, 1995. Testimony was received from the Administration, the World Intellectual Property Organization and the Copyright Office. The House Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property held two days of further hearings in February, 1996. Testimony was received from copyright owners, libraries and archives, educators and other interested parties. In May, 1996, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a further hearing. Testimony was received from copyright owners, libraries and other interested parties. These hearings were supplemented with negotiations in both bodies led by Representative Goodlatte (as authorized by Chairman Moorhead) in the House and by Chairman Hatch in the Senate. Further negotiations were held by the Administration in late summer and fall of 1996.

During consideration of the "NII Copyright Protection Act of 1995," Chairman Moorhead requested that Mr. Boucher and Mr. Berman of California lead negotiations between interested parties regarding the issue of circumvention. While these negotiations were helpful in streamlining and clarifying the issues to be discussed, they ultimately did not result in an agreement.

It is important to note that shortly after its establishment, the Administration task force's working group convened, as part of its consideration, a Conference on Fair Use (CONFU) to explore the effect of digital technologies on the doctrine of fair use, and to develop guidelines for uses of works by libraries and educators. Because of the complexities involved in developing broad-based policies for the adaptation of the fair use doctrine to the digital environment, and due to much disagreement among the participants (including within the library and educational communities), CONFU did not issue its full report until nearly two years after it was convened. An Interim Report was released by CONFU in September 1997 on the first phase of its work. No consensus was reached on how to apply the fair use doctrine to the digital age. In fact, the CONFU working group on interlibrary loan and document delivery concluded in a report to its Chair that it is "premature to draft guidelines for digital transmission of digital documents." The work of CONFU continues today and a final report should be released soon with no agreed conclusions. As you can see, developing sweeping legislation, rather than relying on court-based "case or controversy" applications of the doctrine, is exceedingly difficult to do.

Since before the debate began with the establishment of a task force in the United States in 1993, the international community had also been considering what updates should be made to the Berne Convention on Artistic and Literary Works in order to provide adequate and balanced protection to copyrighted works in the digital age. This culminated in a Diplomatic Conference hosted by the World Intellectual Property Organization at which over 150 countries agreed on changes needed to accomplish this goal.

This goal was not reached easily, however, and many of the issues being debated by the Administration and the Congress in the United States concerning fair use and circumvention were aired at the Diplomatic Conference, with significant changes made to accommodate fair use concerns and the effect on the consumer electronic industries. Representatives of both groups participated in the Conference and aggressively sought to maintain proper limitations on copyright. They succeeded. For example, language was added to ensure that exceptions such as fair use could be extended into the digital environment. The treaty also originally contained very specific language regarding obligations to outlaw circumvention. It was changed to state that all member countries "shall provide adequate legal protection and effective legal remedies against the circumvention of effective technological measures that are used by authors in connection with the exercise of their rights under this Treaty." This left to each country the development of domestic legislation to accomplish this goal.

After the United States signed the WIPO Treaties, the Administration again began negotiations led by the Department of Commerce and the Patent and Trademark Office, in consultation with the Copyright Office and the Congress, to develop domestic implementing legislation for the treaties. It built upon the efforts already accomplished by the release of the Green Paper and the White Paper and all of the testimony and comments heard as part of that process, the House and Senate bills introduced in the 104th Congress and all of the hearing testimony and negotiations associated with them, and the negotiations held by the Administration leading up to and during the Diplomatic Conference. Again, comments were solicited from fair use and consumer

HeinOnline -- 5 William H. Manz, Federal Copyright Law: The Legislative Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th Congress E1207 1999

electronics groups. In the summer of 1997, the Administration submitted to the Congress draft legislation to implement the treaties. In July, 1997, Chairman Hatch and I introduced the current pending legislation in each house. Importantly, the legislation was tailored to match the treaty language by establishing legal protection and remedies not against any technological measures whatsoever, but only "against the circumvention of effective technological measures that are used by authors in connection with the exercise of their rights."

The fair use and consumer electronics groups succeeded, just as they had at the Diplomatic Conference, in assuring in the introduced version of the bills the maintenance of proper limitations on copyright. The Administration had considered originally banning both the manufacture and use of devices which circumvent effective technological measures and had no specific provision on fair use, since Section 107 of the Copyright Act would, of course, continue to exist after enactment of the legislation. The word "use" was eliminated in the device provision and a specific provision relating to the adoption of the fair use doctrine in the digital environment was added.

As it was introduced, H.R. 2281 contained two important safeguards for fair use. First, the bill dealt separately with technological measures that prevent access and technological measures that prevent copying. As to the latter, the bill contained no prohibition on the act of circumvention itself, leaving users free to circumvent such measures in order to make fair use copies. Second, the savings clause in subsection 1201(d) ensures that defenses to copyright protection, including fair use, are unaffected by the prohibitions on circumvention. For example, circumvention of an effective technological measure that controls access to a work does not preclude, or affect in any way, a defense of fair use for copying the work. Moreover, the bill as introduced did not expand exclusive rights or diminish exceptions and limitations on exclusive rights.

Again, a series of legislative hearings were held by the House and Senate Judiciary Committees at which testimony was again heard from copyright owners, libraries and archives, educators, consumer electronics groups and other interested parties. In February, 1998, almost five years to the date of the establishment of the Administration's working group, taking into account all of the concessions and negotiations leading up to it, the first markup was finally held in Congress by the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property on this important legislation. As is evident by the timetable involved in the development of this legislation, and considering the number of hearings, negotiations and conferences dedicated to its contents, this bill certainly has not been placed on any "fast-track."

In the course of Subcommittee and Committee consideration of the bill in the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Ranking Democratic Member of the Subcommittee, Mr. Frank, and I, proposed a number of improvements to the bill, which were adopted by the Committee, that benefit libraries and nonprofit educational institutions. We introduced a special "shopping privilege" exemption that permits nonprofit libraries and archives to circumvent effective technological measures in order to decide whether they wish to acquire lawfully a copy of the work. We added a provision that requires a court to remit monetary damages for innocent violations of sections 1201 or 1202. And we eliminated any possibility that nonprofit libraries and archives or educational institutions can be held criminally liable for any violation of sections 1201 or 1202, even when such violations are willful.

These changes add protection to language already included in the bill which safeguard manufacturers of legitimate consumer electronic devices. Unlike the "NII Copyright Protection Act of 1995," which would have prohibited devices "the primary purpose or effect of which is to circumvent," H.R. 2281 sets out three narrow bases for prohibiting devices. A device is prohibited under section 1201 only if it is primarily designed or produced to circumvent, has limited commercially significant use other than to circumvent, or is marketed specifically for use in circumventing. This formulation means that under H.R. 2281, it is not enough for the primary effect of the device to be circumvention. It therefore excludes legitimate multipurpose devices from the prohibition of section 1201. Devices such as VCRs and personal computers do not fall within any of these three categories (unless they are, in reality, black boxes masquerading as VCRs or PCs).

In addition, H.R. 2281 as introduced does not require any manufacturer of a consumer electronic device to accommodate existing or future technological protection measures. "Circumvention," as defined in the bill, requires an affirmative step of "avoiding, bypassing, removing, deactivating, or otherwise impairing a technological protection measure." Language added in the Senate, referred to below, clarified this even further.

In addition to all of the foregoing, there are a number of amendments that were made in the Senate bill that will be included in the manager's amendment to H.R. 2281. These include: an expansion of the exemptions for nonprofit libraries and archives in 17 U.S.C. §108 to cover the making of digital copies without authorization, for purposes of preservation, security or replacement of damaged, lost or stolen copies; an expansion of section 108 to cover the making of digital copies without authorization in order to replace copies in the collection that are in an obsolete format; a provision directing the Register of Copyrights to make recommendations as to any statutory changes needed to apply the limitations on liability of online service providers to nonprofit educational institutions that act in the capacity of service providers; a provision directing the Register of Copyrights to consult with nonprofit libraries and nonprofit educational institutions and submit recommendations on how to promote distance education through digital technologies, including any appropriate statutory changes; a savings provision stating that nothing in section 1201 enlarges or diminishes vicarious or contributory liability for copyright infringement in connection with any technology, product, service, device, component or part thereof; a provision that states explicitly that nothing in section 1201 requires accommodation of present or future technological protection measures; a provision to ensure that the prohibition on circumvention does not limit the ability to decompile computer programs to the extent permitted currently under the doctrine of fair use; and a provision ensuring that technology will be available to enable parents to prevent children's access to indecent material on the Internet.

I believe that these are constructive provisions that precisely and carefully address specific concerns you have raised in H.R. 3048. In order to assure that fair use applies in the digital environment, in addition to the above changes, I have also agreed to include in the manager's amendment an amendment to Section 107 of the Copyright Act to make it continue to be technology-neutral with respect to means of exploitation.

It may be helpful, in addition to discussing what is contained in H.R. 2281 and the Senate companion, and what will be included in the manager's amendment, to raise directly with you some of the identifiable problems I see associated with H.R. 3048 as introduced.

Section 2 of H.R. 3048 would make two changes to Section 107 of the Copyright Act. It would add a specific reference to make explicit that fair use can apply to both analog and digital transmissions and would direct courts, in weighing fair use, to give no independent weight to either (1) the means by which a work is exploited under the authority of the copyright owner, or (2) the copyright owner's use of a copy protection technology. By amending Section 107 in this manner, H.R. 3048 implies that, currently, Section 107 does not apply to digital transmissions, or at a minimum, suggests that uses that are not mentioned specifically in the statute are less favored than those that are. Given that courts have been applying presently the fair use doctrine to digital transmissions, the risks inherent in burdening Section 107 with technology-specific language must be weighed against any benefit of added clarity the amendment would provide. Because no clarity is needed, since courts routinely apply the doctrine to digital transmissions, it is my opinion that the detriments of such a change outweigh any perceived benefits. As I mentioned, I would be pleased to clarify Section 107 by deleting any references to enumerated rights in Section 106 to reaffirm the application of fair use on the digital environment, rather than by placing technology-specific language in the limitation itself.

The other amendment to section 107 you propose would, for the first time, direct courts to ignore possibly relevant information in making a fair use determination. As it has developed over time, courts have been allowed to look, depending on the case or controversy in question, at the totality of the facts and circumstances surrounding a given use. This has enabled courts to reach a fair result. If, for example, a user breaks a "technological lock" in order to gain access to a work, the user has engaged in activity that goes beyond the bounds of traditional fair use. Fair use has never been interpreted to afford users a right of access. The provision you propose would grant to users a right of free access, rather than a right of fair use. H.R. 3048, therefore, in my opinion, changes U.S. policy in an extreme manner that undermines the free market principles protecting a creator's right to control initial access, as opposed to all uses, of his or her work.

H.R. 3048 also would make the "first sale doctrine," codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, applicable to digital transmissions of copies of works. The first sale doctrine limits the exclusive rights granted a copyright owner with respect to a particular copy of a work to the first sale or transfer of that copy. Thereafter, the purchaser or transferee of that particular copy may generally sell, lend, rent or give it away without violating the copyright owner's distribution right. This doctrine was created by the courts to secure the alienability of tangible property and to curb any effort by a copyright owner to control the after-market for resales of the same copy of a work.

Section 4 of H.R. 3048 would exempt the performance, distribution or display (and the reproduction, to the extent necessary for the performance, display or distribution) of a lawfully-acquired copy of a work (presumably including, under the bill, one obtained for free through circumvention, as long as such circumvention was done for obtaining a copy to make a fair use of portions of it), by means of a transmission to a single recipient, provided that the "original" copy is destroyed.

In my opinion, this extension of the first sale doctrine is antithetical to the policies

HeinOnline -- 5 William H. Manz, Federal Copyright Law: The Legislative Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th Congress E1208 1999

the doctrine was intended to further. The alienability of tangible property is not at issue, since no tangible property changes hands in a transmission. Further, it does not address specifically the ability to control the after-market for resales of the same copy of a work, since in this case distribution of a work by digital transmission necessarily requires a reproduction—it is not the same copy. The bill's answer to this quandary—that the original copy must be destroyed—is unenforceable and certainly not a substitute for disposition of a tangible copy. Destruction involves an affirmative act, generally in the privacy of a home, that is difficult to police and would involve significant invasions of privacy if it were policed effectively.

Further, regardless of whether the original copy is destroyed, the new copy would be free of contractual or other controls placed on the original copy by the copyright owner. It is also likely that this provision would have a much greater impact on an owner's primary market for new copies of a work than the current first sale doctrine has on the primary market for physical copies. Unlike used books, digital information is not subject to wear and tear. The "used" copy is just as desirable as the new one because they are indistinguishable. For this reason, Congress has curtailed the first sale doctrine as it applies to the rental of sound recordings and software in the past, to prevent posing so great a burden on a copyright owner so as to undermine the incentive to create works which is the driving force behind the Copyright Act.

H.R. 3048 would also broaden Section 110(2) of the Copyright Act so that the performance, display, or distribution of any work (rather than just the performance of a non-dramatic literary or musical work and the display of any work) through digital transmission (rather than just through audio broadcasts) would be allowed without the permission of the copyright holder, as long as it is received by students, or by government employees as part of their duties. This broad expansion of the distance learning provisions currently codified in the Copyright Act would permit the transmission of a wide variety of Internet-based or other remote-access digital transmission formats for distance education and raises serious questions about safeguards to prevent such transmissions from unauthorized access. In other words, it may facilitate piracy.

Both CONFU and the Senate have discussed the intricacies involved in safeguarding transmissions used for distance learning purposes and have agreed that it is premature to enact specific legislation at this time. As discussed earlier, the Senate has included a provision in its companion bill, which I plan to include in the House manager's amendment, that will provide for a study with legislative recommendations on this issue, within a six-month time frame. This study will be better able to address the complex problems I have identified.

Section 7 of H.R. 3048 would amend Section 301(a) of the Copyright Act to preempt enforcement of certain license terms under state law. Specifically, it would preempt any state statute or common law that would enforce a "non-negotiable license term" governing a "work distributed to the public" if such term limited a copying of material that is not subject to copyright protection or if it restricted the limitations to copyright contained in the Copyright Act. In effect, it would prohibit standard form agreements, used in the context of copies distributed to the public, that purport to govern use of non-copyrightable subject matter or limit certain exceptions and limitations, such as fair use.

The use of standard form licensing agreements has become prevalent in the software and information industries, as owners seek to protect their investment in these products against the risk of unauthorized copying. Section 7 would result in destroying the ability of the producer of a work to create specific licenses tailored to the circumstances of the marketplace, or, in the case of factual databases and other valuable but noncopyrightable works, destroy the most significant form of protection currently available. This could result, for example, in the loss of crucial revenues to stock and commodity exchanges who rely on such contracts to disseminate information.

Attempts to introduce language similar to Section 7 of H.R. 3048 into Article 2B of the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) have been rejected repeatedly by the UCC Article 2B Drafting Committee on several occasions. The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws also rejected a proposal similar to the one you propose as has the American Law Institute. I agree with these bodies that restricting the freedom to contract in the manner proposed in H.R. 3048 would have a negative effect on the availability of information to consumers.

H.R. 3048 also proposes several changes to Section 108 of the Copyright Act regarding archiving and library activities. As you are aware, library groups and copyright owners have come to an agreement regarding changes in this section to update the Act for the digital environment and those changes were incorporated by the Senate in the companion bill. I will include those same provisions in the manager's amendment in the House.

Finally, the new Section 1201 contained in H.R. 3048 would not prohibit manufacturing or trafficking in devices purposely created to gain unauthorized access to copyrighted works, and insofar as it prohibits conduct, would permit circumvention in the first instance for purposes of fair use. In other words, H.R. 3048, as I discussed earlier, would grant to users a right never before allowed—free access to copyrighted works in order to make a fair use. I believe that is unwise policy and tilts the balance away from the protection of works in a free market economy toward the free provision of works to anyone claiming to make a fair use. This would, I believe, ultimately lead to much more litigation against libraries and others who lawfully engage in fair use and ultimately would diminish the number of works made available over new media.

While it would be impossible to communicate to you all of the problems contained in the exact language of H.R. 3048, I wanted to, in truncated form, reveal my serious concerns with the bill. In its current form, for the above reasons and others, I would oppose it as a substitute to H.R. 2281, as amended. I remain dedicated, however, to working with you, as I have in the past, to address your concerns in a reasonable manner that will result successfully in changes to our nation's copyright law that will benefit both owners and users of works.

I truly believe that we are at the beginning of a long process of addressing adaptation to the digital environment. It is not possible at this point to enact legislation that will contemplate all uses of a work and, as CONFU members aptly point out, many will have to be addressed as we move forward. I am committed, however, to preserving fair use in the digital age and thank you for your valuable and continuing insight and interest.

Sincerely,

HOWARD COBLE,
Chairman,
Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property.

HeinOnline -- 5 William H. Manz, Federal Copyright Law: The Legislative Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th Congress E1209 1999

HeinOnline -- 5 William H. Manz, Federal Copyright Law: The Legislative Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th Congress E1210 1999

Document No. 116

HeinOnline -- 5 William H. Manz, Federal Copyright Law: The Legislative Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th Congress [i] 1999

HeinOnline -- 5 William H. Manz, Federal Copyright Law: The Legislative Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th Congress [ii] 1999