

原文標題: [Defend the Open Web: Keep DRM Out of W3C Standards](#)

候選中文標題:

- 開放網路攻防戰:數位版權管理(DRM)滾出 W3C 規範!
- 開放 Web 攻防戰:將數位版權管理(DRM)踢出 W3C 標準之外!
- 開放網路攻防戰:將 DRM 拒於 W3C 標準之外!
- 
- (寫上你覺得合適的標題)
- (寫幾個都可以, 最後隊長會選出合適的)
- (當然要歡樂一點 ☆)

---

原文:



There's a new front in the battle against [digital rights management](#) (DRM) technologies. These technologies, which supposedly exist to enforce copyright, have never done anything to get creative people paid. Instead, by design or by accident, their real effect is to interfere with innovation, fair use, competition, interoperability, and [our right to own things](#).

The proposal... claims that "no 'DRM' is added to the HTML5 specification" by EME. This is like saying, "we're not vampires, but we are going to invite them into your house"

That's why we were appalled to learn that there is a proposal currently before the [World Wide Web Consortium](#)'s HTML5 Working Group to build DRM into the next generation of core Web standards. The proposal is called [Encrypted Media Extensions](#), or EME. Its adoption would be a calamitous development, and must be stopped.

In the past two decades, there has been an ongoing struggle between two views of how Internet technology should work. One philosophy has been that the Web needs to be a universal ecosystem that is based on open standards and fully implementable on equal terms by anyone, anywhere, without permission or negotiation. This is the technological tradition that gave us HTML and HTTP in the first place, and epoch-defining innovations like wikis, search engines, blogs, webmail, applications written in JavaScript, repurposable online maps, and a hundred million specific websites that this paragraph is too short to list.

The other view has been represented by corporations that have tried to seize control of the Web with their own proprietary extensions. It has been represented by technologies like Adobe's Flash, Microsoft's Silverlight, and pushes by Apple, phone companies, and others toward [highly restrictive new platforms](#). These technologies are intended to be available from a single source or to require permission for new implementations. Whenever these technologies have become popular, they have inflicted damage on the open ecosystems around them. Websites that depend on Flash or Silverlight typically can't be linked to properly, can't be indexed, can't be translated by machine, can't be accessed by users with disabilities, don't work on all devices, and pose security and privacy risks to their users. Platforms and devices that restrict their users inevitably prevent important innovations and hamper marketplace competition.

The EME proposal suffers from many of these problems because it explicitly abdicates responsibility on compatibility issues and let web sites require specific proprietary third-party software or even special hardware and particular operating systems (all referred to under the generic name "content decryption modules", or CDMs, and none of them specified by EME). EME's authors keep saying that what CDMs are, and do, and where they come from is totally outside of the scope of EME, and that EME itself can't be thought of as DRM because not all CDMs are DRM systems. Yet if the client can't prove it's running the particular proprietary thing the site demands, and hence doesn't have an approved CDM, it can't render the site's content. Perversely, this is exactly the reverse of the reason that the World Wide Web Consortium exists in the first place. W3C is there to create comprehensible, publicly-implementable standards that will guarantee interoperability, not to facilitate an explosion of new mutually-incompatible software and of sites and services that can only be accessed by particular devices or applications. But EME is a proposal to bring exactly that dysfunctional dynamic into HTML5, even risking a return to the "[bad old days, before the Web](#)" of deliberately limited interoperability.

Because it's clear that the open standards community is extremely suspicious of DRM and its interoperability consequences, the proposal from Google, Microsoft and Netflix claims that "[\[n\]o 'DRM' is added to the HTML5 specification](#)" by EME. This is like saying, "we're not vampires, but we are going to invite them into your house".

Proponents also seem to claim that EME is not itself a DRM scheme. But [specification author Mark Watson admitted](#) that "Certainly, our interest is in [use] cases that most people would call DRM" and that implementations would inherently require secrets outside the specification's scope. It's hard to maintain a pretense that EME is about anything but DRM.



The DRM proposals at the W3C exist for a simple reason: they are an attempt to appease Hollywood, which has been angry about the Internet for almost [as long as the Web has existed](#), and

has always demanded that it be given elaborate technical infrastructure to control how its audience's computers function. The perception is that Hollywood will never allow movies onto the Web if it can't encumber them with DRM restrictions. But the threat that Hollywood could take its toys and go home is illusory. Every film that Hollywood releases is [already available for those who really want to pirate a copy](#). Huge volumes of music are sold by iTunes, Amazon, Magnatune and dozens of other sites without the need for DRM. Streaming services like Netflix and Spotify have succeeded because they are more convenient than piratical alternatives, not because DRM does anything to enhance their economics. The only logically coherent reason for Hollywood to demand DRM is that the movie studios want veto controls over how mainstream technologies are designed. Movie studios have used DRM to enforce arbitrary restrictions on products, including [preventing fast-forwarding](#) and [imposing regional playback controls](#), and created complicated and expensive "compliance" regimes for compliant technology companies that give small consortia of media and big tech companies [a veto right on innovation](#).

All too often, technology companies have raced against each other to build restrictive tangleware that suits Hollywood's whims, selling out their users in the process. But open Web standards are an antidote to that dynamic, and it would be a terrible mistake for the Web community to leave the door open for Hollywood's gangrenous anti-technology culture to infect W3C standards. It would undermine the very purposes for which HTML5 exists: to build an open-ecosystem alternatives to all the functionality that is missing in previous web standards, without the problems of device limitations, platform incompatibility, and non-transparency that were created by platforms like Flash. HTML5 was supposed to be better than Flash, and excluding DRM *is exactly what would make it better*.



---

翻譯：

[數位版權管理](#) (DRM) 的技術攻防現在有了最新的戰線。DRM 技術本應保障合法版權，但迄今為止，它仍然沒有成功讓有創意的人獲得合理報酬，反而干預了人們創新、合理使用、公平競爭、商品互通以及[我們擁有事物的權利](#)。

這個提案聲稱「沒有任何 DRM 透過 EME 加入 HTML5 規範」。這就像在說「我們不是吸血鬼，但我們要邀請他們進門來。」

這就是為什麼我們對於在 [W3C HTML5 工作小組](#) 前，有個提案想將 DRM 建置入下一世代的網頁標準感到震驚。此提案名稱為 [Encrypted Media Extensions](#) (加密媒體擴展，縮寫為 EME)。我們認為採納 EME 將導致災難性的發展，必須立即予以阻止。

對於網際網路該如何運作，在過去的二十年裡，一直有兩道聲音持續在爭論。其中一派的哲學是，網路需要成為通用的生態系，以開放標準作為根基，並且於各個方面、所有人、任何地點都應該能夠平等的完整實作，不需要取得任何許可或預先協商。這樣的技術傳統，在過去二十年間帶給我們們 HTML、HTTP，接著成就了許多劃時代的創新產物，像是維基、搜尋引擎、部落格、網頁郵件、

JavaScript 應用程式、多用途的線上，地圖以及成千上百都列萬列不完的網站。

另一派則由企業集團為首，試著要透過他們的私有套件控制網際網例如包含 Adobe Flash、Microsoft 的 Silverlight 等具有代表性的技術，並且由 Apple、手機公司、以及[其他高度限制的新興平台](#)所推崇。這些技術傾向於單一來源，或者必須取得授權才能實無論這些技術在何時有多麼流行，他們都會們都對開放生態造成傷諸如害。諸如仰賴於 Flash 或 Silverlight 的網站通常無法被正確連結、被搜尋引擎索引、被機器翻譯、提供身心障礙者取無沒辦法在所有裝置上運行，並且對使用者的安全以及隱私有一定風險等問題。我們相信，限制使用者的平台和裝置，必將面對創新的停滯，並且阻礙市場競爭。

不幸的是，EME 這個提案就具備上述的諸多問題，並且無疑會產生相容性問題，讓網站得需要第三方廠商的軟體元件、特殊的硬體與特定作業系統才能運作（統稱為內容解碼模組 CDM, content decryption modules），而這些在 EME 裡面諸字未提。

EME 的作者聲稱這些 CDM 的功能、及所作所為都與 EME 沒有關係，且不能拿 EME 與 DRM 相提並論，因為並非所有 CDM 都是 DRM 系統。然而，如果一個客戶端無法證明它符合網頁要求的特定環境（沒有可接受的 CDM），就無法正確的顯示該網頁內容。

可笑的是，這不正與 W3C 最初出現的理由背道而馳？W3C 的存在意義就是為了要創造易於理解、可被大眾實作的網頁標準，如此一來才能確保最大程度的相容性，而非幫助這些只能由特定軟體或裝置才能存取的網站或服務的增長。然而 EME 這個提案，正是打算把這些機能性上的變數帶入 HTML5，如此很有可能會使我們回到那個網站之間互不相容的[不太美好的網路世界](#)。

因為開放網路社群對於 DRM 與其可能帶來的後果實在沒什麼信心，因此這個由 Google、Microsoft、Netflix 聯合提案的 EME 內就聲稱「`<abbr title="No "DRM" is added to the HTML5 specification">沒有 DRM 被加入 HTML5 規範</abbr>`」。這就像是在說「我們不是吸血鬼，但我們要邀請他們進門來。」

這個提案的大部分支持者，也聲稱 EME 本身在架構上並不是 DRM。不過規格書撰寫者 Mark Watson 承認「`<abbr title="Certainly, our interest is in [use] cases that most people would call DRM">`當然，我們對於這個標準的興趣，來自於很多人稱之為 DRM 的某些使用情境`</abbr>`」，且實作上勢必得引進一些標準書內未提到的秘密。要我們支持 EME 與 DRM 毫不相關的這種假說，實在是很困難的一件事。

這類 DRM 的提案之所以會送到 W3C，只有一個簡單原因：為了試圖取悅好萊塢。好萊塢對於網際網路的憤怒，[大概就跟網路存在歷史間一樣久](#)，而他們一直以來都希望能透過某些科技架，構來控其視聽人的電腦。我們的感覺是如果是沒有辦法透過 DRM 來限制，好萊塢大概永遠不會允許電影在網路上播放

。不過老實說，這種「好萊塢隨時可以捲舖蓋走人」的威實在脅很不切實際。對於那些看盜版的人，[好萊塢所釋出的每一部電影早就都在邊了](#)，，且而 iTunes、Amazon、Magnatun 與其他網不需要使用 DRM，就上經已售了出大量的音M。像是 Netflix、Spotify 的串流影音服務之所以會成功，是因為他們比下載盜版更方便，並非是 DRM 起了什麼效果。好萊塢之所以要求 DRM 的唯一合理原因，是因為他們希望能抗拒主流科技的原生面貌。電影工作室曾經使用 DRM 在他們的產品上恣意加入限制，像是[禁止快轉](#)與[加入地域的播放限](#)。透過出相容性技術公司複雜且昂貴的「相容性」技術因來阻擋小型的媒體財團及大型科技公司[創新的權力](#)。

過去科技公司一而再再而三地競相開發各種限制的方法，來討好好萊塢的奇想，在這個過程之中，他們也背叛了他們的用戶；開放的網路標準是這種趨勢的一劑解藥。如果我們對好萊塢病入膏肓的反科

技文化敞開大門，讓它們感染 W3C 標準，將會是網路社群一個最可怕的錯誤。這會破壞 HTML5 的存在意義：「建立開放的生態系統，補充先前網頁標準中缺少的所有功能，無設備限制，沒有平台不相容的問題，也不會有 Flash 平台所產生的那種不透明狀況」。HTML5 應該要比 Flash 要好，而將 DRM 排除在外，正是讓它好上加好的法子。

/ [Defend the Open Web: Keep DRM Out of W3C Standards | Electronic Frontier Foundation](https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2013/03/defend-open-web-keep-drm-out-w3c-standards)

作者 / [Peter Eckersley](#) & [Seth Schoen](#)

授權 / [ 創用 CC 姓名標示-3.0-US](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/us/)

φ [Toby, [sntc06](#)] 翻譯 - [Irvin] 編輯

^^^ 請填入名稱, 可自由加上連結