

Chase Vicente

Professor Angeli

Nature and Human Values B06

14 October 2025

Annotated bibliography

1. Thesis statement

Despite claims of privacy concerns and IP infringement by corporations and manufacturers, right to repair laws are crucial to a sustainable circular economy—extending product lifespan, reducing electronic waste, and minimizing the environmental footprint of consumer goods.

2. Annotated bibliography

Lisinski, Chris. *Mass. Judge Dismisses Final 'Right to Repair' Law Challenges*. 2025, <https://www.wbur.org/news/2025/02/12/massachusetts-right-to-repair-carr-law-challenges-dismissed%20Accessed%2016%20Oct.%202025>

The article, “Mass. judge dismisses final ‘right to repair’ law challenges,” is a media source published in 2025. Lisinski reports on a Massachusetts judge’s decision to throw out challenges to vehicle repair laws filed by automakers. The author then explains how the law gave “vehicle owners and independent repair shops access to telematic repair data,” and won land-slide approval in 2020. The

court's decision ended years of litigation, and was opposed for a variety of reason by lawmakers including claims of data security risks and federal law conflicts. Quotes from the auto manufacturers suggest that they threaten to limit sales in Massachusetts if they do not get their way. I plan on using this source to note on the hostility of corporations, and to note how it isn't enough to just pass the laws—public support must be maintained after they are passed as well. Without public support, the lawmakers would see only the perspective of manufacturers.

Hernandez, Ricardo J., et al. "Empowering Sustainable Consumption by Giving Back to Consumers the 'Right to Repair'." *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 3, Jan. 2020, p. 850, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12030850>

The article "Empowering Sustainable Consumption by Giving Back to Consumers the 'Right to Repair'," is a peer reviewed paper published in *Sustainability* 2020. It addresses the environmental benefits of right to repair, and how designing repairable products can empower the consumer to be more sustainable through the continued use of a product. The article explains how industry has improved product sustainability through design around manufacturing, use, and disposal, which are motivated through cost efficiency and market pressures. It then analyses EU directives, such as WEEE (Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment), and RoHS (Restriction of Hazardous

Substances). The authors explain how these directives promote the extended use of a product such as the Ecodesign Directive requiring that companies design products to be repairable. They also look at a shift towards a “circular economy,” discussing how deeper systemic change is needed to integrate a cycle of reuse, reconditioning, repair, and recycling. I plan on using this source to show the benefits of EU regulation to contrast it with legislation in the United States, and to illustrate the importance of keeping products in service to maximize the value of the original materials.

Svensson, Sahra, et al. *The Emerging ‘Right to Repair’ Legislation in the EU and the U.S.* 2018,

<https://doi.org/https://lup.lub.lu.se/record/34ca32eb-5148-4b33-b82a-d7cfca46c672>

“The Emerging ‘Right to Repair’ legislation in the EU and the U.S.” is a scholarly source pre-printed in the Lund University Libraries discussing new right to repair laws, and their impact on the environment and economy. It starts by discussing the current state of right to repair and how the consumer doesn’t get to make the choice of if they will fix a product themselves anymore. The paper then examines specific barriers to open access and repair, such as EULA (End-User License Agreement) forbidding “unauthorized repair,” or planned obsolescence. After listing the barriers, the paper proceeds to suggest policy and regulatory changes to protect consumer rights, eliminating or diminishing the barriers previously examined. Concerns about brand reputation, consumer

safety, and privacy issues with independent repair are briefly mentioned, then the paper concludes by discussing how right to repair and open access laws should prioritize the benefit to the consumer, and of the environment. I plan on using the source to go in depth on how passing right to repair laws will improve the economy, and to discuss the current barriers to right to repair by referencing examples discussed in the paper.

Kass, Madeline June. *Right to Repair and the Environment—Fix It or Nix It?*. 2023, https://www.americanbar.org/groups/environment_energy_resources/resources/natural-resources-environment/2023-fall/right-repair-and-environment/

This article, written by Madeline June Kass is published by the American Bar Association. It examines the balance between innovation incentives and allowing repair of products. It starts with Madeline's personal experience repairing their cell phone. She states that it cost roughly a fifth of the price of a new phone, and claimed that they were tempted to buy a new one because of discounts regarding trade-in, even though the old one worked perfectly fine. I plan on using this anecdote as a way to show how companies incentivize consumers to throw away working devices instead of fixing them up. Madeline then presents facts consistent with the other sources, how manufacturers often impose physical, digital, and legal boundaries to discourage and prevent repair. She then covers the current regulatory landscape, citing that there are already

protections for consumer electronics, medical devices, and farm equipment.

Stating that laws like this are however, localized, and limited in scope, like Minnesota's 2023 Digital Fair Repair Act which only applies to independent consumer electronics repairers. I plan on using this source to highlight how while some legislation may be getting passed, the right to repair scene as a whole is still widely limited to a few exceptions.

Hyatt, Diccon. *Apple Surprisingly Supports White House "Right to Repair" Law*. 2023, <https://www.investopedia.com/apple-surprisingly-supports-white-house-right-to-repair-law-8382562>

"Apple Surprisingly Supports White House 'Right to Repair' Law" is a media source published in 2023. It covers apple's support of white house directives to pass right to repair legislation. Diccon remarks on how in the past apple has lobbied against these laws being passed in . The the change in stance is presented with a quote from Brian Naumann, the VP of worldwide service, stating "[Apple] supports a uniform federal law that balances ease of repair with product integrity, data security, usability, and physical safety." Diccon states that U.S households could save \$382 eliminating or diminishing the barriers previously examined. Concerns about brand reputation, consumer safety, and privacy issues with independent repair are briefly mentioned. The author closes by contrasting the words of Brian Naumann with the fact that apple still

enforces “part pairing” to maintain a high degree of control over the repair market for their devices. I plan on using this source to show how companies claim to be in support of the legislation, while in reality, they still want control over the repair market.

O'connor, John. *FTC Sues Deere & Co. For Monopolizing Farm-Equipment Repair Market*. 2025, <https://www.apnews.com/article/deere-farm-repair-tractors-monopoly-85c18d35a1e0999decb535aa5d7c358e>

The article “FTC sues Deere & Co. for monopolizing farm-equipment repair market” is a media source written by John O’Connor for the Associated Press. It details a class action lawsuit filed by the FTC in cooperation with the attorney general of Illinois and Minnesota, accusing them of monopolizing the repair market of their farm equipment. The FTC alleges that the practice increases repair costs, and causes significant delays for the farmers who rely on the equipment. They also claim that Deere refuses to share the software diagnostics needed to repair their farming equipment, making it impossible for an individual to repair their equipment. O’Connor then presents a quote from Lina M. Khan, an FTC chairperson, stating “[farmers should be] free to repair their own equipment or use repair shops of their choice — lowering costs, preventing ruinous delays, and promoting fair competition.” Deere denies all of the

allegations, and claims to support customer repair. I plan on using this source as an example of the current push against anti-repair practices.

Brannon, Ike. *A Criticism of 'Right to Repair' Laws*. 2024, <https://www.cato.org/regulation/spring-2024/criticism-right-repair-laws>

The article “A Criticism of ‘Right to Repair’ Laws,” is a media source written by Ike Brannon presenting arguments against right to repair. He starts by presenting the argument that emissions control systems in engines should not be tampered with, reporting that companies are directed to make it difficult to modify these systems by the EPA. This first example is a strong argument for preventing consumer-modification of electronic systems, however, it only applies to the automotive sector, where emissions testing is mandatory yearly for all vehicles. His second argument is based on concerns for the intellectual property rights of the manufacturers and concerns for the data privacy of consumers. He presents the case of unauthorized repair of a device compromises the integrity of the data security measures on that device. Brannon claims that proprietary “Diagnostic tools provide access to the entire device,” and that, if an untrusted technician were to act in bad faith, they would be able to access all of the customer’s sensitive data without restriction. However, if the corporations gave consumers the option to properly encrypt their data, this wouldn’t be a

problem. I plan on using this opposing viewpoint to debunk the common arguments against right to repair.