

Dannevi g-Eri k-20050301143004

To: Julie L. Sigall
Associate Register for Policy & International Affairs

Date: 03/01/2005

From: Erik Dannevi g

Comment:

I would respectfully like to request 4 priorities for future copyright methods, and then beyond that, support the Electronic Frontier Foundation suggestions for reform wholeheartedly.

1) As a new system is devised, don't be afraid to start fresh with a system that requires rigorous numbering / coding of each persons individual artistic works by their creator officially to allow easy retrieval of the correct owner of the works at a future time. The justification for this follows=

Technically speaking, it's been binding to merely use the creators production company or first name, with the Big C copyright symbol within the document to protect a work. But court cases often hinge on more solid proof, such as the official form sent to the copyright office, or a letter mailed to oneself, and left sealed. It may be time to abandon this method for as many types of works as possible to streamline the system. 10 years ago we all would have been annoyed with this, but because of large scale piracy due to technology, I for one will go thru the extra effort to LOG my works in a manner productive for my own government to catalog the works unequivocally. For my needs, and that of future generations accessing the works easily.

I assume such a system must be combined with a different system to take care of all the works created before this newly devised method takes effect. A two tier system will create some level of confusion and bureaucracy, but like converting to the metric system, we must have the GUTS to look toward to the future, and not get mired in past methods. Now is the time for change !! Eventually such an amendment will reduce complexity.

2) I am extremely offended that large corporations have been able to amend copyright law to suit their own elitist needs by merely lobbying congress with their desires. Such extensions of the expiration of past works after the fact is plainly MICKEY MOUSE. I will remind the copyright office and all my elected representatives that you directly serve individual holders of copyright, and not massive collective holders of enough money to change the will of the original mandate on each past work on a profitable whim.

I am especially concerned by this, because large scale piracy has moved beyond that of musical works and software, and into piracy of motion pictures, often created with immense financial resources. These large works clearly deserve rigorous protection, but ALL copyright holders deserve to be treated equally under the law. Copyright extension for only some, is no where near resembling justice.

3) I would like to affirm that copyright law as it stands has been a very good system for musicians, contrary to how many view the situation outside the music industry. Unlike my position on past movie rights, I feel the RIAA is getting a bum rap in many ways. The reason I feel this way, is that Copyright royalties for songwriting is one of the few aspects of the typical entertainers contract that pays him directly over time, completely separate from many of the other

Dannevig-Erik-20050301143004

unscrupulous contract methods of the company supporting the artist. It has been an effective system resembling social security for otherwise exploited individuals. And the artist is ultimately to blame for any contract he signs otherwise.

Again, the essence of copyrights justice, is power and protection given an individual and their estate, and not any collective parties representing the artist in other ways.

4) Keep submission fees as cheap as humanly possible to spur creativity, and fees a bit higher on a sliding scale for copyright searches by those not cataloging their works correctly, commensurate with the governments real costs of management.

Thanks for your consideration

Erik Dannevig