Dakota Gordon
7/19/15

To Whom It May Concern,

I'm writing in because I do not approve of the idea of having to "license" copyrights. An artist's copyrights are important to them because it helps protect their careers and also allows them to creatively express themselves without having to fear about their ideas being stolen. However, if these laws pass, it would essentially place the future of all artistic careers in the hands of an arbitrary governmental process, which would create an unhealthy monopoly and would discourage any more artists from entering the field. Furthermore, not everyone can afford to repeatedly license their works, of which they would have to do multiple times, as artists are not only naturally drawn to creative expression through art, but they must repeatedly produce more work in order to support themselves.

Under these laws, many artists would cease to post their works online, in person, or pretty much anywhere their works may end up being copied, because their "orphan" status does not protect them. Speaking of finances, these laws puts the consumer at a huge disadvantage, as large corporations would have no trouble licensing all of their works and properties, whereas a middle-class artist would be inevitably devastated by fees involved with getting their works protected. In short, I think no changes should be made to the preexisting copyright laws, and that these new ones be rejected outright. Thank you.