To Whom It May Concern, COMMENT SUBMISSION.

As I understand it, this is an accurate summation of the current pending bill regarding Copyright Protection for Certain Visual Works;

The Next Great Copyright Act" would replace all existing copyright law.

• It would void our Constitutional right to the exclusive control of our work.

• It would "privilege" the public's right to use our work.

• It would "pressure" you to register your work with commercial registries.

• It would "orphan" unregistered work.

• It would make orphaned work available for commercial infringement by "good faith" infringers.

• It would allow others to alter your work and copyright these "derivative works" in their own names.

• It would affect all visual art: drawings, paintings, sketches, photos, etc.; past, present and future; published and unpublished; domestic and foreign.

The demand for copyright "reform" has come from large Internet firms and the legal scholars allied with them. Their business models involve supplying the public with access to other people's copyrighted work. Their problem has been how to do this legally and without paying artists.

The "reforms" they've proposed would allow them to stock their databases with our pictures. This would happen either by forcing us to hand over our images to them as registered works, or by harvesting unregistered works as orphans and copyrighting them in their own names as "derivative works."

The Copyright Office acknowledges that this will cause special problems for visual artists but concludes that we should still be subject to orphan works law.

I'm writing as a visual artist who posts photographs of my work on the internet for sharing and promotional purposes. It's my understanding that the above set of points is a clear synopsis of the most recent version of a bill that has been rejected two previous

times, yet is still being pushed forward. This bill is clearly driven by greed and a desire by third parties with staffs of lawyers, to find cheap and easy ways to make money from artists, while taking away those very artists' ability to profit from their own creations.

I don't see how this can benefit society, culture, working artists...I don't see how this can be of benefit to anyone but the selfish creators of yet another legal loophole through which unscrupulous people can siphon funds from creations they steal.

The world needs art. Art is made by artists. There is a creative explosion going on right now that is aided wonderfully by the freedom of the internet and the generally courteous camaraderie of the many artists who share work and enjoy collaboration. This bill would kill that...and contribute to the demise of many artists too, by making it impossible for them to rightfully profit from their own creative output. Many people will stop creating art. Tell me how it makes sense to nickel and dime artists with fees like this before they can even begin to seek out places to sell their work? And registration is at best a partial "protection" ...a work could then STILL be stolen and used to create "derivative works". This is greed of the worst kind.

If your office, which is a government office, supposed to be serving the people, wants to really aid the people, you'll create clarity and simplicity in copyright laws. You'll consult with artists who work in ***all*** visual media, both online and offline and who understand the issues clearly. You'll create laws that benefit artists rather than opportunists who want to make money from other people's work.
Please, I urge you to kill the bill, rather than the artists who will most assuredly suffer, should legislation resembling this be foisted upon an unsuspecting and unwilling public. And then convene a reasonable, useful and genuine commission WITH ARTISTS INCLUDED, to consult and craft legislation that benefits the artists for whom creativity is their livelihood.

Sincerely,
Marian Spadone
July 21, 2015
El Prado, New Mexico