July 23,2015

Dear Office of the copyright,

The creation of CMO's would be in direct competition with the financial interests of artists.

To say that this is only for educational purposes, which is covered presently. So why would these CMO's collect and pay royalties, if this were not a money generating entity.

They would mine the inter net for intellectual properties to promote that might never have been the intentions of their creators.

Having to deal with an entity that is in direct competition financially with the artist would be conflict of interest. Where as the office of the copyright is only there to establish, register, and record artists work.

To have to prove to a CMO that may have high jacked an artists intellectual property, would be disadvantageous and cost prohibitive. Where as the present system , that the office of the copyright is not in the business of contracting payment for intellectual property , should still stand.

CMO's would be like creating a large business that would control what an artist will receive as a standard regardless of wether the artist is in their or out of their control by virtue of the monopoly they will build over the business of payments for artists in every discipline.

Why would Museums need these CMO's except to make money publishing artists work for sale. They can use it free for educational purposes under fare use now. This is not the objective. The objective is to get use of intellectual property that they would not have to negotiate for a fair price. They would say well the CMO's only charges this. End of Story. Don't change the present system.

Artists need to be able to register copyright by grouping works of art. Any other system is cost prohibitive to defend to

CMO's created who would effectively , have a license to steal an artists work.
Artist: Nick A Demos, California Artists Agency Inc
Museum of Neo-Symbolic Art

Nick A. Demos