

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [FN-OMB-IntellectualProperty](mailto:FN-OMB-IntellectualProperty)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Intellectual Property rights for small artists  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 23, 2010 4:49:38 PM

---

There must be adequate protections for individual artists, such as photographers, to be able to license their work. This means strong copyright laws for the little guys who do not have the resources to fight the big guys without the big stick of copyright laws. Do not take this away with "Orphan Works" or other similar proposed laws.

The so called "Orphan Works" law, as it has been proposed in the past, does not have any real protections for artists who will lose out because the "penalties" for infringement are so low that any corporate thief will accept the penalty rather than pay the artist the rightful amount due. This will ruin artists ability to make money from their work.

There should be a law that makes it illegal for any newspaper, magazine, or other corporate entity to create a work for hire from an individual free-lance artist/photographer who is not on the full payroll with taxes taken out of their paychecks and health benefits, etc. Corporations are forcing artists and photographers to sign over their copyright rights or lose the job. The corporations should be forced to at least pay a royalty and give credit to any artist whose work they use.

Copyright registration should be made easier. For example, one way to make copyright registration easier is to stop having to make a distinction between published and unpublished works. The creator of a work is the creator of the work, published or not. Why give technical loopholes to high priced corporate lawyers who are protecting their corporate thieves or other infringers? Even if there is a good reason to separate published and unpublished works, as long the registration is filed by the creator that should be enough. There should be no loophole for the infringers if the registration was incorrectly labeled. Make it so the creator is protected, whether or not they follow the sometimes Byzantine requirements of copyright registration. Simplify, simplify, simplify. Again, the creator is the creator and that is the whole point, no? Protect the creator, not the infringer.

Thanks for the opportunity to voice my concerns.

~Paul

--

Paul Antico  
**310-966-0096**  
<http://www.creativeantics.com>  
<http://www.motiobscura.com>  
<http://www.studio1112.com> (studio/office)

**CREATIVE ANTICS**

*Photography & Graphics*

PO Box 50599, Los Angeles, CA 90050

member **Editorial Photographers and**

Advertising Photographers of America

