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INTRODUCTION

Congress has repeatedly extended the term of copyright protection in the past century.1 Most recently, Congress extended the protection term for both existing and future copyrights by twenty years.2 Now imagine that you are an artist, writer, or archivist who uses information in the public domain in order to create new works. Under the current "life-plus-seventy"3 rule for copyrights, an artist who created a work in the 1930s and died at the age of seventy in the year 1970 will own the copyright of that work at least until the year 2040.4 That amounts to 110 years5 of protection under the Copyright Term Extension Act ("CTEA")!

So what is the significance of all this? Not only will the artist's children benefit financially from the copyright, but the artist's grandchildren will profit as well.6 Moreover, it means that the artist, writer or archivist who wants to use the work must track down the copyright holder to get their permission.7 In most cases, the copyright holder is not the creator himself and permission is needed regardless of whether the work is popular or profitable.8 In other cases, the copyright holder will

---


1 See, e.g., Sue Ann Mota, Eldred v. Reno - Is the Copyright Term Extension Constitutional?, 12 ALB. L.J. SCI. & TECH. 167, 169 (2001). In 1831, copyright terms were extended from fourteen years to twenty-eight years. Id. In 1909, this twenty-eight year term was changed from the date of filing to the date of publication. Id. Between 1962 and 1974, Congress passed a series of laws that incrementally extended existing copyrights. Id. By 1976, the Berne Convention recommended a basic copyright term of life of the author plus fifty years, which was adopted by the U.S. in 1989. Id.


3 17 U.S.C. § 302(a) (Supp. 1999). "In General.- Copyright in a work created on or after January 1, 1978, subsists from its creation and, except as provided by the following subsections, endures for a term consisting of the life of the author plus fifty years, which was adopted by the U.S. in 1989. Id.


5 The calculation for obtaining 110 years is as follows: 1970 + 70 (years)= 2040: 1970 · 1930 = 40 (years): 70 years + 40 years = 110 years of protections.

6 Ginsburg, supra note 4, at 674-676.

7 Id.

8 Id.
not be identifiable and the prohibition on using the work impacts the creation of new works.\(^9\)

Consequently, copyright laws, which restrict the ability of people to disseminate speech, have caused tension between creators and the public.\(^{10}\) In this day and age, with the Internet being widely used, many internet publishers as well as others who use information in the public domain have joined forces to argue that the CTEA violates the United States Constitution.\(^{11}\) The Supreme Court has also recently decided to intervene by granting the plaintiffs' writ of certiorari in Eldred v. Ashcroft to determine whether Congress has sided too heavily with writers and other inventors or if Congress has merely given writers and inventors the protection entitled to them under the Constitution.\(^{12}\)

In as soon as two years, Walt Disney Corp. could lose copyrights it holds over Mickey Mouse and other highly profitable characters.\(^{13}\) But there is no need to feel sorry for Disney quite yet. Disney, as well as other companies who are advocates of the twenty-year extension that the CTEA provides, has also profited from using information in the public domain to make new creations such as the "Hunchback of Notre Dame" and the "Little Mermaid."\(^{14}\) Now, for the first time in history, based on the new term extension, no copyrighted work in the United States will enter the public domain before the year 2018\(^{15}\) making it more difficult for new creations to develop.\(^{16}\) Without access to works that would otherwise be public information,

---


\(^{10}\) Id.


\(^{13}\) See generally David Teather, Copyright Case Threatens Disney, THE GUARDIAN (London), February 20, 2002, available at LEXIS Library, News Group File, Most Recent Two Years (discussing how characters including Donald Duck, Pluto & Goofy would also lapse in a few years if the law were overturned).

\(^{14}\) See Amy Harmon, Case Could Shift Balance in Debate on Public Domain, CHICAGO DAILY LAW BULLETIN, February 21, 2002, at 1. The "Hunchback of Notre Dame" was created and owned by Victor Hugo prior to falling into the public domain along with Hans Christian Andersen's "Little Mermaid." Id. Disney has made movies, toys and clothing drawing off of both of these characters and has profited as a result of such use. Id.

\(^{15}\) Works created after 1922 will not fall into the public domain for an addition twenty years. Since the Copyright Term Extension Act was implemented in 1998, protection will last 20 years from that date until the year 2018.

artists incur burdensome costs and become discouraged from creating additional works.\textsuperscript{17}

Considering that the United States Constitution secures for authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their works only for "limited Times," challengers question whether the CTEA is constitutional or whether Congress is abusing its power. Additionally, challengers argue that the CTEA interrupts the progress of science and the useful arts since it prevents others from using any information without permission for extended periods of time.\textsuperscript{18} For example, protection lasting beyond the life of the author, or inventor, benefits people who have not contributed creatively to the work. In essence, such protection merely upholds the moral rights of the creator and it is questionable whether this is what the drafters of the CTEA had in mind.\textsuperscript{19}

This Comment examines the constitutional problems associated with the CTEA by examining the history of copyright law and looking at the CTEA challenges in both \textit{Eldred v. Reno}\textsuperscript{20} and \textit{Eldred v. Ashcroft}. Part I of this Comment will introduce the constitutional guarantees afforded to copyright holders as well as examine the history of copyrights, the current CTEA and discuss certain intellectual property principles. In Part II, this Comment will discuss the United States Court of Appeals decision in \textit{Eldred v. Reno}, addressing the constitutionality of the CTEA in addition to discussing the current U.S. Supreme Court controversy in \textit{Eldred v. Ashcroft}. This Comment will then examine the effect on current and future rights both within the United States and globally. Finally in Part III, this Comment will propose several possible solutions to the constitutional problems with the CTEA such as abandonment provisions, limited assignments, strengthening the fair use exception and placing mandatory ceilings on international copyright protection. This will allow for a better understanding regarding how the Supreme Court decision in \textit{Eldred v. Ashcroft} may have serious effects on all current and future copyrights.

I. BACKGROUND

A. The Constitutional Guarantees Provided for in Article I, Section 8, Clause 8

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 (hereinafter the "Copyright Clause") of the Constitution has been held to be both a grant of power and a limitation on

\textsuperscript{17}Chemerinsky, supra note 9, at 22. "It imposes a new economic cost on those wanted to engage in speech activities: now they must pay royalties if the speech is to occur at all (and even then might not be allowed)." \textit{Id}

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Id}.

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Id}. at 20. The CTEA seemed to be a result of the desire to allocate financial benefits and advancing moral rights did not seem to play any role in this. \textit{Id}.

\textsuperscript{20}239 F.3d 372 (D.C. Cir. 2001).
It gives Congress the power "to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." The Copyright Clause also indirectly requires Congress to balance the interests of authors and publishers against the interest of the public at large. The language of the Copyright Clause is the heart of the controversy for challengers of the CTEA.

Challengers of the CTEA believe that Congress has simply found a clever way to evade the constitutional command providing protection for "limited Times" by continuously extending the copyright term. Moreover, challengers feel that Congress is defeating the intent of the Framers as well as indirectly creating an unlimited copyright term.

In addition, since both the Copyright Act of 1976 and the CTEA are regulations of speech and press, the question becomes whether they should be subject to heightened First Amendment scrutiny. Prior rulings have been interpreted to bar all First Amendment challenges to a copyright statute. Challengers however,

---

21 Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 5 (1966). See also Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc., 489 U.S. 141, 146 (1989) (noting that art. I, § 8, cl. 8 is "a grant of power and certain limitations upon the exercise of that power").
22 U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8 cl. 8.
24 Petitioners' Brief at 4-5, Eldred v. Ashcroft 255 F.3d 849 (D.C. Cir 2001) (No. 01-618) (stating that the "limited Times" condition should be read in light of the Copyright Clause's grant of power -- "To promote the Progress of Science." So understood, retrospective extensions would not be "limited" in a constitutional sense).
25 Id. at 3. See also Damien Cave, Mickey Mouse v. The People, Salon.com Technology, at www.salon.com/tech/feature/2002/02/21/web_copyright/print.html (last visited Mar. 29, 2002). People who created a work in 1950 thought they would receive fifty years protection and that was fine with them. Id. Tying up additional material retroactively, decade after decade, in copyright is robbing the public.
26 See JOSEPH STORY, COMMENTARIES ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, § 502, at 402 (Rotunda & J. Nowak eds. 1987) (discussing how the Framers intended that the copyright terms be, as Justice Story described them, "short," and that after that "short interval," creative works would fall into the public domain "without restraint").
28 CTEA, supra note 2.
29 U.S. CONST. amend. I. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."
30 Ginsburg, supra note 4, at 668. See also Turner Broad. Sys., Inc. v. FCC, 512 U.S. 622, 640-41 (1994) (referring to how the Supreme Court has stated that "laws that single out the press, or certain elements thereof are always subject to at least some degree of heightened First Amendment scrutiny").
31 Harper & Row, Publrs, Inc. v. Nation Enters., 471 U.S. 539, 558-559 (1985). In Harper, the defendant had used illegal or unfair means to obtain a copy of the plaintiff's unpublished manuscript. Id. at 555-556. The defendant argued that because the matter was of such public importance, First Amendment interests should trump Harper & Row's copyright interests. Id. The Court rejected the argument because they found that a copyright function as an "engine of free expression" by creating an incentive to produce speech that would otherwise not be produced. Id. Thus, as long as copyright law regulates expression rather than ideas, Harper holds that there is no First Amendment right to trespass on an otherwise legitimate copyright. Id. at 558-559. See also
point to *Harper & Row v. Nation Enterprises*\(^{32}\) arguing that its holding has simply been transformed from a narrow holding to a general rule.\(^{33}\)

**B. Copyright History in the United States**

Copyrights have always been an integral part of the law in the United States.\(^{34}\) The Copyright Act of 1790 provided for an original term of fourteen years followed by an optional renewal of fourteen years.\(^{35}\) Over time, Congress has expanded both the length of the copyright term and the types of works protected.\(^{36}\) In 1831, the initial term of protection was extended from fourteen to twenty-eight years with the renewal term remaining at fourteen years under a two-tiered renewal system.\(^{37}\) The next change came with the Act of 1909, in which Congress maintained the two-tiered renewal system but extended the renewal term to twenty-eight years.\(^{38}\) The 1909 Act,
however, contained ambiguities, requiring judicial interpretation and eventually leading to a call for further change.39

The Copyright Act of 1976 represented a shift in the way the United States perceived copyrights. With the advent of photocopiers, computers and videocassette recorders, the then existing copyright laws required revision.40 The most drastic change of the 1976 Act replaced the fixed twenty-eight year term followed by the twenty-eight year renewal, with a single term for the life of the author plus fifty years.41 The desire to switch to a single term was sought to eliminate problems associated with failing to renew copyright protection in a timely manner. This new term did not apply to preexisting works.42 However, the renewal term for works already in existence was extended to forty-seven years.43

In addition, another driving force behind the adoption of a single term was the desire of the United States to join the Berne Convention44 for increased international copyright protection.45 At that time, most European countries were already parties to international copyright protection and the absence of the United States from such agreements was significant.46 The purpose of the Convention was to provide the same protection that is available to an author in his own country to authors in all member countries through a policy of reciprocity.47 Since the United States had an interest in international trade and world leadership, it became a signatory to the Berne Convention in 1988 to show their commitment to protecting intellectual property rights.48

39 See Jenny L. Dixon, The Copyright Term Extension Act: Is Life Plus Seventy Too Much?, 18 HASTINGS COMM. & ENT. L.J. 945, 958 (1996) (discussing how "several attempts had been made to revise the 1909 Act between 1924 and 1974, but these general revision bills failed").
40 See Jessica D. Litman, Copyright, Compromise and Legislative History, 72 CORNELL L. REV. 857, 857-858 (1987) (indicating that by the 1970's, the 1909 Act was clearly outdated and legislative action was necessary).
41 17 U.S.C. § 302(a) (1994). "Copyright in a work created on or after January 1, 1978, subsists from its creation and, except as provided by the following subsections, endures for a term consisting of the life of the author and fifty years after the author's death." Id.
42 17 U.S.C §302(a) (Supp. 1999).
45 See generally FRANK ROMANO, GLOBAL TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT 1998: PROTECTING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS AND TREATIES, 545-557 (Practicing Law Institute, 1998) (analyzing international treaties that protect copyrights and discussing the protection they give). See also Mota, supra note 1, at 169-170 (stating that the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) agreement implemented in the United States in 1994 also mandated a minimum copyright term of the author's life plus fifty years).
46 Dixon, supra note 39, at 958-959. The United States efforts encouraging other nations to modernize copyright law were seriously undermined by its own absence from the Berne Convention. Id. In addition, American authors had few guarantees of the protection abroad and the United States felt the pressure of providing a comprehensive solution. Id.
C. The CTEA (The Sonny Bono Act) of 1998

On October 27, 1998, then President Bill Clinton, after extensive lobbying by Disney, approved the CTEA.\(^{49}\) The CTEA amends various provisions of the Copyright Act of 1976.\(^{50}\) Its provisions have also been made applicable both prospectively and retrospectively in order to bring United States rules in line with those of the European Union.\(^{51}\) The most important aspect the CTEA provides is an \textit{additional} twenty years on top of the fifty years following the life of the author for works created after 1977.\(^{52}\) This allows the author to protect the work for his or her lifetime plus seventy-years.\(^{53}\) The provision also extends to joint works where the term is life of the last surviving author plus seventy years.\(^{54}\)

The twenty-year extension served to "ensure adequate copyright protection for American works in foreign nations."\(^{55}\) In addition, Congress believed that the additional twenty-year extension would benefit works in the public domain by encouraging the creation of new works and providing incentives for the preservation of existing works.\(^{56}\) However, challengers of the proposed extension disagree. With the Internet opening the door to draw upon and develop creative works without restraint, they argue the "extension of copyright laws [is] closing off this medium to a broad swath of common culture."\(^{57}\) Some critics of the CTEA also say that the repercussions of such an extension are that books, movies and sound recordings are being lost before they can be archived, and are therefore gone forever.\(^{58}\)

\(^{49}\) Cave, \textit{supra} note 25, at \url{www.salon.com/tech/feature/2002/02/21/web_copyright/print.html}. \textit{See also} \textit{Associated Press, Disney Lobbying for Copyright Extension No Mickey Mouse Effort, CHI. TRIB., available at \url{www.law.asu.edu/HomePages/Karjala/OpposingCopyrightExtension/ChiTrib10-17-98.htm}} (last visited Mar. 29, 2002).


\(^{51}\) Id.

\(^{52}\) CTEA § 102(b) and (d), 112 Stat. 2827 (1998), (amending 17 U.S.C. 302, 304). The Act applied to all original works that, at the time of the Act's effective date, had not fallen into the public domain. \textit{Id.}


\(^{54}\) \textit{See} Pub. L. No. 105-298 § 102(b)(1), 112 Stat: 17 U.S.C. § 302(a). For a work created in 1978 or later, to which an individual author holds the copyright, the Act extends the term to the life of the author plus 70 years. \textit{Id. See also} Pub. L. No. 105 -298 § 102(b)(3), 112 Stat. 2827: 17 U.S.C. § 302(c). For a work created in 1978 or later that is anonymous, or pseudonymous, or is made for hire, the term is extended from 75 to 95 years from the year of publication or from 100-120 years from the year of creation, whichever occurs first. \textit{Id:} Pub. L. No. 105-298 § 102(d), 112 Stat. 2827: 17 U.S.C. § 304. For a work created before 1978, for which the initial term of the copyright was 28 years, the renewal term is extended from 47-67 years, thereby creating a combined term of 95 years. \textit{Id.}


\(^{56}\) Id.

\(^{57}\) \textit{See} Holland & Giearan, \textit{supra} note 12, at 2 (referring to a statement made by Eldred's attorney Lawrence Lessig).

\(^{58}\) \textit{See} \textit{Id.} This, they believe, is based in part on the notion that publishers only keep materials that are economically profitable and once the popularity and profitability ceases, the materials go into storage or become unavailable for a number of years. \textit{Id. See also} Cave, \textit{supra} note 25, at \url{www.salon.com/tech/feature/2002/02/21/web_copyright/print.html}; Chris Springman, \textit{The Mouse that Ate the Public Domain, FindLaw's Legal Commentary, at \url{http://writ.news.findlaw.com/commentary/20020305_springman.htm}} (last visited Mar. 13, 2002).
D. Intellectual Property Principles

There are a number of intellectual property principles that define the rights afforded to both creators and the public. The public domain for one is a term used to indicate that there is not a copyright claim on a creation or that the copyright has expired allowing one to use the materials freely. The main argument that stems from the public domain is whether or not its existence creates rights; and if so, whether there is a constitutional or statutory basis for such a right. Artists in general, depend on a rich public domain because the creation of new works inevitably rests on the borrowing of existing ideas.

History has demonstrated this with the fictional creation of Santa Claus and the famous Christmas season movie “It’s a Wonderful Life.” Santa Claus was created by a 19th century American cartoonist, Thomas Nast, and had his copyright been protected by the CTEA proposal, families across the world may have never been able to enjoy Santa Claus. Instead, people would have had to seek permission from Thomas Nash and pay royalties for its use even though the Santa Claus concept was already recognized by several cultures. Similarly, Frank Capra’s 1946 film “It’s a Wonderful Life” received a second life after it fell into the public domain. After several broadcasting stations aired the movie, the once-forgotten film became a classic.

Robert A. Baron, Making the Public Domain Public, Copyright Town Meeting, at http://www.pipeline.com/~rabaron/VRA-TM-SF-PublicDomain.htm (last visited Mar. 13, 2002). The significance of works that have fallen into the public domain is that one cannot prevent another from using the work. Id.

The advocates who have argued that rights to the public domain exist use the Ninth Amendment which states “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people” to support their position.” Id.

Karjala, supra note 16, at www.law.asu.edu/hopepage/karjala/opposingCopyrightExtension/what.html#EffectofTermExtension. See also Springman, supra note 58, at http://writ.news.findlaw.com/commentary/20020305_springman.htm (noting that there is an abundance of “evidence regarding the vital importance to the progress of our culture of a robust stock of public domain works”).

See Henry Weinstein et al., Studios May Have the Most to Loose, LOS ANGELES TIMES, available at www.latimes.com/business/la-000013191feb21.story (last visited Mar. 13, 2002) (discussing how the Supreme Court ruling in Eldred v. Ashcroft could affect early depictions of Mickey Mouse, film classics such as “Gone With the Wind” and the “Wizard of Oz” as well as novels such as "The Great Gatsby" and "The Sun Also Rises").

See also Reel Classics, It’s a Wonderful Life Academy Awards, at http://www.reelclassics.com/Movies/Wonlife/wonlife-awards.htm (last visited June 30, 2002). “It’s a Wonderful Life” has been nominated for numerous academy awards in the categories of best picture, best actor, best director, best film editing and best sound recording. Id; Roger Cadenhead, Why TV Lost Interest in a Holiday Classic, Knight-Ridder News Service, at http://www.reelclassics.com/Movies/Wonlife/wonlife-articles.htm (last visited June 30, 2002). The practically continuous broadcast of the Frank Capra classic ended in 1993, when Republic Pictures asserted its right to receive royalty payments for each showing of “It’s A Wonderful Life.” Id.
Another popular intellectual property principle is the fair use doctrine. Traditionally, fair use was defined as "a privilege in others than the owner of the copyright to use the copyrighted material in a reasonable manner without consent." The fair use concept, implemented primarily to decrease First Amendment concerns, requires courts to undertake a case by case analysis. As codified in the Copyright Act of 1976, the fair use doctrine employs a general guide for decision including four statutory factors plus any other factors the court deems appropriate. Given the doctrine's open ended, case specific application, there has been criticism for its inconsistent application.

The public domain and the fair use doctrine exist so that all works serve and benefit the public and society as a whole. Since both of these principles are unclear and ambiguous the balancing of the public's rights with those of artists and inventors is difficult. Accordingly, the United States Supreme Court's pending decision in Eldred v. Ashcroft will have an immediate and long-term impact on all current and future copyrights.
II. ANALYSIS

A. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia’s rejection to the Constitutional Challenges of the CTEA - Eldred v. Reno

Eric Eldred, a publisher of old books, never intended to become the heart of a copyright war. In his view, the CTEA harmed the public by retroactively extending the copyright term for works that were about to expire. As a result, huge corporations that were able to spend extensive money lobbying Congress would benefit and the small publishers would suffer. In order to protect the small publishers, Eldred and other plaintiffs like Laura Bjorklund, in a sense, took Mickey Mouse and Sonny Bono to court.

1. The First Amendment Freedom of Speech Challenge

The most prevalent argument challenging the CTEA centered on the First Amendment because of the prospective and retrospective application of the CTEA. The plaintiffs believed that the CTEA failed to sustain the intermediate level of scrutiny test afforded by the First Amendment because the government did not respect the First Amendment's freedom of speech rights.

---

73 Cave, supra note 25, at www.salon.com/tech/feature/2002/02/21/webcopyright/print.html. Eric Eldred is an Internet Publisher whose website has hosted versions of old Nathaniel Hawthorn novels and Robert Frost Poems since 1995. Id.
74 Id.
75 Id.
76 Id. See also Weinstein, supra note 62, at www.latimes.com/business/la-000013191Feb21.story. Large corporations such as Disney have characters with enormous earning potential because of licensing and merchandize. Id. Winnie the Pooh for instance, generated $2 billion a year in the late 1990’s. Id.
77 Cave, supra note 25, at www.salon.com/tech/feature/2002/02/21/webcopyright/print.html. Laura Bjorklund owns a small publishing company in Massachusetts and focuses on genealogy texts and out-of-print histories. Id.
78 See Lawrence Lessig, Copyright’s First Amendment, 48 UCLA L. REV. 1057, 1064 (2001). Congressman Mary Bono lobbied Congress on behalf of her late husband Sonny Bono for extension of copyright protection. Id. According to her, Sonny Bono wanted the term of copyright protection to last forever. Id. Realizing that such a change would in fact violate the U.S. Constitution, Ms. Bono extensively pushed for strengthening copyright laws. Id. Her efforts were successful when Congress increased term protection by 20 years and named the Act after her late husband Sonny Bono. Id.
79 See Phyllis Schlafly, Why Disney has Clout with the Republican Congress, Eagle Forum, at www.eagleforum.org/column/1998/nov98/98-11-25.html (last visited Mar. 4, 2002). The Disney Political Action Committee (PAC) lined up Republican and Democratic co-sponsors on the two Judiciary Committees and rewarded them with direct campaign contributions totaling $95,805 to the Democratic Members of Congress and $53,807 to Republican Members. Id.
81 Turner Broad Sys., 512 U.S. at 640. In First Amendment cases involving different speech issues, Courts have invoked the content-based/content-neutral distinction as a basis for its decisions. Id. Presumably, content-based restrictions are invalid on their face requiring strict
have an "important" interest to justify withholding speech.\textsuperscript{82} The government, on the other hand, questioned the standing of the plaintiffs to even raise a First Amendment issue.\textsuperscript{83} The plaintiffs had to then successfully demonstrate that an injury in fact would be traceable to the CTEA for both current copyrights and works not yet created.\textsuperscript{84} The struggle was far from over. Eldred and his pals still had to overcome the Harper decision, which stood as a bar to their First Amendment theory.\textsuperscript{85}

In Harper, the Court held that a magazine’s advance publication of excerpts from former President Gerald Ford’s memoirs infringed upon the former President’s copyrights.\textsuperscript{86} The Court also explained how a copyright itself respects and adequately safeguards the freedom of speech protected by the First Amendment.\textsuperscript{87} In essence, copyright laws are not restrictions on freedom of speech, as copyright protects only forms of expression and not the ideas expressed.\textsuperscript{88} In following the Harper approach, courts have held that copyrights are categorically immune from challenges under the First Amendment.\textsuperscript{89}

Despite the plaintiffs’ argument that Harper is restricted to cases where a litigant demands a right under the First Amendment to use copyrighted materials, the Court disposed of the claim.\textsuperscript{90} The Court found the plaintiffs’ theory entitling a First Amendment challenge to the constitutionality of the statute granting the

\textsuperscript{82} See Eldred, 239 F.3d at 374-376 (citing San Fran. Arts and Athletics, Inc. v. U.S. Olympic Comm., 483 U.S. 522, 535-41 (1987) which applied heightened scrutiny to a statute granting the United States Olympic Committee trademark like protection for the word "Olympic").

\textsuperscript{83} Id. at 375.

\textsuperscript{84} Id. at 375-376. The plaintiffs’ referred to Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) for the proposition that they would suffer an injury in fact that was traceable to the CTEA. Id.

\textsuperscript{85} Id. at 375-376. The plaintiffs’ referred to Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) for the proposition that they would suffer an injury in fact that was traceable to the CTEA. Id.

\textsuperscript{86} Harper, 471 U.S. at 539. Gerald Ford contracted with Harper & Row and The Reader’s Digest to publish his yet unwritten memoirs. Id. As the memoirs were nearing completion, Harper & Row negotiated a prepublication licensing agreement with Time magazine. Id. Time agreed to pay $25,000, $12,500 in advance and an additional $12,500 at publication with exclusivity being an important consideration. Id. Weeks before the Time article’s scheduled release, an unidentified person secretly brought a copy of the Ford manuscript to Victor Navasky, editor of Nation magazine. Id. Navasky reprinted the material prior to Time’s schedule release and as a result, Time canceled its piece and refused to pay Harper & Row the remaining $12,500. Id.

\textsuperscript{87} Id. at 557.


\textsuperscript{89} United Video, 890 F.2d at 1191 (1989).

In the present case, the petitioners desire to make commercial use of the copyrighted works of others. There is no first amendment right to do so. Although there is some tension between the Constitution’s copyright clause and the First Amendment, the familiar idea/expression dichotomy of copyright law, under which ideas are free but their particular expression can be copyrighted, has always been held to give adequate protection to free expression.

\textsuperscript{90} Eldred, 239 F.3d at 375-376. The plaintiffs’ attacked the constitutionality of the CTEA as a statute and attempted to distinguish their claim from the holding in Harper which dealt with a First Amendment challenge to the use of particular copyrights. Id. The Court was not persuaded. Id.
copyright to lack any cognizable First Amendment right to exploit the copyrighted works of others.  

2. Preexisting Works Lack Originality

A second claim challenging the constitutionality of the CTEA rested on the premise that the originality requirement of the Copyright Act with respect to its application to preexisting works had not been met. The reasoning behind this is that the CTEA cannot be applicable to existing copyrights because their prior existence provides no incentive to create and the speech that benefits from the extension has already occurred. Plaintiffs relied on Feist Publications, Inc. v Rural Telephone Service Co., in which the Supreme Court found originality to be a constitutional requirement for a copyright. Additionally, the plaintiffs pointed to Graham v. John Deere Co., for its proposition that "Congress may not authorize the issuance of patents whose effects are to remove existent knowledge from the public domain, or to restrict free access to materials already available." Applying the Graham standard to the subject of copyrights would preclude Congress from authorizing a copyright to a work already in the public domain.

The District of Columbia, however, shot down this argument by concluding that the requirement of originality is, by its nature, only a threshold question relevant to copyrightability and not a continuing concern relevant to Congress' authority to extend the term of the copyright. According to the Court, in order for the plaintiffs to have prevailed, they needed something more than the requirement of originality upon which to make their argument survive.

---

91 Id.
92 Id. at 376-377.
93 Id. See also Feist, 499 U.S. at 345 (emphasizing that a work of authorship must be "original" in order to qualify for copyright protection).
94 Feist, 499 U.S. at 346.
95 Id. In Feist, the Supreme Court found telephone white page listings did not satisfy the originality requirement because they lacked minimal creativity. Id. at 362-363. The white pages listed the names of telephone service subscribers alphabetically, including the subscriber's town and phone number. Id. The Court deemed this selection and arrangement involved no creativity and thus was not original for copyright protection. Id.
96 Graham, 383 U.S. at 6.
97 See generally U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8 cl. 8. Since both patents and copyrights are governed by the same constitutional clause, the Graham decision should apply equally to copyrights.
98 Graham, 383 U.S. at 6. It would be beyond Congress' constitutional power to grant a patent to a work in the public domain. Id.
99 Id. See also Trade-Mark Cases, 100 U.S. 82, 94, 25 L.Ed. 550 (1879) (discussing the notion that the issuance of a trademark could not be justified under the Copyright Clause because the subject matter of trademark is "the adoption of something already in existence").
100 Eldred, 239 F.3d at 377.
101 Id.
3. The "Limited Times" Restriction Imposed by Article 1 Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution

A third argument challenging the CTEA’s constitutionality was based on the idea that the CTEA violates the “limited Times” requirement of the Copyright Clause which was created “[t]o promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.”\(^{102}\) It was the plaintiffs’ view that since Congress could not make copyright protection permanent, it could not retroactively continue to protect copyrights.\(^{103}\) The CTEA therefore, in effect, indirectly made copyright protection permanent in violation of the “limited Times” restriction.\(^{104}\)

The Court disregarded the argument and found that it ran squarely against the holding in Schnapper v. Foley,\(^{105}\) which rejected the argument that “the introductory language of the Copyright Clause constitutes a limit on congressional power.”\(^{106}\) The Court also refused to acknowledge that the predecessors had interpreted the terms “authors” and “writings” in light of the Preamble, and they refused to do the same by interpreting “limited Times.”\(^{107}\) In dismissing the third and final claim, the Court in effect stated that a court sitting en banc\(^{108}\) in the future could revisit the issue.\(^{109}\)

4. Criticisms of Eldred v. Reno

The most notable criticism of Eldred v. Reno was that its decision was contrary to the Supreme Court’s tradition of rendering copyright decisions that serve the public interest.\(^{110}\) In addition, the Court’s finding that the Copyright Clause is irrelevant to both Congress’ power to enact copyright statutes and their duty to

\(^{102}\) Id. at 377-378.

\(^{103}\) Id. at 378.

\(^{104}\) Id.


\(^{106}\) Eldred, 239 F.3d at 378.

\(^{107}\) Id.

\(^{108}\) See BARRON’S LAW DICTIONARY 167 (4th Ed. 1996) (defining the term en banc as "by the full court"). Many appellate courts sit in parts or divisions of three or more judges from among a larger number of the full court. These parts will generally decide a particular case but sometimes either on the courts motion or at the request of one of the litigants the court will consider the matter by the full court rather than by only a part thereof.

\(^{109}\) Eldred, 239 F.3d at 380.

\(^{110}\) Patterson, supra note 16, at 224. See also Wheaton v. Peters, 33 U.S. 591 (1834) (holding that copyright is a limited statutory monopoly, not the perpetual common law monopoly that the publishers sought); Baker v. Seldon, 101 U.S. 339 (1879) (holding that copyright does not protect ideas, as the Plaintiff claimed in seeking to protect his method of bookkeeping); Bobbs-Merrill v. Straus, 210 U.S. 339 (1908) (holding that a publisher’s sale of a copy of a work exhausted the right to control the future sale of that copy); Sony Corp. of Am. V. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417 (1984) (holding that an individual can copy a copyrighted motion picture off the air for personal use without infringing the copyright); Feist, 499 U.S. at 340 (holding that white pages of telephone directories are not copyrightable because they are not original and originality is a constitutional condition for copyright).
interpret those statutes has been deemed a bad decision-making process. Moreover, lobbying efforts, particularly by Disney, who has made extensive contributions to both the House and Senate, has made the decision in Eldred v. Reno highly controversial.

The dissent in Eldred v. Reno also criticizes the government’s failure to offer any theory as to how retroactive extension can promote the useful arts. Rejecting the majority’s Schnapper argument, Judge Sentelle, dissenting, stated that the decision could be construed not as a holding, but simply dicta and not binding on future panels. In concluding, Judge Sentelle found two of the majority arguments to be unpersuasive. First, the majority’s reliance on the enactment by Congress in 1790 that regularized the state of copyright law for works protected by state acts preexisting the Constitution was, in his opinion, sui generis. Second, the majority’s reliance on the fact that the CTEA matches that of the European Union is immaterial since neither the European Union nor its constituent countries are bound by the Constitution of the United States. Evidently, one or more of these criticisms must have had some weight for there is now another controversy.

B. The Current Controversy - Eldred v. Ashcroft

In the current constitutional challenge to the CTEA, the plaintiffs, who are again corporations, associations and individuals who rely upon works in the public domain for their careers, petitioned for rehearing. The plaintiffs did not challenge the Schnapper v. Foley decision; instead they maintained that the substantive grant of power in the Copyright Clause - authorizing Congress to grant copyrights for “limited Times” - does not authorize Congress to extend the terms of copyrights as it did with the CTEA. In contrast to the plaintiffs approach, an argument by amicus maintained that the CTEA violated the preamble of the Copyright Clause because extending the term of an existing copyright does not promote the progress of science and the useful arts.

111 Patterson, supra note 16, at 225. Logically, courts should be bound by the Copyright Clause in interpreting copyright statutes just as Congress should be bound by it in enacting them. Id.

112 Schlafly, supra note 79, at www.eagleforum.org/column/1998/nov98/98-11-25.html. Of the twelve sponsors of the Senate bill, nine received contributions from Disney. Id. Of the 13 sponsors of the House bill, ten received contributions from Disney. Id.

113 Associated Press, supra note 49, at www.law.asu.edu/HomePages/Karjala/OpposingCopyrightExtensi.../ChiTrib10-17-98.htm. Facing the loss of copyrights for a number of characters, the Walt Disney Co., executives lead a successful lobbying campaign to secure an extra 20 years protection. Id.

114 Eldred, 239 F.3d at 378-380 (Sentelle, J., dissenting).

115 Id.

116 Id. at 379.

117 Id.

118 Id.

119 Eldred, 255 F.3d at 850.

120 Id.

121 See BARRON’S LAW DICTIONARY, supra note 108, at 24 (defining the term amicus as “friend of the court”). As applied, an amicus is one who gives information to the court on some matter of law, which is in doubt.

122 Eldred, 255 F.3d at 851-852.
1. Reasons Eldred Should Prevail: Petition for Writ of Certiorari and the Decisions
Effect on Current and Future Rights

On petition for writ of certiorari, Eldred once again challenges the CTEA's constitutionality. This time around Eldred's arguments should survive for a number of reasons. For one, since retroactive extension does not offer an incentive for creating speech because the speech has already occurred, the government fails the intermediate scrutiny test in violation of the First Amendment. The government's argument that copyright is property and regulation of property is only subject to the rational basis test disregards the fact that such property is in fact speech.

Moreover, the government's argument that the CTEA is constitutional since it provides the resources for producers to engage in more speech activity fails. Based on the speculative nature of such an argument, a court is unlikely to find that this outweighs the speech that is lost by removing works from the public domain.

Whatever the outcome of the controversy, both the interests of the public and the interests of authors are at stake. If the public domain continues to be hindered by copyright term extension, the future of ideas and creations will be seriously impaired. The control of a vast amount of material will continue to be placed in a "fixed and concentrated" group of corporate hands to the dismay of smaller companies and the public at large. Also, because copyright law also precludes "derivative use" of copyrighted material, people will not be able to develop new material based on copyrighted work without prior authorization. This will radically

123 Eldred v. Ashcroft, 255 F.3d 849 (D.C. Cir 2001), petition for cert. filed, (No. 99-5430). The plaintiffs presented three questions on review: 1) whether the D.C. Circuit erred in holding that Congress has the power under the Copyright Clause to extend retrospectively the term of existing copyrights; 2) whether the law that extends the term of existing and future copyrights is categorically immune from challenge under the First Amendment; and 3) whether a circuit court may consider arguments raised by amicus curia briefs, different from arguments raised by either party, on a claim properly raised by a party. Id.
124 See Chemerinsky, supra note 9, at 19 (stating that "[r]etroactive extension is a windfall, benefiting one group of copyright holders, who may or likely may not be the producers, at the expense of another group of those who want wider dissemination of speech.").
125 Id. at 21.
126 Id.
127 Id. at 23.
128 Weinstein, supra note 62, at www.latimes.com/business/la-000013190feb21.story. Everyone in the entertainment business will be impacted as well as individual copyright owners. Id.
129 See Karlin Lillington, Why Copyright Laws Hurt Culture, WIRED NEWS, at www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,48625,00.html (last visited Mar. 28, 2002) (explaining the impact on culture as a result of numerous copyright term extensions that prohibit material from falling into the public domain).
130 Id. An example is the music industry. Five record companies now control 85% of music distribution. Id.
A 'derivative work' is a work based upon one or more preexisting works, such as translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgement, condensation, or any other form in which a work may recast, transformed, or adapted. A work consisting of editorial revisions, annotations, elaborations, or other modifications which, as a whole, represent an original work of authorship, is a 'derivative work'.

Id.
change how human culture will evolve since people will not risk imprisonment or large fines for having used some part of a copyrighted work.\footnote{See Lillington, \textit{supra} note 129, at www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,48625,00.html (quoting Lawrence Lessig, “the property owner has control over how that subsequent culture is built” and stating that a more open business model in which artists have greater control over their productions would create "diverse, competitive industries" rather than centralized, monopolistic companies).}

Moreover, technological innovation is at risk, as developers cannot even \textit{enhance} existing material to produce new creations.\footnote{See generally Digital Millennium Copyright Act, Pub. L. No. 105-304, 112 Stat. 2827 (1998). The DMCA actually criminalizes copyright infringement by providing a term of imprisonment of five years or a fine up to $500,000. \textit{Id.} Prior to the DMCA implementation, copyright infringement was almost exclusively a civil issue and the most normal remedy was to cease publication and repay royalties due. \textit{Id.}} As a result, copyrighted material is being lost because corporations refuse to keep material that is not profitable; with the CTEA extending terms, the material "falls into a black hole where no one could have access to it."\footnote{Id.} In some circumstances, it is also difficult or impossible to establish who owns the rights to a work due to lengthy copyright terms.\footnote{Id.}

Additionally, since international intellectual property protection is important for purposes of international trade and other business dealings across the world, the Supreme Court’s decision could drastically affect the global marketplace.\footnote{See generally Keith E. Maskus, \textit{Intellectual Property Rights and Economic Development}, 32 \textbf{CASE W. RES. J. INT’L L.} 471, 478-493 (Summer 2000) (discussing both the positive and negative impacts of intellectual property rights on economic development).} For instance, if retroactive copyright protection is found to be unconstitutional, American creators may enjoy only the minimal established standards provided in the Berne Convention, whereas citizens of other countries may have extended protection.\footnote{Id. at 479.} This could lead to serious implications on the economy since countries and individual creators may be hesitant to conduct business in the United States. The United States may also lose its position as a global market leader because other countries may continue to increase copyright protection and the United States will lag behind.

\textbf{IV. PROPOSAL}

Pressure from corporate moneymakers such as Disney, has turned the fight against copyright extension into a war.\footnote{Weinstein, \textit{supra} note 62, at www.latimes.com/business/la-000013191feb21.story. This will be the biggest copyright decision since the landmark 1879 decision that divided intellectual property into functional works, which are patented, and artistic works, which are copyrighted. \textit{Id.} See also Associated Press, \textit{supra} note 49, at www.law.asu.edu/HomePages/Karjala/OpposingCopyrightExtensions/ChiTrib10-17-98.htm.} In addition, the European trend away from the minimum life-plus-fifty standard under the Berne Convention to life-plus-seventy has put additional pressures on the United States to extend protection in order to
maintain their world leadership position. With this in mind, this comment proposes solutions that may find the proper balance between creators who need protection and the public who need access.

A. Allowing for an abandonment provision to eliminate the "blackhole"

With the increased length of copyright terms, there is tremendous concern about works falling into a black hole where no one can have access to them. Corporations have tremendous power in demanding the copyright to works they fund, and once they have all the rights to a work, they have the power to provide the public with the access they need. The problem with this is that corporations only use the works as long as they are profitable and once the corporations cease from using the work, the public is denied access for the remainder of the copyright term, which can be very lengthy. Moreover, copyrights that are not held by corporations are controlled by the heirs of the original copyright holder and are difficult if not impossible to locate.

Implementation of abandonment provisions to ensure the works do not fall into the black hole will give access of these works to the public for the creation of new works. Like Trademark law, if the holder of a copyright has not used a work in a number of years and has no interest in the remainder of the copyright protection, the copyright should be deemed abandoned and the work should fall into the public domain.

---


141 Lillington, supra note 129, at www.wired.com/news/print/0, 1294, 48625, 00.html.

142 Id. Corporations have “enormous power and will do whatever they can to protect the survival of the dinosaurs over the coming of the mammals.” Id.

143 Id.

144 Id. “The period of copyright primacy is going to end up as a huge hole in the cultural record”. Id. The major problem is that copyrighted material simply vanishes when corporations are not interested in keeping all that they copyright commercially available. Id.


A mark shall be deemed to be "abandoned" when either of the following occurs:
1) When its use has been discontinued with intent not to resume such use. Intent not to resume may be inferred from circumstances. Nonuse for 3 consecutive years shall be prima facie evidence of abandonment. "Use" of a mark means the bona fide use of such mark made in the ordinary course of trade, and not made merely to reserve a right in a mark.
2) When any course of conduct of the owner, including acts of omission as well as commission, cause the mark to become the generic name of the goods or services or in connection with which it is used or otherwise to lose its significance as a mark. Purchaser motivation shall not be a test for determining abandonment under this paragraph.

Id.
B. Limiting assignments by authors to reduce excessive copyright terms

If abandonment provisions would be difficult to implement based on tracking possession or ownership of who has what materials, it may be easier to implement limitations on assignments.146 As mentioned earlier, large corporations can be very persuasive when it comes to assigning copyrights for financial incentives.147 By limiting the assignments of copyrights, corporations will not be in a position to bargain or negotiate as they do now because they will not have the same bargaining power.148 Corporations will therefore be unable to exploit technologies or other creations where limitations on such assignments are imposed.

Limitations would also decrease the amount of lost materials as a result of corporations going out of business or going bankrupt.149 Older films, books and music that have been assigned many times will no longer be at risk if assignments are limited since the copyright holder will be easily identified.150 A limitation on assignment that balances the interests of the author of getting the work produced and that of the corporations who look only at profitability may be the key in eliminating many public concerns.151

C. Strengthening the Fair-Use Exception

Fair use152 and the public domain are closely related concepts designed to benefit society as a whole.153 The CTEA has currently attempted to minimize some societal costs associated with longer copyright terms by allowing for non-commercial uses of copyrighted works.154 Qualified libraries, archives and certain non-profit educational

---

148 Patry, supra note 146 at 927-929. Assignments between distributors and authors contain clauses granting the distributor the right to any future term extensions. Id. Authors, who receive lump sum payments for assigning their rights, will not receive a penny from the extended twenty years of copyright. Id. Every penny will go to corporations who, “did not bargain for it, did not expect it, and did nothing to deserve it”. Id.
149 Lillington, supra note 129, at www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,48625,00.html. “If a corporation goes bankrupt, we’re going to lose access to our culture.” Id.
150 Id.
151 Id.
152 See infra Part I.D and notes 67-72.
153 Baron, supra note 59, at http://www.pipeline.com/~rabaron/VRA-TM-SF-PublicDomain.htm. Fair use offers a way to override the rights of the holders in intellectual property when it is in the public interest. Id. Similarly, the passage of works into the public domain secures, on behalf of the public, intellectual properties that were once private. Id.
154 See Senator Orrin G. Hatch, Toward a Principled Approach to Copyright Legislation at the Turn of the Millennium, 59 U. PITT. L. REV. 719, (Summer 1998) (discussing how although copyright term extension does encourage creativity and does not unduly hamper the widespread dissemination of works, there are certain works for which the costs of restricting dissemination do outweigh the benefits of term extension).
institutions will be able to reproduce, distribute, display or perform a copy of a protected work for purposes of preservation, scholarship or research.155

This fair use exception,156 however, requires courts to undertake a case-by-case analysis, employing as a general guide for decision four statutory factors.157 This broad approach has made the fair use exception highly criticized for its inconsistent application since each factor has been interpreted differently.158 Strengthening the fair use exception to employ consistency may ease the effects of long copyright terms.159 This can be accomplished by amending § 107 of the Copyright Act160 to include a wider range of uses that will be exempt from copyright infringement. The four-factor analysis161 can also be amended in order to define the proper purpose in order to eliminate confusion and inconsistency. The balance between the copyright holders and the public will then be met since the objective of each will be addressed.162

**D. Mandatory Ceilings on International Copyright Protection**

The European-influenced international copyright treaties erect no barriers to lengthening the term of copyright protection.163 Because the CTEA was largely viewed as necessary to keep up with international trade competition with the

---

155 Id.
156 See 17 U.S.C. § 107 (2001) (excluding certain uses from infringing on a copyright such as criticism, comment, news, reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research).
157 See Neil Weinstock Netanel, Locating Copyright Within the First Amendment Skein, 54 STAN. L. REV. 1, 21 (Oct. 2001) (stating that the United States' courts developed the fair use doctrine in the 19th century as an equitable privilege).
158 Id. See also William W. Fisher, III, Reconstrueting the Fair Use Doctrine, 101 HARV. L. REV. 1661, 1668-69, 1692-95 (1988) (describing equitable nature of fair use doctrine, but concluding that doctrine as it stands is incoherent).
159 Baron, supra note 59 at http://www.pipeline.com/~rabaron/VRA-TM-SF-PublicDomain.htm. Fair use and the public domain exist to counterbalance the weight given to the right of exclusive temporary ownership. Id.
In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use the factors to be considered shall include:
(1) the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;
(2) the nature of the copyrighted work;
(3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
(4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or the value of the copyrighted work.
The fact that a work is unpublished shall not itself bar a finding of fair use if such finding is made upon consideration of all the above factors.
Id.
162 Id.
163 Ayers, supra note 140, at 74. The natural law roots of European copyright law suggest no philosophical barriers to a copyright of eternal duration. Id.
Europeans, mandatory ceilings on protection are essential to avoid conflict with the United States Constitution. 164

Since the inception of the Berne Convention, the European Union has decided to lengthen the term of copyright protection further than the minimum term of life-plus-fifty. 165 The United States responded with the CTEA under the rationale that it was important to keep protection consistent with the Europeans. 166 The United States failure to take a stronger stand in international treaty negotiations for mandatory ceilings on copyright protection encouraged a competition among nations in offering the strongest intellectual property protection. 167 Now the United States will do anything in order to keep up with the competition. 168

What will the United States do when the Europeans continue to increase copyright protection? The “limited Times” restriction and the promotion of the progress of science and the useful arts seem to be caught flat in the middle of globalization. 169 Is eternity minus one day what the Framers of the United States Constitution had in mind? 170 The stage is now set and the United States must focus on implementing ceilings through the use of Preambles like that of the WIPO Copyright Treaty. 171 Otherwise, the United States will continue to follow the

164 Id. See also Mota, supra note 1, at 168-169 (stating that “Congress’ purpose was to ensure adequate copyright protection for American works in foreign nations and the continued economic benefits of a healthy surplus balance of trade in the exploitation of copyrighted works”).

165 Ayers, supra note 140, at 73.

166 Id. at 74. U.S. copyright owners were at a potential disadvantage in foreign countries following the “rule of the shorter term”. Id. Under that rule, U.S. copyright holders receive the benefits of national treatment in the foreign country except in regard to the duration of copyright protection. Id. Works whose copyright has expired in the home country do not receive protection in the foreign country, even where the foreign country would provide longer protection under its own copyright laws. Id. See also Mota, supra note 1, at 170 (noting that because Congress wanted to give present and future U.S. copyright holders the benefit of twenty more years of protection in countries with extended copyright protection, the CTEA was passed).

167 Ayers, supra note 140, at 75-76. See also Patry, supra note 146, at 930-931. If harmonization is so important, it is baffling that the U.S. negotiators did not seek (or seek in acquiesce in) a basic international standard of life plus seventy in the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Id. No such argument was made or even contemplated because the harmonization argument is entirely post hoc. Id.

168 Patry, supra note 146, at 930-931.

169 Ayers, supra note 140, at 74-75. Not only may it exceed the “limited Times” requirement, it may also fail to “promote the progress of science and the useful arts” because it is granting term extensions to already existing works. Id. The grant does not act as an incentive for the production of these works – they were produced with the incentives under earlier law. Id. Nor does the public receive any benefit, and new “quid pro quo,” for lengthening copyright protection for works already created. Id.

170 Id.

171 Id. at 74. The Preamble of the WIPO Copyright Treaty balances the rights of authors and the public interest. Id. at 76. See also World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty, Dec. 20, 1996 at http://www.wipo.org/eng/dip/conf/distrib/94dc.htm (last visited Mar 30, 2002). The Preamble reads as follows:

The Contracting Parties,

Desiring to develop and maintain the protection of the rights of authors in their literary and artistic works in a manner as effective and uniform as possible,

Recognizing the need to introduce new international rules and clarify the interpretation of certain existing rules in order to provide adequate solutions to
Europeans in order to be the world leader in intellectual property policy. The problem with this is that Europeans are not bound by the same "limited Times" provision present in the United States Constitution.

V. CONCLUSION

The Copyright Term Extension Act is an overprotection of authors' and inventors' rights. Such protection leads to a reduction of public access to information, depriving future authors of raw materials and encouraging private censorship. Although there is need for copyright protection to encourage authors to produce new works, there is also a need to protect ordinary citizens' rights of access to this information.

By providing abandonment provisions and limitations on assignment rights, the detrimental impact of lengthy copyright terms on United States culture and economic development may be decreased. In addition, strengthening the fair use exception to provide consistent access for the creation of new works would also be beneficial. The United States has a world leadership position that could hinder other countries from exploiting copyright protection. The Supreme Court's decision in *Eldred v. Ashcroft* will be the deciding factor.

---

The questions raised by new economic, social, cultural and technological developments,
Recognizing the profound impact of the development and convergence of information and communication technologies on the creation and use of literary and artistic works,
Emphasizing the outstanding significance of copyright protection as an incentive for literary and artistic creation,
Recognizing the need to maintain a balance between the rights of authors and the larger public interest, particularly education, research and access to information, as reflected in the Berne Convention,
Have agreed as follows:

*Id.*


174 Springman, *supra* note 58, at http://writ.news.findlaw.com/commentary/20020305_springman.htm. Subsisting and future copyright extension substantially burdens free speech by foreclosing use of expression that would otherwise be available in the public domain, while advancing no important government interest. *Id.*

175 *Id.*


178 *Id.*

179 *Id.*
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