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tive. His objective was not to repackaging “Silk Stockings” but to employ it. “I want the viewer to think about his/her personal experience with these objects, products, and images and at the same time gain new insight into how these affect our lives.” Koons Aff. at P4.

While Blanch “wanted to show some sort of erotic sense … to get … more of a sexuality to the photographs.” Blanch Dep. At 112-13.

Which if you can follow that seems to say that Blanch was creating mass media and Koons was commenting on the aesthetic consequences of said media. Hence, Koons wins on the transformative issue.

2. Is it for commerce or for nonprofit educational purposes? 17 U.S.C. § 107(1). Well, Jeff is pretty much into commerce, no matter how you dress it up in ArtSpeak.

American Geophysical Union v. Texaco, 60 F.3d 913 (2d Cir. 1994) dealt with commercial exploitation via photocopying which was not transformative. But Campbell held that commercial use in itself is only a subfactor, and the more transformative, the less commerce will hold weight. Campbell, 510 U.S. at 584.

Koons’ work was not a market replacement for “Silk Stockings.” Koon’s take-home loot did not exclude the broader public benefits of art.

3. Parody and satire justify copying, which was the whole Campbell issue. In satire, “prevalent follies or vices are assailed with ridicule.” 14 Oxford English Dictionary, at 500. If Koons is satirizing anything, it’s the genre of the photo and not the photo itself.

“By using a fragment of the Allure photograph in my painting, I thus comment upon the culture and attitudes promoted and embodied in Allure Magazine. By using an existing image, I also ensure a certain authenticity or veracity that enhances my commentary – it is the difference between quoting and paraphrasing – and ensure that viewers will understand what I am referring to.” Koons Aff. at p.12.

So where are we? “Niagara” is transformative. It’s not truly commercial exploitation, and commerciality is not dispositive anyhow. So Koons wins this one.

Nature of the Copyrighted Work

Expressive or creative works are closer to the core of what copyright law intended to protect than factual works.

Which isn’t to say that non-fiction isn’t protected. It’s just got a whole bunch of facts between two covers, and only the expressive part is protected.

The district court had called “Silk Sandals” “banal rather than creative.”

As opposed to Koons’… well, whatever it is he did.

The appeals court disagreed with that, but it doesn’t matter when a creative work is transformed into another creative one.

Amount and Substantiality of the Portion Used

Are the quantity, quality and value of the portion used “reasonable in relation to the purpose of copying”? Campbell, 510 U.S. 586.

Koons has explained his reasons for using preexisting images vis-à-vis his artistic goals. Did he do it excessively? Did he go beyond his justified purpose?

Of importance to Blanch was the first-class airplane cabin and laying the legs across those of a presumed high-roller Alpha-male who paid for the tickets. Koons trimmed all that out, leaving this issue in his favor. But the court says this is not a heavy factor in their final decision.

Which you are breathlessly awaiting. So get to the point, Strauch.
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Just as I was beginning to think I was running out of things to say in this column, the ACRL obliged by issuing a report in early November on “Establishing a Research Agenda for Scholarly Communication: A Call for Community Engagement.” This is the product of a special meeting convened on July 21 by the ACRL’s Scholarly Communications Committee co-chaired by John Ober and Joyce Ogburn. Besides these two, the assembled group included Karla Hahn (ARL), Charles Henry (CLIR), Heather Joseph (PAP), Suzanne Lodato (Mellon), Clifford Lynch (CNI), Kara Malenfant ACRL, Meredith Quinn (Ithaka), and consultant/facilitators October Ivins and Judy Luther.

I am going to respond to this report in two parts. The first I call “The Paranoid View” as it represents my immediate, gut-level reaction and may help librarians understand how this report will be viewed by some publishers who share the kinds of concerns to which I give voice in this first part. The second part to follow I will call “The Sympathetic View” because it comes from discussions I had with a number of people with whom I shared this version including Karla Hahn (who visited Penn State recently) and my Penn State librarian colleagues, Nancy Eaton and Michael Furlough, who opened my eyes to other dimensions of librarianship I had not seen so clearly before and thus provided a fuller context for me to understand what underlies this report. (I also benefited from reading the draft of an article by Furlough forthcoming in College & Research Libraries and an article to which Karla Hahn referred me on the evolution of peer review.) This kind of successful collaboration itself may bear out the hopes expressed by the report for more “community engagement.” As you read on, though, remember that this immediate response will appear in some ways grumpy and defensive. In Part II, I will try to restore some balance.

It is a very well-informed group that the ACRL Committee convened, but one cannot help wondering in light of the report’s subtitle if it really makes sense to create such an agenda without wider participation at the outset. Though people like the two consultants and Clifford Lynch know a great deal about how publishing works, nevertheless there are noticeably absent from this group any direct representatives of three major stakeholders in the system of scholarly communication: university administrators, faculty, and presses. It is true that the report itself acknowledges “the limitations of this singular brainstorming effort” (p. 16) and calls for “community efforts” to refine and expand the agenda. And Joyce Ogburn herself, having heard of a skeptical comment I made to press directors on the AAUP listserv, extended a special invitation to university presses: “We would welcome input from the UP community regarding particular points to which presses would like to contribute or any additional research questions that could be added.” This invitation is much appreciated. Still, as one of my colleagues recently observed, they “welcome our responses to the questions and issues they’ve framed, but it never occurred to them we might have something interesting to say about how they get framed in the first place, or even about what questions are worth asking.”

A case in point is the lengthy section at the end devoted to “Public Policy and Legal Matters.” Anyone familiar with the debates about copyright will immediately recognize that the agenda set forth here reflects the viewpoint of librarians about fair use and the other issues discussed here, as in this claim: “Our current environment may be undermining the intent of fair use provisions as works of research and scholarship shift from print to digital formats…. Actually, university presses can agree with this statement, but only if it is interpreted also to mean that the digital environment has unleashed major new threats to the revenue streams of presses through the expansive interpretations of fair use embedded in the operation of many e-reserve and course management systems — obviously, not the meaning intended in this report. The unashamedly positive comment about the Google Books Library Project also is clearly a library-centric viewpoint.

Particularly telling is this admission: “Libraries may not have the requisite experience and expertise in assembling copyright services to assist authors to incorporate others’ material
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