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INTRODUCTION

Copyright: Legal and Cultural Perspectives (INF 390C) examines copyright from a number of disciplinary points of view. These include legal studies, cultural history, information studies, political and social history, literary studies, anthropology, cultural studies, public policy, science and technology studies, and other disciplines. We will use these multiple disciplines and their literatures to investigate how copyright in the United States has evolved. The cultural commons, ideologies of property and protection, shared cultural production, considering natural rights “vs.” social bargain/statutory arguments for copyright, and identifying and protecting the public interest in information will be major themes of the semester’s work.

The course has no prerequisites and is available to graduate students from all departments and schools.

The course will closely examine long-standing as well as current controversies in the ownership of so-called “intellectual property,” aiming to prepare students to be competent practitioners in their professions, to be informed citizens, and to be well read in the field. Students will also develop strategies for professional and personal political action.

The course, as its title indicates, weaves together the study of the law of copyright with the study of cultural categories such as the “author,” “the work,” “property,” and “creation.” More specifically, the course will:

- Consider Enlightenment assumptions about creation, knowledge, and social life
- Review important court cases in copyright
- Investigate the history of the concepts of the personal author and the “unitary work”
- Explore concepts of “print culture” and its relations to copyright and cultural expression generally
- Examine appropriate statutes and major international copyright conventions
- Consider some questions related to indigenous people’s interests and how they conflict with or are supported by copyright regimes
- Explore the replacement of public law (copyright) by private law (contract and licensing)
- Examine the replacement of first sale and ownership by licensing and leasing
- Consider how copyright, privacy, and free speech are related
- Investigate how the international context for copyright figures into its evolution; organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Trade Organization are especially important here
- Explore the implications of the European Union’s moves to copyright databases of “facts”
- Help students engage papers in law reviews, legal journals, and other sources
- Theorize the public domain as a major source of creativity and (shared) cultural expression
- Examine the Creative Commons and other alternatives to copyright regimes
- Explore ideologies of property, especially “intellectual property”
- Consider how identity, cultural creation, and property are intermingled in both the creation and use of copyrighted works
- Give students practice in the application of the law to particular circumstances
- Consider the strengths and weaknesses of various disciplinary perspectives on copyright, cultural production, and property
- Demonstrate how law evolves and is different across jurisdictions
- Explore the concept of vicarious liability.
Among our goals this semester will be to make it clear that well-informed people often disagree about copyright in a number of ways, e.g., what the public interest in copyrighted works may be, what reasonable behaviors related to copyright might be, how best to encourage the creation and distribution of creative works, what the breadth and character of the public domain are, and what reasonable interpretations of the law may be.
EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS’ PERFORMANCE

Students are expected to be involved, creative, and vigorous participants in class discussions and in the overall conduct of the class. In addition, students are expected to:

• Attend all class sessions. If a student misses a class, it is her responsibility to arrange with another student to obtain all notes, handouts, and assignment sheets.

• Read all material prior to class. Students are expected to use the course readings to inform their classroom participation and their writing. Students must integrate what they read with what they say and write. This imperative is essential to the development of professional expertise and to the development of a collegial professional persona.

• Educate themselves and their peers. Successful completion of graduate programs and participation in professional life depend upon a willingness to demonstrate initiative and creativity. Participation in the professional and personal growth of colleagues is essential to one’s own success as well as theirs. Such collegiality is at the heart of scholarship, so some assignments are designed to encourage collaboration.

• Spend 3-4 hours in preparation for each hour in the classroom; therefore, a 3-credit graduate hour course requires a minimum of 10-12 hours per week of work outside the classroom.

• Participate in all class discussions.

• Complete all assignments on time. Late assignments will not be accepted except in the limited circumstances noted below. Failure to complete any assignment on time will result in a failing grade for the course.

• Be responsible with collective property, especially books and other material on reserve.

• Ask for help from the instructor or the teaching assistant, either in class, during office hours, on the telephone, through email, or in any other appropriate way. Email is especially appropriate for information questions, but the instructor limits access to email outside the office. Unless there are compelling privacy concerns, it is always wise to send an additional copy of any email intended for the instructor to the TA who has access to email more regularly.

Academic dishonesty, such as plagiarism, cheating, or academic fraud, is intolerable and will incur severe penalties, including failure for the course. If there is concern about behavior that may be academically dishonest, consult the instructor. Students should refer to the UT General Information Bulletin, Appendix C, Sections 11-304 and 11-802 and Texas is the Best . . . HONESTLY! (1988) by the Cabinet of College Councils and the Office of the Dean of Students.

The instructor is happy to provide all appropriate accommodations for students with documented disabilities. The University’s Office of the Dean of Students at 471.6259, 471.4641 TTY, can provide further information and referrals as necessary.
ANALYSIS AND HOLISM IN READING, WRITING, AND PRESENTING

Students in this class must be analytic in their reading of others' work, in their own writing, and in their presentations. What follows are suggestions for developing analytic and critical methods of thinking and communication. These suggestions are also indications of what you should expect from the writing and speaking of others.

Please remember that a holistic, integrative understanding of context must always complement depth of analysis.

- First and foremost, maximize clarity – be clear, but not simplistic or patronizing.
- Remember that writing is a form of thinking, not just a medium to "display" the results of thinking; make your thinking engaging, reflective, and clear.
- Provide enough context for your remarks that your audience can understand them but not so much that your audience's attention or comprehension is lost.
- Be specific.
- Avoid jargon, undefined terms, undefined acronyms, colloquialisms, clichés, and vague language.
- Give examples.
- Be critical, not dismissive, of others' work; be skeptical, not cynical.
- Answer the difficult but important "how?," "why?," and “so what?” questions.
- Support assertions with evidence.
- Make explicit why evidence used to support an assertion does so.
- Identify and explore the specific practical, social, and intellectual implications of courses of action.
- Be evaluative. Synthesize and internalize existing knowledge without losing your own critical point of view.
- Identify the specific criteria against which others' work and recommendations for action will be assessed.

See the Standards for Written Work and the assignment descriptions in this syllabus for further explanations and examples.
STANDARDS FOR WRITTEN WORK

You will meet professional standards of clarity, grammar, spelling, and organization in writing. Review these standards before and after writing; I use them to evaluate your work.

Every writer is faced with the problem of not knowing what her audience knows; therefore, effective communication depends upon maximizing clarity. Wolcott in *Writing Up Qualitative Research* (1990, p. 47) reminds us: "Address ... the many who do not know, not the few who do." Remember that clarity of ideas, of language, and of syntax are mutually reinforcing.

Good writing makes for good thinking and vice versa. Recall that writing is a form of inquiry, a way to think, not a reflection of some supposed static thought “in” the mind. Theodore Dreiser’s *Sister Carrie* shows how this process of composition and thought works (1994, p. 144):

Hurstwood surprised himself with his fluency. By the natural law which governs all effort, what he wrote reacted upon him. He began to feel those subtleties which he could find words to express. With every word came increased conception. Those inmost breathings which thus found words took hold upon him.

We need not adopt Dreiser’s breathless metaphysics or naturalism to understand the point.

All written work for the class must be done on a word-processor and double-spaced, with 1" margins all the way around and in either 10 or 12 pt. font, in one of three font styles: Times, Times New Roman, or Palatino.

Some writing assignments will demand the use of notes (either footnotes or endnotes) and references. It is particularly important in professional schools such as the School of Information that notes and references are impeccably done. Please use APA (American Psychological Association) standards. There are other standard bibliographic and note formats, for example, in engineering and law, but social scientists and a growing number of humanists use APA. Familiarity with standard formats is essential for understanding others’ work and for preparing submissions to journals, funding agencies, professional conferences, and the like. You may also want to consult the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (2010, 6th ed.).

DO NOT USE A GENERAL DICTIONARY OR ENCYCLOPEDIA FOR DEFINING TERMS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL OR IN PROFESSIONAL WRITING. If you want to use a reference source to define a term, use a specialized dictionary such as *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* or subject-specific encyclopedia, e.g., the *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. The best alternative, however, is having an understanding of the literature related to the term sufficient to provide a definition in the context of that literature.

Use a standard spell checker, but be aware that spell checking dictionaries have systematic weaknesses: they exclude most proper nouns, e.g., personal and place names; they omit most technical terms; they omit most foreign words and phrases; and they cannot identify the error in using homophones, e.g., writing "there" instead of "their;” or in writing "the" instead of "them."

It is imperative that you PROOFREAD YOUR WORK THOROUGHLY AND BE PRECISE IN EDITING IT. It is often helpful to have someone else read your writing, to eliminate errors and to increase clarity. Finally, each assignment should be handed in with a title page containing your full name, the date, the title of the assignment, and the class number (INF 390C). If you have any questions about these standards, I will be pleased to discuss them with you at any time.

Remember, every assignment must include a title page with:
• The title of the assignment
• Your name
• The date
• The class number – INF 390C.
Since the production of professional-level written work is one of the aims of the class, I will read and edit your work as the editor of a professional journal or the moderator of a technical session at a professional conference would. The reminders below will help you prepare professional written work appropriate to any situation. Note the asterisked errors in #’s 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21, and 25 (some have more than one error):

1. Staple all papers for this class in the upper left-hand corner. Do not use covers, binders, or other means of keeping the pages together.

2. Number all pages after the title page. Notes and references do not count against page limits.

3. Use formal, academic prose. Avoid colloquial language, *you know?* It is essential in graduate work and in professional communication to avoid failures in diction – be serious and academic when called for, be informal and relaxed when called for, and be everything in between as necessary. For this course, avoid words and phrases such as "agenda," "problem with," "deal with," "handle," "window of," "goes into," "broken down into," "viable," and "option."

4. Avoid clichés. They are vague, *fail to "push the envelope,"* and do not provide "relevant input."

5. Avoid computer technospeak like "input," "feedback," or "processing information" except when using such terms in specific technical ways.

6. **Avoid using “content” as a noun.**

7. Do not use the term "relevant" except in its information retrieval sense. Ordinarily, it is a colloquial cliché, but it also has a strict technical meaning in information studies.

8. Do not use "quality" as an adjective; it is vague, cliché, and colloquial. Instead use "high-quality," "excellent," "superior," or whatever more formal phrase you deem appropriate.

9. Study the APA style convention for the proper use of ellipsis* . . . *

10. Avoid using the terms "objective" and "subjective" in their evidentiary senses; these terms entail major philosophical, epistemological controversy. Avoid terms such as "facts," "factual," "proven," and related constructions for similar reasons.

11. Avoid contractions. *Don’t* use them in formal writing.

12. Be circumspect in using the term "this," especially in the beginning of a sentence. *THIS* is often a problem because the referent is unclear. Pay strict attention to providing clear referents for all pronouns. Especially ensure that pronouns and their referents agree in number; e.g., "each person went to their home" is a poor construction because "each" is singular, as is the noun "person," while "their" is a plural form. Therefore, either the referent or the pronoun must change in number.

13. "If" ordinarily takes the subjunctive mood, e.g., "If he were [not "was"] only taller."

14. Put "only" in its appropriate place, near the word it modifies. For example, it is appropriate in spoken English to say that "he only goes to Antone’s" when you mean that "the only place he frequents is Antone’s." In written English, however, the sentence should read "he goes only to Antone’s."
15. Do not confuse possessive, plural, or contracted forms, especially of pronouns. *Its* bad.

16. Do not confuse affect/effect, compliment/complement, or principle/principal. Readers will not *complement* your work or *it’s* *principle* *affect* on them.

17. Avoid misplaced modifiers; e.g., it is inappropriate to write the following sentence: As someone interested in the history of Mesoamerica, it was important for me to attend the lecture. The sentence is inappropriate because the phrase "As someone interested in the history of Mesoamerica" is meant to modify the next immediate word, which should then, obviously, be both a person and the subject of the sentence. It should modify the word "I" by preceding it immediately. One good alternative for the sentence is: As someone interested in the history of Mesoamerica, I was especially eager to attend the lecture.

18. Avoid use of "valid," "parameter," "bias," "reliability," and "paradigm," except in limited technical ways. These are important research terms and should be used with precision.

19. Remember that the words "data," "media," "criteria," "strata," and "phenomena" are all PLURAL forms. They *TAKES* plural verbs. If you use any of these plural forms in a singular construction, e.g., "the data is," you will make the instructor very unhappy:

20. "Number," "many," and "fewer" are used with plural nouns (a number of horses, many horses, and fewer horses). "Amount," "much," and "less" are used with singular nouns (an amount of hydrogen, much hydrogen, and less hydrogen). Another useful way to make this distinction is to recall that "many" is used for countable nouns, while "much" is used for uncountable nouns.

21. *The passive voice should generally not be used.*

22. "Between" is used with two alternatives, while "among" is used with three or more.

23. Generally avoid the use of honorifics such as Mister, Doctor, Ms., and so on when referring to persons in your writing, especially when citing their written work. Use last names and dates as appropriate in APA.

24. There is no generally accepted standard for citing electronic resources. If you cite them, give an indication, as specifically as possible, of:

   - responsibility (who?)
   - title (what?)
   - date of creation (when?)
   - date viewed (when?)
   - place to find the source (where? how?).


25. *PROFREAD! PROOFREED! PROOOFREAD!*

26. Citation, quotation, and reference are nouns; cite, quote, and refer to are verbs.

27. Use double quotation marks ("abc."), not single quotation marks (‘xyz.’), as a matter of course. Single quotation marks are to be used to indicate quotations within quotations.
28. Provide a specific page number for all direct quotations. If the quotation is from a Web page or other digital source, provide at least the paragraph number and/or other directional cues, e.g., “(Davis, 1993, section II, ¶ 4).”

29. In ordinary American English, as ≠ because.

30. Use "about" instead of the tortured locution "as to."
31. In much of social science and humanistic study, the term "issue" is used in a technical way to identify sources of public controversy or dissensus. Please use the term to refer to topics about which there is substantial public disagreement, NOT synonymously with general terms such as "area," "topic," or the like.

32. On a related note, avoid the locution of “public debate.” Such a locution makes a series of faulty assumptions:

- It presumes that a public policy issue has only two “sides.” There are usually three or four or more perspectives on any topic of public dissensus that merit consideration. “Debate” hides this complexity.
- “Debate” implies that one “side” and only one “side” can be correct; that presumption ignores the fact that the many perspectives on a public policy issue have contributions to make to its resolution.
- “Debate” implies that there can be and will be one and only one “winner.” This presumption naively ignores the fact that some public policy issues are intractable, that these issues are often emergent as are their resolutions, and that compromise is oftentimes a mark of success rather than of failure or “surrender.”

33. Please do not start a sentence or any independent clause with “however.”

34. Avoid the use of “etc.” – it is awkward, colloquial, and vague.

35. Do not use the term “subjects” to describe research participants. “Respondents,” “participants,” and “informants” are preferred terms and have been for decades.

36. Do not use notes unless absolutely necessary, but, if you must use them, use endnotes not footnotes.

37. Please adhere to these orthographic (spelling) conventions:

- Web with a capital “W.”
- Web site, two words, with a capital “W.”
- Internet with a capital “I” to indicate the TCP/IP-compliant computer network with a shared address convention. Otherwise, internet with a lower-case “i” simply means any of the many millions of networks of networks.
### SOME EDITING CONVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS’ PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>number OR insert a space; the context will help you decipher its meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWK</td>
<td>awkward and usually compromises clarity as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK</td>
<td>make into a block quotation without external quotation marks; do so with quotations ≥ 4 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caps</td>
<td>capitalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLOQ</td>
<td>colloquial and to be avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG</td>
<td>sentence fragment; often means that the verb or subject of the sentence is missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAL</td>
<td>italicize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc</td>
<td>make into lower case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lib'ship</td>
<td>librarianship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org, org’l</td>
<td>organization, organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q’naire</td>
<td>questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF?</td>
<td>what is the referent of this pronoun? to what or whom does it refer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SING</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w.c.?</td>
<td>word choice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor also uses **check marks** to indicate that the writer has made an especially good point. **Wavy lines** indicate that usage or reasoning is suspect.
GRADING

Grades for this class include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Extraordinarily high achievement</td>
<td>not recognized by the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>Barely satisfactory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unacceptable and failing.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the memorandum from former Dean Brooke Sheldon dated August 13, 1991, and the notice in the School of Information student orientation packet for explanations of this system. Consult the iSchool Web site (http://www.ischool.utexas.edu/programs/general_info.php) and the Graduate School Catalog (e.g., http://registrar.utexas.edu/catalogs/grad09-11/ch01/grad09.ch01a.html and http://registrar.utexas.edu/catalogs/grad09-11/ch01/grad09.ch01b.html#Student-Responsibility) for more on standards of work. While the University does not accept the grade of A+, the instructor may assign the grade to students whose work is extraordinary.

The grade of B signals acceptable, satisfactory performance in graduate school. The instructor reserves the grade of A for students who demonstrate not only a command of the concepts and techniques discussed but also an ability to synthesize and integrate them in a professional manner and communicate them effectively, successfully informing the work of other students.

The grade of incomplete (X) is reserved for students in extraordinary circumstances and must be negotiated with the instructor before the end of the semester. See the former Dean's memorandum of August 13, 1991, available from the main iSchool office.

The instructor uses points to evaluate assignments, not letter grades. He uses an arithmetic – not a proportional – algorithm to determine points on any assignment. For example, 14/20 points on an assignment does NOT translate to 70% of the credit, or a D. Instead 14/20 points is roughly equivalent to a B. If any student's semester point total ≥ 90 (is equal to or greater than 90), then s/he will have earned an A of some kind. If the semester point total ≥ 80, then s/he will have earned at least a B of some kind. Whether these are A+, A, A-, B+, B, or B- depends upon the comparison of point totals for all students. For example, if a student earns a total of 90 points and the highest point total in the class is 98, the student would earn an A-. If, on the other hand, a student earns 90 points and the highest point total in the class is 91, then the student would earn an A. The instructor will explain this system throughout the semester.
TEXTS AND OTHER TOOLS

There are five required texts for this class, and they are available at the Co-op on Guadalupe:


There are seven recommended texts:


The course Web site, Blackboard, and direct email messages will inform students of changes in the schedule and assignments. By the second class, please subscribe to three lists:

Coalition for Networked Information copyright list, now owned by Peter Jaszi:
http://roster.wcl.american.edu/cgi-bin/wa.exe?A0=PIJIP-COPYRIGHT&X=5D71B90996102E1081&Y=mpalmedo%40wcl.american.edu
The archives through February 2007 live at http://www3.wcl.american.edu/cni/
Politech: http://politechbot.com/mailman/listinfo/politech

Digital Copyright Digest: http://www.umuc.edu/distance/odell/cip/listserv.html
LIST OF ASSIGNMENTS

The instructor will provide additional information about each assignment. Written assignments are to be word-processed and double-spaced in 10- or 12-point font, using Times, Times New Roman, or Palatino font, with 1” margins. Assignments are due in class unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>Percent of Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-class preparation and participation</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal case “brief” in class</td>
<td>FEB 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkin-Koren (2000) and privatizing information policy (5 pp.)</td>
<td>FEB 8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case “brief” and discussion questions (4-5 pp.)</td>
<td>FEB 22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading in-class discussion and annotated bibliography GROUP</td>
<td>MAR 8, 22, 29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and approval of topic for final paper</td>
<td>MAR 22</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of classmate’s paper to review</td>
<td>APR 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft of final paper (≥10 pp.)</td>
<td>APR 19</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of classmate’s draft (3-4 pp.)</td>
<td>APR 26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class presentation</td>
<td>APR 19, 26</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final paper (15-20 pp.)</td>
<td>FRI, MAY 6 12:00 N in UTA mailroom</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All assignments must be handed in on time, and the instructor reserves the right to issue a course grade of F if any assignment is not completed. Late assignments will be accepted only if:

1. At least 24 hours before the date due, the instructor gives explicit permission to the student to hand the assignment in late.

2. At the same time, a specific date and time are agreed upon for the late submission.

3. The assignment is then submitted on or before the agreed-upon date and time.

The first criterion can be met only in the most serious of health, family, or personal situations.
All of your assignments should adhere to the standards for written work; should be clear, succinct, and specific; and should be explicitly grounded in the readings, class discussions, and other sources as appropriate. You will find it particularly useful to write multiple drafts of your papers.
# OUTLINE OF COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics and assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | JAN 18 | Introduction to the course and review of the syllabus  
|         |        | Introduction to the concept of “intellectual property”  
|         |        | The exclusive rights of rights holders  
|         |        | Exceptions to these exclusive rights  
|         |        | SUBSCRIBE: CNI-COPYRIGHT-digest@cni.org  
|         |        | Politech  
|         |        | Digital Copyright Digest  
| 2       | JAN 25 | Origins of U.S. copyright law  
| 3       | FEB 1  | Begin Boyle (1996)  
| 4       | FEB 8  | Continue Boyle (1996) and Litman (2001)  
|         |        | • Due: Paper on Elkin-Koren (2000) and privatizing information policy (10%) (5 pp.)  
| 5       | FEB 15 | Continue Litman (2001) and Goldstein (2003)  
|         |        | • In-class exercise: informal case “brief”  
| 6       | FEB 22 | Selected cases – fair use  
|         |        | • Due: Case “brief” and discussion questions (15%; 4-5 pp.)  
| 7       | MAR 1  | Selected cases – vicarious liability?  
|         |        | Considering the commons  
| 8       | MAR 8  | **Student-led discussion and annotated bibliography** – the construction of authorship (20%) GRP  
|         |        | **Spring Break: No class**  
| 9       | MAR 22 | **Student-led discussion and annotated bibliography** – international copyright treaties and conventions/indigenous people’s interests (20%) GRP  
|         |        | • Due: Identification and approval of topic for final paper  
| 10      | MAR 29 | **Student-led discussion and annotated bibliography** – the public domain and its enclosure (20%) GRP  

Copyright – Philip Doty, University of Texas at Austin, December 2010
• Due: Choice of classmate’s paper to review
The Digital Millennium Copyright Act – anti-circumvention as threat to fair use and other statutory exemptions, surveillance, and legislative history

Paper presentations

- Due: Draft of final paper (≥10 pp.)

Paper presentations

- Due: Peer review of classmate’s draft (10%; 3-4 pp.)

Course evaluation

Summary

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 12:00 N in Doty’s mailbox in fifth floor workroom of UTA

- Due: Final paper (30%; 15-20 pp.)
**SCHEDULE**

This schedule is tentative and may be adjusted as the class progresses. **GRP** indicates a group assignment, and **AS** indicates additional sources. **CD** indicates that a document can be found in the Course Documents section of the class Blackboard site. The various court cases and portions of the *U.S. Code* can be found online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TOPICS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND READINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| JAN 18   | Introduction to the course and review of the syllabus  
The exclusive rights of rights holders  
Exceptions to these exclusive rights                                                                                                                                 |
|          | **READ:** Boyle (2008), Chapters 1-5  
Litman (2001), Introduction, Chapters 1 and 2  
Copyright Act (see U.S. Copyright Office, 2009) §§ 106, 106A, 107, 108, 109, 110, 121 (skim) **online**  |
|          | **AS:** Miller & Davis (1990, pp. 323-339)                                                                                                                  |
|          | **SUBSCRIBE:** CNI-COPYRIGHT-digest@cni.org  
Politech  
Digital Copyright Digest                                                                          |
| JAN 25   | Origins of U.S. copyright law                                                                                                                                   |
|          | **READ:** Boyle (2008), 6-10  
Litman (2001), 3, 4, and 5  
Rose (2002a) **CD**  
Copyright Act §§ 104, 104A (see U.S. Copyright Office, 2009) **online**  |
|          | **AS:** Association of Research Libraries (ARL) (2002) [Timeline . . .] **online**  
(U.S. Congress) OTA (1986), Summary **online**                                                        |
| FEB 1    | **READ:** Boyle (1996), Preface, 1, 6, 10, 11                                                                                                               |
| FEB 8    | **READ:** Boyle (1996), 3, 4, 5, 13, Conclusion, Appendix A  
Litman (2001), 3, 4, 5                                                                                      |
|          | • **Due:** Paper on Elkin-Koren (2000) and privatizing information policy  
(10%) (5 pp.)                                                                                                |
| FEB 15   | **READ:** Litman (2001), 6, 7, and 8  
Goldstein (2003), 1, 4, and 5  
_Eldred v. Ashcroft_, 537 (2003) [read majority opinion + both dissents]                                    |
• In-class exercise: informal case “brief”
FEB 22  Selected cases – fair use

READ:  
American Geophysical Union v. Texaco (1994)  
Feist v. Rural Telephone (1991)  
Sony v. Universal City Studios (1984)

•  DUE: Case “brief” and discussion questions (15%; 4-5 pp.)

MAR 1  Selected cases – vicarious liability?
Considering the commons

READ:  
MGM v. Grokster (2005)  
Bollier (2007) CD  
Hardin (1968) online  
Lessig (2004c) online  
Lougee (2007) CD

AS:  
Creative Commons (2004) online  
Carroll (2006) online  
Hess & Ostrom (2007a)

MAR 8  Student-led discussion and annotated bibliography – the construction of authorship (20%) GRP

READ:  
Barthes (1977) online  
Foucault (1984) CD  
Jaszi (1994) CD  
Jaszi & Woodmanse (1994) CD  
Kamuf (1988) CD  
Lury (1993b) CD  
Rose (1988) online  
Woodmansee (1994) CD

MAR 15  Spring Break: No class

MAR 22  Student-led discussion and annotated bibliography – international copyright treaties and conventions/indigenous people’s interests (20%) GRP

READ:  
Brown (2003a) CD  
Brown (2003b) CD  
Brown (2003c) CD  
Carroll (2004) online  
Garrity (1999) online  
Goldstein (2003), 5  
Okediji (1999) CD  
Warren (1999) CD

• Due: Identification and approval of topic for final paper
MAR 29  
**Student-led discussion and annotated bibliography** – the public domain and its enclosure (20%) GRP

READ:  
- Kranich (2007) CD  
- Boyle (2003b) online  
- Rose (2002b) online  
- Copyright Act §§ 101, 102, 103, 302, 303, 304, 305  

AS:  
- Kranich & Schement (2008)  
- Lange (2003)  
- Lessig (2001a), Preface and 1-8  
- National Research Council (1999)

APR 5  
READ:  
- Gillespie (2007), 1, 2, and 3  
- Litman (2007) online

- **Due:** Choice of classmate’s paper to review

APR 12  
The Digital Millennium Copyright Act – anti-circumvention as threat to fair use and other statutory exemptions, surveillance, and legislative history

READ:  
- Gillespie (2007), 4, 5, and 6  
  review Boyle (2008), 5  
- Doty (2011, forthcoming) CD  
- Goldstein (2003), 6  
- Litman (2001), 9, 10, 11  
- Copyright Act, §§ 1201 and 1202  
  17 USC 1201(2) – chart summarizing prohibitions of 1201 and 1202 CD  
- Electronic Frontier Foundation (2003) online

APR 19  
**Paper presentations**

- **Due:** Draft of final paper (≥10 pp.)

APR 26  
**Paper presentations**

- **Due:** Peer review of classmate’s draft (10%; 3-4 pp.)

MAY 3  
**Course evaluation**

**Summary**

READ:  
- Doty (2001) CD  
- Gillespie (2007), 8, 9  
- Goldstein (2003), 7  
- Litman (2001), 12, 13  
- Lury (1993a) CD
AS: Gillespie (2007), 7

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 12:00 N in Doty’s mailbox in fifth floor workroom of UTA

• Due: Final paper (30%; 15-20 pp.)
ASSIGNMENTS

Elkin-Koren (2000) and privatizing information policy (10%) – due FEB 8

Niva Elkin-Koren (2000) writes about the privatization of information policy in the United States. Using her analysis, Boyle (1996), Boyle (2008), Litman (2000), and any other sources you find useful, please answer these three questions in 5 double-spaced pp.:

1. In your opinion, what are the major elements of Elkin-Koren’s argument? (2 pp.)

2. What implications does her work on the privatization of information policy have for copyright and cultural production in the United States? How does her argument support or undermine those of Boyle (1996), Boyle (2008), or Litman (2000)? (3 pp.)

Be specific and clarify to the fullest extent you can what privatization of information policy means generally and in the context of copyright.

Case “brief” and discussion questions (15%) – due FEB 22

We will be reading a number of legal opinions this semester. Four of them are particularly important to the concept of fair use: American Geophysical Union v. Texaco (1994), Feist v. Rural Telephone (1991), Kelly v. Arriba Corp. (2003), and Sony v. Universal City Studios (1984).

In preparation for class on Tuesday, March 1, each student will prepare a very informal brief related to one of the four cases and at least one discussion question for the class based on any of the four cases. The instructor will assign the cases by lot and inform the students about the choices no later than February 8, two weeks before the assignment is due.

Each brief will be 4-5 double-spaced pp. and will have the following seven components often found in students’ legal briefs:

- Title
- Citation
- Facts of the case
- Issue
- Holding

[a total of two double-spaced pp. for these five components]

- Reasoning [one double-spaced page]
- Analysis [one or two double-spaced pages].

We will use the briefs and your discussion questions, along with the texts of the cases and additional material from our readings, to structure our discussion in class.

Leading in-class discussion and annotated bibliography GROUP (20%) – due MAR 8 (6), MAR 22 (20), and MAR 29 (27)

Each student will self-select into one group to lead class discussions on these dates.
• March 8   The construction of authorship
• March 22  International copyright treaties and conventions/Indigenous people’s interests
• March 29  The public domain and its enclosure.
There are four elements of this assignment:

- Each team will prepare three or four questions to help facilitate the classroom discussion, and these questions should be posted to the Blackboard site in the appropriate forum no later than 12:00 N the Sunday before class, i.e., March 6, March 20, and March 27. Each team should work as a group to develop these questions, and the other members of the class should check the forum before class to prepare for the discussion. The discussion leaders should prepare a handout with the questions to distribute in class.

- The instructor will make a few comments (perhaps 10-15 minutes’ worth) before turning the class over to each team to lead the discussion for 90 minutes. Each member of the team should assume roughly the same amount of leadership in the class; no one should dominate the conversation. Be prepared to run class for an hour and a half – for about an hour up to the break and then for another 30 minutes after the break. The instructor will use the last 30 minutes to expand on the day’s topic and/or introduce new material.

- Each team should also distribute in class an annotated bibliography of ten (10) items that we have NOT read as a class and that are germane to the day’s discussion. The annotations should be about 3-4 sentences long and should be very specific about the sources’ value to the day’s topic. The team should distribute a paper copy of the annotated bibliography to each member of the class and give two paper copies to the instructor in class.

- The team should post the annotated bibliography in the appropriate Blackboard forum no later than 9:00 AM the day of class.

The discussion questions and facilitating the discussion will be worth 5% of your grade, while the annotated bibliography will be worth 15% of your grade. All members of the group will receive the same grade for both elements of the assignment. The most important word of advice I can offer is to remind you to facilitate the discussion, not monopolize it – get your classmates involved.

Final paper and peer review of classmate’s draft (30%) – due APR 19, APR 26, MAY 6

Each student will choose one aspect of the copyright regime in the U.S. to write about at length, especially keeping in mind our legal and cultural emphases this semester. The final paper should be 15-20 double-spaced pp.

There are six deadlines for this assignment, one of which is variable:

- Identification and approval of topic – due MAR 22

Each student must submit a topic for the final paper for approval of the instructor no later than March 22. Post a note to the appropriate forum in Blackboard so that the class can review them as well. The topic can be related to the texts we have read, cases we have reviewed, or material we have not explicitly covered in our semester’s work. Useful sources for ideas include class readings and additional sources in the syllabus, your own knowledge of copyright, discussion with the instructor and your colleagues (both inside and outside of the class), reading ahead in the syllabus to identify upcoming topics, the mass media, Web and other Internet sources, and the bibliographies of what you read.
Do not limit your consideration of topics to those in the early part of the semester – the more initiative you take in identifying a topic of interest to you, the better the final product will be.
• Choice of classmate’s paper to review – due APR 5

No later than April 5, each student will choose to be a peer reviewer for another student’s final paper. While the choices will generally be on a first-come-first-served basis, the instructor reserves the right to assign partners for appropriate reasons. Students will notify the instructor by private email about their preferences and will receive replies about them.


Each student will turn in two copies of a draft of the final paper on April 19. One copy will be for the peer reviewer, one for the instructor. This draft should be a minimum of 10 double-spaced pp., with all the elements of the final paper, including a one-page abstract.

• Peer review of classmate’s draft (10%) – due APR 26 – 3-4 pp.

Each individual student will review another student’s draft and submit two copies of a three-to four-page, double-spaced critique of the paper: one to the student who wrote the draft and one to the instructor. Be specific in your critique -- what works in the draft? What does not? Why or why not? What specific suggestions can you offer for improvement to the paper, whether about the topic, the argument, definitions, organization, sources, composition, citations, lay-out, and so on? Help your classmates improve their work – this kind of review is a primary responsibility of professional life. You might find useful the evaluative criteria specified in Dunn (1994) on p. 24 of this syllabus.

• In-class presentation – (APR 5) APR 19 or APR 26

Each student will make a 20-minute oral presentation about her final paper. While the presentation will be informal and ungraded, you should plan to use visuals and handouts as appropriate; both Windows and Mac computers are available, as are an Internet connection and projector. Each peer editor will act as first respondent to the presentation. The dates for the presentations are April 19 or April 26. Please notify me of your preference for presentation dates no later than Tuesday, April 5.

• Final paper (30%) – due Friday, MAY 6, 12:00 N in Doty’s mailbox, fifth floor of UTA – 15-20 pp.

This final paper of 15-20 double-spaced pp. should consider any approved topic in copyright. The paper should be both analytic and holistic and include a one-page abstract. Remember to look at three sections in the syllabus: (1) Analysis in Reading, Writing, and Presenting, (2) Standards for Written Work, and (3) Suggestions for Writing Policy Analysis.

Although the paper need not follow the policy analytic models, it should be informed by the systematic consideration of public conflicts that policy analysis provides. Pertinent policy instruments, stakeholders, and recommendations to resolve conflicts are of particular import.

Post your final paper to the appropriate forum in Blackboard no later than 12:00 N, Friday, May 6.

AND

Put two paper copies of your final paper in Doty’s mailbox in the fifth floor workroom of UTA by 12:00 N, Friday, May 6.
SUGGESTIONS FOR WRITING POLICY ANALYSIS

This section of the syllabus offers three general, interrelated models for doing policy analysis and then writing policy reports, beyond that offered in Majchrzak’s *Methods for Policy Research* (1984). You can use these to guide your own writing as your study of copyright and policy analysis progresses beyond this semester, but they are also useful for evaluating the work of others. Such evaluations are common in policy studies, whether for critique, literature review, or formal peer review. Policy analysts constantly review each other’s work in a collegial but rigorous way.

The first model is based on one developed by Charles R. McClure, with my own modifications added. Particular analysts and topics may demand different approaches:

- **Abstract**

- **Introduction**
  - Importance of specific topic
  - Definition of key terms
  - Key stakeholders
  - Key policy areas needing analysis and resolution

- **Overview of current knowledge**
  - Evaluative review of the literature about the topic, including print and electronic sources

- **Existing policy related to the topic**
  - The most important legislative, judicial, and regulatory policy instruments
  - Ambiguities, conflicts, problems, and contradictions related to the instruments

- **Key issues**
  - Underlying assumptions
  - Effects on and roles of key stakeholders
  - Conflicts among key values
  - Implications of issues

- **Conclusions and recommendations**
  - Recommendations
  - Rationale for recommendations
  - Implications and possible outcomes of specific courses of action

- **References**
  - APA style
  - All sources cited in the paper.

- “Define the problem
- Assemble some evidence
- Construct the alternatives (for action)
- Select the criteria
- Project the outcomes
- Confront the trade-offs
- Decide!
- Tell your story.”

Despite his somewhat misplaced emphasis on problem solving (see, e.g., Schön, 1993, on generative metaphor) and an implicit linearity he uses to characterize policy analysis, Bardach’s book is very useful for understanding the overwhelming importance of (1) narrative in the process of policy analysis, (2) iteration in analysis, and (3) clarity in argumentation. Bardach also gives some important insights into the contributions of econometric analysis to policy studies.

The third model is based primarily on the work of William Dunn, with contributions from the work of Ray Rist on qualitative policy research methods, Emery Roe on narrative policy analysis, and Donald Schön on generative metaphor. I avoid the rhetoric of problems and problem solving deliberately; see, e.g., Doty (2001b).
**Elements of the policy issue paper** (adapted from Dunn, 1994, with material from Rist, 1994; Roe, 1994; and Schön, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Examples of Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive summary</td>
<td>Are recommendations highlighted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background of the issue or dilemma</td>
<td>Are all the important terms clearly defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the social dilemma</td>
<td>Are all appropriate dimensions described?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of earlier efforts to address the dilemma</td>
<td>Are prior efforts clearly assessed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and severity of the conflict</td>
<td>Why is the social conflict important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of past policy efforts</td>
<td>What are the major assumptions and questions to be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue statement</td>
<td>Is the issue clearly stated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of the issue</td>
<td>Are all major stakeholders identified and prioritized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major stakeholders</td>
<td>Is the approach to analysis clearly specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and objectives</td>
<td>Are goals and objectives clearly specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures of effectiveness</td>
<td>Are major value conflicts identified and described?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential “solutions” or new understandings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy alternatives</td>
<td>Are alternatives compared in terms of costs and effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of alternatives</td>
<td>Are alternatives systematically compared in terms of political feasibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of future outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints and political feasibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy recommendations</td>
<td>Are all relevant criteria clearly specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for recommending alternatives</td>
<td>Is a strategy for implementation clearly specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of preferred alternative(s)</td>
<td>Are there adequate provisions for monitoring and evaluating policies, particularly unintended consequences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline of implementation strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations and possible unanticipated outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCES

Many required readings are available online. Some of the course readings are in the Course Documents section of Blackboard (CD), while some others require you to be logged in with your UT EID through the UT libraries. Those journals are usually available online for only part of their publication run, and UT often has more than one arrangement through which to get these journals online, so there may be more than one URL for each journal. Explore the various online journal packages; the more familiar you are with such arrangements, the better.

I. References in the schedule and assignments

A& M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc. 239 F. 3rd 1004 (9th Cir. 2001)
http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/239_F3d_1004.htm

American Geophysical Union v. Texaco, 60 F.3d 913 (2d Cir. 1994)
http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/60_F3d_913.htm


http://faculty.smu.edu/dfoster/theory/Barthes.htm


Elkin-Koren, Niva. (2000). The privatization of information policy. Ethics and Information Technology, 2(4), 201-209. Also available at http://www.springerlink.com/content/3lugryckutjl/?p=9ed7fd02ace24e7c958a892c69b44039&pi=27


Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp. (2003), 336 F. 3d 811, 9th circuit http://images.chillingeffects.org/cases/Kelly_v_Arriba.html


http://www.eff.org/IP/P2P/MGM_v_Grokster/


Okediji, Ruth. (1999). Perspectives on globalization from developing states: Copyright and public welfare in global perspective. CD

http://www.lib.jjay.cuny.edu/research/brief.html (Original published 1982)


http://www.eff.org/Legal/Cases/sony_v_universal_decision.html


II. Selected Other Court Cases

http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/baystatevbowerdiscussion.htm

Blizzard Entertainment Inc. v. Jung (2005), 8th Cir., No. 04-3654, September 1


http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/greenwichvtimber.htm

http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/cas/comm/free_speech/harperandrow.html

http://www.law.uh.edu/faculty/cjoyce/copyright/release10/IntRes.html

Lee v. A.R.T. Co., 125 F. 3d 580 CA 7 (Ill.) 1997
http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/125_F3d_580.htm

Lochner v. New York 98 U.S. 45 (1905)
http://www2.law.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/foliotoc.exe/historic/query=%5BGroup+198+U.S.+45:%5D%7C%5BLevel+Case+Citation:%5D%7C%5BGroup+citemenu:%5D)/doc/%7B@1%7D/hit_headings/words=4/hits_only

New York Times et al. v. Tasini et al. No. 00-201 (2001a) [majority opinion]
http://supct.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/00-201.ZS.html

New York Times et al. v. Tasini et al. No. 00-201 (2001b) [dissent]
http://supct.law.cornell.edu/supct/pdf/00-201ZD

http://www.law.emory.edu/6circuit/nov96/96a0357p.06.html

ProCD Inc. v. Zeidenberg, 86 F. 3d 1447 (7th Cir. 1996)

www.eff.org/legal/cases/RIAA_v_Verizon/opinion-20031219.pdf

Satava v. Lowry, 323 F.3d 805 (9th Cir. 2003), cert denied
http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/323_F3d_805.htm

Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken. 422 U.S. 151, 156 (1975).


http://www.digital-law-online.com/cases/62PQ2D1736.htm
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Universal City Studios Inc. v. Eric Corley et al., 273 F.2d 429 (2d Cir. 2001)
http://www.nd.edu/~pbellia/corley.pdf
III. Selected Additional Readings


Bowrey, Kathy, & Rimmer, Matthew. (2002). Rip, mix, burn: The politics of peer to peer and copyright law. *First Monday, 7*(8).


Creative Commons. (2004). http://creativecommons.org/


Okediji, Ruth. (1999). Perspectives on globalization from developing states: Copyright and public welfare in global perspective. CD


http://weblinks2.epnet.com/citation.asp?tb=1&_ua=bt+ID++UPL+shn+1+db+aphjnh+bo+B%5F+5D2C&_ug=sd+C02AA866%2D6FD7%2D4390%2D869D%2DDE452EAAE00F%40sessionmgr2+ +dbs+aph+op+b+5D2C&_us=dstb+ES+ri+KAAACB1D00194252+fcl+Aut+sm+ES+sl+%2D1+or+Date+Ｂ４85&_uh=bt+N+6C9C&_uso=st%5B0+%2D%5D%2D%22University++of%2DPennsylvania++Law++Re +view%22++and++DT++19990401+tg%5B0+%2D+db%5B0+%2Daph+op%5B0+%2D+hd+False+63 +A9&cf=1&fn=1&rn=2&


Slater, Derek. (2003). Take another little piece of my art [review of Illegal Art]. http://creativecommons.org/getcontent/features/illegalart


U.S. Congress. (1976). Agreement on guidelines for classroom copying in not-for-profit educational institutions. Agreed to by the Ad Hoc Committee on Copyright Law Revision, the Author-Publisher Group and Authors League of America, and the Association of American Publishers, Inc. http://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/Copyright/guidebks.htm


Young, Edward. (1759). *Conjectures on original composition*. Dublin.

**Selected law reviews and journals of special interest to copyright**

*Berkeley Technology Law Journal* http://www.law.berkeley.edu/journals/btlj/
Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal http://www.cardozo.yu.edu/aelj/

Duke Law & Technology Review http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/dltr/

Harvard Journal of Law & Technology http://jolt.law.harvard.edu/

Intellectual Property Law Review http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/form/academic/s_lawrev.html?_m=0cd7a31f47f9114a4483775c1cafe6e4&wp=dGLbViz-zSkVb&md5=592d0d3acbc667e6898e441696cad113[a more general source]


Law and Contemporary Problems http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/lcp/

Richmond Journal of Law & Technology http://law.richmond.edu/jolt/index.asp


**Governmental and Commercial Serial Sources of Government Information**

Code of Federal Regulations

Constitutional Digest

Constitutional Information Service

Constitutional Quarterly

Constitutional Record


Federal Register

Supreme Court Reporter

U.S. Code

U.S. Code and Congressional and Administrative News

U.S. Code Annotated

United States Supreme Court Reports

**Journals and Other Serial Sources on Information Policy and Government Information**

Annual Review of Information Science and Technology
Atlantic Monthly

The Bowker Annual: Library and Book Trade Almanac

Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science

Communications Yearbook

Electronic Public Information Newsletter

EPIC [Electronic Privacy Information Center] Alert

ERIC

EDUCAUSE Review

Federal Computer Week

Government Computer News

Government Information Quarterly

Government Technology

Harpers

Information, Communication, and Society

Information Management Review

Information Processing and Management

The Information Society

Internet Research: Electronic Networks Applications and Policy (formerly Electronic Networking: Research, Applications, and Policy)

Internet World

Journal of Academic Librarianship (especially its Information Policy column)

Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (formerly the Journal of the American Society for Information Science)

Journal of Communication


Journal of Information Science

Journal of Policy Analysis and Management

Journal of Policy Research
The Journal of Politics
Knowledge
Knowledge in Society
Minerva: A Review of Science, Learning and Policy
Philosophy and Public Affairs
Policy Sciences
Policy Studies Journal
Policy Studies Review
Privacy Journal
Proceedings of the ASIS Annual Meeting
Public Administration Review
Public Affairs Information Service
Research Policy
Sage Yearbook of Politics and Public Policy
Science
Scientific American
Science and Public Policy
Serials Review
Technology Review
Telecommunications Policy
Utne Reader
Wired

Newspapers
Los Angeles Times http://www.latimes.com/
Wall Street Journal http://www.wsj.com/
Other online sources

(Barry Kite’s) Aberrant Art http://www.aberrantart.com/


Association of American Publishers (AAP) http://www.publishers.org/
  Government Affairs http://www.publishers.org/govt/index.cfm

(University of California) Berkeley Center for Law & Technology
http://www.law.berkeley.edu:80/institutes/bclt/

Chilling Effects http://www.chillingeffects.org/

Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) http://www.cni.org/

(United States) Code http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/

(Compiler Press’) Compleat World copyright Website [sic]
http://www.compilerpress.attreweb.com/journal.htm

Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility (CPSR) http://www.cpsr.org/dox/home.html

(U.S.) Congressional Research Service (CRS) http://www.cnie.org/nle/crs_main.html

Copyright and Fair Use (Stanford U.) http://fairuse.stanford.edu/

Copyright Clearance Center http://www.copyright.com/

Copyright Crash Course (Georgia Harper's home page on copyright and other “IP” topics)
http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/gkhbio2.htm

Copyright Management Center http://www.iupui.edu/~copyinfo

(U.S. Library of Congress) Copyright Office http://lcweb.loc.gov/copyright/

Copyright Society of the U.S.A. http://www.csusa.org/

Cornell University, Computer Policy & Law Program http://www.cornell.edu/CPL/

Corporation for National Research Initiatives (CNRI): http://www.cnri.reston.va.us

(U.S.) Department of Commerce (DoC) http://www.doc.gov

(U.S.) Department of Justice (DoJ) http://www.usdoj.gov/

Digital Future Coalition http://www.dfc.org//
National Academy Press (NAP) http://www.nap.edu/

National Information Infrastructure: Servers with comprehensive sources http://www.cuny.edu/links/nii.html

(U.S.) National Information Infrastructure Virtual Library http://niist.gov/

National Science Foundation (NSF) http://www.nsf.gov

National Security Agency (NSA) http://www.nsa.gov:8080


National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) http://www.ntia.doc.gov

(U.S.) Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) http://www.ota.nap.edu -- see Institute for Technology Assessment -- and Princeton University archive of OTA reports http://www.wws.princeton.edu/~ota/

Public Knowledge http://www.publicknowledge.org/

Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) http://www.riaa.com/default.asp
Anti-piracy http://www.riaa.com/issues/piracy/default.asp

Software & Information Industry Association http://www.siia.net/
SIIA Anti-Piracy Division http://www.siia.net/piracy/

Telecommunications and Information Policy Institute http://www.utexas.edu/research/tipi/

(University of California) UCCopyright http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/copyright/
especially see Additional Resources http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/copyright/resources.html

University of Texas Libraries http://www.lib.utexas.edu/

Government information http://www.lib.utexas.edu/government/
More Gov’t Information http://www.lib.utexas.edu/government/us.html
International Gov’t Information http://www.lib.utexas.edu/government/world.html
Texas Government Information http://www.lib.utexas.edu/government/texas.html

(Laura “Lolly” Gasaway) When U.S. Works Pass into the Public Domain
http://www.unc.edu/%7Eunclng/public-d.htm

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) http://www.wipo.int/

Copyright and Related Rights http://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/copyright.html
FAQs About Copyright http://www.wipo.int/copyright/en/faq/index.htm
WIPO Copyright Treaty

Copyright – Philip Doty, University of Texas at Austin, December 2010