Media Convergence: *Grand Theft Audio*: Negotiating Copyright as Composers

Dànielle Nicole DeVoss, Suzanne Webb [*]

Department of Writing, Rhetoric, & American Cultures, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

Abstract

Today, writing often requires composers to draw upon multiple modes of meaning making. Today's computers and robust networks allow writers to choreograph audio, video, other visual elements, text, and more. This is new. Admittedly, some professionals have been mixing media for years to create advertisements, movies, and CDs, for instance, but access to these technologies is now available in ways we haven't seen before—and multimedia composing rubs against issues of intellectual property in ways we haven't seen before, at least not in the writing classroom. In this manuscript, we address issues of copyright trouble and fair use related to multimedia composing in our current cultural context of media convergence. Specifically, we use a piece of work titled *Grand Theft Audio* as a launching point to discuss the ways in which copyright trouble is inevitable in multimedia composing. The piece draws on appropriated, remixed, and reconfigured audio, video, text, and images to pose a particular argument about the affordances of media convergence and issues of negotiating copyright permissions. We scaffold our discussion of *Grand Theft Audio* with the work of scholars including Martine Rife, John Logie, and Lawrence Lessig to push at the ways digital composing is situated in a free use vs. "permission culture" climate.
© 2007 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Convergence; Copyright; Creative commons; Fair use; Intellectual property; Piracy

> Convergence is both a top down corporate-driven process and a bottom up consumer driven process... Sometimes, these two forces reinforce each other, creating closer, more rewarding relations between media producers and consumers. Sometimes, these two forces are at war and those struggles will redefine the face of American popular culture. (Jenkins, 2005, p. 5)

> The emergent knowledge culture will never fully escape the influence of commodity culture. (Jenkins, 2006, p. 27)

[*] Corresponding author at: c/o Rhetoric & Writing, 5 Olds Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA.
Email addresses: devossda@msu.edu (D.N. DeVoss), webbsuza@msu.edu (S. Webb).

1. The Composer: from Dad's Tie to a Green Day Soundtrack

When I came to Michigan State University on New Year's Eve 2005, I brought with me very limited Microsoft PowerPoint knowledge, relying on visuals such as the "Dad's Tie" design template. That was about it when it came to using "visual rhetoric" in my work, and this was when I still thought that a Dad's Tie presentation was better than a presentation without visuals (I'd refute that now). I also thought an essay was an essay: 12 pt, Times New Roman, 1″ margins, double-spaced, etc.

I thought copyright law was something affecting the outside world—the "real world"—and that inside higher education, the realm of academe and the ivory tower, we were all protected by Fair Use.[1] As long as I cited my sources, ideally in MLA format, Fair Use covered my every move. Little did I know.

What changed my perception of slideshow presentations and threw me into high gear with PowerPoint as a tool was my then 15-year-old son Matthew. About three weeks into my first semester of teaching first-year writing at MSU, he sent me his PowerPoint on the Cold War. He had written captions for pictures he collected from the Internet, used the transitions elegantly in the slideshow, and timed the whole slideshow to automatically play through "Wake Me Up When September Ends" by the band Green Day. It was striking. I actually learned more about the Cold War in that 4 min 47 sec slideshow than I had in my 17 or so years of formal schooling. I showed the slideshow to the students in my first-year writing class and they immediately asked, "How old is your son?" I said "15," and thus Matthew raised the bar significantly for multimedia work in my class that semester.

2. The Field: Lessigs, Lawyers, Writers, and Artists

Twenty years ago, the computer mouse was a clunky oddity. Fifteen years ago, in 1991, the Web was relatively new, existing in small scale on a particle physics laboratory machine in Switzerland. It wasn't until 1993 that the Web was infused with the power to share graphics. In 2000, iMovie was in its original version. YouTube didn't exist in 2004. The technological, networked landscape for composing has transformed significantly over the past years. Framing this rapidly evolving digital landscape is the ease with which media are available, downloadable, and integrateable in today's digital writing environments, where copy-and-paste is the norm, robust search engines offer audio and video search interfaces, and high school freshmen, such as Sue's son, produce robust multimedia compositions both for and outside of school. Supporting the ease of these practices is convergence—writ simply, the ways in which distinct tools or technologies come together. For instance, the ways in which we can download songs and listen to them on our cell phones or watch television shows on the Web. In 1999, Bill Gates, Chairman of Microsoft, published "Everyone, Anytime, Anywhere" in *Forbes*. In the

---

[1] We use "fair use" in two ways throughout this manuscript. We use "fair use" or "fair uses" to speak generally about activities that we think are ethically appropriate and likely legally appropriate. We use "Fair Use" when we are speaking specifically of the Fair Use clause of the Copyright Act (title 17, U.S. Code).

essay, Gates discussed the ways in which convergence had been conceptualized, primarily as the ways in which computers have been meshed with other consumer electronics, like televisions. He noted that the 21st century convergence paradigm will relate directly to access. He meant access not in the way technorhetoricians speak of access—in terms of infrastructure, sociodemographics, and other variables that either facilitate or prohibit the ways in which people interface with computers. Gates specifically meant the ways in which all of our gadgets and tools can work together, link in sync, and be used to share information. He refers to "virtual convergence," where universal connectivity brings information to us on any device, anytime, anywhere. Six years later, in 2005, Henry Jenkins, literature professor cum Director of the Comparative Media Studies Program at MIT, offered three lessons on convergence in an essay published in *Receiver*; the second lesson is worth repeating here: "convergence is a cultural and social process as much as it is a technological one" (p. 3). We would add to the set of processes Jenkins offered the argument that convergence is also a *rhetorical* process.

Students in our classrooms, for instance, may have a deep rhetorical sophistication about how audio, video, and other elements can affect a particular composition—that is, they "get" how these elements "work" in a composition. They may not have, however, the technical skill to create or to converge these elements into a multimedia composition of their own. In our classrooms, for instance, when students turn in assignments with graphics, how often have they created those graphics themselves? When students turn in a web page assignment that has streaming audio, how often have they created that music themselves? When students turn in a slideshow presentation that includes or links to video, how often have they choreographed that video themselves? Further—and more compelling in terms of this manuscript—writers may wish to deliberately draw upon popular imagery or widely circulating audio or video, for instance, to embed in their work, to craft a parody piece, to make an argument, or to make their claims most effective within the particular media in which they're composing. It is inevitable, in these situations that composers' work will rub up against intellectual property issues.

At his New York Public Library talk in April 2005, Lawrence Lessig opened by noting that—in this converged *and* network-distributed media context—we need to hear less from lawyers, and less from Lessigs, and more from writers and artists. We thus draw across this manuscript from Sue Webb's rich experiences crafting the *Grand Theft Audio* piece to call attention to how other writers and artists can lend their voices and their media compositions to the ways in which laws, practices, and policies must be adjusted in a world of media convergence. Sue's experiences situate our work from the perspective of "the composer," as Lessig suggests, and her experiences are framed by broader and theoretical discussions currently ongoing in "the field."

3. The Composer: Pushing PowerPoint in New Directions

Since the day my son's PowerPoint played to that astonished class of predominantly 18- and 19-year-olds, I wanted to try my hand at an automated slideshow with a soundtrack. Matthew and I tend to push each other in new directions for knowledge; it was my turn to master PowerPoint. I had an assignment due in a graduate-level visual rhetoric course during the summer of 2006; I was asked to make a PowerPoint of,

about, or illustrating a color. We were to apply color psychology to our slideshows—not just to list the color's abilities to communicate but to push deeper at the ways in which color can be read culturally, geographically, physically, and psychologically. I'd done some prior work with yellow, so yellow it was.

Coldplay has a song called "Yellow" (with some pretty provocative lyrics), and thus I found a soundtrack for my presentation. I set out to make an argument on the multiple moods of yellow. PowerPoint and I argued for two weeks straight. Sometimes I won, sometimes not. On the due date, I had a 4 min 29 sec argument demonstrating the moods of, and associations with, yellow. My PowerPoints would never wear Dad's Tie again! I had even tested this piece on my computer, my office computer, and a friend's computer—all worked great. Presentation day came and my turn to present and . . . and . . . and . . . nothing. The slideshow wouldn't play. The university's PC network had Windows 2000 installed, and Office 2000. Every computer I had tested my slideshow on had Office 2003. I lost not only points on the assignment but also my audience that day. The class never saw the 50+ hours of work all boiled into 4 minutes 29 seconds. Sometimes technology backfires—it caused me grief, but it made me want to push the limits of that software all the more.

4. The Field: Myriad Issues and Complexities

Computers and writing researchers have long paid attention to shifts in digital writing environments—especially the rhetorical implications of these shifts.[2] Teachers of writing in computer-mediated spaces have been attentive to the spaces in which they teach and to the physical and digital spaces in which students work; for 20 years, composition scholars have published on possibilities and complications related to teaching in computer-mediated settings (for example, in technology classrooms: Bernhardt, 1989; Britton & Glynn, 1989; Dinan, Gagnon, & Taylor, 1986; Gruber, 1995; Haas, 1996; Kent-Drury, 1998; Moran, 1998; Palmquist, 1993; Palmquist et al., 1998; Selfe, 1987; with/in electronic spaces like email, bulletin board systems, and MOOs/MUDs: Cooper, 1999; Cooper & Selfe, 1990; Grigar, 1999; Holdstein, 1996; Kinkead, 1987; LeCourt, 1999; Moran & Hawisher, 1998; Spooner & Yancey, 1996; Thompson, 1990; and via distance and online education spaces: Alexander & Dickinson, 2006; Buckley, 1997; Harris & Wambeam, 1996; Webb-Peterson & Savenye, 2001).

Compositionists have also attended to issues of agency and subjectivity in regard to digital media and online spaces. For instance, Stephen Knadler (2001), Heid McKee (2002), Teresa Redd (2003), Elaine Richardson (1997), Todd Taylor (1997), and others have addressed issues of race and difference in digital spaces, both from an instructor standpoint and a student perspective. A strong thread of composition scholarship has explored issues of gender and sexualities in digital space, attending to the male-centered context of computing and to possi-

---

[2] We are well aware of and apologize for the brevity of this list. We aren't trying to document *all* of computers and writing studies here—to do so would take volumes (see, for instance, Hawisher, LeBlanc, Moran, & Selfe, 1995). Rather, here we are attempting to trace *some* of the threads that we feel aligns with or orbits around intellectual property issues, convergence, and composition.

ble feminist interventions in electronic spaces (e.g., Alexander & Banks, 2004a, 2004b; Brady Aschauer, 1999; Hocks, 1999; Pagnucci & Mauriello, 1999; Sullivan, 1999; Takayoshi, Huot, & Huot, 1999; Webb, 2003; Wolfe, 1999). Access—which often manifests at intersections of gender, class, and race—has also been addressed as an issue crucial to computers and composition scholarship. Jeffrey T. Grabill (1998, 2003a, 2003b, 2007) and Alison E. Regan and John D. Zuern (2000) have targeted issues of access by exploring the movement of computer-mediated composition outside of the classroom and into communities. Lester Faigley (1999), Charles Moran (1999), and Joseph Janangelo (1991) have studied issues of access and traced access across cultural, social, and historical trends.

New technologies have raised questions not only about manifestations of race and gender in the "bodiless" realm of cyberspace and about the very real issues of access to machines and networks, but new technologies have also raised speculation about emergent and electronic literacy practices (see, for example, Bolter, 1991; Burbules, 1998; Heba, 1997; Holdstein & Selfe, 1990; Tuman, 1992). Closely related is scholarship analyzing how specific interfaces potentially shape writing practices and processes (e.g., Curtis, 1998; Condon, 1992; Forum, 1992; LeBlanc, 1993; McGee & Enricsson, 2002; Sullivan, 1998; Selfe & Selfe, 1994; Vernon, 2000; Wysocki, 2001; Wysocki & Jasken, 2004); certainly, text messaging, blogs, and wikis are shaping research paths related to interfaces of/for writing. Framing all this work are examinations of institutional and political dynamics as they impact writing classrooms via, for example, policies and guidelines (Lang, Walker, & Dorwick, 2000; Porter, 1998; Porter, Sullivan, Blythe, Grabill, & Miles, 2000; the CCCC Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Work with Technology, 1998).

As technologies have changed shape, mingled, and allowed for articulations of word, image, movement, sound, and other components in ways we have not before had access to, scholars have written on issues of visual rhetoric, design, and word and image (e.g., Allen, 2002; Bernhardt, 1993; George, 2002; Hocks, 2003; Handa, 2001, 2004; Kress, 1998, 1999; Markel, 1998; Ruszkiewicz, 1988; Sirc, 1999; Ulmer, 1994; Wysocki & Johnson-Eilola, 1999). These contributions are significant and help situate composition scholars in relation to emerging—and existing—issues of visual rhetorics and possibilities for new media production, or at least analysis. Specifically, these contributions help us to better understand the ways that composition researchers have made sense of past and current integrations of technology and writing. None of these issues is exclusive; they all merge to, first, help us as technorhetoricians to negotiate media convergence and its impact in our writing and our classrooms, and second, to form the fabric that frames intellectual property issues in the composition classroom.

Along with the scholarly threads mapped above, computers and writing researchers have explored the influence and impact of intellectual property within our classrooms. For instance, in special issues of *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric*, *Technology*, *and Pedagogy* and *Computers and Composition*, both published in 1998, authors explored a range of issues connecting plagiarism, authorship, copyright, and the composition classroom. Diana Christian Boehm and Laura Taggett (1998), in the *Kairos* special issue, raised a critical, pervasive issue, situating writing in a digital culture where composers, users, and consumers often don't realize that digitally published work is copyright protected. The authors argue that this lack of realization is in part a function of the intangibility of digital text: ". . . we no longer have an object—a

book or a chart or a sheaf of papers—to claim as evidence of intellectual work. Without a physical object, individuals may sense no need to attribute to a source."

Although we certainly have a rich and intellectually ripe history of negotiating digital writing practices, processes, and tools, and although we have in the past explored the intersections of intellectual property in our composition classrooms, there are unanswered questions we must continue to push at, especially as we more and more often ask and expect students to converge media, both their own and that of others. These questions include, but are of course not limited to:

- How are technorhetoricians situated in convergence culture? What are our roles and responsibilities? How can we attend to our tradition of negotiating issues of authorship and ownership and also chart new territory in a world where remix and convergence are the primary production paradigms?
- How can technorhetoricians play a larger role in shaping intellectual property understandings, approaches, and legislation? Addressing this question responds to Martine Rife's (2006) call for technorhetoricians and composition teachers to write guidelines and to "continue to research and write upon current areas of law and legal developments that influence what we are 'allowed' to write." John Logie (2006) echoed this when he asked us to focus "on using rhetoric to interrogate and expose the often-startling shifts in intellectual property policies, which have tilted decisively away from scholarly and public access and toward permission and restrictions imposed by copyright holders" (p. 1).
- In what ways can the conversations occurring in other fields and professions (e.g., digital rights management) inform our understandings? In what ways can the work of technorhetoricians help to inform other fields' understandings?
- How can we both protect the rights of authors to their work and also facilitate steps toward making it easier to discover the copyright holders of protected works and to access them when appropriate?

These questions arise, for us, at the intersection of the work of the computers and writing researchers cited above and the work of scholars like Lawrence Lessig. Just one month prior to his New York Public Library talk in April 2005, where he argued that we need to hear more from remix artists and writers, Lawrence Lessig opened his featured talk at the 2005 Conference on College Composition and Communication in San Francisco by defining remix as "what we do when we mix together culture or knowledge, and then give others the opportunity to re-express that which we have mixed. . . culture is remix, knowledge is remix, politics is remix. Remix is how we as humans live and everyone within our society engages in this act of creativity." Lessig characterized our current cultural and technological moment as "remix culture"—a culture of derivative works, a culture where everything and anything is up for grabs to change, to integrate, to mix, and to mash. Certainly, the ability to do so has been accelerated by the personal computer and by digital networks, which allow us to more easily share, copy, download, and mix media. Lessig has also noted consistently across his work that if we are not careful, the affordances of remix will dissolve in the face of the 21st century regime of copyright control and permission; what is at stake is a "read-only Internet," where the power to read/write dissolves. Converged media will be for consumption, often passive consumption (although many advertisers and net marketers would have us believe that clicking to add an

item to our electronic shopping cart is highly interactive). In 1999, Lawrence Lessig spoke at a conference on media convergence in New York City and argued that we live in a "property obsessed era" where progress is associated with, linked to, and assumed to be the result of ownership. This is clearly a dangerous and, perhaps, defeating assumption when it comes to media convergence and remix possibilities.

Bernard Schütze's (2004) work runs parallel with Lessig's characterization of remix culture, but Schütze was more politically fervent in his declarations that remix culture "upholds the remix as an open challenge to a culture predicated on exclusive ownership, authorship, and controlled distribution." Schütze contextualized remix culture as existing in a space where authority, ownership, and originality have been displaced: The Internet, where "the heap has reached the highest critical mass, permitting remix practices to Spread and Disseminate on a planetary scale. With its free-floating file sharing, splicing and sampling, and instant distribution of digital media, the Web has become an ideal ground for remix practices of all sorts." Lev Manovich's (2002) work situated the ways in which delivery happens in remix culture. Instead of a single author producing solitary work in isolation and that work being attributed to that single, solitary author and delivered in one-way fashion, we have distributed, shared views of authorship—think of spaces like Wikipedia, for instance, where work and authorial agency are attributed often in diverse, diffuse ways. Wikipedia and YouTube are the spaces in which convergence is not a noun, but a verb—not a product, but a process. Think of spaces like those facilitated and supported by Creative Commons, where authors and artists can determine the ways in which they want to assert control over their work—and, in fact, most, rather than asserting control, invite use, participation, and co-production. Ownership is framed less by copyright and authorial claim and more by Fair Use conventions and community expectations and related motivations for writing—think of Blogger or MySpace and the conventions that have been cultivated amongst these communities of writers. Typically, distribution, like production, is multi-point, nonlinear, and rhizomatic—and often very interactive.

While Lessig spoke of remix culture, Siva Vaidhyanathan (2001) labeled our particular cultural time "the digital moment," a time during which information can, theoretically, flow seamlessly across converged tools, but also a time where the spread of information is constantly policed and restricted. This particular digital moment is characterized by the multiple ways in which people can "share ideas, information, expressions, truths, and lies over vast distances in virtually no time" (p. 152). This particular digital moment is also, however, characterized by the ways in which information is restricted and remix culture and prosumer practices exist in tension with what Lessig termed "permission culture," where copyright restrictions are everywhere and are rigorously policed. Permission culture might be characterized by fee-per-use or cost-per-click approaches to intellectual products, where the default setting is read-only and to act, compose, and converge, each discrete piece of intellectual property must be licensed or purchased, and derivative works are virtually nonexistent due to the costs of licensing. The champions of permission culture, which typically include industry groups such as the RIAA and MPAA, actively work to erode Fair Use and actively assert copyright control in ways that require permission for any and all uses of almost any and all cultural material. Industry groups that take a highly copyrightist approach want media convergence to relate only and entirely to the ways in which we can be content consumers, rather than active producers. They're willing

to present converged media forms to us—movie trailers embedded on a larger promotional web site, for instance, or the ability for us to receive alerts on our cell phones that urge us to head online for a special promotion—but they're unwilling to share those cultural artifacts with us to parody, to argue, or to otherwise question or complicate.

5. The Composer: Jabbing at the Presidency

One of the most silly, entertaining, and informative pieces of digital work I ever saw was JibJab's "This Land," launched live on the JibJab web site during the 2004 presidential campaign. JibJab was an unknown company one day and on the nightly news—local and cable—the next because they crafted a parody using Arlo Guthrie's "This Land" in Macromedia Flash and intertwined it with cartoon characters resembling George W. Bush and John Kerry in order to highlight all of the idiosyncrasies of this campaign and its two main candidates. This piece was fast-paced and funny and soon went viral. Everybody knew about "This Land." And, although "This Land" was *certainly* a parody, the brother's Jab were also soon in trouble for using Guthrie's song without having first secured copyright release. Yet, "This Land" was not only parody but also a teaching tool. All three of my boys (then 14, 12, and 11) knew about the presidential election. Two of them even memorized the whole "This Land" soundtrack and would sing it, one being Bush and the other Kerry. I never paid attention to any election at that age. "This Land" was doing some mighty heavy work in my world. "This Land" influenced my children, myself, and eventually even my work on *Grand Theft Audio*. And yet, "the law" almost made "This Land" go away before it had a chance to do its work—to literally inform millions.

The lawyers representing Ludlow Music claimed copyright to Woody Guthrie's song soon after the JibJab short went viral. The owners of JibJab received cease-and-desist orders; the lawyers representing Ludlow Music also demanded a complete accounting for all "income received from the exploitation of the unauthorized movie" (Metz, 2004). Soon after, however, Ludlow was forced to allow JibJab to distribute the film without any legal interference. JibJab's lawyers found evidence that the copyright on "This Land" had expired in 1973, making the song part of the public domain—part of our shared creative commons (Hansen, 2004). Although the song was protected under Ludlow's initial copyright in 1956 and renewal in 1984, Ludlow Music didn't know that Guthrie initially sold the sheet music for "This Land" in 1945, which established that year as the date-stamp for the 28-year copyright term.

6. The Field: Writers as Prosumers

Regardless of the constant tension between open access and the highly controlled use of media that we've described above and that the copyfight over the JibJab "This Land" parody illustrates, most of us—those of us online regularly (or constantly)—see examples of media convergence on a daily basis. In the spring of 2007, as we drafted this manuscript, for

instance, "Web 2.0. . . The Machine is Us/ing Us" premiered on YouTube. Within two weeks of its posting, more than 1.2 million people had viewed the video. Almost 3500 people had commented on the video and more than 14,000 people had given the video "favorite" status. Michael Wesch, an assistant professor at Kansas State University, originally crafted the video for his cultural anthropology students. The video became a viral phenomenon when a popular blogger hyped it and posted a link to it from his site. The short video launches with a hand writing on a piece of paper and morphs into typing on a screen, then editing in HTML, tagging and categorizing, searching, scanning, blogging, and much, much more. The video merges graphics, animations, motion, and music. The video situates us—Web users—as creators, composers, and convergence artists. The video eloquently argues in and across multiple media for the very practices it illustrates.

We've mentioned prosumer practices, another characteristic of remix and convergence culture. Prosumers are consumers who are proactive in design and creation processes, who both consume goods and produce goods. Daniel Anderson (2005), in "Prosumer Approaches to New Media Composition," provided a rich, extended discussion and examples of the affordances of prosumer approaches, opening with a definition of prosumer as referring "to the convergence of professional and consumer-level equipment and software. It allows professionals to do things with less, and those who have less, to do things that professionals have been in the past only able to do." He called attention to the ways in which the dynamics between consumer and producer have shifted and anchored prosumerism to literacy, arguing that "by producing, one is able to produce more and be a more critical consumer. . . and to take action or have some sense of agency as being a producer." Passive consumption doesn't allow us to see and doesn't encourage us to make visible the techniques and strategies of production—for instance, to question and understand why a particular piece of music is used to frame a scene, or why a particular camera shot is used at a particular moment. Certainly, Wesch's viral "Web 2.0" video is emblematic of the types of processes and products Anderson described. We see Wesch use, deeply engage, and, we would argue, transform the digital products he used in his video. Wesch wasn't just a passive Web consumer, clicking and linking and shopping and surfing (and, admittedly, in early hypertext theory, we saw these as fantastically interactive and active means of moving across the Internet, but in today's digital spaces, mere clicking seems fantastically passive in the face of so many co-creative possibilities). Wesch took the tools of the Web and crafted a new piece, a new intellectual good (a more anemic approach to prosumer practices might be, for instance, the NikeID interface, where customers can "create" their own Nike shoes by choosing base and swoosh colors, and by personalizing the shoes with their name—with 8 characters, selecting from 10 colors).

With the distribution of "The Machine is Us/ing Us" across our email lists and in the discussions that followed on those lists and in our hallways, there was a collective sigh of "I want my students to be able to do *that*." This collective sigh is framed by our emergent, situated goals about multimedia composing (e.g., Ball, 2004; Halbritter, 2006; Heba, 1997; Hocks & Kendrick, 2003; Peoples Halio, 1996; Rickert & Salvo, 2006; Wysocki et al., 2004). For instance, the 2004 "CCCC Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments" argued that writing curricula is expanding (if not bulging at the seams). Writing curricula must engage students in best practices of digital communication (see the WIDE Research Collective's 2005 "Why Teach Digital Writing?" for an extended

discussion), and we, ideally, want to encourage students to explore, experiment, and play with a range of technologies to select the best media, means, and modes to shape their ideas. Further, we want to encourage students' development as reflective practitioners—those who can select carefully and critically among media choices and also explain, rationalize, and reflect upon those choices. This collective sigh is also framed, however, by the fact that we live and work at a nexus of complexities related to the infrastructures in which we work (see DeVoss, Cushman, & Grabill, 2005 for an extended discussion of infrastructure), the expectations placed upon our classrooms, our own technological know-how, and many other competing and complex factors that orbited around and framed Sue's work on *Grand Theft Audio*.

7. The Composer: An Extra Reading Becomes a Teachable Moment

Above and beyond the weekly readings of textbooks and journal articles required in my graduate-level composition pedagogies class, the professor wanted us to give a book report. We had a list of eight or ten books to choose from, and I overhead the prof say "(somebody) Lessig is a must-read for anyone teaching multimedia." I immediately thought, well, that's what I do, and so I chose Larry Lessig's *Free Culture* (2004) to read and review. In *Free Culture*, Lessig explores the worlds of "Piracy" and "Property" when it comes to using images and other media and how these uses are influenced (or not) by our current copyright laws. The course assignment said that we were to teach the text—not by lecture alone—in 20 minutes. We could incorporate an activity for the rest of the class, and we should try to vary our teaching techniques during the 20-minute time span. It sounded like a lot to try to accomplish in a mere 20 minutes. I thought of Matthew's Cold War report. Maybe PowerPoint could help me teach 352 pages in 20 minutes.

8. The Field: Moving Beyond the Chalkboard and the Overhead Projector

In her course, Sue's professor asked that students not only lecture and tell but also engage and show; certainly, we know this to be good pedagogical practice, and this activity makes perfect sense in a composition pedagogies course. Today, myriad technologies are available to assist in this endeavor. Admittedly, "visuals" have always been available in the composition classroom, and savvy teachers have always used the chalkboard, the overhead projector, and other means to engage students. Never before, however, have we had at our fingertips the capacity to so richly and seamlessly integrate digitally anchored multiple media in our teaching practices.

Just as writing today often means weaving what we might call "traditional" (certainly older) media (like text, graphics, and audio) with and for computer interfaces, teaching today requires us to weave newer media in digital spaces. The space and the shape of writing has clearly changed in digital environments where writers can do what they couldn't easily do in 1999 when Chris Anson traced the separate and discrete nature of different media. Anson noted that "personal computers have done little to disrupt our decades-old habits of working with and responding to students' writing," primarily because

the channels of electronic media have been separate and discrete. Video has been kept apart from computer text, audio systems, and still pictures, requiring us to use different equipment for each technology (and allowing us to focus on computer text to the exclusion of other media). (p. 265)

Today, however, our habits of writing are shifting. Ten years ago, writing teachers couldn't easily integrate a movie clip within an electronic presentation. Five years ago, writing teachers couldn't easily create a movie clip themselves. As Mary Hocks (2003) aptly noted, "interactive digital media have increasingly become part of what we analyze and teach when we teach writing" (p. 631); we would argue further that interactive digital media have increasingly become part of what we *produce* when we teach writing. Composition teachers are now very much a part of the remix culture Lessig and others have described, and with this space comes the responsibility to address issues of intellectual property. Certainly, we have long-spoken of issues of authorship, authority, and ownership of text—shifting gears to address intellectual property is not necessarily a matter of walking the intellectual plank.

9. The Composer: Piracy as a Pirate

I dove right into reading *Free Culture*. Lessig's book is separated into two main sections: Piracy and Property. When I started reading Lessig on piracy, and he kept talking about how we were all breaking the law every time we right-clicked and downloaded a song or a picture or a font face, it didn't take long before Judas Priest's tune "Breakin' the Law" started playing over and over in my head. That's when my slideshow idea solidified. I wanted to make a mini-movie, complete with a soundtrack—using, of course, Judas Priest's "Breakin' the Law"—to help me present, situate, and analyze Lessig's *Free Culture*. Interest piqued and creative juices flowing, I decided to discuss piracy *as* a pirate.

This approach allowed me to think of this book report more as a conference presentation. I wanted to engage my audience, share examples and illustrations, and give them a deeper awareness of the complex issues Lessig presents. I had only 20 minutes to accomplish this task. Using PowerPoint as my tool set me on my way. Finding data on copyright law is easy. Finding compelling data that breaks down complex and confusing law into digestible chunks is quite another story. I wanted the latter.

Doing research for this project was much like all my previous research projects: I started by typing a query into Google. The difference this time? I was looking for *images*. With the idea of "piracy *as* a pirate" firmly planted in my head, I began my process of seamlessly and smoothly grabbing images. For effect and for fun, I started looking for Judas Priest images, their album cover art, and pictures of *Pirates of the Caribbean*. I created a "piracy" folder on my computer, and created an "images" subfolder; within an hour, I had logos of the band, pictures from the movie, animated GIFs of rotating skulls, and public service announcements about illegal downloading. In short, I had a plethora of images to accompany my words and Judas Priest's song. I went back to reading Lessig.

I knew that I did not have permissions to use a vast majority of these images (let alone the music) I had gathered; that didn't matter to me at this point. I was looking for some shock value. I wanted to push the limits not only of PowerPoint, but also the limits of "right and wrong." I wanted my audience to question our laws. I felt Lessig's main theme throughout *Free Culture* was to question our laws; we must challenge their validity, and we must see them changed, but meanwhile, *they are still our laws*. I wanted this theme to be my theme throughout my mini-movie as well.

My favorite example of remix that Lessig discussed in the book happened way back in 1928 when Walt Disney took the concept from Buster Keaton's movie *Steamboat Bill*, *Jr*. and built "Steamboat Willie" (the very first Mickey Mouse cartoon). This was an excellent piece of information, one I knew I could get some mileage from—and an example that other authors, such as Kembrew McLeod (2005) and Vaidhyanathan (2001),have drawn upon. Walt remixing! Walt, using someone else's works—this was particularly delightful to me in light of the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act of 1998, which emerged essentially to keep Mickey Mouse out of the public domain! I went back to Google, typed in keywords, and in a couple minutes had not only stills, but also the actual video from "Steamboat Willie." Then there were proprietary issues and a Google video that wouldn't imbed into a PowerPoint movie.

What started out as easy to do now became a bit of a nightmare. I had never really worked with videos; I had barely learned to use music in PowerPoint, so the task of taking a Google video, capturing it onto my equipment, and translating it into something Windows Media Player could handle was a bit daunting for me. The video was not going into my slideshow. I was forced to settle on two image files – two static and stagnant shots of a truly mutating moment in our history – not nearly the impact movement could have held at this juncture in my movie. Moreover, those images did not depict the remix process well at all; the movement of the video could have totally reinforced the movement from *Steamboat Bill*, *Jr*. to "Steamboat Willie". Ah well. Technology! Using the tools so often at our fingertips is much harder than YouTube makes it seem. Although active content producers are quick to say "oh it's so easy," that statement is only sometimes true.

The second half of Lessig's book is about property. I thought my PowerPoint could present its argument in two sections, or acts, just like *Free Culture* did. I titled my second act "Property" and set out to figure out what "property" meant to Larry Lessig. That is where I started to stray from *Free Culture* and into other Lessig works. Lessig has several speeches uploaded onto YouTube, and he discusses—at length—illegal music downloads during these lectures. I started wondering what music I could use in act two of my argument. In my head, I played with the association between Creative Commons and work being free, accessible, and usable. It didn't take but a couple of minutes before this line of thought led me to The Who's song "I'm Free." "I'm Free" would definitely lighten the air. The acoustic guitar during the opening could transition my little movie from dark to light—from heavy-hitting Judas Priest's law-breaking legend, to the light and airy Who and their lyrics of liberation. It was a lot to ask of myself, my remixing abilities, and of the music itself, but I felt I could pull it off.

10. The Field: Negotiating Fair Use

In an important footnote to the Daniel Anderson (2005) piece we discussed above on prosumer practices, Anderson asked, "How are intellectual property concerns and access to new media literacy related? You can make this stuff, but will you be allowed to?" He defends his use of material in his piece, which includes a range of television footage (both still images and video), a Britney Spears photo (taken from a student project), and recurrent loops of music including No Doubt's "Underneath it All" and Moby's "Porcelain." Anderson called attention to the need for instructors to be Fair Use advocates in teaching prosumer approaches and new media composing practices. Anderson included a set of guidelines from the University of Texas system. The "Multimedia Fair Use Guidelines" and Anderson cites are robust and detailed, and certainly a helpful starting point, but their danger is that they further confuse intellectual property issues in the ways in which they situate Fair Use. For instance, the guidelines include very strict "portion limits," such as "motion media—up to 10% or 3 minutes, whichever is less" and "text—up to 10% or 1000 words, whichever is less" (Anderson, 2005, np).

Martine Rife's (2006) research indicates that any Fair Use guidelines, whether they be conventions suggested by institutions or policies enacted by government, are just that—guidelines. Rife aptly noted that:

> While various institutions have "Guidelines" [such as] Stanford . . . and Texas, *we* do not have *one* set of guidelines we can look to that allows us the freedom and protection we need. . . there are no Fair Use Guidelines that have been widely adopted or sanctioned by all the copyright stakeholders. . .

Rife calls attention to two key variables: First, that there are multiple guidelines-masquerading-as-rules (such as the UT guidelines Anderson invokes), and, second, we as a field have never worked together to construct any overarching approaches to allow us the "freedom and protection we need" (Rife, 2006, np) to do our work and to teach multimedia in ways protected by constitutional provision.

The 1978 revision to U.S. copyright law is key to negotiating Fair Use; it provided an overview of Fair Use, but provided no definitions and delineations, no specific percentage-of-whole equations. Rather, the focus was on context and effects—on individual instances—not on generic portions or percentages of some whole. This is a point that Steve Westbrook (2007) made in his presentation, "Innovators or Outlaws," at the 2007 Conference on College Composition and Communication, a presentation that served, somewhat, as a postscript to his 2006 *College English* article that explored issues of intellectual property in the classroom. In the 2006 article, Steve Westbrook situated students' work within our post 9 11 climate and within a copyright controlled economy; he argued that we are still negotiating what visual rhetoric is and can be in our classrooms, and that in a climate of change, we "redeploy" the commonplace approaches of "authorities of print culture... whether or not these are entirely appropriate for and ultimately beneficial to writing students of the twenty-first century" (p. 459). Westbrook makes an important distinction between analysis and production to argue that we don't engage students to *do* as much as we engage them to *look*, thus limiting the importance of production as part of critical citizenship. Further, copyright law often also infringes on student possibilities to produce and to share the products with broader, distributed audiences.

What is absent, also, from most guidelines is the fact that copyright infringement is decided in court. The context in which we have worked has been framed by composers and producers policing and regulating their own work—these practices apply to us and to students. We are asked to carefully assess the amount of work we photocopy or post online via the course- or content-management systems now fairly ubiquitous at our institutions (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, ANGEL). We ask students to carefully research authorship and permissions to use media pieces in their work. At times, however, composers and producers aren't asked institutionally—the decision is made for us, when we teach, learn, and compose within chilled spaces where institutions find it safer to hyper-regulate intellectual property and establish rigorous guidelines and rules rather than allow composers agency and defend Fair Use approaches. Thus, although the UT guidelines are certainly helpful, they are arhetorical and acontextual, and prescribe rules rather than champion Fair Use. If we, as instructors, as researchers, and as composers continue to translate lore into law, we risk chilling the work we can potentially do as we mix, mash, and converge media.

11. The Composer: Perusing the Creative Commons vs. Breakin' the Law

Lessig invented Creative Commons. People use the commons to post media work they have created (music, videos, pictures, etc.), and they grant others *the rights to use* their work. So, Creative Commons is a place where we (artists, teachers, students, you, me) can go for resources where we don't have to break the law. Creative Commons can keep us producing and remixing history *while we advocate for change* in our laws so that we can all use *all* of our cultural artifacts. Much of Lessig's message seemed to be that our laws stink, but they are, nevertheless, our laws, and while we (patiently?) wait to get these laws adjusted to today's digital contexts, we have to have some way to continue to make new and to remix old pieces of our culture.

I imagined that using The Who to discuss the Creative Commons would be a great way to thrash out issues of property. I thought I could show the ease with which we become pirates, right-clicking and committing crimes, and then I could transition into how to *not* become a pirate. Through Creative Commons, I could find images and music and actually use these pieces without fear of incarceration. "I'm Free" by the Who depicts this idea with its title, with its lyrics, and with its light and upbeat rhythms. Of course, "I'm Free" by the Who is *not* in the Creative Commons.

I actually asked a friend to "get" the two songs I wanted to use. The "Breakin' the Law" mp3 she acquired would not load into PowerPoint and play, but the mp3 version of "I'm Free" worked just fine—until I suffered a conscience attack, went on iTunes, and bought my own copy. I also bought a copy of "Breakin' the Law." The new Judas Priest mp3 would not load either, no matter what I did, so I downloaded a third copy of "Breakin' the Law" from Wal-Mart's online music store. That still didn't work. I bought another "Breakin' the Law" copy from iTunes. No go. Finally, I bought *The Essential Judas Priest* CD from Best Buy for twenty bucks. Nope, it didn't work either. In the end, in order to get the music to run in both programs (in PowerPoint and in Windows Media Player), I had to jump back and forth between the two programs,

which worked technically but disrupted the seamlessness I wanted in my slideshow. I had to open the PowerPoint file and then click on the mp3 icon for the Judas Priest song (hoping Windows Media Player was set to default on the particular machine on which I was running my slideshow) and then (quickly) toggle back to PowerPoint and select Slideshow > View Show. A royal pain, but it did work. And, this was *the* song. "Breakin' the Law" complemented the first part of my slideshow in a most engaging way—heavy guitar and hard-hitting drums, along with a damn-near-baritone voice, all matching the law-breaking going on within my PowerPoint. As GIFs and JPEGs—most copyright protected and none used with permission—danced across on the screen, Rob Halford and the boys of Judas Priest screamed about breaking the law.

As my interest amplified and my research grew, I had more data than I had soundtrack. I had to find one more song. One day, while granting myself a bit of space from the project, I cleaned my apartment and listened to my iTunes (loudly). I heard the lyrics to a Beastie Boys song. My sons had visited over the summer and had expanded my music menu to include the Beasties. These boys were singing something about rhyming and stealing. Could that be, I wondered? No way. Too perfect. I decided to incorporate "Rhymin' and Stealin'" into the center of my movie. This was a great fit.

After I had selected the three key audiotracks for use in my slideshow, I wanted to work more on the design of the show itself. As suggested by a colleague, I searched for and added the font that *Grand Theft Auto*, the video game, uses as its signature typeface—its logotype. There are multitudes of sites where we can download fonts for free. Are logotypes legal to take or to use? I didn't know. Still, it was a fabulous addition having the *Grand Theft Auto* logotype on the title slide of *Grand Theft Audio*. Maybe the law could consider my piece a parody? A satire? I doubted it.

Come to find out, interestingly enough, font/type faces are considered "ornamentation" and are not protected by U.S. Copyright law. That surely seems strange when we think of the creative genius that has to go into designing 26 letters and countless symbols, all of which have similar attributes and structure. Crafting a typeface certainly takes creativity. Why the inconsistency in the law?

12. The Field: Typography as Visual Rhetoric

Some work in technical communication addresses issues of readability and usability in selecting typefaces (see especially Brumberger, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c). John Trimbur and Anne Wysocki have helped to bring typeface attention to the broader composition studies audience. Little work in composition studies addresses letters themselves as visual elements, as graphics. We have focused for so long and so strictly on text as the container of content and ideas that we have overlooked text as a designed object, and the intricacies of letters-as-designs. John Trimbur (2002) articulated this point well when he noted that "one of the main obstacles to *seeing* the materiality of writing has been the essayist tradition and its notion of a transparent text" (p. 188). Trimbur continued by noting that we can do much in working toward rematerializing literacy by acknowledging the cultural work that typography does. Anne F. Wysocki (2004) called attention to letterforms, argued that typefaces are a "major

visual strategy" (p. 127) and articulated that the form a text takes gives readers cues as to its genre, and thus its purpose. Certainly, attention to typography is forefront under most of the writing we see everyday (e.g., signage, packages, type treatments as logos). Although scholars like Trimbur and Wysocki have asked us to consider type-as-image and typographic implications in the work we do, no work that we know of in composition studies addresses issues of the *ownership* of typestyles.

Graphic artists and typographers have been addressing the issue of type control for years. In *Emigre* magazine, for instance, Alan Marshall (1997) tackled long-standing claims that type pirates will kill typographic design and the work of professional typographers and foundries. (Sound familiar? This argument is very similar to the argument being made by the RIAA and the MPAA as they raise melodramatic concerns about file-sharing "killing" the music and movie industry.) Marshall and others have argued, however, for the historical, cultural, and economic situatedness of type design, and that type's use typically always trumps type's birth. That is, how a typeface is put into use is more critical a factor than how it came to be. Type theorists have further addressed the fact that U.S. Patent law can protect type design, but only for a very limited period, and it is not as extensive and as potentially international as copyright protection. As Rudy VanderLans (2001) stated, "the United States is one of the few, if not only, industrialized nations in the world that does not extend copyright protection to typeface designs" (p. 224). The context in which this lack of protection emerged situates type as utilitarian; much like how composition studies has traditionally approached the "transparent text" and letters as mere conveyers of meaning, the U.S. Copyright Office has similarly treated letterforms.

13. The Composer: Obtaining Permission? Yeah, Right!

I didn't seek permissions for the *Grand Theft Auto* font face, assuming that the design was only protected if it spelled *Grand Theft Auto*, the title of the now-iconic video game. I started and stopped my music-use permissions search quite abruptly. It seemed as if all the Internet searches I did took me to copyright.com which—for a fee—helps educators (and, of course, the business world) gain permission to use varied works. After a brief visit to their site, I determined that they were working with print materials and that they wouldn't be able to help me with the audio files I was using in my project—even if I could afford them. But who does hold the copyright-release abilities for Judas Priest, the Beastie Boys, and The Who? The artists themselves? The songwriters? The record companies? The RIAA? How does one go about finding this out? I was befuddled, and I deeply suspected that no matter how media-savvy the students in my classroom were, this was an issue that would also likely befuddle them.

14. The Field: Situating and Negotiating Permissions

In the November 2005 *Council Chronicle*, an article appeared titled "Teaching About Plagiarism in a Digital Age: Students Listen When Teachers Discuss the Issues." In the article, Michael Day is quoted as noting that:

> Students need to be particularly vigilant when using audio, video, and graphics from the Web that may be protected under copyright law. It is usually no problem for them to use any sources they like for a project that will only be viewed by the teacher and other class members. But once a student project goes public on the Web, there are many more laws and issues that must be considered.

This, we would argue, is certainly true, and the points we have made here link well with Day's convictions about the need for vigilance when using the works of others—certainly, the words and ideas of others, but also the audio, video, graphics, and other copyright-protected works of others. Later in the article, Monica Corton, the Vice President of Creative Affairs and Licensing at Next Decade Entertainment, Inc., is paraphrased as noting that:

> students need to obtain permission to use copyrighted materials in their multimedia presentations that might include music, writing, and video elements. Because it's an educational use, she says students would most likely be granted a gratis license allowing them to use the material for free.

This is deceptive ground to walk on. Those of us who have worked to secure copyright releases for our work know what a tangled web exists surrounding the ownership of a media piece. Certainly, an author is typically visible, but in many cases it is not this attributed author who is the actual owner of the copyright for the piece. Often, it's lawyers, representatives, media companies, or conglomerates that hold the actual rights to release the work for other purposes. Playing detective to find the actual copyright holder and then working through the channels to request permission is incredibly complex, especially for those of us who do not have a background in copyright law or in the fields that situate and police copyright permissions and releases.

If we teach students to ask for permission to fairly use media work in their educational endeavors, we risk pushing them into a wall—a wall that they likely will not be able to climb and conquer within the 15-week semesters in which we typically teach. It is phenomenally difficult—and deliberately so—to find out who actually holds the copyright to a work. For music, for instance, this may be the singer or performer, or it may be a representative. It may be the record company itself. And it may be even more difficult to contact that copyright holder to secure permission to reproduce work. Most importantly here, even if students' work or our own work does fall squarely under Fair Use, most often release requests will be denied. This is because we currently live in a copyright-focused culture in which groups like the RIAA (which, incidentally, distributes 90% of all recorded music in the United States) and the MPAA have more of a vested interest in continuing their hold on copyright than they do in facilitating fair uses and fostering the type of creative public commons that Lessig and others champion. So, had Sue requested copyright release for each of the multiple media pieces she integrated—at times, exactly, and at other times, with some remixing and redesigning—she would likely *still* be working to secure releases for work, and would have likely been declined permissions to use much of the work she integrated, regardless of her purpose, her intent, and her "impact" on the work's market value.

15. The Composer: Laws vs. Ethics

When I showed this video instead of just giving a verbal overview of *Free Culture* (2004), it sparked a 90-minute discussion that centered around fair uses but went into complete "copyleftism" as we discussed downloading movies and songs as well as what is and isn't ok in the classroom. Even after the 90 minutes, grad students (first-year writing teachers) were still confused and still questioning the laws and still wondering what their rights were. They wanted to make sure they weren't "Breakin' the Law." Some teachers couldn't even agree on what aspects to cover in their classrooms, or what to teach and what to ignore, or why to even care. And while a classroom of grad students erupted in an edgy but productive conversation about the ethics of illegal downloading and what we can and cannot legally do, my video received kudos from one prof and curtness from another. One wanted me to submit it; one warned me of what I had done.

I didn't realize the impact this video could have until a classmate asked if she could show it to her class, and my teacher asked if I was interested in submitting to a conference or to publication. Another TA asked to show it in her class. Wow! Didn't I have too much illegal activity going on in there? Oh Sue, you gotta publish, they'd say. Not sure I can, I'd say. Not sure it's legal. Not sure how to get the permissions to make it legal. Not sure of much of anything when it comes to copyright and Fair Use. It's all so shady…

Students love it because it's engaging; it's engaging because of the soundtrack. The soundtrack is the part of the piece that might not be Fair Use. The soundtrack consists of three published songs, and while I do own a legal copy of each of these songs (as required for Fair Use), I do also use them in their entirety (not usually allowed under Fair Use). But the soundtrack is *imperative*; the soundtrack *makes* this movie. The soundtrack makes this movie a viable teaching tool—and a viable argument. It is because of its not-so-legal soundtrack that this movie engages its audiences.

16. Our Conclusions are Merely Beginnings

> Today we have the impression of living not in the here-and-now of a particular historical period, but in a world that is both instantaneous and cumulative, in which all things (consumer goods and cultural products included) accumulate and crumple up endlessly. Everything ends up as odds and ends and debris to be glued back together, and thus begin anew. (Boisvert, 2003)

> Right now, the cultural shifts, the legal battles, and the economic consolidations which are fueling media convergence are preceding shifts in the technological infrastructure. How those various transitions play themselves out will determine the balance of power in the next media era. (Jenkins, 2005, p. 4)

In contexts of media convergence, it is inevitable that we, and the students in our classrooms, will rub against intellectual property issues. We would argue that the best approach is an informed approach. We can't merely claim "Fair Use" protection without being able to explain

our understandings of this clause and how it applies to our work. We can't tell students to "go ahead" without helping them to understand the implications of their actions. Certainly, the most dangerous path this might lead to is students heading into their internships or professions with this "go ahead" attitude, and the costs of intellectual property infringement in corporate spaces is phenomenal. We cannot ask students to merge media, and we cannot equip them to best select among the multiple meaning-making modes at their disposal, unless we work with them to understand the full range of contexts and consequences for their work—both positive and negative.

In 1974, Hans Enzensberger noted that "the new media are oriented towards action, not contemplation; towards the present, not tradition. . . The media produce no objects that can be hoarded and auctioned. They do away completely with 'intellectual property' and liquidate 'heritage,' that is to say, the class-specific hanging-on of nonmaterial capital" (p. 106). So, how can we negotiate the productive practices that new media and digital composing allow while not erasing contemplation and while retaining the value of some of our most useful traditional practices? We can work to equip our students and our colleagues to engage in thoughtful, deliberate, ethical, and fair use of others' work. Negotiating convergence and remix practices admittedly requires dramatically different approaches to authorship and ownership of texts and also requires attention to intellectual property issues. Our approaches to teaching convergence must recognize and call attention to multiply authored pieces, work that is written "collaboratively" with other artists and writers (living or dead, in physical proximity or across the globe), and work where ownership is shared across networks (of people and machines) and servers. Our approaches to teaching convergence must be attentive to intellectual property issues and where and how students and teachers can best enter into debates about the ownership of texts, visuals, animations, and much more.

17. The Composer: A Space for Change

Current copyright laws are based on a Declaration-of-Independence-era climate and they restrict our ability to use prior works to make new works—to remix. When artists can take and add and remix and converge existing work and make new media, the artists have contributed to society, and to our intellectual and artistic public commons. When works sit idly by and no one can use them because of corporate control and greed or because of outdated laws, those works don't help our culture grow.

For me, the *Grand Theft Audio* project was a space for change in me as a media artist, a writing scholar, and a teacher. As I researched Lessig's views on our laws and how he vows our laws must change, I too began to change. I realized that there's a monumental conversation *that is not happening*. Oh, lawyers and Lessigs are talking, some musicians are talking, a few designers and artists are talking, the RIAA and the MPAA and their teeming body of lawyers are talking. Some educators are talking. The whole world *did* talk about Napster for a few months. But these folks are talking in their own itty bitty local worlds and not globally, not holistically—not *with one another*.

Maybe a way to promote change is to *be* change. I tried to be that change in my slideshow. I use the logos, the typefaces, the album covers, the pictures, the songs,

and more to make a statement that it sure is easy to get and use all of these elements. But I also recognize that something's got to give, and that there are alternatives to the current copyright regime. In the meantime, though, that monumental conversation I mentioned is not happening. I am not advocating that we all just right-click-save-file-as anything we want; I do advocate that change must occur. At the risk of cease and desist orders and lawsuits, I advocate for change with my slideshow *Grand Theft Audio*.

18. The Field. . .

Thus we echo Lessig's call to artists and writers, and Porter, Rife, and Logie's call to technorhetoricians and composition teachers. We advocate for the monumental and so necessary conversation to happen, especially in light of the ways in which writing and multiple media are converging in exciting – but potentially perilous – ways in our classrooms.

Dànielle Nicole DeVoss is an associate professor and director of the Professional Writing Program at Michigan State University. Her research interests include intellectual property issues in digital spaces; computer/technological literacies; feminist interpretations of and interventions in computer technologies; and professional writing and technical communication. DeVoss' work has most recently appeared in *Computers and Composition* and *Pedagogy*: *Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature*, *Language*, *Composition*, *and Culture*. DeVoss recently co-edited a collection on behavioral interventions in cancer care: *Evidence-based Cancer Care and Prevention* (2003), and co-edited *Digital Writing Research*: *Technologies*, *Methodologies*, *and Ethical Issues* (2007).

Suzanne Webb is a Master of Arts student in Rhetoric and Writing at Michigan State interested in digital arguments. Her background includes professional experience in graphic design and bachelor's degrees in Creative Writing and Psychology. She next seeks a PhD, which will concentrate on the crossroads of digital-professional writing, graphic design, class studies, and creative non-fiction.

References

Alexander, Jonathan, & Banks, William (Eds.). (2004). Special issue: Sexuality, technology, and the teaching of writing. *Computers and Composition*, *21*(3).

Alexander, Jonathan, & Banks, William P. (2004). Sexualities, technologies, and the teaching of writing: A critical overview. *Computers and Composition*, *21*(3), 273–293.

Alexander, Jonathan, & Dickson, Marcia (Eds.). (2006). *Role play: Distance learning and the teaching of writing*. Hampton Press: Cresskill, NJ.

Allen, Nancy (Ed.). (2002). *Working with words and images: New steps in an old dance*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Anderson, Daniel. (2005). Prosumer approaches to new media composition: Consumption and production in continuum. *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy, 8* (1). Retrieved January 2, 2007 from http://www.hu.mtu.edu/kairos/CoverWeb/anderson/story.html.

Anson, Chris M. (1999). Distant voices: Teaching writing in a culture of technology. *College English*, *61*(3), 1–20.

Ball, Cheryl. (2004). Show, not tell: The value of new media scholarship. *Computers and Composition*, *21*, 403–425.

Bernhardt, Stephen A. (1989). Designing a microcomputer classroom for teaching composition. *Computers and Composition*, *7*(1), 93–110.

Bernhardt, Stephen A. (1993). The shape of text to come: The texture of print on screens. *College Composition and Communication*, *44*(2), 151–175.

Boehm, Diana Christian, & Taggett, Laura. (1998). About plagiarism, pixels and platitudes. *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy, 3* (1). Retrieved January 2, 2007 from http://www.english.ttu.edu/KAIROS/3.1/binder2.html?coverweb/boehm/pixels.htm.

Boisvert, Anne-Marie. (2003). On bricolage: Assembling culture with whatever comes to hand (Trans. Timothy Barnard). *HorizonZero, 8* (April/May). Retrieved January 2, 2005, from: http://www.horizonzero.ca/textsite/remix.php?is=8andfile=4andtlang=0.

Bolter, Jay David. (1991). *Writing space: The computer, hypertext, and the history of writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brady Aschauer, Ann. (1999). Tinkering with technological skill: An examination of the gendered uses of technologies. *Computers and Composition*, *16*(1), 7–23.

Britton, Bruce, & Glynn, Shawn M. (1989). *Computer writing environments: Theory, research, and design*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brumberger, Eva R. (2003a). The rhetoric of typography: The persona of typeface and text. *Technical Communication*, *50*(2), 206–223.

Brumberger, Eva R. (2003b). The rhetoric of typography: The awareness and impact of typeface appropriateness. *Technical Communication*, *50*(2), 224–231.

Brumberger, Eva R. (2003c). The rhetoric of typography: Effects on reading time, reading comprehension, and perceptions of ethos. *Technical Communication*, *51*(1), 13–24.

Buckley, Joanne. (1997). The invisible audience and the disembodied voice: Online teaching and the loss of body image. *Computers and Composition*, *14*, 179–187.

Burbules, Nicholas C. (1998). Rhetorics of the Web: Hyperreading and critical literacy practices. In Ilana Snyder (Ed.), *Page to screen: Taking literacy into the electronic era* (pp. 102–122). London: Routledge.

Condon, William. (1992). Selecting computer software for writing instruction: Some considerations. *Computers and Composition*, *10*(1), 53–56.

Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Committee on Computers and Composition. (1998). *Promotion and tenure guidelines for work with technology*. Retrieved January 10, 2007 from http://www.ncte.org/about/over/positions/level/coll/107658.htm.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2004). *CCCC position statement on teaching, learning, and assessing writing in digital environments*. Retrieved December 20, 2006 from http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/123773.htm.

Cooper, Marilyn, & Selfe, Cynthia L. (1990). Computer conferencing and learning: Authority, resistance, and internally persuasive discourse. *College English*, *52*(8), 847–869.

Cooper, Marilyn. (1999). Postmodern pedagogy in electronic conversations. In Gail E. Hawisher & Cynthia L. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions pedagogies and 21st century technologies* (pp. 140–160). Logan: Utah State University Press.

Curtis, Marcia S. (1998). Windows on composing: Teaching revision on word processors. *College Composition and Communication*, *39*(3), 227–344.

DeVoss, Dánielle Nicole, Cushman, Ellen, & Grabill, Jeffery T. (2005). Infrastructure and composing: The when of new-media writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *57*(1), 14–44.

Dinan, J. S., Gagnon, R., & Taylor, J. (1986). Integrating computers into the writing classroom: Some guidelines. *Computers and Composition*, *3*(2), 33–39.

Enzensberger, Hans. (1974). *The consciousness industry: On literature, politics and the media*. New York: Seabury Press.

Faigley, Lester. (1999). Beyond imagination: The Internet and global digital literacy. In Gail E. Hawisher & Cynthia L. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions pedagogies and 21st century technologies* (pp. 129–139). Logan: Utah State University Press.

Forum. (1992). A conversation about software, technology, and composition studies. *Computers and Composition*, *9*(1), 151–168.

Gates, Bill. (1999, October 4). *Everyone, anytime, anywhere. Forbes ASAP*. Retrieved December 5, 2006 from http://www.microsoft.com/presspass/ofnote/10-04forbes.mspx.

George, Diana. (2002). From analysis to design: Visual communication in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *54*, 11–39.

Grabill, Jeffery T. (1998). Utopic visions, the technopoor, and public access: Writing technologies in a community literacy program. *Computers and Composition*, *15*, 297–315.

Grabill, Jeffery T. (2003a). Community computing and citizen productivity. *Computers and Composition*, *20*(2), 131–150.

Grabill, Jeffery T. (2003b). On divides and interfaces: Access, class, and computers. *Computers and Composition*, *20*, 455–472.

Grabill, Jeffrey T. (2007). *Writing community change: Designing technologies for citizen action*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Grigar, Dene. (1999). Over the line, online, gender lines: E-mail and women in the classroom. In Kristine Blair & Pamela Takayoshi (Eds.), *Feminist cyberscapes: Mapping gendered academic spaces* (pp. 257–281). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Gruber, Sibylle. (1995). Re: Ways we contribute: Students, instructors, and pedagogies in the computer-mediated writing classroom. *Computers and Composition*, *12*(1), 61–78.

Haas, Christina. (1996). *Writing technology: Studies on the materiality of literacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Halbritter, Bump. (2006). Musical rhetoric in integrated-media composition. *Computers and Composition*, *23*, 317–334.

Handa, Carolyn (Ed.). (2001). Special issues: Digital rhetoric, digital literacy, computers, and composition. *Computers and Composition, 18* (1 and 2).

Handa, Carolyn (Ed.). (2004). *Visual rhetoric in a digital world*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Hansen, Evan. (2004, August 25). *JibJab beats copyright rap*. CNET News.com. Accessed June 11, 2007 from http://www.news.com.com/JibJab+beats+copyright+rap/2100-1026_35322970.html.

Harris, Leslie D., & Wambeam, Cynthia A. (1996). The Internet-based composition classroom: A study in pedagogy. *Computers and Composition*, *13*, 353–371.

Hawisher, Gail E., LeBlanc, Paul, Moran, Charles, & Selfe, Cynthia L. (1995). *Computers and the teaching of writing in American higher education 1979–1994: A history*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Heba, Gary. (1997). HyperRhetoric: Multimedia, literacy, and the future of composition. *Computers and Composition*, *14*, 19–44.

Hocks, Mary E. (1999). Feminist interventions in electronic environments. *Computers and Composition*, *16*, 107–119.

Hocks, Mary E. (2003). Understanding visual rhetoric in digital writing environments. *College Composition and Communication*, *54*, 629–656.

Hocks, Mary E., & Kendrick, Michelle. (2003). *Eloquent images: Word and image in the age of new media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Holdstein, Deborah, & Selfe, Cynthia L. (1990). *Computers and writing: Theory, research, practice*. New York: Modern Language Association.

Holdstein, Deborah. (1996). Interchanges: Counterpostings on a genre of email. *College Composition and Communication*, *47*, 279–284.

Janangelo, Joseph. (1991). Technopower and technoppression. *Computers and Composition*, *9*(1), 47–64.

Jenkins, Henry. (2005, March). Welcome to convergence culture. *Receiver, 12* (1). Retrieved May 31, 2007 from http://www.vodafone.com/flash/receiver/12/articles/pdf/12_01.pdf.

Jenkins, Henry. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York: New York University Press.

Kent-Drury, Roxanne M. (1998). Finding a place to stand: Negotiating the spatial configuration of the networked computer classroom. *Computers and Composition*, *15*(3), 387–407.

Kinkead, Joyce. (1987). Computer conversations: E-mail and writing instruction. *College Composition and Communication*, *38*, 337–341.

Knadler, Stephen. (2001). E-racing difference in e-space: Black female subjectivity and the Web-based portfolio. *Computers and Composition*, *18*, 235–255.

Kress, Gunther. (1998). Visual and verbal modes of representation in electronically mediated communication: The potentials of new forms of text. In Ilana Snyder (Ed.), *Page to screen: Taking literacy into the electronic era* (pp. 53–79). London: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther. (1999). English at the crossroads: Rethinking curricula of communication in the context of the turn to the visual. In Gail E. Hawisher & Cynthia L. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions pedagogies and 21st century technologies* (pp. 66–88). Logan: Utah State University Press.

Lang, Susan, Walker, Janice, & Dorwick, Keith (Eds.). (2000). Special issue: Tenure. *Computers and Composition*, *17*(1)

LeBlanc, Paul. (1993). *Writing teachers writing software: Creating our place in the electronic age*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

LeCourt, Donna. (1999). Writing (without) the body: Gender and power in networked discussion groups. In Kristine Blair & Pamela Takayoshi (Eds.), *Feminist cyberscapes: Mapping gendered academic spaces* (pp. 153–176). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Lessig, Lawrence. (1999). *Code and other laws of cyberspace*. New York: Basic Books.

Lessig, Lawrence. (2004). *Free culture: How big media uses technology and the law to lock down culture and control creativity*. New York: The Penguin Press.

Lessig, Lawrence. (2005a, April). *Who owns culture?* Presentation at the New York Public Library, New York, NY.

Lessig, Lawrence. (2005b, March). *Remix culture*. Presentation at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA.

Logie, John. (2006). *Copyright in increasingly digital academic contexts: What it takes*. Paper Presentation at the WIDE Research Center 2006 Conference, "Writing: Digital Knowledge," East Lansing, MI. Retrieved March 20, 2007, from http://www.wide.msu.edu/widepapers/Logie-WIDEresponse.pdf/file_view.

Manovich, Lev. (2002). *Who is the author? Sampling/remixing/open source*. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from http://www.manovich.net/DOCS/models_of_authorship.doc.

Markel, Mike. (1998). What students see: Word processing and the perception of visual design. *Computers and Composition*, *15*, 373–386.

Marshall, Alan. (1997). Decay and renewal in typeface markets: Variations on a typographical theme. *Emigre*, 42.

McGee, Tim, & Ericsson, Patricia. (2002). The politics of the program: MS Word as the invisible grammarian. *Computers and Composition*, *19*, 453–470.

McKee, Heidi. (2002). "YOUR VIEWS SHOWED TRUE IGNORANCE!!!": (Mis)communication in an online interracial discussion forum. *Computers and Composition*, *19*, 411–434.

McLeod, Kembrew. (2005). *Freedom of expression®: Overzealous copyright bozos and other enemies of creativity*. New York: Doubleday/Random House.

Metz, Rachel. (2004, July 29). Sue you: This song is our song. *Wired News*. Accessed June 11, 2007 from http://www.wired.com/culture/lifestyle/news/2004/07/64376.

Moran, Charles, & Hawisher, Gail E. (1998). The rhetorics and languages of electronic mail. In Ilana Snyder (Ed.), *Page to screen: Taking literacy into the electronic era* (pp. 80–101). London: Routledge.

Moran, Charles. (1998). From a high-tech to a low-tech writing classroom: "You can't go home again". *Computers and Composition*, *15*, 1–10.

Moran, Charles. (1999). Access: The a-word in technology studies. In Gail E. Hawisher & Cynthia L. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions pedagogies and 21st century technologies* (pp. 205–220). Logan: Utah State University Press.

Pagnucci, Gian. S., & Mauriello, Nicholas. (1999). The masquerade: Gender, identity, and writing for the Web. *Computers and Composition*, *16*, 141–151.

Palmquist, Micheael E. (1993). Network-supported interaction in two writing classrooms. *Computers and Composition*, *10*(4), 25–57.

Palmquist, Mike, Kiefer, Kate, Hartvigsen, James, & Godlew, Barbara. (1998). *Transitions: Teaching writing in computer-supported and traditional classrooms*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Peoples Halio, Marcia. (1996). Multimedia narration: Constructing possible worlds. *Computers and Composition*, *13*, 343–352.

Porter, James E. (1998). *Rhetorical ethics and internetworked writing*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex.

Porter, James E., Sullivan, Patricia, Blythe, Stuart, Grabill, Jeffrey T., & Miles, Libby. (2000). Institutional critique: A rhetorical methodology for change. *College Composition and Communication*, *51*(4), 610–642.

Redd, Teresa. (2003). "Tryin to make a dolla outa fifteen cent": Teaching composition with the Internet at an HBCU. *Computers and Composition*, *20*, 359–373.

Regan, Alison E., & Zuern, John D. (2000). Community-service learning and computer-mediated advanced composition: The going to class, getting online, and giving back project. *Computers and Composition*, *17*, 177–195.

Richardson, Elaine B. (1997). African American women instructors: In a net. *Computers and Composition*, *14*, 279–287.

Rickert, Thomas, & Salvo, Michael. (2006). The distributed Gesamptkunstwerk: Sound, worlding, and new media culture. *Computers and Composition*, *23*, 296–316.

Rife, Martine. (2006). Why Kairos matters to writing: A reflection on its intellectual property conversation and developing law during the last ten years. *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy, 11* (1). Retrieved March 11, 2007 from http://ww.kairos.technorhetoric.net/11.1/topoi/rife/index.html.

Rouzie, Albert. (2001). Conversation and carrying-on: Play, conflict, and serio-ludic discourse in synchronous computer conferencing. *College Composition and Communication*, *53*, 251–299.

Ruszkiewicz, John. (1988). Word and image: The next revolution. *Computers and Composition*, *5*(3), 9–15.

Sanchez, Raul. (1998). Our bodies? Our selves? Questions about teaching in the MUD. In Todd Taylor & Irene Ward (Eds.), *Literacy theory in the age of the Internet* (pp. 93–108). New York: Columbia University Press.

Schütze, Bernard. (2004). Samples from the heap: Notes on recycling the detritus of a remixed culture. *HorizonZero, 8* (April/May). Retrieved October 20, 2006 from http://www.horizonzero.ca/textsite/remix.php?tlang=0andis=8andfile=5.

Selfe, Cynthia L. (1987). Creating a computer-supported writing lab: Sharing stories and creating vision. *Computers and Composition*, *4*(2), 44–65.

Selfe, Cynthia, & Selfe, Richard J., Jr. (1994). The politics of the interface: Power and its exercise in electronic contact zones. *College Composition and Communication*, *45*(4), 480–504.

Sirc, Geoffrey. (1999). "What is composition. . .?" After Duchamp (notes toward a general teleintertext). In Gail E. Hawisher & Cynthia L. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions pedagogies and [21st] century technologies* (pp. 178–204). Logan: Utah State University Press.

Spooner, Michael, & Yancey, Kathleesn. (1996). Postings on a genre of email. *College Composition and Communication*, *47*, 252–278.

Sullivan, Laura L. (1999). Wired women writing: Towards a feminist theorization of hypertext. *Computers and Composition*, *16*, 25–54.

Sullivan, Patricia. (1998). Desktop publishing: A powerful tool for advanced composition courses. *College Composition and Communication*, *39*, 344–347.

Takayoshi, Pamela. (1994). Building new networks from the old: Women's experiences with electronic communications. *Computers and Composition*, *11*(1), 21–35.

Takayoshi, Pamela. (2000). Complicated women: Examining methodologies for understanding the uses of technology. *Computers and Composition*, *17*, 123–138.

Takayoshi, Pamela, Huot, Emily, & Huot, Meghan. (1999). No boys allowed: The World Wide Web as a clubhouse for girls. *Computers and Composition*, *16*, 89–106.

Taylor, Todd. (1997). The persistence of difference in networked classrooms: Non-negotiable difference and the African American student body. *Computers and Composition*, *14*, 169–178.

Teaching about plagiarism in a digital age: Students listen when teachers discuss the issues. (2005, November). *Council Chronicle*. Retrieved September 6, 2006 from http://www.ncte.org/pubs/chron/highlights/122871.htm.

Thompson, Diane. (1990). Electronic bulletin boards: A timeless place for collaborative writing projects. *Computers and Composition*, *7*(3), 43–53.

Trimbur, John. (2002). Delivering the message: Typography and the materiality of writing. In Gary Olson (Ed.), *Rhetoric and composition as intellectual work* (pp. 188–202). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Tuman, Myron C. (1992). *Literacy online: The promise (and peril) of reading and writing with computers*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Ulmer, Gregory L. (1994). *Heuretics: The logic of invention*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Vaidhyanathan, Siva. (2001). *Copyrights and copywrongs: The rise of intellectual property and how it threatens creativity*. New York: New York University Press.

VanderLans, Rudy. (2001). The trouble with type. In Steven Heller & Philip B Meggs (Eds.), *Texts on type: Critical writings on typography* (pp. 223–227). New York: Allworth Press.

Vernon, Alex. (2000). Computerized grammar checkers 2000: Capabilities, limitations, and pedagogical possibilities. *Computers and Composition*, *17*, 329–349.

Webb, Patricia. (2003). Technologies of difference: Reading the virtual age through sexual (in)difference. *Computers and Composition*, *20*, 151–167.

Webb-Peterson, Patricia, & Savenye, Wilhelmina. (2001). Special issue: Distance education. *Computers and Composition*, *18*(4)

Westbrook, Steve. (2006). Visual rhetoric in a culture of fear: Impediments to multimedia production. *College English*, *68*(5), 457–480.

Westbrook, Steve. (2007, March). *Innovators or outlaws*. Paper presentation at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, New York, NY.

Wolfe, Joanna L. (1999). Why do women feel ignored? Gender differences in computer-mediated classroom interactions. *Computers and Composition*, *16*, 153–166.

Writing in Digital Environments (WIDE) Research Center Collective. (2005). Why teach digital writing? *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy, 10* (1). Retrieved January 3, 2007 from http://www.english.ttu.edu/kairos/10.1/binder2.html?coverweb/wide/index.html.

Wysocki, Anne F. (2001). Impossibly distinct: On form/content and word/image in two pieces of computer-based interactive multimedia. *Computers and Composition*, *18*, 137–162.

Wysocki, Anne F. (2004). The multiple media of texts: How onscreen and paper texts incorporate words, images, and other media. In Charles Bazerman & Paul Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it* (pp. 123–164). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wysocki, Anne F., & Jasken, Julia I. (2004). What should be an unforgettable face. . .. *Computers and Composition*, *21*, 29–48.

Wysocki, Anne F., & Johnson-Eilola, Johndan. (1999). Blinded by the letter: Why are we using literacy as a metaphor for everything else? In Gail E. Hawisher & Cynthia L. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions pedagogies and 21st century technologies* (pp. 349–368). Logan: Utah State University Press.

Wysocki, Anne F., Johnson-Eilola, Johndan, Selfe, Cynthia##L., & Sirc, Geoffrey. (2004). *Writing new media*. Logan: Utah State University Press.