

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [FN-OMB-IntellectualProperty](#)  
**Subject:** Cost of Copyright on Creatives  
**Date:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:35:25 AM

---

Hello

Seems a little ironic that these messages have been asked to be sent via an electronic form, as it has been the invention of the computer some twenty years ago that has seen the slow and decapitating demise of the creative all around the world. It is the third great revolution, in fact, that denotes a greater global aspect to business and finance and away from the beauty and talent of craftsmanship. So, what cost does this all have on the global and individual creative? A great deal.

Ever since the ability for anyone to believe creating something on a computer has made them a creative is the issue that has dogged truly creative people, because if there remains people out there that believe doing some crude and undesignated drawing in their kitchen on a Sunday afternoon as a past-time or hobby is enough to place them in the same league as people who have been through college in order to understand all the necessary skills and knowledge regarding such a craft, then our work is in jeopardy. If there remains the transglobal communication network that enable people to create in low income and low economic countries, and challenge the work of people who cannot compete at such rates, then our livelihood is at stake. If companies continue to pop up and grow, willing to sell images a \$1 a piece because of an ignorant demand in the commerce rather than the skill and time aspect of such creative pieces, we are doomed.

The whole gamut of creatives is not just about copyright. It is about morally raping an ability that has been regarded as a lower form of career option for decades. In hardly any other career does it get affected as much as the path of a creative. Struggling to work for hours to make pennies for a love of something that people then go ahead and make thousands from is not ethically correct. The development of microstock sights has in fact done to the design industry what sweat shops have done to the clothing industry. However this has become global. Let me give some extreme examples. The local plumber here makes more money than I do for his weekly work. He has the ability on to be challenged by the local competition. So he comes to my home fixed a pipe and can charge \$40, lets say, for a ten minute piece of work. A lawyer can represent me in court, do hours of litigation and still loose and be paid thousands. Doctors, tell you to take an aspirin and get paid extortionate amounts of money, and we still remain sick. Congressman get elected to represent their people and fail to achieve this in order to achieve a greater goal and are rewarded by such luxuries as high salaries and benefits from commerce. I was asked to take a job the other day. Six drawings for a children's book. Something that could take maybe 3 days to a week to achieve, complete. I was told that in today's market I would be reimbursed \$5 a piece.

Now you congressman live by these same rules and tell us creatives that that is fair. Every time you pass a bill your voters requested you get \$5. See the analogy. So, not only does the idea of global copyright control disintegration scare the hell out of most artists, it will be the final nail in the coffin for most. One reason is that people are known by what they do. Creatives, to be known, have to show their work; their portfolio. If the restrictions of protecting this are lifted then it is apparent that not only will these artists find it hard to make a decent buck, but all past work will be open for exploitation. It has been said of myself many a time, I do this for the love of it. When I could that is true, but would a doctor treat patients under the hypocritical oath alone with NO remuneration? I think not. This is not just about copyright. It is about respect for a creative process that has been looked down upon with whimsical disdain. It is about the "cannots" exploiting the "can dos". The simple truth is that all aspects of modern and past human life have been designed. In some artificial method, but in the same mode that good old mother nature has designed every single thing on the planet Earth. It has become so transparent, that the creators (good or bad) of this design work, have also become transparent. Their rights to make a decent buck from what they have achieved for their life's ambition has been eroded.

Not only does the copyright laws need to be strengthened to protect individual creates, the whole structure by what is considered creative needs to allow the creatives to earn a better living from their ability. Minimum price per piece of work, registered databases for qualified operators with recognised accreditation for their work. More control of global market variations and some protection of contract

structure by which people use and retain rights over artist work. I am sure if you talk to any number of artists they will have bad stories to tell of being exploited. Opening up the copyright laws to allow them to be exploited even further is just a final straw that will put many out of business or struggling to make ends meet. I urge the American, and global legislative community to see the people who are affected by this and not the commerce that can be gained from this. I watch in eager anticipation for a good result for creatives globally and hope that you will do the right thing by the people.

Thank you for listening to my words.

Yours sincerely

Rob Snow  
creative