

[REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:00 AM
To: FN-OMB-IntellectualProperty
Subject: Joint Strategic Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Victoria Espinel
Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator
Office of Management and Budget
Executive Office of the President
Filed via email

Dear Ms. Espinel:

There is reason to protect the interests of creators. First among those interests is some assurance that their creations will find "customers"...

Throughout most of human history, creators lived by selling their services directly to "customers". Musicians entertained, and were paid by those they entertained. Artists and sculptors sold their work to "customers". When printing appeared, authors made deals with printers for a share of the proceeds from book sales to "customers". Actors were paid by ticket sales to "customers".

Those artists made a living. No matter what copyright law may say tomorrow, they will continue to make a living, just as they always have.

The people who benefit from unending extension of "copyright protection" are NOT the creators. The beneficiaries are parasites who create nothing, but who control creators' estates or commercial distribution of creators' work. These parasites -- like all parasites -- bring little or no value to the body that feeds them, but rather devour inordinate amounts of that body's essence.

The creators' "customers" know that most of what they pay does NOT go to the creators, but to the parasites. So if the "customers" find a way to obtain the creators' works without paying, they know that they are not so much stealing from the creators as from the parasites. And in that they see no evil!

When online music became available at a reasonable price, "illicit" file-sharing tapered off. The "customers" are reasonable people...

Unless future copyright law appear equitable to the "customers", it will be violated, with ever greater sophistication. "Illicit" copies will dominate.

Robert Nelson