
Subject: Re: I'm not really a

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 30 Sep 2005 00:52:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What part don't you get; I can explain it. If someone has the right to say what can be done with a piece of art such as a CD of music; then by virtue of having a say in how that art is used he has rights over that art. Copyright law says that when you purchase a CD you do not get to own the music on that CD; it belongs to the artist. You can play it but that is all; you can't do anything else with it. You can't sell it if you have made a copy of it/copy it/play it for others if there is a cover charge/change it in any way etc. All you are allowed to do with that CD is play it for yourself. So if you cannot own the music on the CD then what theoretically would happen if for some reason the artist decides he does not want that art out in the world anymore? Is he locked into hearing his art played in a way he doesn't like forever? He has the right under Copyright law to adapt the piece. If the definition of owning something is that you have the right to decide how it is used and by whom and where it is used; then by all rights the artist who adapts that work should have the right to rescind that art and have it returned or destroyed. If we were talking about a painting or a photo-graph it would then be covered by the Doctrine Of Fair Use which gives the right to sell or give away the art to another who then can sell or give away the art again. Stereophile has a three part article concerning copyright that spells out exactly what rights the artist has and you have. After reading it I thought about what would happen if the artist wished to recall the music performance on that CD. While it obviously sounds kooky the fact is he owns the music on that CD. So I pondered the effect of taking that concept to the extreme. No big deal.
