From: lairds2015
To: Section52CDPA
Subject: Section 52 consultation
Date: 14 December 2015 17:37:33

Have I misunderstood the intent and implications of this change in legislation?

I am a human being. I create things, it's what human beings are famous for.

Why should copyright be extended so far beyond my lifetime, or even beyond it at all? My descendants have done nothing to deserve the right to benefit from copyright beyond my lifetime (likewise any commercial enterprise)---that is an entirely arbitrary decision by legislators. Why not extend it to 100 years, 200, 1000, indefinitely?

So far as I can see this change in legislation is motivated by nothing other than the greed of those who stand to gain; although the supposed justification is the simplification of administration and reduction in associated costs. If the simplification idea is true why not simplify in the direction of reason and inspirational fairness by reducing the period of copyright after the death of the creator? Five years would be sensible, if the law makers cannot bring themselves to go with what actually makes sense and make copyright available only during the lifetime of the creator.

It appears that the 'collateral damage' caused will be the potential criminalisation of entirely innocent parties, a spirit of fear for those who take any notice of the rules in pursuit of their hobbies and art, not to mention the conduct of perfectly legitimate businesses, and an unwarranted smothering of creativity intrinsic to an outrageous extension of copyright beyond any reason (apart from the greed of people determined to leach as much money as possible out of the work of dead people).

Knowing the cost of everything but the value of nothing is a sad description of anyone, and a great shame that it should be applied to those responsible for protecting the creative spirit of society.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]