

Dear Andrew,

I most certainly have a strong view on the subject of copyright law regarding music.

It seems the music industry is only interested now that big sellers like the Beatles, Elvis and Cliff Richard will have their material go out of copyright. What about us lovers of pre-rock material? If the copyright law is extended, all this music will remain forgotten and unissued. The companies who own all this material seem happy to just sit on a huge pile of gems stuck in their archives. And often when it is issued, even when master tapes are used, the remastering is done poorly. These smaller companies often pay much better attention to the recordings, and they are taken from vinyl or shellac records! The recordings often sound like master tapes have been used, and they find big audiences. While if it was left to the big companies, it would never be issued again.

Then there's also artists not wanting their material issued. An artist is often not the best person to judge their own work - fans want to have everything, and the copyright law makes it possible to preserve this material once and for all.

Aren't Cliff Richard, Elton John and Paul McCartney rich enough already? And I severely doubt that profits from recordings fifty years old are enabling new artist to break through. The Beatles catalogue sells about 100,000 copies in the UK in total every year - and for other artists of similar ilk it will be even less. 100,000 copies is tiny compared to what new albums from the likes of James Blunt sell. Surely his multi-million selling album could finance new talen several times over? Why rely on the past - look to the future, I say.

The only people who will benefit from an extended law are the aforementioned greedy megastars. Most people making recordings fifty years ago, and some even more recently, are dead now.

Keep the law as it is.

Regards,
Theo Morgan