6. IP Abolition

This book will discuss what intellectual property rights are and the reasons why we should get rid of them

- 1. What is Intellectual Property ?
  - 1. Goal of Copyright
  - 2. Fair Use Clause
  - 3. Towards Creative Commons License
  - 1. History of Copyright
  - 1. Trademarks
- 2. The Problems of IP
  - 1. Streaming Giants
  - 2. Why Streaming services keep removing content ?
  - 3. Average artists are making more money via donations
- 3. Reasons we should get rid of them
  - 1. Why Creators Shouldn't Own their Creations (And Why its Good for them too)
  - 2. Disney Micky Mouse Act
  - 3. Venture Capitalists investing in old songs
- 4. AI Generated Content
  - 1. Netflix AI Studio
  - 2. Promptography
  - 3. Copyright for Generative AI

1. What is Intellectual Property ?

1. Goal of Copyright

The Real Issue Copyright Was Solving

Is copyright really about making sure that authors are not begging on the streets or is it about something else ?

Your point exposes something important: copyright was designed primarily to solve the profit-distribution problem ("How do creators earn money in a scarcity economy?"), not the attribution problem.

In a non-profit commons:

- The profit problem disappears — no one is extracting value from your work
- The attribution problem remains solvable — and arguably solvable *better* through transparent, traceable systems than through law

A creator in this world might actually prefer perpetual attribution with no legal gatekeeping over exclusive copyright that becomes invisible once the work enters the commons. Your name becomes the brand, not the legal restriction.

2. Fair Use Clause

It would be very difficult to determine what is fair and what is not. It is very vague for a reason, so you can never really be sure if it is going to work or not. The

Chilling effect,

if in doubt cut it out

Among essayist, academics, book writers, musicians,

Our culture is getting narrower and narrower

3. Towards Creative Commons License

Since we promote the open source mindset and reduction of Big Tech in any sector of life we would like an open source equivalent for artworks. Luckily that already exists for a long time and it is called the Creative Commons License. Just to quote from there official website they state that

Copyleft vs Creative Commons License

Without CC licenses, copyright offers only two extremes: “all rights reserved” or “no rights reserved.” That doesn’t reflect the many ways creators want their work to be shared.

Creative Commons licenses offer a standardized, legally-sound way to grant permission in advance, so that creators can clearly communicate how their work may be used, without negotiating individual permissions every time. This enables access to knowledge by offering a “some rights reserved” option for content that would otherwise be closed off.

Most creators share a basic belief: that knowledge and creativity grow through sharing, not locking it away.

Creators choose CC licenses for many reasons:

- Share their work widely while keeping credit
- Encourage remixing, collaboration, and learning
- Reach global audiences more easily (
  In essence, CC licensing transforms your work from something people must ask permission to use into something people can freely share and build upon, dramatically expanding its potential audience.
)
- Support open education, research, and culture
- Build visibility, reputation, and impact

For the public, CC licenses:

- Eliminate legal uncertainty around reuse
- Make it easier to find openly usable content
- Enable lawful remixing, adaptation, and redistribution
- Support education, research, journalism, and creative work

- Reduce permission friction across borders

Without copyright, someone could:

- Sell your art commercially without paying you
- Incorporate it into their own products
- Modify it and claim it as theirs
- License it to corporations without your consent

You're describing a situation where your work spreads freely, but that "freedom" cuts both ways—it's free from *your* control too.

1. History of Copyright

Wikipedia - The **Venetian Patent Statute** of March 19, 1474, established in the Republic of Venice the first statutory patent system in Europe, and may be deemed to be the earliest codified patent system in the world.[1][2] The Statute is written in old Venetian.[1] It provided that patents might be granted for "any new and ingenious device, not previously made", provided it was useful.[3] By and large, these principles still remain the basic principles of patent law

Notable copyleft licenses include the GNU General Public License (GPL), originally written by Richard Stallman, which was the first software copyleft license to see extensive use; the Mozilla Public License; the Free Art License; and the Creative Commons ShareAlike license condition – with the last two intended for non-software works, such as documents and pictures, both academic or artistic in nature.[3] Wikipedia is copyleft under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike license

According to Creative Commons many people do not regard default copyright as helping them in gaining the exposure and widespread distribution they want. Creative Commons argue that their licences allow entrepreneurs and artists to employ innovative business models rather than all-out copyright to secure a return on their creative investment.

The copyright developed in the USA. They did not in 1886 sign the Berne convention only since 1989. However, since then the USA has turned the tables nad introduced much more exstensive protection for created work.

Software programs are literally works, by created the vast proprietary software industry where it extracts huge profits year after year.

Copyright for sheet music,

Long history of

In copyright law it has worked over and over again

Eventually, people thought well give it a 100 years why not haha

1. Trademarks

These range from direct counterfeiting (fake products with copied logos) to brand dilution (using similar marks in ways that weaken the original brand's distinctiveness) to nominative use disputes (referring to a brand while discussing it or comparing products

Proponents contend that blockchain and decentralized ledgers could replace copyright by enabling direct, micropayment-based incentives or timestamped proofs of creation without monopoly grants, though empirical implementations like NFT marketplaces have largely reinforced rather than supplanted IP norms.[105] AI's data-hungry training paradigms, requiring billions of copyrighted images, texts, and code snippets, have escalated these claims, with some scholars arguing that prohibiting such uses would stifle causal chains of innovation akin to how libraries historically permitted transformative reuse

2. The Problems of IP

1. Streaming Giants

Disney’s combined properties (Disney+, Hulu, ABC, ESPN)

(covering Prime, Prime Video, Audible, and other subscriptions combined

Paramount Skydance: Owner of paramount, warner bros. discovery

2. Why Streaming services keep removing content ?

Source: Looper

sdf

3. Average artists are making more money via donations

The Core Problem: Network Effects Trump Economics

Audius (and similar Web3/independent platforms) offer better payouts, but Spotify offers something more valuable: listeners. This is the fundamental tension:

- Spotify: Poor payout rates (0.003–0.005 per stream), but 500+ million users browsing, discovering, and sharing music daily
- Audius: Better artist economics (estimated 90% of revenue to artists), but vastly smaller listener base (peaked around 7 million monthly active users, now smaller post-2024 scaling challenges)

A musician earning $0.0001 per stream to 1 million Spotify listeners makes more than earning $0.01 per stream to 10,000 Audius listeners. Exposure and discoverability aren't luxuries—they're the primary business driver for musicians trying to build careers.

Why the Collective Action Problem Prevents Migration

Even if donation-based platforms are "better for musicians" theoretically, here's why they don't win in practice:

1. The Chicken-and-Egg Problem

Musicians won't move without listeners; listeners won't move without musicians. Audius tried to bootstrap this by paying users to join in 2021–2022 (incentivized early adoption), but this collapsed when the incentives ended. Listeners stayed on Spotify because that's where all their friends' playlists are.

2. Casual Listeners Don't Care About Artist Economics

Your average Spotify user doesn't know or care that artists get 0.003 per stream. They care about:

- Seamless UX
- Massive catalog
- Playlist discovery
- Integration with devices and social media

Audius offers none of this better than Spotify. It's competing on values (decentralization, artist fairness) that casual listeners don't prioritize.

The Real Issue: It's Not About Individual Choice

Your suggestion implies musicians could collectively decide to abandon Spotify. But this isn't a rational individual choice problem—it's a coordination problem. Each musician's incentive is to be on Spotify *plus* alternative platforms, not to choose one or the other.

Example: An artist who leaves Spotify to go all-in on Audius is making a personal economic sacrifice hoping other musicians do the same. That's a collective action problem. Game theory suggests most will stay on Spotify while dabbling elsewhere.

What This Reveals About "Decentralized" Solutions

Audius and similar platforms assume that better economics alone will drive adoption. But they're competing against:

- Incumbent network effects (everyone's already on Spotify)
- UX polish (Spotify is genuinely easier to use)
- Listener psychology (people are creatures of habit)
- Artist necessity (musicians need the audience Spotify has, regardless of fairness)

This is why most successful musician-friendly alternatives don't try to replace Spotify—they *supplement* it:

- Bandcamp works because it's for fans who already know an artist
- Patreon works because it rewards superfans who want deeper engagement
- Kickstarter works as occasional one-time funding

These platforms succeed by solving a *different* problem (direct relationships, deeper engagement) rather than trying to beat Spotify at its own game (discovery and reach).

Could This Change?

Theoretically, yes—but it would require:

1. A critical mass of major artists leaving simultaneously (to make Audius worth joining for listeners)
2. Massive infrastructure investment in discovery/UX (to compete with Spotify's algorithm)
3. A cultural shift where listeners care about artist fairness (unlikely without education)
4. Regulatory intervention (breaking up Spotify's dominance or mandating fairer payouts)

Right now, the most realistic path forward isn't migration—it's regulation. The EU's Digital Markets Act and similar policies are starting to pressure Spotify on artist economics without requiring collective action from musicians.

So yes, economically it would be better for musicians if Spotify disappeared—but the market dynamics that created Spotify's dominance are the same ones that prevent alternatives from overtaking it. The problem isn't lack of trying; it's that network effects are incredibly sticky.

The Actual Incentive Structure

Here's the uncomfortable truth: a donation-based model fundamentally can't compete with attention-based monetization at scale.

- Spotify model: Maximize listeners → sell ads/subscriptions → pay per stream
- Donation model: Maximize *engaged superfans* → they donate → artist gets paid

These are completely different business models. Donation platforms are better for artists with loyal, invested communities (1,000–100,000 true fans). But megastars don't have "loyal communities"—they have billions of casual listeners. Those casual listeners will never donate; they just want background music.

Actual Income Potential Across Platforms

Bandcamp

More viable than Spotify for those with engaged fans. Artists retain 82% of sales (after payment processing), meaning an $10 album sale nets $8.20—equivalent to 2,500 Spotify streams. The "name your price" model works well: fans often pay 50% above the minimum. However, this requires:

- An existing fanbase
- Regular promotion and engagement
- Direct-to-fan relationships

3. Reasons we should get rid of them

1. Why Creators Shouldn't Own their Creations (And Why its Good for them too)

Source: Youtube

This video argues against two ideas

1. Without IP people cannot make a living from things that are infinitely copiable. In this video he argues why you can make a profit as well without IP
2. You have an Ethical right to those ideas. In this video he will argue why the right to an idea is a contradiction

The first thing that we need to realize is that in Today's world profits from IP come from Distribution instead of from Production. With any other sector the profits come from production. Now, what if we flipped this on its head and made a profit from Production ??? But how you might ask ?

Well, this is already happening today on a sort of small scale let's say and you most likely have heard about it as well it is called crowdfunding. Basically, people make propose a project i.e a film or show and raise resources to make it. The resources can be money, equipment or people.

1. The idea is that you provide a trailer of the movie you want to make
2. Then provide a list of all the tools you need and what their costs might be
3. Then on top of that you can add an optional profit margin to pay people involved in the creation of the movie
4. The great benefit is that the don't loose money from people that copy their works since people have paid for the production costs already.
5. Lots of money and resources will be saved on intruding people's privacy to check if they indulge in copyright infringement.
6. Today if a producer of a movie or show is treating they story badly, is doing plagiarism (That is not crediting original creators), acts unethical, raises prices, adds add or anything else that annoys people then the new season or sequel can be made by another creator or studio. Today that is not possible due to the large IP these large conglomerates have.
7. Now, people decide what is build and not corporations decide it for you.

The beauty is that everything is transparent and there will be no large studio or streaming service owning the rights to the created artworks and make billions of profits out of it for just being the distributor. We don't need these corporate oligopolistic distributors anymore because we the community can be the distributors without needing the expensive datacenters expenditures that companies like Netflix have. How ??

Well this is also you must have heard about and the answer is the Bittorent protocol or more recently the IPFS protocol.

It is not that crowdsourcing cannot pay for our media, it is just that not enough people engage with it yet to use it.

Kickstarter

Indiegogo

Patreon

Buymeacoffee

What about Artificial generated content ?

Well yes, in a world without copyrights your material can indeed be used to create artificial generated content. Now, the thing is even with IP this is happening regardless. The largest AI companies have done "copyright infringement" anyways and even companies like Netflix, Disney, Prime, Spotify are going all in on this as well.

There is a high chance that lot's of future films will be completely made by using generated AI. But that is not necessarily a bad thing because people can choose if they want a movie/show with human actors or that is artificially generated.

First of all you can never know if the ideas generated came from LLM's or any other sources on the internet that inspired a creator to choose for their new film/show. Yes, you can let AI do all the script writing

2. Disney Micky Mouse Act

Disney filing for longer copyrights up till 95 years. In the United States, copyright protection for characters generally lasts for 95 years from the date of first publication for works created after January 1, 1978. This means that characters can enter the public domain after this period, allowing others to use them freely

Copyright, trademark, patents (20 years)

3. Venture Capitalists investing in old songs

4. AI Generated Content

This chapter discusses AI generated content, what it is, how it is used, how the big streaming services most likely will start using it, and the future of film

1. Netflix AI Studio

Source: Digital Trends

2. Promptography

Promtography has been coined by AI prompt photographer

3. Copyright for Generative AI

How should copyright be dealt with for Generative AI ?

If a human paints an exact copy of AI-generated output by hand using paint and brushes, the situation becomes more nuanced, but the work likely still would not be copyrightable.

Here's the reasoning:

The creative content still originated from AI. Even though the human is using a traditional medium and manual technique, they're not making creative decisions about the *design, composition, imagery, or artistic vision*—they're simply replicating what the AI already created. The creative authorship still belongs to the AI, which cannot hold copyright.

Exact reproduction ≠ original authorship. Copyright protects original expression. An exact hand-painted copy, by definition, isn't introducing new creative choices or original expression—it's faithful reproduction of someone else's (or something else's) work.

Manual skill ≠ copyrightable creativity. The human's technical skill in painting accurately is not the same as creative authorship. A skilled copyist can produce a perfect reproduction of a masterpiece, but that reproduction doesn't become the copyist's copyrighted work—the original remains protected (if it has copyright).