



[michela](#)  
[Preferences](#)  
[Subscribe](#)  
[Journal](#)  
[Logout](#)

[Sections](#)  
[Main](#)  
[Apache](#)  
[Apple](#)  
[1 more](#)  
[AskSlashdot](#)  
[Books](#)  
[BSD](#)  
[Developers](#)  
[Games](#)  
[13 more](#)  
[Hardware](#)  
[Interviews](#)  
[IT](#)  
[Linux](#)  
[Politics](#)  
[Science](#)  
[1 more](#)  
[YRO](#)

[Help](#)  
[FAQ](#)  
[Bugs](#)

[Stories](#)  
[Old Stories](#)  
[Old Polls](#)  
[Topics](#)  
[Hall of Fame](#)  
[Submit Story](#)

[About](#)  
[Supporters](#)  
[Code](#)  
[Awards](#)

[Services](#)  
[Broadband](#)  
[PriceGrabber](#)  
[Product Guide](#)  
[Special Offers](#)  
[Jobs](#)

## Creative Commons In the News

Posted by [Zonk](#) on Tuesday  
 March 15, @06:49PM  
 from the [remix-this](#) dept.

An anonymous reader writes  
*"MSNBC is running an article on a new licensing scheme being used to bring civility to the world of copyright."* From the article: *"Interest in Creative Commons*

*licenses comes as artists, authors and traditional media companies begin to warm to the idea of the Internet as friend instead of foe, and race to capitalize on technologies such as file-sharing and digital copying." At the same time, [mpesce](#) writes "Boing Boing is reporting that the Australian equivalent of the Screen Actors Guild, the MEAA, has forbidden its members to work in Creative Commons productions. "The MEAA Board decided that it could grant none of the dispensations sought by MOD Films, on the grounds that these would be inappropriate."*



michela (531690)

[michela](#)  
[michela@thequality.com](mailto:michela@thequality.com)  
 shown as [\\_michela\\_](#) at [.thequality.com](#).  
<http://michela.thequality.com/>  
 Karma: Neutral

Michela makes films and stuff for the Net. She likes Slashdot even though it's rough as guts.

### Related Links

- [Review IT Products](#)
- [Compare prices on Legal Items](#)
- [Compare prices on Legal Items](#)
- [a new licensing scheme](#)
- [mpesce](#)
- [forbidden its members to work in Creative Commons productions](#)
- [More Patents stories](#)
- [More Censorship stories](#)
- [Also by Zonk](#)

Get Started NOW >



Eliminate bottlenecks. Optimize performance

**AMD In the Enterprise** | An Online Series  
**Event #2 Happening TODAY**

This discussion has been archived. No new comments can be posted.

Creative Commons In the News | [Preferences](#) | [Top](#) | **253** comments | [Search Discussion](#)

Threshold:       Save:

**The Fine Print:** The following comments are owned by whoever posted them. We are not responsible for them in any way.

**One sentence license:** (Score:3, Insightful)  
by Anonymous Coward on Tuesday March 15, @06:51PM ([#11947846](#))  
Any one can use this free of charge for anything, forever.

What's so hard about that?

- [Re:One sentence license:](#) by scragz (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @06:58PM
  - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by QuantumG (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @07:06PM

**Re:One sentence license:** (Score:4, Informative)  
by [Siniset \(615925\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:09PM ([#11948007](#))  
(<http://bill.nowherecollective.net/index2.php> | Last Journal: [Monday March 15, @01:37PM](#))

i don't think you understand what the liability is in the public domain copyright notice: it is that if the work of art is not in the the public domain, the person publishing it can be held accountable. It's not liability if something breaks, but rather if you don't have rights over it in the first place.

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:One sentence license:](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:12PM
    - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by scragz (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:16PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:51PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by Cyno (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:46PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by QuantumG (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @09:06PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by scragz (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @09:11PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by Gorm the DBA (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @10:28AM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by itsnotthenetwork (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @11:36AM
    - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by Siniset (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:45PM
    - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by Qzukk (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:38PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:44PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by Qzukk (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @11:50PM
      - [Re:One sentence license:](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @12:08AM
- Re:One sentence license:** (Score:4, Insightful)  
by [Qzukk \(229616\)](#) on Wednesday March 16, @01:35AM ([#11950847](#))

Forwards this time!

*No, copyright does not cover the "idea" which your song expressed, it covers the exact embodiment of your song. When I convert your song to another embodiment I'm making a derivative work of your embodiment, which is why it is also covered by your copyright.*

The copyright isn't about the paper I put ink on or the canvas I painted on or the floppy disk I saved my thesis on then stapled to the submission form. It is about the text in the floppy, the image on the canvas that matters. Your logic is flawed (calling a copy in a different format "derivative work [answers.com]" indeed. The term is applied to works where you add some small value such as a translation or typesetting or performance or additional text or notes, where the original work makes up a basis for the derivative too large to dismiss as fair use or quoting. Ripping your CD to mp3s adds no literary or other artistic merit to the work, it simply copies it to newer, more convenient "paper" with "better" ink) yet the outcome of your thought process is still valid: the song/picture/movie/document is still copyrighted.

*Yes, you are responsible for the damage an mp3 does to my equipment.*

So if you download an Aerosmith mp3 from kzaaa, and your ipod freezes up, you're going to sue Aerosmith? You ignore the fact that beyond my song being present, there is no control over the container with certain CC licenses that allow re-encoding or re-distributing (hell, with "All Rights Reserved" copyright in effect, they still can't crush all illegal copying. Are you going to go to court and insist that you thought the mp3 was an authorized Aerosmith good being given away by Aerosmith for free because copying is illegal so therefore the mp3 must be legal?). If A records a song, B re-encodes it in a malicious format and sends it to you, you can try suing A, but the judge will call you to the bench, slap you, tell you to sue B, and dismiss the case. If you somehow win, A will appeal, and appeals court judges slap harder.

*present something as factually correct when it is not you open yourself up to litigation if your claims*

*cause damage.*

Yet there are millions of idiots in this world all claiming things that are flagrantly, even intentionally incorrect. Yet aside from claiming incorrect things *about someone* (ie, libel or slander) I don't see a lot of lawsuits over how Jane told Billy she had a headache that night but was really just turned off by the fact that he ate a garlic sandwich after dinner. If I have a page reading "On Formally Decidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Related Systems" consisting of a thesis that at every turn attempts to disprove Godel's law, with no text beyond the title and the body of the thesis and a CC license at the bottom, with no other statement indicating that in reality, I stapled my Mathematics PhD to my application form and failed to get my Doctorate, can you sue me for that? Even though I make no claims claiming I am a math whiz? Does the CC license matter? What if I marked it "All Rights Reserved"?

*A formular for making styrofoam cups is indeed an invention* Yes, and I explicitly stated that inventions are separate, as they can blow up and kill people. Shakespeare does not blow up and kill people, no matter how long you cook it. Brittney Spears does not blow up and kill people. Mona Lisa secretly blows up when noone is looking, the rest of the time she smirks about what she's getting away with. The formula for TNT can be used to blow up and kill people. See the difference? Literary work, musical work, artistic work, invention.

And now we're on rat poison on a playground which has nothing to do with copyright, and even less to do with creative commons licenses for copyrighted works.

--

(\)

(-.-) Give me back my damn feet!

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:One sentence license](#): by QuantumG (Score:2)  
Wednesday March 16, @02:06AM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward  
Wednesday March 16, @02:10AM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Qzukk (Score:3)  
Wednesday March 16, @02:25AM

- [Re:One sentence license](#): by QuantumG (Score:2)  
Wednesday March 16, @02:56AM
  - [Re:One sentence license](#): by Qzukk (Score:2)  
Wednesday March 16, @09:36AM
  - [Re:One sentence license](#): by araemo (Score:1)  
Wednesday March 16, @10:36AM
  - [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward  
Wednesday March 16, @01:32PM
  - [Re:One sentence license](#): by QuantumG (Score:2)  
Wednesday March 16, @07:08PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:02PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by tmasky (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @07:09PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by rtb61 (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:12PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:12PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by DrJay (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:20PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:33PM
  - [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:42PM
    - [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward (Score:1) Tuesday  
March 15, @08:21PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Swamii (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @07:38PM

**Re:One sentence license:** (Score:5, Interesting)

by [SydShamino \(547793\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @08:29PM (#11948768)

One downside of public domain is that it doesn't nothing to avoid the implication of plagiarism.

What if I write something truly insightful in one of these posts? Then, later, I use the same words in a speech when I'm running for some government office?

If I release the text into the public domain, others can take those words and reuse them without any credit required. I could take Tom Sawyer and republish the novel without listing the author at all; neither he nor his descendents have any rights to the book.

But, if I reuse the words later in another context, I could be accused of plagiarism. It might be difficult to prove that I was the original author of text that had been passed around through the public domain for X years. By retaining copyright on my posts, I can force those that wish to quote them to attribute them to me.

(This did happen. Someone from a public domain advocacy website wanted to use quotes from one of my slashdot posts on his site. But he had released all text on his site into the public domain. I had to decline unless he could change his license, not because I care where my words were used, but because I care that they be attributed to me. /shrug)

[ [Parent](#) ]

**Whoa** (Score:4, Funny)

by Anonymous Coward on Tuesday March 15, @08:39PM (#11948884)

"What if I write something truly insightful in one of these posts? "

Dude, stick with the realm of possible here for just a few minutes. I can't get

past this line.

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:Whoa](#) by SydShamino (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:43PM
- [Re:Whoa](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @09:12AM

**Re:One sentence license:** (Score:4, Insightful)

by [ortholattice \(175065\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @10:21PM (#11949725)

So plagiarism of Tom Sawyer is a serious problem these days? Get real. You're making a mountain out of a molehill. Most people (even assuming they are unethical in the first place) don't plagiarize not because of copyright but because it would damage their professional reputation if found out (or in school, get them expelled). But hey, if you're so paranoid someone's going to "steal" your words, please copyright the hell out of them; even better, don't release them in the first place. I notice, by the way, the public domain guy seemed perfectly willing to acknowledge you and even asked your permission. That's what most reasonable and honest people do. I just don't understand the big deal here - how are you going to suffer if someday, somewhere someone quotes your slashdot post without attribution? Copyrighted or not, it's pretty easy to prove you originated the words with a search engine, if it becomes an issue, and probably embarrass the person who plagiarized them. Would really take them to court though (the only benefit of copyright I can see)? To me people who obsess with the copyright of the most trivial minutiae seem to have hair up their ass.

[ [Parent](#) ]

**Re:One sentence license:** (Score:4, Informative)

by [Anthony Boyd \(242971\)](#) on Wednesday March 16, @02:29AM (#11951089)  
(<http://www.outshine.com/>)

*Someone from a public domain advocacy website wanted to use quotes from one of my slashdot posts on his site. But he had released all text on his site into the public domain. I had to decline unless he could change his license, not because I care where my words were used, but because I care that they be attributed to me.*

Yes, that was [one of my Web sites](#) [respectthe...domain.org]. However, since my interaction with you is getting lumped into a discussion of plagiarism, I would mention that I do not plagiarize -- everything I put up there is extensively cited and credited. The reason I didn't change my license for you was simply that other people were more easy-going, so there was no need to pursue your writing.

--

[Publisher Database](#) [publisherdatabase.com]

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:One sentence license:](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @04:48AM
- [Re:One sentence license:](#) by abesottedphoenix (Score:1) Wednesday March 16,



@09:27AM

- [Re:One sentence license](#): by BroadwayBlue (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @10:26AM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Thursday March 17, @01:18PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Leo McGarry (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:38PM
  - [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @10:03PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by davidsyes (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @10:37PM
- [Specificity counts in licensing](#): by jbn-o (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @10:40PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @10:40PM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by tod\_miller (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @12:44AM
- [Re:One sentence license](#): by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @02:23AM

**An importante message to MEAA** (Score:-1, Offtopic)

by [JamesP \(688957\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @06:51PM ([#11947851](#))

GO TO HELL!

No, really, they're "acting" as a bunch of trolls...

--

Creationism is not a theory, it is a load of waffle.

**Anti-Comeptitive** (Score:5, Interesting)

by [PepeGSay \(847429\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @06:52PM ([#11947856](#))

Does anyone else see the MEAA's decision as anti-competitive?

- [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by ackthpt (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @06:55PM
 

**Re:Anti-Comeptitive** (Score:5, Insightful)  
by [IntelliTubbie \(29947\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:05PM ([#11947968](#))  
*Does anyone else see the MEAA's decision as anti-competitive?*

Of course. They're a union; it's their job to be anti-competitive. (That is, to protect their members from competition with non-members.) Essentially, the MEAA is a labor cartel, placing restrictions on members' output to boost the asking price.

Cheers,

IT

--

Power corrupts. PowerPoint corrupts absolutely.

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by Breakfast Pants (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:34PM
- [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by awful (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @09:16PM
  - [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by pavon (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:47PM
    - [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by awful (Score:2) Monday March 21, @01:14AM
  - [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by cortana (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @10:08PM
- [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @01:43AM
- [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by Qzukk (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:06PM

- [Doesn't work in Oz](#) by Goonie (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:25PM
- [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by pavon (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @07:18PM
  - [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by donothingsuccessfull (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:42PM
    - [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by Cyno (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:37PM
    - [Re:Anti-Comeptitive](#) by Pseudonym (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @01:09AM
- [Non-union pornography!](#) by buckhead\_buddy (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:37PM

**Rights** (Score:1)

by [vandon \(233276\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @06:52PM ([#11947860](#))  
[\(http://www.silverwolf-den.com/\)](http://www.silverwolf-den.com/)

Unless the production company reserves all rights, they feel they will lose money. No lawsuits over unauthorized translations, no lawsuits over non-commercial copying and viewing, etc....

- [not just money](#) by ackthpt (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:01PM
  - [Re:not just money](#) by Qzukk (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:14PM
    - [Re:not just money](#) by ackthpt (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @07:24PM
      - [Re:not just money](#) by Breakfast Pants (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:37PM
    - [Re:not just money](#) by 91degrees (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:27PM
      - [Re:not just money](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @05:29AM
    - [Re:not just money](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:04PM
      - [Re:not just money](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @08:42PM
        - [Re:not just money](#) by cpt kangarooski (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @02:27AM
    - [Substantial similarity](#) by tepples (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:19PM
- [Re:Rights](#) by flajann (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:55PM
  - [You can't lawfully spend a photocopied \\$100 note](#) by tepples (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:17PM
    - [Re:You can't lawfully spend a photocopied \\$100 not](#) by Taladar (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:14PM
      - [EPA](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @07:29AM

**Slashdot does not have a monopoly on bad grammar** (Score:2, Funny)  
 by [tabkey12 \(851759\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @06:55PM ([#11947877](#))  
[\(http://4freeuk.info/\)](http://4freeuk.info/)

From TFA Sub-Heading: Creative Commons is new licensing scheme

--

**[All the info on the UK free item sites!](#)** [4freeuk.info] Do

- [Creative Commons is new licensing scheme?](#) by game kid (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:40PM

**MICHAEL SIMS DREDGED UP BY TSUNAMI** (Score:-1, Troll)  
 by Anonymous Coward on Tuesday March 15, @06:57PM ([#11947890](#))

Recently 86'd /. "editor" Michael Sims was dredged up by a metaphorical tsunami of regret this morning, after years of corruption, power-tripping, and unethical behaviour finally became self-evident.



Countless minute tremors involving Censorware and friends, Roland Piquepaille, and /. readers triggered the gargantuan wave, lifting Sims to the surface of a previously unknown reality.

"It was incredible," recounts Sims. "I just couldn't get 'Hello, World!' to compile, so I posted a question to /. Strangely, my comment wasn't deleted, modded into oblivion, or arbitrarily recontextualized - in fact, someone took the time to point out that GCC isn't usually installed on rotary phones."

It was at that point, Sims says, that the flood hit.

"Not only did someone offer assistance, but /. itself was admin'd in a pretty cool manner. I'm a better person now because of this - thanks guys!"

- [Re:MICHAEL SIMS DREDGED UP BY TSUNAMI](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:-1) Tuesday March 15, @07:22PM

**Silly MEAA** (Score:2)

by [slashrogue \(775436\)](#) <[roguecode.gmail@com](mailto:roguecode.gmail@com)> on Tuesday March 15, @06:58PM (#11947902) (<http://roguecode.net/>)

The boing-boing isn't clear if this is part of the press release or not, but I quote: "Mash-up and re-mix potential is an intrinsic part of the Sanctuary project empowering the audience to exercise greater control over purchased film content and treating re-use as an opportunity as opposed to a threat."

And how is that bad, exactly?

- [Simple - it's a union.](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:02PM
  - [Re:Simple - it's a union.](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:31PM
  - [Re:Simple - it's a union.](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:05PM
    - [No, Mr. Kneejerk Union Man](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @08:42PM
  - [Re:Simple - it's a union.](#) by bayvult (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @09:50PM

**tr0IL** (Score:-1, Offtopic)

by Anonymous Coward on Tuesday March 15, @06:59PM (#11947909)

dying. Everyone Juliet Are together code sharing and personal troubled OS. Now to die. I will 6am in a head spinning ransom for their development. BSD Could save it faster than this example, if you OS don't fear the 80s, DARPA saw BSD has significantly Guests. Some people Which don't use the Theo de Raadt, one trouble. It website Third, you they are Come very distracting to product, BSD's posts. Due to the FreeBSD's me if you'd like, \*BSD has steadily of all legitimate Though I have never and its long term Networking test. its readers and fucking market more grandiose fact there won't poor dead last first organization in our group Study. [rice.edu] faster than this

**you know** (Score:-1, Flamebait)

by [Dogun \(7502\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:00PM (#11947921) (<http://www.indistinct.net>)

When I first read that, I thought, hey how cool, the Creative Commons license made it in the news!

Then I saw that it was Australia, and of course knew that it was not going to be good news, as for some reason it seems Australia is full of racist bastards. Basically, white people.

Prove me wrong.

**Re:you know** (Score:4, Funny)

by [QuantumG \(50515\)](#) <[qg@biodome.org](mailto:qg@biodome.org)> on Tuesday March 15, @07:03PM (#11947950)  
(<http://rtfm.insomnia.org/~qg/>)

Yep, and America is full of gun totting Christians.

Oh, and Denmark is full of clog wearing porn stars who own chocolate factories.

And, France is full of stuck up arrogant smokers who.. (oh wait, that one's true)

Can you at least *try* not to generalise an entire nation?

--

*Do so few linux users play [Cube](#) [fov120.com] just because there's no deps/rpms?*

[ [Parent](#) ]

**Re:you know** (Score:4, Funny)

by [schon \(31600\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:05PM (#11947969)  
(<http://slashdot.org/>)

*Denmark is full of clog wearing porn stars who own chocolate factories.*

Why am I just being told this **now**?!?!?!?

--

"Once in the enlightenment of vivid concoction I saw God."

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:you know](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @10:54PM
- [Re:you know](#) by merlin\_jim (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @11:26AM
- [Re:you know](#) by Drachemorder (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:10PM
- [Re:you know](#) by Rude Turnip (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:14PM
- [Re:you know](#) by The Fanta Menace (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:07PM
- [Re:you know](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:07PM
  - [Re:you know](#) by Dogun (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:40PM
    - [Re:you know](#) by brindafella (Score:1) Wednesday March 23, @03:57PM
- [Australia is hardly FULL](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:09PM
- [Re:you know](#) by ReverendLoki (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @07:12PM
  - [Re:you know](#) by Dogun (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:38PM
  - [Re:you know](#) by purple\_cobra (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:11PM
  - [Re:you know](#) by Junior J. Junior III (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @11:52PM
- [Re:you know](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:21PM
- [Re:you know](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:21PM

- [when in doubt....](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:-1) Tuesday March 15, @07:24PM
  - [Re:when in doubt....](#) by Dogun (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:44PM
- [Re:you know](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:-1) Tuesday March 15, @07:25PM
- [Re:you know](#) by weighn (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:42PM
  - [Re:you know](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @08:24PM
    - [Re:you know](#) by weighn (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:32PM
      - [Re:you know](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @10:04PM
      - [Re:you know](#) by zsau (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @01:52AM
    - [Re:you know](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @10:43PM
      - [Re:you know](#) by spuzzzzzzz (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @03:27AM
- [Addendum](#) by Dogun (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:55PM
  - [Re:Addendum](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @08:11PM
    - [Re:Addendum](#) by Dogun (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @09:02PM
      - [Re:Addendum](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @01:26PM
        - [Re:Addendum](#) by Dogun (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @04:08PM
  - [Re:Addendum](#) by femto (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @09:01PM
    - [Re:Addendum](#) by Dogun (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:16PM
  - [Re:Addendum](#) by zsau (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @01:48AM
  - [Re:Addendum](#) by weighn (Score:1) Thursday March 17, @09:39PM


**Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons** (Score:5, Interesting)  
 by [QuantumG \(50515\)](#)  <[qg@biodome.org](mailto:qg@biodome.org)> on Tuesday March 15, @07:00PM  
 (#11947922)  
 (<http://rtfm.insomnia.org/~qg/>)

The part I dislike the most about the Creative Commons set of licenses is the advocacy of non-commercial restrictions, as if they were a good idea. This thoroughly reduces the distribution of the work. Suppose you make an icon set and place it under one of the Creative Commons licenses that has the non-commercial restriction. This means that Red Hat, Suse, Mandrake and all the other commercial Linux distributions can't put your icon set on their CD. It means that only people who contact you directly can use your icon set. That's hardly freedom.

On a totally different note. I was thinking about the part of the GPL that most people really don't get: the offer to supply source code at a later date. More than any other part of the GPL that section really confuses people. Maybe we should make a GPL-lite, where source code simply MUST accompany all binary distributions. That'd clear up the confusion for programs licensed under it at least.

--

*Do so few linux users play [Cube](#) [fov120.com] just because there's no deps/rpms?*

**Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons** (Score:5, Interesting)  
 by [Da Biz \(267075\)](#)  <[slashdot AT petelee DOT org](mailto:slashdot AT petelee DOT org)> on Tuesday March 15, @07:07PM (#11947979)  
 (<http://petelee.blogspot.com/>)

I disagree. I've written several prose pieces where I have used Creative Commons to limit how it's used. As the creator and copyright holder of the piece, I believe I have the right to say how it's used.

In my case, I permitted free distribution of the piece, restricted anyone from selling a reprint of it without my permission, and did not want anyone to build upon to work to preserve it's artistic integrity. I'm not entirely sure what's wrong there.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.0>

[ [Parent](#) ]

- o [What?](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @08:03PM
- o [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by captwheeler (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:04PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:57PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by captwheeler (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @09:28PM
      - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:34PM
        - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @10:56PM
      - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by MrAndrews (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @12:58AM
        - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @01:12AM
          - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by MrAndrews (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @01:20AM
          - [Coding and politics](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:11AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @02:20AM

**Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons** (Score:5, Insightful)

by [iminplaya \(723125\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @08:16PM ([#11948648](#))  
(Last Journal: [Saturday July 16, @06:24PM](#))

*I believe I have the right to say how it's used.*

That's like telling me where I can take my car, or what kind of tires I have to use. It's like needing the architect's(sp) permission the paint my house. The closest thing you have to natural rights on a work is to have your name attached. Everything else is fair game. The "artistic integrity" is in your eyes only. Your rights to property are determined by the society you live in. They are NOT absolute or inherent.

--

Oooo...standing for the Queen, are we? [RTFM](#) [bfi.org]

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by seifried

(Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:21PM

**Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons**

(Score:4, Insightful)

by [Peter La Casse \(3992\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @08:38PM (#11948878)

(<http://www.cs.wisc.edu/~lacasse/>)

*Problem is if I as a content/whatever creator have no rights regarding my work why should I distribute it at all? I'm better of getting a job at McDonalds.*

Because you enjoy it? (Rhetorical question; the answer is "yes".)

If you don't enjoy it, then don't do it; nobody's forcing to you be creative. Get a job at McDonald's if that's what floats your boat.

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by seifried (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @11:12PM
  - [CC by-sa is for you](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:17AM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by iminplaya (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:58PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @11:11PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by seifried (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @11:17PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @12:03AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @02:21AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @07:54AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @08:10AM
    - [A "content creator" is a happy deity](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:26AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @09:27AM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by seifried (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @11:27PM
  - [Contracts of adhesion](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:22AM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz

- (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @11:03PM
  - [Bravo! \\*claps\\*](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @07:45AM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by LionKimbro (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:18PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Da\_Biz (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @10:26PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @02:28AM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Dwonis (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @12:17AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by LionKimbro (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @02:33AM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by bbc (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:39AM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by j00b4k4 (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:44AM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by runderwo (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @02:33PM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by imag0 (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:09PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:15PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:35PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by the arbiter (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:10PM
      - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:34PM
        - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by the arbiter (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @10:17PM
      - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by schon (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:48PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by jbn-o (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @11:08PM
- [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by scragz (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:11PM

**Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons** (Score:4, Insightful) by [MindStalker \(22827\)](#) ● <[jlarsen@\[ \] .edu](mailto:jlarsen@[ ] .edu) ['fsu' in gap]> on Tuesday March 15, @07:11PM (#11948020)  
(Last Journal: [Friday September 07, @02:27PM](#))

Well honestly you don't want every joe blow calling you waisting your time. But how hard is it for a corperation to call you up and say "Hi, we'd like to use your icons?".

--

~

[ [Parent](#) ]

- [Logistics](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:29AM
  - [Re:Logistics](#) by MindStalker (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @10:48AM
    - [Watch the exact wording of the license](#) by tepples (Score:1)



Wednesday March 16, @06:41PM

**Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons** (Score:5, Interesting)  
by [schon \(31600\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:16PM ([#11948069](#))  
(<http://slashdot.org/>)

*the advocacy of non-commercial restrictions, as if they were a good idea.*

Maybe it's because people believe that they *\*are\** a good idea?

*Suppose you make an icon set and place it under one of the Creative Commons licenses that has the non-commercial restriction. This means that Red Hat, Suse, Mandrake and all the other commercial Linux distributions can't put your icon set on their CD.*

First of all, no it doesn't. What it means is that Red Hat, Suse, Mandrake, etc can't put your icon set on CDs that they *\*sell\**. They're perfectly free to include it in a downloadable ISO, or some other means.

Second of all, if someone's making money of something *\*I\** made, why should it not be me? (Or, why is it such a big deal if they have to contact me first?)

*It means that only people who contact you directly can use your icon set.*

Yes, well let's see: there's Red Hat, Mandrake, Suse... who else? I can see how difficult it is for *\*all these people\** to contact me - man, how could I ever manage the time to talk to them all? There are clearly *tens* of people who are selling Linux commercially.

*That's hardly freedom.*

Bullshit. They're perfectly free to make their own icons.

--


"Once in the enlightenment of vivid concoction I saw God."

[ [Parent](#) ]

- o [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by ComputerSlicer23 (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @07:54PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by schon (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @10:07PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @11:33PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by ComputerSlicer23 (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @11:37PM
    - [Bad analogy](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:31AM
- o [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by LionKimbro (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @08:38PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by schon (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @09:57PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by LionKimbro (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @11:08PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by zotz

- (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @11:46PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by N3wsByt3 (Score:2) Thursday March 17, @06:20PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by KiloByte (Score:2) Saturday March 19, @02:27PM
      - [ermm \(?\)](#) by N3wsByt3 (Score:2) Monday March 21, @08:33AM
        - [Re:ermm \(?\)](#) by KiloByte (Score:2) Monday March 21, @08:43AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @02:20AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by runderwo (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @02:42PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by rlds (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:56PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by James McGuigan (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:06PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:28PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Elwood P Dowd (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @11:24PM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by millette (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @07:03AM
      - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Elwood P Dowd (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @01:20PM
  - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Feztaa (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @04:49AM
    - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @05:00AM
      - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by Feztaa (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @05:52AM
        - [Re:Non-commercial elements of the Creative Commons](#) by QuantumG (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @06:51AM

**Gotta love Creative Commons!** (Score:2)

by [rscrawford \(311046\)](#)  <[rscrawford@@@mossroot...com](mailto:rscrawford@@@mossroot...com)> on Tuesday March 15, @07:03PM (#11947949) (<http://www.mossroot.com/> | Last Journal: [Wednesday February 09, @08:19PM](#))

I've got a couple of papers (nothing professional, mind you, just short grad school papers on the use of open source technologies in public libraries) and a short story all licensed under a Creative Commons License.

Most of the writing I do, however, I'm not licensing yet. I need to see how the rights that mainstream magazine and anthology publishers want to buy work alongside Creative Commons licenses. Some of us still want to make money off our writing someday (well, we can dream, at least).

--

-- The reason it's called the *right* wing? Irony.

**Australia?** (Score:0, Flamebait)

by [HyoImowano \(761382\)](#) <[admin@yellowdisk.net](mailto:admin@yellowdisk.net) ['isk' in gap]> on Tuesday March 15, @07:07PM (#11947990) (<http://yellowdisk.net/>)

Does anyone really care what Australia thinks anymore?

--

By now you should have guessed...I'm your magic negro.

**Over a barrel** (Score:4, Interesting)

by [Stumbles \(602007\)](#) <[dveatch@l.rr.com](mailto:dveatch@l.rr.com) ['woh' in gap]> on Tuesday March 15, @07:11PM (#11948022)

*has forbidden its members to work in Creative Commons productions.*

I think the above phrase is being overlooked by most people. I mean that's a pretty strong statement, to paraphrase, "I/We forbid you to do any work that does not make us money."

The question I have, is that part of "the members" contract or is this "a new policy"?

Either way I have to wonder just how far they can go at curtailing a members outside activities.

- [Re:Over a barrel](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @07:41PM
  - [Re:Over a barrel](#) by Jah-Wren Ryel (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @11:57PM
- [Re:Over a barrel](#) by Alsee (Score:3) Wednesday March 16, @01:21AM
  - [Re:Over a barrel](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @04:00AM

**MEAA?** (Score:2, Interesting)

by [ta bu shi da yu \(687699\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:12PM (#11948032) (<http://www.kuro5hin....20bu%20shi%20da%20yu>)

Are they an important part of Australian film making? And if so, isn't this restraint of trade?

--

XML is like violence. If it doesn't solve the problem, use more.

- [Re:MEAA?](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @08:23PM
  - [Re:MEAA?](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @08:34PM
  - [Re:MEAA?](#) by ta bu shi da yu (Score:1) Tuesday March 15, @08:55PM

**Small Wurld...** (Score:2, Funny)

by [Mr.Progressive \(812475\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:13PM (#11948040)

*Sony BMG, Universal Music Group, EMI and Warner Music Group, for instance, inked deals to distribute songs on a fee-based download service run by **Wurld Media**, a Saratoga Springs, N.Y., peer-to-peer software company.*

Does anyone else think these guys made a serious typo in their Articles of Incorporation and couldn't be bothered to fix it?

--

[SDF: Public Access Unix System](#) [lonestar.org]

- [Re:Small Wurld...](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:21PM

**We need more CC webcomics.** (Score:2)

by [FooAtWFU \(699187\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:16PM ([#11948063](#))  
(<http://fennec.homedns.org/>)

Seriously, people need to start pushing the idea of the Creative Commons licenses to webcomic artists out there. My own comic (link above) is CC-BY-NC-SA. I figure that this sort of license is a whole lot better than me trying to come up with my own sans lawyer, and the 'noncommercial' bit would preclude most of the stuff you would be worried about (people printing your comic in books in an unauthorized manner, or sticking up your comic with ads on some site you don't want them to...)

And if you're really concerned with artistic integrity, there's a No-Derivatives version last I checked.

--

"I enjoy slaughtering beasts," he said, "and I think of my relatives constantly."

**Why?** (Score:2)

by [northcat \(827059\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:17PM ([#11948076](#))  
(Last Journal: [Friday May 06, @08:02PM](#))

Can someone please tell me why they are doing this without going into conspiracy theories/nonsense?

- [Re:Why?](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:30PM

**And the award ...** (Score:2)

by [rhysweatherley \(193588\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:17PM ([#11948077](#))

And the award for burying their head in the sand and hoping that reality goes away goes to ... MEAA.

Seriously, if the actors know going into this what will be done, and are being paid a fair wage to appear, where's the beef? Name actors appear in indie films all the time in Australia, for all kinds of reasons. Sometimes for no pay at all. How is this different?

**strange interests for a labor union** (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on Tuesday March 15, @07:18PM ([#11948078](#))

Is it a misguided attempt to keep from having any exceptions where actors rights are taken away or something shadier? (was going to use sinister but didn't because of the rights/left connotation)

Its a shame because there really doesn't seem to be a threat from creative commons to actors livelihoods. To the extent that creative commons is non-commercial it really falls outside of the film industry and shouldn't be regulated as such. In the US, SAG can be pretty brutal on actors who don't make big bucks. They can be forced to turn down roles and get blacklisted in the industry if they don't even if they need the income to get by.

- [Re:strange interests for a labor union](#) by Anonymous Coward Tuesday March 15, @07:35PM

**Suggestion** (Score:3, Informative)

by [ta bu shi da yu \(687699\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:18PM ([#11948084](#))  
(<http://www.kuro5hin....20bu%20shi%20da%20yu>)

There is an email form to [register your disgust](#) [alliance.org.au].

--

XML is like violence. If it doesn't solve the problem, use more.

- [Re:Suggestion](#) by Anonymous Coward Wednesday March 16, @11:29AM

**I'm withholding opinion** (Score:2, Insightful)

by [sfjoe \(470510\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:19PM ([#11948088](#))

I'd like to get this story from a source that's not named "Boing Boing" and doesn't use words like "sez" in their articles. Even Fox News would be a better source of information. Maybe.

--

Buy Blue!! <http://buyblue.org/>

- [Re:I'm withholding opinion](#) by Ex Machina (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @08:48PM
- [Re:I'm withholding opinion](#) by GeorgeH (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @09:03PM
- [Re:I'm withholding opinion](#) by Cletus the yokel (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @10:04PM
- [Re:I'm withholding opinion](#) by Anonymous Coward (Score:2) Tuesday March 15, @10:15PM
- [Please dismiss this account with a better reason.](#) by jbn-o (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @10:32PM
  - [Re:Please dismiss this account with a better reaso](#) by sfjoe (Score:2) Wednesday March 16, @08:30PM
    - [Re:Please dismiss this account with a better reaso](#) by tepples (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:48PM
- [Re:I'm withholding opinion](#) by bbc (Score:1) Wednesday March 16, @08:19AM

**Get out the future's way before it runs you down** (Score:2)

by [FunWithHeadlines \(644929\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:32PM ([#11948182](#))  
(<http://www.funwithheadlines.net/>)

*"The MEAA Board decided that it could grant none of the dispensations sought by MOD Films, on the grounds that these would be "inappropriate."*

Then the actors said they could grant none of the wishes sought by the MEAA Board, on the grounds that these would be "inappropriate."

Or at least I hope that what some of them say, though I don't know how hard that might hit them in the wallet. Look, the future is coming, and the MEAA can either join the 21st-century, or they can fade into irrelevance. Their choice, but the future already made its choice.

**fu3k a trollkoRe** (Score:-1, Offtopic)

by Anonymous Coward on Tuesday March 15, @07:58PM ([#11948476](#))

Startling turn Obsessives and the uncover a story oVf If you have mire of decay, Yes! moronic, dileetante of business and was Bottoms butt. Wipe are almost

**I suspect** (Score:0, Troll)

by [GeorgeMcBay \(106610\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @07:59PM (#11948480)

I suspect Creative Commons licensed work will just be assigned to shit that nobody wants anyway, just as "Free Software" licences are assigned to crappy software nobody wants to buy (eg, Linux).

- [Re:I suspect](#) by [usurper\\_ii](#) (Score:3) Tuesday March 15, @09:24PM

**Free music, go ahead suckers** (Score:2)

by [geekee \(591277\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @08:17PM (#11948657)

If everyone switches to creative commons, I'll never pay a cent for a movie or for music again. That's the economics of it for me.

--

"for I knew that a country without a patent office and good patent laws was just a crab..." - Mark Twain

**May not mean that much** (Score:2, Informative)

by [Jherek Carnelian \(831679\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @08:18PM (#11948672)

*the Australian equivalent of the Screen Actors Guild, the MEAA, has forbidden its members to work in Creative Commons productions. 'The MEAA Board decided that it could grant none of the dispensations sought by MOD Films, on the grounds that these would be inappropriate.'*

I'm sure I don't have the correct terminology, but in the USA independent productions (i.e. very little, if any pay) can get exemptions from SAG which allow union actors to officially work on the project - I guess there are still some minium standards they require of the production like workmans comp.

Furthermore, union actors often work on non-union projects under a pseudonym and to the best of my knowlege. no SAG member has ever been forced out of the union for working in a non-union project.

- [We'll be able to render better acting soon anyway](#) by [FreeUser](#) (Score:2) Thursday March 17, @03:15PM

**Public domain** (Score:1)

by [spywarearcata.com \(841806\)](#) on Tuesday March 15, @08:36PM (#11948849)

When I put a bunch of my stuff in the public domain in the mid 1990's I knew well that this was both irrevocable and that--if a person so chose--he or she could used the work in any way they wanted to, including commercially.

I have since seen several product contain my compilations. I see this as a good thing if my goal was (and it was) to make sure the material had a wide a distribution as possible, including free for the small shop just starting out.

Putting things simply into the public domain, especially in the age of the internet where it



can be easily found and cheaply retrieved, is still the way I would go.

**Union Ideal Gone Sour** (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on Tuesday March 15, @09:17PM (#11949183)

What's a union doing telling its members what they can or cannot do with their time? I'm a writer rather than an actor, but no writers union is going to tell me I can't write for free or place my work under a Creative Commons license.

A century ago, unions were thought to be one of mankind's great hopes. It was assumed they would stand up for workers against people such as John Rockefeller and Henry Ford, both notorious for crushing strikes with hired thugs.

Unfortunately, that's hasn't happened. Like the pigs in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, many present-day union officials seem to believe that some workers (themselves) are "more equal" than others. Sad.

--Mike Perry, Seattle, Author: *Untangling Tolkien*

**Re:Union Ideal Gone Sour** (Score:4, Informative)

by [werdna \(39029\)](#) on Wednesday March 16, @08:22AM (#11952042)

(<http://www.lawhacker.com/> | Last Journal: [Saturday July 26, @10:14AM](#))

Its more reasonable than it seems. Actors own a right to publicity, the commercial use of their image, which is only granted in part to the production company for certain conduct related to the sale of the film. They negotiate this reservation of rights with the production companies, who then do not overreach with individual actor agreements on the point. Thus, folks who want to use a commercial film clip outside the scope need to negotiate with the actors to do so. This provides some residual rights for all actors in the film.

The problem is that the standard provision gets in the way of the CC license. There is no obvious or practical solution here. The actors are asked to donate their right to publicity, which is simply outside the scope of the deal. The reason this provision is collectively negotiated serves largely to benefit the union members, but it does limit the scope of flexibility actors in the union have to give broader rights. And it does this by design.

Now, I'm a US lawyer, so I may just be guessing what is going on down under. But that would be the problem if the issue came up here.

[ [Parent](#) ]

**Artitsts?** (Score:3, Insightful)

by [k-zed \(92087\)](#) on Wednesday March 16, @03:28AM (#11951252)

(<http://hactar.net/> | Last Journal: [Sunday July 21, @04:11AM](#))

According to quite a number of articles here and on The Register, most (true) artists, authors and musicians were never really against file-sharing - it helps by spreading their work, lets more people experience their talent. It's just the traditional media company that doesn't like it's N-approaches-infinity percent profit margin diminished.

--

we discovered a new way to think.

**Star Dragon under CC license (Score:2)**

by [mbrother \(739193\)](#) <[mbrotherNO@SPAMuwyo.edu](mailto:mbrotherNO@SPAMuwyo.edu)> on Wednesday March 16, @04:13AM (#11951364)  
(<http://www.mikebrotherton.com/>)

My first novel is available for free download under a CC license at my website above. Sure, at some level this is a gimmick, free advertising, that I hope will help paperback sales. But it is there.

--

Professor of Astronomy, Author of Star Dragon (now available for FREE d/l)

**Why this is a good thing for actors... (Score:3, Insightful)**

by [Teancum \(67324\)](#) <[robert\\_horning.netzero@net](mailto:robert_horning.netzero@net)> on Wednesday March 16, @07:57AM (#11951971)  
(<http://127.0.0.1/> | Last Journal: [Saturday August 14, @12:21PM](#))

Please read through this before flaming away, and I'm not here trying to advocate that the MEAA is doing the right thing, but there is a point of view that has not been expressed yet here on /.

The point of a professional associations, wheither it is something like the American Medical Association (for doctors), the American Bar Association (for lawyers), or the Screen Actors Guild, is that you want to restrict exactly who is going to be a "member" of the club. Basically, this is a hold-over from the medieval trade guilds, where they viewed people practicing their "craft", if done in a free-for-all fashion could kill their entire industry. (BTW, I'm mainly familiar with these American institutions, but there are many others like this throughout the world).

One way that these organizations help to improve their "craft" or "profession" is to try and restrict membership in the form of formal certificates... often issued through a government and where possible even enforced and backed up by laws that make it illegal to practice that craft without possessing that certificate.

The purpose of this is to make a small pool of hopefully talented people where there will be enough work available to keep everybody comfortable, and raise wages for the members of the organization. Some sports player associations in the USA have done an incredibly good job at raising the salaries of its members, notably the Major League Baseball Players Association and the National Basketball Players Association.

In the case here, the MEAA is merely trying to cull out the riff raff and try to keep its members from getting involved in projects that would from their perspective lower the value of the rest of its members.

A comment was made on [another message board](#) [apc.org.au] that this would in effect keep unemployed actors from getting jobs. This is precisely what the intent is here, where they are trying to drive out in this case actors with low skill. By following the Creative Commons license it doesn't seem likely that actors participating in these projects will ever make substantial amounts of money. Indeed, the attempt here is that actors who are so desparate that they want to participate in films like this should not be in the profession anyway (from the viewpoint of the MEAA). By restricting its members they will (hopefully) be improving the income for its remaining members.

The danger in a situation like this for any guild-like organization is that non-members and ex-members may totally ignore the guild and either form a rival organization that permits the activity being banned (in this case a group that would be willing to work under the Creative Commons license), or that the guild would be so diluted in power due to small membership that it would be ineffective. This BTW is the problem with a guild-like organization for computer programmers (there are a few but fortunately/unfortunately they are all rather small).

If you think projects for actors involved with something like a project with the Creative Commons license (or other open source equivalent) could make some money, it would have to be from this financial aspect that you would have to encourage the MEAA.

Unfortunately, from experience with the open source movement I don't see this as a positive experience to compare what computer programmers are getting paid via open source programming projects vs. closed source programming projects. This isn't to say that humanity and mankind in general aren't better off for having open source projects, but from the perspective of a professional guild I can see that it is incompatible with the ideas of the open source community.

---

*I went to a Grateful Dead Concert and they played for SEVEN hours. Great song. -- Fred Reuss*

All trademarks and copyrights on this page are owned by their respective owners. Comments are owned by the Poster. The Rest © 1997-2005 [OSTG](#).

[ [home](#) | [awards](#) | [contribute story](#) | [older articles](#) | [OSTG](#) | [advertise](#) | [about](#) | [terms of service](#) | [privacy](#) | [faq](#) | [rss](#) ]