

Regarding the Doit de Suit

To whom it may concern,

As an artists daughter who was also his assistant and since my father's death the curator, archivist, repair person, photographer and historian for his work I am very much in favor of a doit de suit for artists and their heirs. I study the original sculpture books where my father recorded each sculpture he created and the details of their sales. I also keep up on auction records. It is always painful for me to see works that were originally sold for several hundred dollars in the 1950's come to auction or sale in a gallery and bring in many thousands of dollars. I wish that my father might have benefited from the higher sales and it seems morally unfair that strangers reap the benefits for something they paid very little for and had nothing to do with creating. Since I work mostly without any pay to provide photographs, exhibition history and identification of works to galleries and auction houses, and sometimes cleaning and repairing, although I do it out of love, I could also use some love (appreciation) in the form of money so I can maintain the studio and the work.

So I vote for the doit de suit. Since I have not read the proposal I am voting yes on the general idea of doit de suit. I would like to see the actual wording, and I would like it to be very favorable to the artist and their heirs.

Musicians, photographers, filmmakers and play-writes earn royalties on their works whenever they are performed, authors earn them on the sales of books. Why should visual artists (painters and sculptors) not be treated with the same respect.?

Sincerely,
D. Lassaw