Billie Abbott
Abbott Arts

As a new fine artist I have found the professional barriers-to-entry quite steep for the average person. Often, for fine artists, the traditional method of reaching an audience is fraught with technical, financial and even social difficulties that can far supersede the production of art in both time and effort. Artists, by necessity, must branch out into new territory. They must now explore the use of websites, social media, blogging, and v-logging, amongst other technologies. I use the term technologies because the barrier on the tech end is a steep mountain of instruction one must consume to become remotely proficient in the use of that tech. The same attention and cost that was once given to galleries and collectors is now being disseminated to a broader public. So, to monetize fine art through these media streams an artist must begin by developing a finished (and color corrected) image into an "imprint" commodity. At smaller (thumbnail) sizes an artist need not worry about their image being stolen off the internet and used as an imprint by companies looking to make a quick buck. But as the size and detail increases artists must take precautions to ensure their artwork does not become the next great coffee cup design, without the artist getting paid a royalty. The preferred method seems to be a watermark over the image to prevent non-credited imprinting, the mark being either visible or invisible on the internet. The visible option protects against internet use of the image for the financial gain of other website owners. With the visible watermark left intact the artist has the added benefit of getting free advertising from the viral dissemination of their artwork, even if illegal. And herein lies the problem. In order to make sales of their artwork, to collectors willing to pay a higher price for fine art prints or originals, the artist must place on the internet a reasonably large and detailed version of their artwork. At this point the artist becomes vulnerable to even moderately skilled Adobe® Photoshop users who can, and do, re-work the image to eliminate the maker's mark. Sometimes the watermark is covered so badly that the image is obviously altered. Yet, the image is used to make imprinted objects that can be sold on the black-market both in, and especially outside of the United States. Most individual artists cannot afford a legal team to go after these modern day pirates. And, often, cannot even afford the copyright registration fees. In addition, students (and professors) often misinterpret the "Fair Use" statute. They think because an item is on the internet it is fair game to use or reference on their websites, and even to turn into one-off items like t-shirts and coffee mugs. This is made all-the-worse when the maker's mark is removed or altered to hide the owner's identity. In addition to putting a bit more bite into copyright law i.e. allowing copyright cases to be heard in small claims court. It would be nice if the "Fair Use" statute had a bit more bite as well. In addition, I think Universities (I worked at a major University in California for over six years) should be the incubator for Copyright education. As it stands, copyright is often seen as an unenforceable joke, even amongst the administration.