

# Sampling and copyright essay sample

[Art & Culture](#), [Artists](#)



The twenty first century will be marked in the history of music when sampling was on its top. Nowadays, musicians prefer to sample other musicians' works and not to create their own songs. To write this essay, I watched a documentary Copyright criminals. The documentary presents several significant ideas which will be revealed in this essay. The essay will consist of three parts, each answering a question: arguments for and against sampling, how copyright protected artists' profits and whether the copyright influenced the way of making music.

There are different arguments for and against sampling. While watching the documentary, I realized that those who sample always have arguments for it. On the contrary, people who prefer to record, make music on their own have many arguments against it.

### **Arguments for sampling:**

- It helps people feel closer to music legends who have passed already;
- It is a rather difficult process. Samplers spend hours and days to choose the right composition or a record;
- One of the samplers interviewed, presented an interesting theory. He stated that the world is changing and so should we. To make a picture is much easier than to paint it; nevertheless photography is still considered an art; the same goes for sampling.

### **Arguments against sampling:**

- Sampling may be considered stealing;
- This music is soulless;
- Lazy musicians prefer to sample;

- It is not real music;
- It is more difficult to make a record than a sample.

When speaking about the profit protection, it is worth to mention that nowadays all samplers should pay artists for using one's material. It does not matter, whether a sampler uses an entire song or only a part of it, or only some seconds of music. There were several laws developed which guarantee the payment. Besides, it is significant to determine the "value" of a song: if a song is legendary (e. g. one of The Beatles' song or The Queen's), it will obviously cost more to use the song for a sample. On the contrary, almost unknown songs are cheaper. However, there is one peculiarity. If there is a band and a sampler is willing to take only guitar or drum part, he or she will pay for it to a producer. However, there is not guarantee that a person who played that very part (a guitarist or a drummer) will be compensated.

When speaking about changes in music making with the appearance of copyright laws, there is no doubt that changes were significant. When watching the documentary, it became more and more clear that music making has changed since the last decade of the last century. The point is that in the end of the last century there were no copyright laws. When listening to some samples, it is clear that some of them resemble legendary songs. However, nowadays, samplers prefer to use only some seconds of a song so it does not resemble any other. Besides, every musician is willing one's song to be unique and authentic. Hence, samplers tend to present the compositions written mostly by themselves.

Time is changing and music is changing as well. In my opinion, samplers only try to follow all the tendencies. After watching the documentary and

analyzing, I would like to mention that samplers should definitely pay artists; on the other hand, the payment rules should not be so strict. The point is that some good high quality samplers give second life to a song.

Resources: