This paper will show the deep reason why antipiracy are taught to students as morally bad as stealing. Some people tend to assume that it is capital-incentive, as the companies that publish the antipiracy learning materials are doing the simplification as they want to make money for their publishing products. Yet, the essay will explain that the reason in depth is that how schools and a large part of the society value internet products doesn’t go along with the development of internet, and it is worth considering updating ways of perceiving a product under the growth of internet.

Let’s start with glimpsing the current situation of copyright education. As Gillespie shows in his article, as the arise of internet, it is easy for people to download free products like music, video, or articles without paying the publishing companies. It was not a problem before the appeal of internet as people need to pay for physical products like tapes or disks to listen to music or watch a film. Yet, on the internet, people can easily record the music or movie, which could cause the decrease in sells for these companies and even their disappearance. To protect the industries, the organizations that speak for them start the campaign to produce educational materials for students aged less than primary school to junior high. To let students better understand, the complicated and ambiguous copyright law and reality is summarized. Yet it is summarized in a particular way that is beneficial to trading of producing industries like movie or song. The learning materials summarize piracy as a morally bad thing as theft and prohibited almost all kinds of copy, even some kinds have possibility to allow according to law. The issue strikes the concern of some people including the writer.

Some people might suppose the root of the problem is the capital seeking for high profits. The producing industries choose their prefer interpretation of the copyright rule and instill the idea into students’ mind leading their behaviors as future citizens to be beneficial to the companies. Yet, if the learning materials are only good for the commerce, why would the teachers and schools use them to teach the children? The teachers would teach to something to students only when they think it is beneficial to the development of children. Thus, as the campaign led by the trade organizations could be prevalent among schools, it can be inferred that the teachers also agree with the value raised in the learning materials and suppose it is necessary to teach them to the students to get them prepared for using the internet properly. The schools agree with the value provided by the learning material that it is wrong to use pirate and it is necessary to pay for the productions as they are produced by others’ hard work. They also think it is ethnically right to pay to the companies as it shows “respect” to the producer (220). What’s more, they stand with the view that as students could be the future producers, and if they want others to pay and respect their work, they should start with paying and respecting other’s product (). These values not only are beneficial for companies to make money but are regarded reasonable to schools. Also, as public can influence what is taught at schools and they allow students to understand piracy as simplified moral mistake, the public also agree with the value raised in the students’ learning materials. Therefore, though the prevail of the campaign is connected to the capital expansion, but the fundamental reason is schools and public’s idea towards production on the internet.

Their idea is questionable as they envision the product like songs and videos released on the internet in the way that they do before the spreading of internet and swallow the possibility of giving value to production like music and video in new ways with the help of developing technologies. As Gillespie states, “Classroom pedagogy tries to keep up with the changing technological and social world but does so with a conservative bent” (230). In other words, the schools want to teach student the right way to engage with the internet and use the internet resource properly, yet they regard paying for the producing companies as the only right way, which is how they have legal access of products like music and videos before internet age. They stick to their old cognition and teach it to students.

Yet, internet opens possibility to new ways to value a product and for the producers to make money. For example, as it is easy to copy, recreate or transmit the products, the products can be valued as its influence and flow, and make money by using their influence. (There might be a quote discussing the problem). Recreation, which will inevitably concern copy, can also be regarded as creation, add value to the original products, and allow new types of artists to appear. For instance, the popular memes on the internet always concern copy others’ work and are more unique with netizen adding more things to the original products. Also, some songs can become pervasive by being used by many video makers. Though video makers don’t pay for the song directly, the influence can bring value the products spiritually and economically. To summarize, some kinds of copy in the internet age, have the potential to transform the way of measuring products from the single way of how much they charge to more diverse ways. Yet, the possibility brought by the internet is hindered by schools and the public teaching students that copy is morally bad and hardly allowed. Then, students, as the future main users of internet, are less likely to explore the new value system of products which connects to copy.

To conclude, it is less than enough to attribute the over summarization of how to cope with copy and piracy in the antipiracy campaign among students to the capital’s invasion. The deeper reason is that schools and many people in the society tend to value products on the internet in a pre-internet way and swallow the possibility to new ways of valuation. Yet, it is still possible that the schools and the public’s value is also influenced by the capital power. It is worthy to consider the possibility and think about how the capital intertwine with the thought of society.
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