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1736 m., tai galbūt būtų praejus kelerius metus po Didžiosios Jalių chartijos (Magna Charta) priėmimo, bet šis būtų turėjęs nustatyti anksčiau įtraukti ir kitų kūrinių plėtimą. Rašytojo bei gravieravimo skatinimas, simboliškai nusibėgęs tėvų pavyzdžių, tokių kaip jis patyrę arba dirbtis ir krašto išsirinkama ir krašto grafikas. Žodis po požiūri į įvairias nuosavųjį pasaulio politines Autorius turi įtaką nei tokiu skatinoje, kurią vaidina iššūkis, nes tai galbūt būtų spausdinta ir būtų išvystyta visą tarpą. Tokia išvadavimo arba dokumento teksto katės arba pagrindinio kūrinių tekstų kūrėjas, remiantis šiuo kūriniu, visiškai įtraukia ir krašto vaidmenį. Tai yra tikriausia teisė ir įvairiausios spaudos pavyzdžio darbu teksto kūrėjai, pavyzdžiui, šis skirtas įvairių tikslų. 

It's 1736, and yes, it may only be after a few years after the Magna Carta, but here in the United Kingdom we had "An Act for the Encouragement of the Arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other Prints, by vesting the Proprieties thereof in the Inventors and Engravers, during the Time therein mentioned". Word for word in this Act, "Copyright Act from "people of the law", we can clearly read what is exactly different from the daily, and generally needs protection. This is "Rogers' Act", and section One tells us something about the protection: "...That every person who shall invent, design, engrave, etch, or work, in mezzotint or chiaroscuro, or from his own works and in which he shall be designed and engraved, etched, or worked, in mezzotint or chiaroscuro, any historical or other print or prints, shall have the sole right and liberty of printing and repeating the same for the term of fourteen years, to commence from the day of first publishing thereof, which shall be truly engraved with the name of the proprietor on each plate, and printed on every such print or prints..." And what wonderful description of a free artist: "...every person who shall invent and design, or from his own works and in which he shall be designed and engraved, etched, or worked, shall have the sole right and liberty of printing and repeating the same for the term of fourteen years, to commence from the day of first publishing thereof, which shall be truly engraved with the name of the proprietor on each plate, and printed on every such print or prints..." And what wonderful description of a free artist: "...every person who shall invent and design, or from his own works and in which he shall be designed and engraved, etched, or worked, shall have the sole right and liberty of printing and repeating the same for the term of fourteen years, to commence from the day of first publishing thereof, which shall be truly engraved with the name of the proprietor on each plate, and printed on every such print or prints..."

This is the basis for the "The Copyright Act" in the United Kingdom, and it came before the international "Copyright Convention", the German-speaking world followed with the "Berne Convention".

Artist's books have their place in the free arts, but other books may more correctly belong to the domain of crafts after they pass judgment. It may seem that "other books" have been leading society for many years, but they could not be allowed without first stepping in the footsteps made by artist's books. Of course, I speak from the books of the "brothers Litho" and the like. I need to use an example. Typographers like an "every page", where "an apple" has the same emphasis as a "greenhouse murder". Artists don't like that kind of emphasis. Their story was original, they told their original story first-hand, it had emotion, and it should show that emotion in the way they intended. Expression is a emotion in a appropriate manner, thinking about the means and the circumstance, is the canvas of artists. A lot has been said about this contradiction, and is good to know about it, STERYNHO (Kossay), The protection juridiques des caractères typographiques (Geneva, Droz, 1981) p.11: "Bien pis qu'un brin industriel, les caractères typographiques sont une création artistique. Lorsque l'art n'est pas simplement de serveur de support de la pensée écrite, mais de l'illustrer. Comme le souligne A. Neppart: "L'esprit de la création en typographie, Paris 1922) "Le créateur de caractères doit donner vie à ses lettres, afin d'exprimer une idée nouvelle le lecteur de l'alphabet doit colorer les mots et la pensée moyennant la seule force de sa propre intuition, il doit avoir une phénoménos visage, un propre visage sur lequel peut apparaître une émotion". Le créateur de caractères compose ainsi l'apport intellectuel de l'auteur par une satisfaction visuelle directe. Sin semblant le lecteur par la forme esthétique qu'il associe à la valeur intrinsèque du texte, il s'attache comme artiste à part entière..." Newton v. Cws (1872), 7 Bing. 234 (C.P.) Best J. p. 245-246: "An engraver is always a copyist, and if engraving from drawings were not to be deemed within the dominion of the legislature, these acts would afford no protection to that useful body of men, the engravers. The engraver, al- though a copyist, produces a resemblance by means very different from those employed by the painter or draughtsman from whom he copies: "means, which require great labor and talent. The engraver produces his effects by the management of light and shade, or, as the term of his art expressed it, the chiaroscuro. The due degrees of light and shade are produced by different lines and dots: he who is the engraver must decide on the choice of the different lines or dots himself, and on his choice depends the success of his prints. If he copies from another engraver, he may see how the person that engraved that has produced the desired effect, and so without skill or intention becomes a cripple; the test: Brooks v. Dick (1880) 19 Ch. 22 (C.C.) James J. p.34: "Now, it appears to me that the protection given by the subsequent Acts to the engraver was intended to be, and was, commensurate with that which the engraver did - that the engraver did not acquire against anybody the right to that which was the work of the original painter, did not acquire any right to the design, did not acquire any right to the grouping or composition, because that was not his work, but the work of the original painter. What, as seems to me, the Act save