

.

From: Drew Lipsher [Lipsher@greycroftpartners.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 12:18 AM
To: Sina Simantob
Subject: RE: Long time no talk!!

Thanks Sina. I would not want stealing anyone's Thunder. I am excited to spend time with the whole team and meet Nancy. It is important to see the home turf and kick the tires. I look forward to getting together with in NY at your convenience. Just let me know when.

In the meantime, on a personal level, I understand the ask forgiveness and not permission strategy. It is a hard one to swallow as an investor knowing what I know, but the labels have been so horrible and naïve that I think it is the only thing that makes sense. I also think that when the labels finally settle with Spotify (and I hear they are close), that will make your life better as well.

As for financing, while Greycroft maybe not be a good fit at that time (although you never know), maybe we get something in the end. Worst case is I come and help build the whole thing!

Drew

Andrew B. Lipsher
Partner
Greycroft, LLC
601 Lexington Avenue; 53rd Floor
New York, New York 10022

212-419-2444 (office)
917-455-5261 (mobile)
lipsher@greycroftpartners.com

From: Sina Simantob [mailto:sina@highlandcityclub.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 12:12 AM
To: Drew Lipsher
Subject: RE: Long time no talk!!

I can make it to Gainesville next week but I know that Sam is really excited about having you there all to himself. Then there is Nancy who wants to meet with you and talk shop re Grooveshark, Spyderlynk and more. So if I show up I'll steal his thunder. Sam and Josh have gotten a lot done recently so they want to show off a bit and get your advice and stamp of approval that they are on the right track.

Briefly, we bet the company on the fact that it is easier to ask for forgiveness than it is to ask for permission. When EMI sued, everyone thought it is the end of the company. Once we settled that suit everyone said EMI was weak anyway so the real Goliath to beat is UMG. Well it took the boys a bit before they could re-group but I think these guys have a real chance to settle with UMG within a year and by that time they'll be up to 35m uniques and a force to be dealt with.

Personally I rather hook up with you in NY one-on-one, meanwhile, I really appreciate your taking the time to visit them in their own humble home turf and I know that they will remember all your help after they settle with UMG and go out to get the big C round that I know you are interested in.

8/11/2010

From: Jia Gottlieb (jia@stillmountain.com)
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2009 5:17 PM
To: Sina Simantob
Subject: Re: Groovespark in 1 Year

Sina,
Sina,

This is EXCITING. Staying in the saddle as you dodge the bullets and jump the fences will make for a thrilling ride. If possible I'd love to be a fly on the wall at your Dec. 18 meeting.

Jia

On Tue, Dec 1, 2009 at 8:16 PM, Sina Simantob <sina@highlandcityclub.com> wrote:

Josh, you may have missed your call as a writer. This is an excellent review.
The only thing that I want to add is this: we are achieving all this growth without paying a dime to any of the labels.
My favorite story related to our case is the story of a kid who appears in front of the judge for sentencing for the crime of having murdered both his parents, saying "judge, have mercy on me cuz I am an orphan."
In our case, we use the label's songs till we get a 100m uniques, by which time we can tell the labels who is listening to their music where, and then turn around and charge them for the very data we got from them, ensuring that what we pay them in total for streaming is less than what they pay us for data mining.
Let's keep this quite for as long as we can.
Alex, we still need you to do the report outlining all of our recent data like last month's \$135K revenue, deals in progress, the Inverness deal closed, etc. But we no longer need this report for our investors cuz the \$3m Bridge round is done, as much as we need it for the internal team and the December 18 Board meeting in Boulder.
On the Label front, Merlin has their full contract and we are waiting for their final feedback, but I'd say that's 90% done. Sony is coming along well with our next meeting scheduled for Monday. We have got Warner's feedback and it ain't pretty, but neither is their financial condition so this may turn out to be another long-and-hard fight. We have opened a channel to Universal but it is too early to say where they stand.
Great teamwork. Now lets kick some serious ass.
Sina

REDACTED

From: Sina Simantob <sina@highlandcityclub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2010 1:05 AM
To: Ring, David <david.ring@umusic.com>
Cc: Sam Tarantino <sam.tarantino@escapemg.com>
Subject: Catching up

Hi David,

Hope this note finds you well.

Late last week Grooveshark received the paperwork re UMG's suit.

I am writing to acknowledge that we are now officially on notice and will respond within 30 days; and to own up to the fact that I promised you a Term Sheet by mid-December and did not deliver, so no hard feelings on the receipt of the legal docs. We acknowledge the fact that Grooveshark owes UMG for the use of its valuable content, and plan to settle this case to everyone's satisfaction hopefully sooner than later so that we can focus on future cooperation.

I also want to let you know that from the start we knew that Universal is in a class of its own, and that we'll never get a second chance to make a first best impression. So, since I was not able to secure a face-to-face meeting with you and your team to explain why we are more than a Freemium service started by a couple of collage kids, I spent a lot of time finding common colleagues who could act as a bridge between us. In retrospect, I realize that this may have been a mistake.

I respect rules and laws, so I'll leave it up to our mutual lawyers to do what they do best to protect us. But since our main objective is to secure the necessary licenses to use UMG's music for our mutual benefit, I want to know if it is possible to expedite and advance our cause on parallel tracks so that while our lawyers talk, we can take the lead and continue to explore a solution that works for UMG and Grooveshark.

As I stated before, Sam and I are more than willing to fly out to LA to meet with you and your team to introduce ourselves, discuss Grooveshark's vision and why VCs like Intel would like to finance us; and hopefully explain why we think Grooveshark has the key to monetize all digital content, including music, to the benefit of users and right's holders, including UMG.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sina Simantob
Executive Chairman
Escape Media Group

digital music news

home

search

Login

Username
Password

login

forgot your password?

Register to access archived stories or to receive the Daily Snapshot email.

Jobs

The latest openings. Complete list here.



Label Relations Manager
eMusic
New York, NY

Interactive Marketing Rep
EMI CMG
Brentwood, TN

Marketing Director
Om Records/Om Entertainment Group
San Francisco, CA

Strategic Sales Manager
Beeblemusic

Manager, Marketing
EMI CMG
Brentwood, TN

Senior Manager, Music Product Management
Sonos
Santa Barbara, CA or Cambridge, MA

Direct Sales Manager
Mexican Summer/Kemado Records
Brooklyn, NY

VP Business Development
Shindig
NYC

King Crimson Can't Get Their Music Off of Groovespark. So They cc'd Digital Music News...

paul

Thursday, October 13, 2011

The following are excerpts from a lengthy and angry email exchange between King Crimson guitarist Robert Fripp, his team, and Groovespark. It dates back at least two months, and reveals a fruitless attempt to clear Groovespark of Fripp's materials. We were cc'd on the thread today.

Date: September 13th, 2011
From: Declan Colgan
To: Groovespark SVP Paul Geller

This is not simply about takedowns.

Most of the material taken down over the weekend has already re-appeared.

This is about that fact that Groovespark has, repeatedly, allowed this material to be made available illegally, despite numerous notices that this represents an infringement of the copyrights involved: from Grayzone (one behalf of the copyright owner), from myself (as the licensee of the material) & communications that have been personally addressed directly to the company by the copyright holder Robert Fripp.

Irrespective of whether or not a third party label did warrant to Groovespark that they had such rights (& Virgin/EMI - mentioned by Mr. Ford in writing to a fan who asked the question recently as having granted such licenses to Groovespark assure us that they did not grant such rights), they are not the copyright owners & would have had no rights to do so.

I can ask Mark Furman, a senior lawyer at the company & copied on this note to confirm this yet again if it will help?

You ask for time & patience from us on the basis that "takedowns have been honored", yet your site continues to offer King Crimson music illegally to the public.

That deserves public comment.

If you were taking our position "seriously", you would disable the facilities to search & upload King Crimson music as you do for other artists.

- Declan

Reply.
From: Geller
To: Colgan, Robert Fripp, David Singleton, Mark Fumer (Virgin Music), et. al.

Declan,

I think I've been respectful of your position and I don't object personally to your public commentary. I just said that it doesn't make me take you more seriously, because I already do. I'm trying to find a solution that fits your needs. Thank you for your understanding.

-Paul

Date: September 13th, 2011
From: Robert Fripp
To: Geller

dear mr. geller,

<http://groovespark.com/#/search/song?q=king+crimson>

my assumption is that you have not yet managed to find a solution that fits (our) needs.

sincerely, rf.



Most Read Stories

[30 Years Of Music Industry Change In 30 Seconds Or Less...](#)

[What an Artist Really Gets Paid, Continued...](#)

[King Crimson Can't Get Their Music Off of Groovespark. So They cc'd Digital Music News...](#)

[This Morning, Groovespark Sent Us This Angry Email...](#)

[We Just Tested Spotify's Facebook And It's Got Serious Issues...](#)

[We Asked Rhapsody What They Pay Artists And This Is What They Said...](#)

[fast-forward to October 13th...]

From: David Singleton
To: Groovespark SVP Paul Geller

Dear Paul,

I read your [recent interview in Digital Music News](#) with interest. With regard to artist's rights you clearly stated:

"You have complete control over what you put on Groovespark and what you don't."

This seems to be at odds with our own experience, where we have NO choice about what we put on Groovespark. The only choice we are offered is over how much of our time and money we wish to waste in REMOVING items from a service we have never chosen to engage with - a completely different scenario.

You will appreciate that there is huge difference between someone inviting a guest into their home (where they have a choice in advance) and someone moving into your home uninvited and then giving you the chance to evict them. Particularly if that same uninvited guest returns every day until they are evicted again - at your own expense.

Have Groovespark changed their modus operandi, or is your statement to Digital Music News utterly misleading as it quite clearly implies that artists put their music onto Groovespark and choose what to present?

Best

David Singleton

Reply.

Hey David,

I am going to leave Paul Resnikoff CCed on this email against my better judgement but I removed Aaron Ford since he no longer works for us. I hope you let Paul know that I don't just respond to emails like this while he is watching but take time with unhappy artists like the one you represent whenever necessary - suffice to say that your case is the only one I felt it necessary to be involved with. Ever.

Your experience with Groovespark was unique in that you followed the procedures to a T, we claimed to have removed the links to your content, but as you demonstrated, they remained intact. I have never seen that happen before. After finding that, there was an exhaustive review of what technical procedures could have caused it and we put two additional safety nets in place to help prevent it from happening to you or anyone else again.

I'll spare you the technical details except to say: we found a bug. We didn't see that it had ever effected anyone before. Fixed the bug and now monitor it to make sure it never effects you or anyone else. I thought we resolved that after our last email thread since I had not heard back from you or Declan.

The fact that it ever reached my desk was regrettable in that the conversations escalated through Aaron. There was some idea that your content had been delivered by a label but wasn't completely ingested. (We've had some ingestion problems this year that were producing weird results like that.) I don't know where that mistruth originated but I know what I saw in email threads prior to my involvement. I saw some opportunities to handle your case better.

Long story short: We're sorry. I'm sorry. Aaron is sorry. Not our M.O. but we made changes anyway. Email me if you ever have a problem again.

-Paul

@Paul Resnikoff, I'd appreciate it if you didn't publish my email. I think I've given you enough as of late but if you find it within your realm of journalistic responsibility to do so, I won't hold it against you.

Like

118 people like this. Be the first of your friends.

Leave a Comment • View Comments Flat

Comment By: megan

Thursday, October 13, 2011

more utter bullshit from groovespark.

I have tried repeatedly, yet failed, to have my material removed from the platform. I get no response to anything filed through their DMCA channel and emails (nearly 30 of them) direct to the company go ignored.

I was never asked if I want my music to be on there (I don't), no effort has ever been made to contact me once it was (I found out by chance), and I can't get it removed.

Grooveshark are worse than any 'pirates' out there. They are a bunch of people in Florida who want to become rich from ripping off artists who have neither the stamina nor powerful enough lawyers to fight them.

People like Grooveshark are the cancer of the music world and should be shut down as soon as possible.

Reply

Comment By: You should read this:

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Comment By: Ben

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Stop sending the DMCA notices to the scammers themselves. They have no respect for artists. Instead, send the notices directly to their hosting provider.

safe harbor = hosting provider

You send a DMCA notice to YouTube directly because they have their own servers (Google empire).

Grooveshark is hosted by Level3 (level3.com). This hosting company's DMCA designated agent information is on this page:

level3.com/en/network-security/designation-of-agent/

Put the pressure on the hosting companies themselves. And if any company lies to you or tries to cover a scammer, go public and ask all the other artists to never do business with the hosting company that had this mafia behavior.

Hurt them where it hurts the most...

<http://www.digitalmusicnews.com/stories/10171grooveshark>

Reply

Comment By: @EricSongza

Thursday, October 13, 2011

Eric Davich
This is amazing.

Reply

Comment By: Joda

Thursday, October 13, 2011

Nice expose Paul! Keep up the good work!

Reply

Comment By: Trumped4399

Thursday, October 13, 2011

I guess you gotta add King Crimson to that list of artists who'd gladly spit in the faces of the bottomfeeders at Grooveshark...

Grooveshark — how does it feel to be so universally hated by artists?

Reply

Comment By: tony colman

Thursday, October 13, 2011

more utter gash from Grooveshark. They have no respect for creators whatsoever. They do not take down content if you ask them to, and they upload content illegally. They make Pirate Bay look good. At least PB don't pretend to be hollier than thou.

Reply

Comment By: blu mar ten

Thursday, October 13, 2011

+1 on the grooveshark hate from artists.

getting stuff removed from there is next to impossible unless you want to make it a full-time job.

fuck you grooveshark, fuck you

	Reply
<p>Comment By: Food For Thought</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>What Megan reports above is verbatim to what I've heard dozens of times.</p> <p>All indications are that Groovespark's takedown mechanism is a ruse intended to exhaust and frustrate artists & labels while making their site appear to be DMCA compliant.</p> <p>Don't believe me (or the others posting same here)? Try to get a track you own/control taken down (and if you do get it down watch how quickly it "mysteriously" goes back up).</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: Mich</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>"Ingestion problems"? I'm having a bit of trouble swallowing that.</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: Visitor</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Haha http://groovespark.com/#/album/In+The+Court+Of+The+Crimson+King/5049111</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: Visitor</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Still up: http://groovespark.com/s/The+Court+Of+The+Crimson+King/3d30tp?src=5</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: lcart210</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Exposing these conversations brings far more pressure to bear than the most exhaustive article. Really appreciate it, Paul. Keep up the great work.</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: JSS</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>*yawn*</p> <p>How long will people continue to gripe about file sharing and oline streams? Aren't we in year 13 of this same old debate. The landscape has changed. You can't put it back in the box. Bread's also more expensive than it was in 1970. That's how it goes. Evolve or die.</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: Steve</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Evolve or die?</p> <p>Simple-minded argument. Historically, as technology has evolved, copyright law has evolved along with it. Not just "died." The rights of artist and songwriters aren't simply thrown out the window.</p> <p>Jeez -- try to at least contribute <i>something</i> of value to the conversation.</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: Bread IS more expensive</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>And it doesn't become more affordable when the artist gets ripped off.</p> <p>I've heard this lame response more than I care to remember. Would you work for free, or worse yet, have your labor stolen?</p>	
	Reply
<p>Comment By: tom thumb</p> <p>Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>clarify for me - you seem to be saying that if some new technology arrives that allows wannabe tech company millionaires to take what you create without giving you anything in return, you're some sort</p>	

of stick-in-the-mud for not cheering and going along with it?

"there is huge difference between someone inviting a guest into their home (where they have a choice in advance) and someone moving into your home uninvited and then giving you the chance to evict them. Particularly if that same uninvited guest returns every day until they are evicted again - at your own expense."

Reply

Comment By: What?

Saturday, October 22, 2011

There's a huge difference here. This isn't simple filesharing. This is a bunch of punks making MILLIONS of dollars on the backs of these artists. These artists are getting ZERO compensation.

I e-mail you a track, fine. You really should technically have bought it, but who cares? I've shared albums with friends, send them copies. It's all good. Even torrenting is cool. Why? Because for the most part, people aren't directly profiting off of this. Beyond that, tracking down exactly what you're looking for and then building your collection of improperly tagged tracks is a pain in the ass. It's much easier to just go to grooveshark. For the less than tech-savvy it's the bomb! A single website with search-click-play functionality, all built into a legit/legal looking operation. That way, even those who have probably never used P2P in their lives and those who might think they're not doing anything scummy jump on board and and enjoy the freebies.

People then sit there and think, "Man. Pandora is crap. I can't listen to whatever I want, I have to sit through those lame-ass audio ads, and I can only skip forward a limited number of times. I'm going to grooveshark. They run ads too. So the artists must be getting a piece there too." Most of the uninformed masses fail to realize that Pandora has licensing agreements in place and is playing by the books. That's how they're (barely) able to offer a free service. Meanwhile, these chumps at Grooveshark are pocketing virtually ALL of the ad revenue they bring in. I'm not a musician and am in no way involved in the music industry. But I know wrong when I see it. And Grooveshark is just plain wrong.

Reply

Comment By: contentprovidernot

Monday, October 24, 2011

You don't understand the problem.

Reply

Comment By: What's a "mistruth"?

Friday, October 14, 2011

That has to be one of the funniest things I've read lately.

My kids tell me mistruths all the time, apparently. But I can send them to their room. Can't do that here, unfortunately.

Excellent post.

Reply

Comment By: Steve

Friday, October 14, 2011

I feel all the hate towards Grooveshark is justified. Yes, things are moving towards that direction, and I fully support it, as a musician and a music fan. The cat's out of the bag, so to speak, and as much as my life would potentially be easier if it was 1993, I haven't played an actual CD in years. Haven't had to.

The only thing that bugs me about this is while Grooveshark is trying to circumvent the issues that other sites are having, you can't find Crimson music on any 'legit' streaming site either. As a King Crimson fan, I think much of that music is timeless and should be available to be discovered by younger musicians, and it frustrates me that Fripp is so determined to keep his music away from them. At least I was able to upload my Crimson (and Beatles. And Zep. And AC/DC) collection to Google Music.

Reply

Comment By: Oh, honestly.

Friday, October 14, 2011

RF's music is readily available. He just insists that it's come by honestly. There is absolutely no truth in the implication that he is trying to keep his music away from people.

Reply

Comment By: Kev

Friday, October 14, 2011

Here's the net take away from this story -- and from similar stories that will inevitably come out in the future.

Grooveshark loses.

Regardless of how well arguments are made, pro or con, in this silly comments section — Grooveshark loses. The headline says it all — and that is the take-away in the minds of the collective public. That GS is part of the problem, and not artist advocates.

GS wants so badly to be in the same conversation as MOG, Rdio, Spotify and the other more legitimate streaming sites. But they're most often not. Articles like these — with damning headlines, no less — are each a nail in their eventual coffin. Their investors (Michael Buckley @ Intel Capital), their brand sponsors, their advertisers — even the artists they choose to promote — they'll eventually fall by the wayside. The reason being: the cons of the association with Grooveshark exceed the pros. Essentially, there's too much residual stink associated with GS.

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Friday, October 14, 2011

When told for the umpteenth time by Declan Colgan and Robert Fripp to remove unauthorised King Crimson and related material (for which all recording copyrights are owned outright by Fripp) from their site, Groove\$hark's "VP of Legal Affairs" responded:

Mr. Panegyric and Mr. Fripp:

I am surprised by your complete lack of professionalism and diligence...

I think this tells you what kind of outfit they are - they're completely in the wrong and know it, but rather than apologise, make amends and clean up their act, they prefer to sling mud.

Parasites, pure and simple.

Reply

Comment By: HA

Friday, October 14, 2011

I love that people think anyone at Grooveshark actually makes money.

Reply

Comment By: lol

Friday, October 14, 2011

Comment By: HA

I love that people think anyone at Grooveshark actually makes money. "

no one thinks that they make money. we know this because they don't pay any of us.

what we object to is them trying to build a business without paying for any of the construction materials.

as someone said above - parasites

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Friday, October 14, 2011

\$2million a month and 'profitable' by their own reckoning

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Friday, October 14, 2011

Here are profiles of the gentleman who accused Robert Fripp and his licensee of a "complete lack of professionalism" when they asked Groove\$hark to stop illegally streaming their copyright recordings.

His name is Marshall Custer and he plays the drums.

www.linkedin.com/pub/marshall-custer/4/153/409
www.colorado.edu/law/careers/profiles/custer.htm

Reply

Comment By: @amaccardo

Friday, October 14, 2011

Anthony Accardo

Absolutely outrageous

Reply	
Comment By: @LondonElek Friday, October 14, 2011	
London Elektnicity	
good to see Grooveshark maintaing their rep for illegally uploading music.	
Reply	
Comment By: WILL Friday, October 14, 2011	
Paul, you're gonna be taking Hypbot's ad revenue real soon! It's kicking off on here!	
Reply	
Comment By: LOL Friday, October 14, 2011	
at this comment	
Reply	
Comment By: @Alternate1985 Friday, October 14, 2011	
Nick Mango	
It's 12:57pm est, and I can still listen to King Crimson on Grooveshark.	
Reply	
Comment By: Theo Aronson Friday, October 14, 2011	
kudos to both Pauls for how they handled themselves	
Reply	
Comment By: justin1992 Friday, October 14, 2011	
Uh -- sounds like a mangement shuffle is long over-due at good 'oi Grooveshark...	
What a bunch of hacks.	
Occupy Grooveshark!!	
Hahahaha...	
Reply	
Comment By: Indie Label Friday, October 14, 2011	
We had this exact same experience with an extremely similar email exchange.	
Totally and blatently illegal and they don't care. They're hoping to sell to someone before anyone calls them on it and walk away with cash.	
Reply	
Comment By: Darren Friday, October 14, 2011	
I know this is the kind of sensational bull that Paul R thrives on, but for some reason or another, I expected more out of the digitalmusicnews community.	
This is what I hear ad nauseum from the majority of content holders and industry authorities (work at majors, indies, management, artists, etc.)	
-since Napster, the industry is evolving to some kind of cloud-based access model (remains to be seen exactly what this will look like in ~5 years)	
-teens (the next generation of music buyers) almost never pay to listen to music because they don't feel they have to. Again, Napster reeducated the consumer side of the industry into this mindset and that's never changing. This being the next generation of music consumers, this leads to hopes of bundling and subscription revenues which leads to..	
-they really hope subscription model works, but VERY few people are hopeful considering there would need to be ONE winner to meet the kind of numbers that would pay out everyone who owns a piece of the content. I say 'very' few because anyone who looks at the numbers knows that Spotify has to reach a RIDICULOUS number of subscribers before they can become profitable and start paying actual revenues	

rather than the money Sean Parker and the rest of their VCs gave them to start

-Grooveshark is a 'disrupter' (more on this to follow)

-No one, and I mean, NO ONE is happy about per-stream pay outs. If you're an artist or a manager and you're banking on per-stream payouts being your major revenue generator for the future, you need to start looking into the alternative revenue streams that are going to fund the careers of the musicians with slightly more business-savvy.

I don't agree with everything Grooveshark's done in the past. For the majority of their time around, they've been a young company that's made some pretty immature decisions. What I do believe is that Grooveshark's model of free-to-play, unlimited access to music is what's going to prevail, if not in 5, certainly in the next 10 years.

*Technology takes consumers ahead,
copyright laws fight to keep up,
a newly realized industry is born via new revenue streams.*

As a content rights holder, I'm doing my best to learn the lesson from 10 years ago the industry failed at when they flipped the finger to both consumers and 'Napster', the disrupter that absolutely changed this industry for the better. Now 'that's an outrageous statement' is what you're saying because we still haven't figured out how to become a \$40 billion/year industry yet, but we'll get there. This industry is better than ever because...

-more music is being created than ever before

-more people are listening than ever before

Reply

Comment By: Andrea Friday, October 14, 2011

Snooze...

And Grooveshark as *disrupter*? Please, you insult truly disruptive technologies by this statement. No one is trying to stop new technology — in fact, we clearly welcome it. But models that rip off artists won't last. The tide will turn.

What to do with the monies *not* being paid out for artist royalties? Grooveshark should a great crisis PR firm and try dearly to find a positive spin out of all this...

(Kudos to Digital Music News...)

Reply

Comment By: Darren Friday, October 14, 2011

Clearly. This industry is well known for embracing the technology leaps.

/unnecesecary sarcasm

But in all seriousness and so I understand where you're coming from, is your point that per stream royalties are going to be the major revenue generators for artists in our 'new industry'?

Reply

Comment By: pissed off artist Friday, October 14, 2011

all utterly irrelevant.

what grooveshark are doing by allowing unmoderated upload of artist material then refusing to take it down is basically saying that you have no option but to be raw material in their build-a-business-model experiment.

If artists don't want to be a part of it why are they being forced into it?!?!?

Whether the artists are short-sighted or not is neither here nor there. Their *right* to be short-sighted is being removed from them in order to build someone else's business that they will never see any benefit from, and that is simply *wrong*.

Reply

Comment By: Andrea Friday, October 14, 2011

Amen, PissedOffArtist.

Groovesharks arrogance amazes me.

Reply

Comment By: Darren

Friday, October 14, 2011

I agree with you on that. Grooveshark needs to figure out their ingestion problems.

Reply

Comment By: Indie Label

Friday, October 14, 2011

Darren,

What you're saying is that since someone figured out away to give artists stuff away for free, artists are dumb for not letting them? You're saying that artists and labels are not "business savvy" because they want to be paid for their work? That's literally the opposite of "business savvy."

What you're seeing is one group of folks who play by the rules (laws) and another group who, since they're not collectible monetarily, don't really have any motivation to follow those rules. This is how YouTube built a business on Viacom properties and sold to Google for a bagillion dollars; then google was immediately sued by Viacom.

The OTHER option, the one that makes sense, the one that's "savvy," is that artists and labels stop laying down and accepting this "people think music is free" (which, by the way, isn't true... iTunes sells a metric assload of music every day). If everyone who makes music decides to stick up for themselves and demand to be paid what they deserve... then it's no longer the "reality."

Oh, well, people are stealing all our shit... we'd be dumb not to let them.

Bull.

Reply

Comment By: Indie Label

Friday, October 14, 2011

Also, Darren...

Your statement, which is echoed by many, that teens don't buy music is compeltely not true. Do you have any idea where you first heard that statement? Probably from someone else who heard it from someone who heard it from the guy who totally made it up because it sounded right.

It's False.

You want proof? Justin Bieber has \$100 Million + in iTunes sales of proof.

Apparently you think that's 65-year-old coal miners downloading Biebs.

If people stopped ASSUMING these things as given; and scams like Grooveshark would stop taking it upon themselves to "liberate" other people's content... that would allow the industry to creat a solution that works for everyone.

Until then, look at an actual number/statistic now and then.

Reply

Comment By: Anon Coward

Friday, October 14, 2011

http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=king+crimson

7,380 Results and Counting

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Friday, October 14, 2011

what's your point? youtube have a proper payment structure in place and are paying out no problem - i make a lot of money from youtube plays.

They also have a dmca process that works and take stuff down within 24 hours or less.

no problem with youtube at all. loads of problems with grooveshark though.

Reply

Comment By: The Laughing Man

Friday, October 14, 2011

You get paid for views of content uploaded by users other than yourself? Man, my understanding of how youtube advertising works is way off.

I must assume then that isn't the case and you do periodic searches of youtube's content yourself and submit takedown requests. AFAIK, isn't that exactly how you'd deal with Grooveshark or any other company that has to abide by the DMCA?

I'm not a lawyer, but I don't know of any minimum/maximum time someone has to complete the DMCA process. I'd think anything within a few days would be acceptable.

The original point of posting that search URL is because others have been posting Grooveshark search URL's in a similar format. If the shit pot is going to be stirred I'm one to ensure that *all* the shit gets stirred.

If the copyright holder of King Crimson want's to exercise their owner rights I'd hope that they'd do so to all DMCA compliant sites.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Friday, October 14, 2011

You get paid for views of content uploaded by users other than yourself? Man, my understanding of how youtube advertising works is way off.

Yes, exactly so. You get on youtube's content program and you get paid for plays regardless of who uploaded it. In fact the more people that upload your stuff the better it is for you. We make good quality videos for our tracks and give them out free to our fans to stick on their channels specifically for this reason. It helps them by giving them decent quality content for their channels and saves them the hassle of have to create videos, and it helps us because we get paid for the plays and get to control the quality of the content.

I must assume then that isn't the case and you do periodic searches of youtube's content yourself and submit takedown requests. AFAIK, isn't that exactly how you'd deal with Grooveshark or any other company that has to abide by the DMCA?

No, see above. The difference is youtube honours takedown requests and deals with them immediately whereas Grooveshark just ignores them.

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Saturday, October 15, 2011

Hello Visitor, thanks for your comment.

> We make good quality videos for our tracks and give them out free to our fans to stick on their channels specifically for this reason.

Great - but other musicians prefer not to give away their recordings free, which is really what this row with Groove\$hark is about.

Reply

Comment By: Jon b.

Friday, October 14, 2011

For what it is worth, Mr. Geller responded almost immediately to an email from us and promised to act quickly on our take-down request.

Jon b.
Valley Entertainment

Reply

Comment By: Haha

Friday, October 14, 2011

Of course he's going to act quickly, now that he has completely humiliated himself, and his company!

Geller isn't going to amount to much in this business the way he conducts himself...

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Saturday, October 15, 2011

For what it is worth, Mr. Geller responded almost immediately to an email from us and promised to act quickly on our take-down request.

Jon b. (Valley Entertainment)

Thanks Jon. Unfortunately it probably isn't worth much; Groove\$hark have repeatedly promised Declan Cogan and Robert Fripp they will take down illegal materila, but it always reappears.

This suggests they don't really want to sort out the problem.

Reply

Comment By: GR8FL	Saturday, October 15, 2011
<p>Just wondering how Robert Fripp, King Crimson, Porcupine Tree, et al thinks they are going to expose their music; attract new fans and keep their current ones with their seeming investment in the archaic business model in this digital age that we currently are in? I truly believe that musicians should be fairly compensated for their work and nobody should be ripping anyone off, but there has to be some realism inserted into this thread.</p> <p>I am just a regular person who happens to like a lot of music. Personally, I have invested thousands and thousands of \$\$ over the years. But I am not going to buy anything that I have never heard of. Because of the Internet and sites such as GS (which I don't like much for other reasons), I have been exposed to more new music than through any combined medium which includes XM/Sirius (also on the decline). Once upon a time I used to go to record stores and sample vinyl records. I would walk in having no intention to buy anything, only to walk out an hour later having purchased 20 albums, all because I sampled a few tracks. The same held true when I purchased CDs. But the demise of local music retailers has curtailed this experience.</p> <p>It's only been through the Internet and sites that allow music to be streamed that has served to 'market' music for free for the recording industry. Because of the Internet, I have discovered plenty of music which has resulted in spending large amounts of money on CDs, digital downloads, upgraded audio software/hardware, shows, merchandise, etc. I know 1000s of people that have done the same. I just don't get how the recording industry refuses to see how this all benefits them. But instead of being grateful, they bury their head in the sand and refuse to understand how their artists are promoted at no cost to them at all.</p> <p>And yes, GS was wrong to not have honored the takedown request when first asked. I will also respect the wishes of Robert Fripp and never listen online again to anything to do with his music.</p>	
Reply	

Comment By: Visitor	Saturday, October 15, 2011
<p>Comment By: GR8FL</p> <p><i>Just wondering how Robert Fripp, King Crimson, Porcupine Tree, et al thinks they are going to expose their music; attract new fans and keep their current ones with their seeming investment in the archaic business model in this digital age that we currently are in? I truly believe that musicians should be fairly compensated for their work and nobody should be ripping anyone off, but there has to be some realism inserted into this thread.</i></p> <p>Realistically, those particular artists are doing fine and are good examples of the new business model: they own their own recordings, advertise their music on their own sites and don't have to resort to Spotify et al (at the rate of \$0.000001 per play or whatever it is) to attract listeners.</p> <p>Of course it's not so easy for new bands, but one way forward would be for artists to set up their own online shops and form alliances with similar-minded acts and labels to form commercial mini-networks. Musicians are a co-operative breed and will happily link to each others' sites if they like the music.</p> <p>Good point about the demise of record shops; but really, it's not hard to find new music on the internet via legitimate, artist-approved sites and their audio clips.</p> <p><i>Because of the Internet, I have discovered plenty of music which has resulted in spending large amounts of money on CDs, digital downloads, upgraded audio software/hardware, shows, merchandise, etc.</i></p> <p>Cool - nothing wrong with the Internet, the beef here is about the unethical behaviour of some companies who trade on it.</p>	
Reply	

Comment By: GR8FL	Saturday, October 15, 2011
<p>Visitor: You stated "Realistically, those particular artists are doing fine and are good examples of the new business model: they own their own recordings, advertise their music on their own sites and don't have to resort to Spotify et al (at the rate of \$0.000001 per play or whatever it is) to attract listeners."</p> <p>This would be true if people actually heard of King Crimson and purposely went to their site to find the music. But I can guarantee you that for every person that has heard of this band, that there are dozens that never have.</p> <p>The music sites that I have frequented, where I have joyously streamed a new track that I legally purchased, then digitized and uploaded, has in many cases exposed thousands to a particular artist for the first time. Some would argue that I am breaking the law by uploading and making it available. I argue in return that I have benefitted the artist because now they have 10 or 100 or 1000 new fans who are in turn telling their community about it, which in turn creates even more interest exponentially. Bottom line is more revenue to the artist through CD sales, ticket sales, merchandise sales, etc.</p> <p>Maybe this isn't the right thread to be discussing this and I am not defending Grooveshark at all; they were slapped with a DMCA Takedown and have ignored it. They should comply.</p> <p>But I want to make very clear that music lovers such as myself, who have no profit making motive, only the desire to listen and share with others on a global level, are not being exposed to bands such as King Crimson if this is the business model they are sticking with.</p>	

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Monday, October 17, 2011

"Realistically, those particular artists are doing fine and are good examples of the new business model: they own their own recordings, advertise their music on their own sites and don't have to resort to Spotify et al (at the rate of \$0.000001 per play or whatever it is) to attract listeners."

Actually it was me (Allan) who said this - something went awry with the 'reply' procedure :)

I think it's worth briefly discussing the exposure angle since it's frequently cited as a justification for illicit music usage.

... I have benefitted the artist because now they have 10 or 100 or 1000 new fans who are in turn telling their community about it, which in turn creates even more interest exponentially.

That's an argument one hears a lot. Where I would disagree is that you don't "create fans" by adding a group's name and tracks to a list of 5,000 others on some streaming site. It's too indiscriminate. The internet is supposed to be a tool for intelligent, target-based marketing: a good example of that is Burning Shed in the UK, who intelligently group together acts who might appeal to the same listeners.

I can guarantee you that for every person that has heard of this band, that there are dozens that never have.

That's OK. It's sensible not to try to market to everybody. Most music doesn't have mass appeal, and there would be no point in marketing a special-interest band like King Crimson to the world at large. IMHO what the music scene needs now is intelligent, consensual focus, not the scattergun, globalized approach of the old record companies..

I understand you're not defending Grooveshark et al, thanks for making that clear!

Reply

Comment By: T

Monday, October 17, 2011

How Mr Fripp & others like him expose their music is by utilising the internet to market it & they should then be entitled to expect due reward for their efforts. On dgralive.com I watched the video of Scarcity of Miracles, & bought the cd, went to a performance by Travis & Fripp advertised there, bought the cd of "Thread" & a couple of weeks later downloaded the same performance. Perhaps I am out of date as well, but the expectation that music of quality will continue to be made by those like Fripp if they can't scrape some sort of living from it. I wonder how many there are like Martin Orford who have quietly given up as piracy has taken their livelihood away. Buy his cd (or legitimate download) "The Old Road"

Reply

Comment By: party people!

Friday, October 14, 2011

calling all artists, songwriters and copyright creators:

there's too much hatin', and not enuf lovin'!

come show some real love to those fluffy, wacky groovesharkers!

they're throwing a party next thursday night, october 20th, from 9 until midnight, at the LES Thompson Hotel. this isn't a cmj event, so all you have to do is rsvp to cmj@soundctrl.com

paul, jack, sam and the rest of the grooveshark crew can't wait to meet you!

;)

Reply

Comment By: Mathew

Saturday, October 15, 2011

You think you can insult a musician and then expect the rest to act as if it never happened?

The only way I am licensing my label's catalog (+450 titles) for Grooveshark is if Robert Fripp does the same.

Want to bet how many other label managers and artists think like this?

Reply

Comment By: mellowlandings Saturday, October 15, 2011

Comment By: party people!
calling all artists, songwriters and copyright creators:

there's too much hatin', and not enuf lovin'!
come show some real love to those fluffy, wacky groovesharkers!

...more like "too much stealin', not enough hidin'!"

After Grooveshark's blatant disrespect and disregard for the artists' right to compensation, you seriously expect them to just turn the other way and run to this so-called 'party' with opejn arms>

Pray tell me, 'party person'...are you nuts?

Reply

Comment By: I had enough of this Saturday, October 15, 2011

My \$0.10 piece of public advice to Robert Fripp and any one else hurt by the piracy websites like Grooveshark:

If Grooveshark is not responding to "multiple" DMCA notices, it is time to start sending them to their hosting company and domain registrar (yes, they are service providers as well, yes I have done this successfully in the past).

Also, BMI, ASCAP, SEAC, MCPS e.t.c. have to step up and protect their members. Enough is enough. Let's see if a hosting company wants to ignore a notice from a PRO.

Reply

Comment By: Jazz Musician Saturday, October 15, 2011

Sad times !

Is greed the new religion ?

Reply

Comment By: Ty Sunday, October 16, 2011

Grooveshark is not only built on the backs of artists and writers, but also on the backs of intern labor.

Reply

Comment By: @LondonElek Monday, October 17, 2011

London Elekcity

good to see Grooveshark maintaing their rep for illegally uploading music.

Reply

Comment By: @MusicTechPolicy Monday, October 17, 2011

Editor Baker

Grooveshark wants "time & patience" because "takedowns have been honored", yet you sell King Crimson music illegally

Reply

Comment By: DMCA much? Monday, October 17, 2011

Enough with the Grooveshark hate. They are entitled to the DMCA for user-generated content just like everyone else. The only way to get undistributed/orphan content into a subscription service is to incorporate a user-upload function. The more millions of tracks, the more people will subscribe. These sites are the future of the music industry, but must be scaled out to provide the residual annuity that will eventually replace record sales. Stop living in the past people.

Reply

Comment By: IGNORANT	Monday, October 17, 2011
Protecting artists and songwriters IS the future. And protecting these rights in a way that encourages the development new technologies: that's the very do-able goal.	
What Groovespark does is old school, sleazy, and straight-up highway robbery.	
Reply	

Comment By: Los Angeles Artist (still comi	Monday, October 17, 2011
Essentially what you have here, is a ton of people upset at how things have changed and moved on beyond their means to control them.	
What you don't have here, is all the artists who are doing great right now.. because they quite simply don't hang out on these kind of blogs and lament for brighter times that past.	
The Internet = Free	
No matter which way you dice it,	
Sure there are some services that provide easier access to music, and some people who don't mind paying for that, but I genuinely feel King Crimson and any artist on here who is mad at groove shark would be better off getting off the blogs, and into their bedroom and writing a decent enough song that people actually want to SHARE!	
That's not a personal stab at any band but more so a reality check, because last time I looked the only bands making any money right now are:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Touring Artists - that actually have tons of people who want to see them, because they were SHARED a lot. - Synced Artists - that write either astounding songs that suit a certain film, or have been so SHARED that their perceived value to a brand is worth enough to shell out good size amounts of money for them. - Pre Internet era bands - bands that got out to the masses before the Internet did, and largely have been able to maintain and hold a following before the Myspace era and beyond, of course the ones that haven't are perhaps the ones right now who are fighting all this 'progress' 'change' etc etc 	
Doesn't that make SHARING sort of a new currency? because the value of each SHARE.. or LIKE or any of that.. is something not even your major labels can buy. You can't fake excitement for a song, but yet when you are SHARED / LIKED a lot then all sorts of things start happening for your career...	
Funny enough, all the new platforms do provide just that currency.. Spotify, Groovespark etc..	
So their 'Groovespark' model for how they get paid, is not really your problem, your problem is how you get paid.. and you gotta wake up soon and realise, your not gonna be buying a house because a million people streamed your song.. but fuck! a million people streamed your song? That must have been due to a TON of SHARES and LIKES, and that must mean its really good.. so get off your argumentative arse, write a decent enough song, get SHARED, get LIKED then get on tour and go see them.. your also not gonna buy a house because you yanked your music off spotify or fought groovespark with such bravado ..just so that you could remain in the past?	
You will quite simply in my opinion, fall slowly into the 'where are they now' part of most of your fans/supporters minds...	
..because they are all on Groovespark, Spotify, etc etc.. and if they aren't yet they will be within a year or so.	
Welcome to the new music industry people, its different, very different, but people still LIKE and SHARE it just like they did when it was word of mouth in the 50s..	
(I wrote this quickly because I have a busy day, but scanned my emails this morning and got frustrated by this stupid pointless debate.. so apologies if my grammar is not decent)	
much love and luck to all	
x	
Reply	

Comment By: Allan	Monday, October 17, 2011
Hi Los Angeles Artist,	
Thanks for your positivity. "I" think essentially what we have here is a lot of people upset at Groovespark, but I take your general points and appreciate you made them without insulting anyone!	
>The Internet = Free	
OK, so you're suggesting that artists should SHARE their music, as in give it all away? And if they give it away in sufficient quantities, they will make money by other means, right?	
>your problem is how you get paid..	
Quite! Can you kindly give me a specific example of a contemporary act this financial strategy (i.e. giving away their recordings) has worked for?	
Best wishes, Allan	
Reply	

Comment By: Los Angeles Artist (still comi) Monday, October 17, 2011

Yes Alan.. check out a band called The Weeknd

<http://the-weeknd.com/>

they have been giving their album / music away free on their site since march i believe.. and its so good and getting shared so much that they now are getting booked with very good fees all across this fine country.. upward of 25k per show.. because there is DEMAND for them that came from thousands of SHARES and LIKES.

Many different blogs got behind them because they are GOOD. Also their music is for this time apparently.. That doesnt mean your band or my band is BAD, it just means we either havent had the luck or the right timing collide with all our hard work just yet.. but if our songs are actually good.. then you know what! im sure something positive will happen for each of us.

If not it doesnt matter.. we still made good art that we can be so proud of..

its disheartening to comprehend and hard to realise sometimes that things will NEVER again be how they were.

But sooner or later whether you realise it or not you will either evolve like the artists that aren't fighting this.. or you will simply be left behind bitter and twisted..

again that is not directed at you.. its simply directed at myself, at any artist that is struggling to get their head around this adaptation that is currently taking place.

hope that makes sense?

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Monday, October 17, 2011

none of that is either here or there
someone above already discussed this. the conversation is not about whether artists are being shortsighted but whether they have the right to be shortsighted or not.

grooveshark is removing artists right to be stupid or not and that's simply unacceptable.

Reply

Comment By: Los Angeles Artist (still comi) Monday, October 17, 2011

@Visitor

respectfully disagree..

And I also believe that first and foremost reality.. removes the right to be stupid.. the term evolve or die, is very relevant in this discussion.

After reality.. perhps, progress.. the future.. life.. evolution.. all of those removes the artist right to be stupid..

maybe not even removes it.. just artists should not be stupid.

People had to stop selling horse and carts when the car was invented.. whether they wanted to or not.. they didnt have a choice. The Car cannot be blamed for being disrespectful to the horse and cart industry..

either ways, this is the kind of argument or topic that will never resolve.. i just wanted to say something so that other artists reading this who are open minded to the future, and how its all evolving may see another side to this very ill-advised and ignorant debate..

If your mad at the new industry.. leave it, get involved with real estate or something else. Last time i checked you still cant download a house.

I cant imagine it being too helpful to your creativity to remain negative and futile, Perhaps start smiling, and stop fighting for the last few crumbs of sales from the old horse and cart music industry, and keep making your art!!

the future is bright people.. its just very different!

again..

much love

x

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Monday, October 17, 2011

you're just reiterating the same point

"People had to stop selling horse and carts when the car was invented.. whether they wanted to or not.. they didnt have a choice."

that analogy only works if you change it to

"People were forced into selling horse and carts when the car was invented, whether they wanted to or not...with the money for their work going straight to the car company - they didn't have a choice."

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Monday, October 17, 2011

Thanks for that example LAA!

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Monday, October 17, 2011

I work for GroovesHark. Here is some information from the trenches:

We are assigned a predetermined amount of weekly uploads to the system and get a small extra bonus if we manage to go above that (not easy). The assignments are assumed as direct orders from the top to the bottom, we don't just volunteer to "enhance" the GroovesHark database.

All search results are monitored and when something is tagged as "not available", it gets queued up to our lists for upload. You have to visualize the database in two general sections: "known" stuff and "undiscovered/indie/underground". The "known" stuff is taken care internally by uploads. Only for the "undiscovered" stuff are the users involved as explained in some posts above. Practically speaking, there is not much need for users to upload a major label album since we already take care of this on a daily basis.

Are the above legal, or ethical? Of course not. Don't reply to give me a lecture. I know. But if the labels and their lawyers can't figure out how to stop it, then I don't feel bad for having a job. It's tough times.

Why am I disclosing all this? Well, I have been here a while and I don't like the attitude that the administration has acquired against the artists. They are the enemy. They are the threat. The things that are said internally about them would make you very very angry. Interns are promised getting a foot in the music industry, only to hear these people cursing and bad mouthing the whole industry all day long, to the point where you wonder what would happen if GroovesHark gets hacked by Anonymous one day and all the emails leak on some torrent or something.

And, to confirm the fears of the members of King Crimson, there is no way in hell you can get your stuff down. They are already tagged since you sent in your first complaint. The administration knows that you can't afford to sue for infringement.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Monday, October 17, 2011

quoted before deletion ^

"

I work for GroovesHark. Here is some information from the trenches:

We are assigned a predetermined amount of weekly uploads to the system and get a small extra bonus if we manage to go above that (not easy). The assignments are assumed as direct orders from the top to the bottom, we don't just volunteer to "enhance" the GroovesHark database.

All search results are monitored and when something is tagged as "not available", it gets queued up to our lists for upload. You have to visualize the database in two general sections: "known" stuff and "undiscovered/indie/underground". The "known" stuff is taken care internally by uploads. Only for the "undiscovered" stuff are the users involved as explained in some posts above. Practically speaking, there is not much need for users to upload a major label album since we already take care of this on a daily basis.

Are the above legal, or ethical? Of course not. Don't reply to give me a lecture. I know. But if the labels and their lawyers can't figure out how to stop it, then I don't feel bad for having a job. It's tough times.

Why am I disclosing all this? Well, I have been here a while and I don't like the attitude that the administration has acquired against the artists. They are the enemy. They are the threat. The things that are said internally about them would make you very very angry. Interns are promised getting a foot in the music industry, only to hear these people cursing and bad mouthing the whole industry all day long, to the point where you wonder what would happen if GroovesHark gets hacked by Anonymous one day and all the emails leak on some torrent or something.

And, to confirm the fears of the members of King Crimson, there is no way in hell you can get your stuff down. They are already tagged since you sent in your first complaint. The administration knows that you can't afford to sue for infringement."

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Says it all, doesn't it? Now watch Grooveshark deny that this person works for them. If you're not sure who's telling the truth, reflect on the fact that G'shark's boss lied to Robert Fripp when he said he had permission from a "label partner" to upload KC material. (A lie he subsequently publicly retracted.)

Reply

Comment By: Nick

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Actually, it's not that easy. They can't just deny it, because they can't be 100% sure if this person has documents or files at hand. What if they send out a press release to deny it, only to wake up to a data leak the next day?

They will probably try to find out who this person is, by making some kind of unofficial investigation inside the company. That is also very tricky, because what are you going to do, sue him...? That would be like a gang going to the nearest police station and making a complaint about a member for going online and saying that they are scamming people's credit cards.

On the other hand, maybe I give Grooveshark too much credit. Maybe they are stupid enough to go down that road. That would be fun. I can picture the Feds in the field office laughing just by reading these lines... :D

Reply

Comment By: L. Hayes

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

This is huge!

Hey @Visitor from Grooveshark, if you're listening you HAVE to email Digital Music News to confirm your identity and they'll protect your confidentiality. This has to get out there.

LH

Reply

Comment By: No, no, no.

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

That's a very bad idea - Grooveshark could request that Digital Music News reveal their source in court. Perhaps the whistleblower has his/her reasons not to reveal his identity. We have to respect that.

Another interesting fact is that Grooveshark grabs interns from the University of Florida. I wonder what the university officials think about the whole situation of internship labor in "web 2.0" corporations.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Yeah, sorry but that is not going happen any time soon. I am not stupid. If someone from digitalmusicnews.com thinks I am trolling, they can go ahead and delete my post. All the King Crimson music will eventually be available again, anyway. Song by song, perhaps, so that pissed English old man won't notice too soon. Don't take my word for it, just be a little bit patient, wait and see for yourselves. Do a search after a couple days or whatever. Maybe make a "mistake" and search for "King Crimson" as "song", instead of "artist".

Just because you can't see an album available right now, doesn't mean its not sitting quietly in the background. It is policy to put albums on "backup", when they have to be taken down due to a DMCA notice, to chill things out with the labels and what not. The albums are not deleted, if that's what you guys think.

My impression is that the labels only take action when some artist literally prints a page and holds it in front of their noses. So, if you are an artist, either accept it and move on, maybe find some other business to invest your time and talent, or do what you have to do to defend your current business. Pretending that there is some sort of middle ground won't take you very far.

(You should hear the Big Boss screams today. Ho ho ho. Furious. King Crimson - office chair / Big Boss - Steve Balmer)

Reply

Comment By: tarquin

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Looking at the numerous communications about this topic, it appears that Grooveshark are no better than thieves masquerading as a legitimate business. In King Crimson's case, it is abundantly clear who owns the copyright on the band's product.

The copyright owner has requested (demanded) on numerous occasions to remove King Crimson's music from Grooveshark and make it permanently unavailable. This has not happened.

If I walk into a record store and help myself to a bunch of CDs and walk out without paying, am I guilty of theft? Absolutely. Similarly taking music from the internet without paying for it is also stealing. Providing stolen goods for others to pilfer is also a crime, for which one can be tried in court: it is commonly known as "fencing".

Grooveshark has no case, or justification here. They should lose their business license on account of such (criminal) practice. Did Paul Geller get a degree at the Bernie Madoff School of Business Studies?

Reply

Comment By: the irony

Wednesday, October 19, 2011

Grooveshark admits they have no respect for artists' rights.

Yet "Grooveshark" is trademarked! :D

Reply

Comment By: Adam

Wednesday, October 19, 2011

This is crazy. You can still find King Crimson/Robert Fripp material on Grooveshark.

Fripp should e-mail a DMCA notice to Grooveshark's hosting company. The hosts generally avoid bad PR at all costs.

Reply

Comment By: Jeremy A

Thursday, October 20, 2011

OK, Grooveshark is a mafia company. No one in the music industry denies that.

But have King Crimson ever googled their band name? Right now there are piracy results in the first page on Google Search. If you want to protect yourself, you have to do it all around. Otherwise, scams like Grooveshark may play the "they are targeting us" card for PR purposes.

Reply

Comment By: Lisa Thomas Music Services

Monday, October 24, 2011

Paul Geller is either completely out of touch with his own company, hallucinatory, or just a complete liar.

I am the publishing administrator for the main songwriters of the Eagles and have spent hours upon hours serving DMCA takedown notices on Grooveshark's designated agent demanding the site remove all of the compositions owned and controlled by my clients. I have cited the specific url's of each *infringing* post in the notices. To date, Grooveshark has not removed any of the material. (I have noticed, however, that the url's constantly change, meaning that, while Grooveshark *might* momentarily remove a specific url, another identical replacement is uploaded within 24 hours.)

Grooveshark has not made any effort to serve NOI's with respect to its use of any compositions owned by any of my clients, and is not paying to use the music on its service, unlike Spotify, unlike Rhapsody, unlike the legitimate music services.

They do not pay labels; they do not pay artists. However, Mr. Geller and his staff surely do not work for free. Perhaps it's time for the artists who are being ripped off by Grooveshark to begin to contact the advertisers paying Grooveshark for ad space to let them know that association with the "evil" internet companies like Grooveshark will bring them the kind of bad publicity and reputation that's difficult to undo.

Artists have power. Grooveshark should be mindful of that.

Reply

Comment By: @JonMoskow

Tuesday, October 25, 2011

Jon Moskowitz

Music biz monkey business. Would be more compelling if I actually liked KC.

Reply