

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 05:39:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Not to fear, the RIAA will eventually make it effectively unattractive for consumers to purchase commercial recorded music of any kind and put most major labels out of business - a practice commonly known as "biting the hand that feeds you". This ruling has the makings of even turning legal download purchases into a legal quagmire.

The door is wide open for indie artists to wipe the slate clean of this corporate crap and offer music with a different licensing option. Consumers just won't (or at least shouldn't) stand for so many restrictions that make it a royal PITA to buy and listen to music.

I'm all for getting royalties on music for artists, writers, etc, but the RIAA is about as bad as banpiracy.org and Waves (who have permanently lost my business) - it's all just lynch mob (emphasis on "mob") tactics with no intent on actually protecting the creators, just trying to grab blackmalesque money disguised as legal fees instead of selling a quality product in a new market.

Seriously, this corporate shortsighted scare tactic crap has to stop. It's pathetic.

On 12/30/07 11:21 PM, in article 47787c3e\$1@linux, "DC"  
<dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>  
> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>  
> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>  
> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
> takes to download...  
>  
> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>  
> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>  
> DC  
>

---

Subject: oh swell...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 06:21:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>

Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.

Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it takes to download...

We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette for use in the car, why not for the iPod?

Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.

DC

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [rick](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 11:08:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

C.E.P works fine for this. i recently did about 70 cd's new and old for the cars mp3 player @ 320 kbs.

On 31 Dec 2007 16:21:02 +1000, "DC" <[dc@spammersinhell.com](mailto:dc@spammersinhell.com)> wrote:

>  
> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>  
> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>  
> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
> takes to download...  
>  
> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>  
> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>  
> DC

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 17:58:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't been watching the RIAA closely enough.

There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae dubplates. We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12" copies made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall dweebs like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright law in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin with. But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told we owe \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.

And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity in microeconomics. I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu. 700MB on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my work network (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other research institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest link in the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall. Soon enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>  
> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>  
> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>  
> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
> takes to download...  
>  
> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>  
> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>  
> DC  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 18:47:51 GMT

The Answer is and has always been to "get back to Live playing". The Live Experience of a 'said' musical act will again emerge as the must have event. People will pay to see their fav artist perform. These artist(s) can then sell a CD or data stick at their shows. Just look at the outrageous money old acts are making \$\$\$ ..These acts did not make these kinds of monies when they were current..

The video music genre has got to change. Video spins like ring tones must be counted as "sold" song sold.

As for file sharing, some kind of "Intelligent" tracking software needs to be attached to each song of a CD that can monitor where it has been transferred. As well as, Songs can only be copied once, then locked .. Well, the work around on this is, to use or copy via analog. Oh well..

Another

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>  
> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>  
> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>  
> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
> takes to download...  
>  
> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>  
> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>  
> DC  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 19:13:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."

That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the supply of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees, they are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price has an

impact but it isn't the main value.

As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value. When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing or acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they wouldn't bother with it.

Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable. Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio and TV, and with web content.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

TCB wrote:

> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't been  
> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>  
> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae dubplates.  
> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12" copies  
> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall dweebs  
> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright law  
> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin with.  
> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told we owe  
> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
>  
> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of data  
> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity in microeconomics.  
> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu. 700MB  
> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my work network  
> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other research  
> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest link in  
> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall. Soon  
> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available  
> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>  
> TCB  
>  
> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>>  
>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your

>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>  
>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
>> takes to download...  
>>  
>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>  
>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>  
>> DC  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...  
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 21:19:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Actually I am surprised because of the longstanding legal practice  
of making cassette copies of CD's or records you own for use  
in the car. I think they will lose this one.

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>  
>Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't been  
>watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>  
>There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae dubplates.  
>We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12" copies  
>made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall dweebs  
>like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright law  
>in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin with.  
>But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told we owe  
>\$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
>  
>And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of data  
>decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity in microeconomics.  
>I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu. 700MB  
>on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my work network  
>(100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
>to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other research  
>institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest link in  
>the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall. Soon  
>enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available

>at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>  
>TCB  
>  
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>>  
>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12 /28/AR2007122800693.html  
>>  
>>Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
>>computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>  
>>Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
>>takes to download...  
>>  
>>We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>>for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>  
>>Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>  
>>DC  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 21:20:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If you're saying costs of delivering data is decreasing, that's certainly true, and predictable.

But the primary driver of the decrease in data transmission costs is the value of the content and services that people are seeking. The demand creates opportunity. Consequently, delivery capacity is added by the marketplace. Adding more delivery capacity doesn't necessarily devalue the products being delivered. Rather, it's a consequence of the demand for the content and services. Without compelling content and useful services, no one would be online.

Gutenberg's invention sparked a huge new marketplace of books. It increased rather than reduced value. You can call books "commodity" but they aren't like an interchangeable computer part. There must be value in the content itself for anyone to seek out a particular book. It's not just a wad of paper.

I don't believe the dynamic of a growing marketplace is something to fear. People are becoming more involved with content, not less. Content has value when people want that content. The challenge is to grow that

demand and build workable business models around that value.

Apple has done pretty well, for example, with iPods and the iTunes online store. They sell music encoded as ones and zeros, but they are not marketing the ones and zeros, that's merely the carrier (a carrier with some major advantages over plastic disks). They are marketing portable, quick and convenient music and video playback hardware as a fashion accessory, and the artists are getting paid.

Another model is the one you suggest, selling ancillary products and playing live. Those ideas won't work for every artist (especially composers who don't play live), but they aren't the only possibilities.

Along those lines, it's a bit tiresome for independent musicians to hear that music should be given away for free to promote live shows, and live shows should be done at a loss to promote the music. It would be easy to burn the candle at both ends with that combination of common armchair advice. Also, not every artist aspires to be a T-shirt shop.

As for the RIAA, they are not a forward thinking bunch. I think we would agree about that.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

TCB wrote:

> Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data decreases,  
> but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations where  
> prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily) breached.  
> Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg invented  
> movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA to produce,  
> but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum it  
> was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over 1000 printing  
> shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years the  
> output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on their  
> way to being commodity items.  
>  
> I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic with  
> the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales because  
> it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy the CDs  
> to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.  
>  
> If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how that price  
> dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus price  
> control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one place at



> a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music can be  
> stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's just the  
> way things are going to go.  
>  
> TCB  
>  
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>> "As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."  
>>  
>> That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the supply  
>  
>> of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It  
>> doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees, they  
>> are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price has an  
>  
>> impact but it isn't the main value.  
>>  
>> As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.  
>> When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing or  
>> acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they  
>> wouldn't bother with it.  
>>  
>> Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's  
>  
>> a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.  
>> Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio and TV,  
>  
>> and with web content.  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> TCB wrote:  
>>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't been  
>>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>>>  
>>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae  
> dubplates.  
>>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12" copies  
>>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall dweebs  
>>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright law  
>>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin  
> with.  
>>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told we owe

>>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
>>>  
>>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of data  
>>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity in  
> microeconomics.  
>>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu. 700MB  
>>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my work  
> network  
>>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
>>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other  
> research  
>>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest link  
> in  
>>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
> Soon  
>>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available  
>>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>>>  
>>> TCB  
>>>  
>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>>>>  
>>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
>>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>>>  
>>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
>>>> takes to download...  
>>>>  
>>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>  
>>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>>>  
>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>>  
>>>> DC  
>>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 21:33:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data decreases, but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations where prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily) breached.

Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg invented movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA to produce, but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum it was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over 1000 printing shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years the output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on their way to being commodity items.

I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic with the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales because it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy the CDs to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.

If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how that price dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus price control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one place at a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music can be stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's just the way things are going to go.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>"As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."

>

>That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the supply

>of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It

>doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees, they

>are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price has an

>impact but it isn't the main value.

>

>As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.

>When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing or

>acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they

>wouldn't bother with it.

>

>Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's

>a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.

>Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio and TV,

>and with web content.

>

>Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>TCB wrote:  
>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't been  
>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>>  
>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae  
dubplates.  
>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12" copies  
>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall dweebs  
>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright law  
>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin  
with.  
>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told we owe  
>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
>>  
>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of data  
>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity in  
microeconomics.  
>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu. 700MB  
>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my work  
network  
>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other  
research  
>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest link  
in  
>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
Soon  
>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available  
>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>>  
>> TCB  
>>  
>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>>>  
>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>>  
>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long it  
>>> takes to download...  
>>>  
>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette

>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>>  
>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>  
>>> DC  
>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 02 Jan 2008 16:27:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jamie,

You're confusing 'value' with 'price.'

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>  
>If you're saying costs of delivering data is decreasing, that's  
>certainly true, and predictable.  
>  
>But the primary driver of the decrease in data transmission costs is the  
  
>value of the content and services that people are seeking. The demand  
>creates opportunity. Consequently, delivery capacity is added by the  
>marketplace. Adding more delivery capacity doesn't necessarily devalue  
>the products being delivered. Rather, it's a consequence of the demand  
>for the content and services. Without compelling content and useful  
>services, no one would be online.  
>  
>Gutenberg's invention sparked a huge new marketplace of books. It  
>increased rather than reduced value. You can call books "commodity" but  
  
>they aren't like an interchangeable computer part. There must be value  
>in the content itself for anyone to seek out a particular book. It's not  
  
>just a wad of paper.  
>  
>I don't believe the dynamic of a growing marketplace is something to  
>fear. People are becoming more involved with content, not less. Content  
  
>has value when people want that content. The challenge is to grow that  
>demand and build workable business models around that value.  
>  
>Apple has done pretty well, for example, with iPods and the iTunes

>online store. They sell music encoded as ones and zeros, but they are  
 >not marketing the ones and zeros, that's merely the carrier (a carrier  
 >with some major advantages over plastic disks). They are marketing  
 >portable, quick and convenient music and video playback hardware as a  
 >fashion accessory, and the artists are getting paid.  
 >  
 >Another model is the one you suggest, selling ancillary products and  
 >playing live. Those ideas won't work for every artist (especially  
 >composers who don't play live), but they aren't the only possibilities.  
 >  
 >Along those lines, it's a bit tiresome for independent musicians to hear  
  
 >that music should be given away for free to promote live shows, and live  
  
 >shows should be done at a loss to promote the music. It would be easy to  
  
 >burn the candle at both ends with that combination of common armchair  
 >advice. Also, not every artist aspires to be a T-shirt shop.  
 >  
 >As for the RIAA, they are not a forward thinking bunch. I think we would  
  
 >agree about that.  
 >  
 >Cheers,  
 > -Jamie  
 > [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >TCB wrote:  
 >> Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data decreases,  
 >> but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations where  
 >> prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily) breached.  
 >> Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg invented  
 >> movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA to  
 produce,  
 >> but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum  
 it  
 >> was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over 1000  
 printing  
 >> shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years the  
 >> output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on their  
 >> way to being commodity items.  
 >>  
 >> I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic  
 with  
 >> the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales  
 because

>> it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy the CDs  
>> to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.  
>>  
>> If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how that price  
>> dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus price  
>> control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one place at  
>> a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music can be  
>> stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's just the  
>> way things are going to go.  
>>  
>> TCB  
>>  
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>> "As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."  
>>>  
>>> That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the supply  
>>  
>>> of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It  
>>> doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees, they  
  
>>> are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price has an  
>>  
>>> impact but it isn't the main value.  
>>>  
>>> As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.  
  
>>> When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing or  
  
>>> acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they  
  
>>> wouldn't bother with it.  
>>>  
>>> Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's  
>>  
>>> a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.  
  
>>> Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio and TV,  
>>  
>>> and with web content.  
>>>

>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't  
been  
>>>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>>>>  
>>>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae  
>> dubplates.  
>>>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12"  
copies  
>>>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall  
dweebs  
>>>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright  
law  
>>>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin  
>> with.  
>>>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told we  
owe  
>>>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
>>>>  
>>>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of  
data  
>>>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity in  
>> microeconomics.  
>>>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu. 700MB  
>>>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my work  
>> network  
>>>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
>>>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other  
>> research  
>>>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest link  
>> in  
>>>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
>> Soon  
>>>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available  
>>>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>>>>  
>>>> TCB  
>>>>  
>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>



>>>>>  
>>>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
>>>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long  
it  
>>>>> takes to download...  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>>  
>>>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> DC  
>>>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 02 Jan 2008 18:56:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nope, I got that you said value when you meant price. Thanks for clarifying that earlier.

Just wanted to add the point that we shouldn't confuse content with carrier. Lowered carrier cost is an opportunity for expanded content distribution, rather than an automatic devaluing of the content. Demand for content and services is what is driving the efficiency of the carrier.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

TCB wrote:

> Jamie,  
>  
> You're confusing 'value' with 'price.'  
>  
> TCB  
>  
> Jamie K <[Meta@Dimensional.com](mailto:Meta@Dimensional.com)> wrote:  
>> If you're saying costs of delivering data is decreasing, that's  
>> certainly true, and predictable.  
>>

>> But the primary driver of the decrease in data transmission costs is the  
>  
>> value of the content and services that people are seeking. The demand  
>> creates opportunity. Consequently, delivery capacity is added by the  
>> marketplace. Adding more delivery capacity doesn't necessarily devalue  
>> the products being delivered. Rather, it's a consequence of the demand  
>> for the content and services. Without compelling content and useful  
>> services, no one would be online.  
>>  
>> Gutenberg's invention sparked a huge new marketplace of books. It  
>> increased rather than reduced value. You can call books "commodity" but  
>  
>> they aren't like an interchangeable computer part. There must be value  
>> in the content itself for anyone to seek out a particular book. It's not  
>  
>> just a wad of paper.  
>>  
>> I don't believe the dynamic of a growing marketplace is something to  
>> fear. People are becoming more involved with content, not less. Content  
>  
>> has value when people want that content. The challenge is to grow that  
>> demand and build workable business models around that value.  
>>  
>> Apple has done pretty well, for example, with iPods and the iTunes  
>> online store. They sell music encoded as ones and zeros, but they are  
>> not marketing the ones and zeros, that's merely the carrier (a carrier  
>> with some major advantages over plastic disks). They are marketing  
>> portable, quick and convenient music and video playback hardware as a  
>> fashion accessory, and the artists are getting paid.  
>>  
>> Another model is the one you suggest, selling ancillary products and  
>> playing live. Those ideas won't work for every artist (especially  
>> composers who don't play live), but they aren't the only possibilities.  
>>  
>> Along those lines, it's a bit tiresome for independent musicians to hear  
>  
>> that music should be given away for free to promote live shows, and live  
>  
>> shows should be done at a loss to promote the music. It would be easy to  
>  
>> burn the candle at both ends with that combination of common armchair  
>> advice. Also, not every artist aspires to be a T-shirt shop.  
>>  
>> As for the RIAA, they are not a forward thinking bunch. I think we would  
>  
>> agree about that.  
>>  
>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie  
>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> TCB wrote:  
>>> Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data decreases,  
>>> but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations where  
>>> prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily) breached.  
>>> Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg invented  
>>> movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA to  
> produce,  
>>> but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum  
> it  
>>> was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over 1000  
> printing  
>>> shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years the  
>>> output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on their  
>>> way to being commodity items.  
>>>  
>>> I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic  
> with  
>>> the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales  
> because  
>>> it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy the  
> CDs  
>>> to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.  
>>>  
>>> If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how that  
> price  
>>> dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus  
> price  
>>> control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one place  
> at  
>>> a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music can  
> be  
>>> stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's just  
> the  
>>> way things are going to go.  
>>>  
>>> TCB  
>>>  
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>>> "As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."  
>>>>  
>>>> That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the supply  
>>>> of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It  
>>>> doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees, they

>  
 >>>> are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price has  
 > an  
 >>>> impact but it isn't the main value.  
 >>>>  
 >>>> As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.  
 >  
 >>>> When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing or  
 >  
 >>>> acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they  
 >  
 >>>> wouldn't bother with it.  
 >>>>  
 >>>> Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's  
 >>>> a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.  
 >  
 >>>> Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio and  
 > TV,  
 >>>> and with web content.  
 >>>>  
 >>>> Cheers,  
 >>>> -Jamie  
 >>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
 >>>>  
 >>>>  
 >>>>  
 >>>>  
 >>>> TCB wrote:  
 >>>>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't  
 > been  
 >>>>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
 >>>>>  
 >>>>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae  
 >>> dubplates.  
 >>>>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12"  
 > copies  
 >>>>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall  
 > dweebs  
 >>>>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright  
 > law  
 >>>>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin  
 >>> with.  
 >>>>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told we  
 > owe  
 >>>>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
 >>>>>  
 >>>>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of  
 > data

>>>>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity in  
>>> microeconomics.  
>>>>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu. 700MB  
>>>>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my work  
>>> network  
>>>>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
>>>>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other  
>>> research  
>>>>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest link  
>>> in  
>>>>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
>>> Soon  
>>>>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available  
>>>>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>>>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
>>>>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long  
> it  
>>>>>> takes to download...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>>>>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> DC  
>>>>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 01:29:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Except that the world has never worked that way. I didn't say with enough bandwidth everything is free, I said that as bandwidth (and storage) increase the price of data will inevitably decrease. It might not be a linear relationship and it might not happen right away, but it's the way the world works.

And it doesn't matter whether an artist wants to be a T-Shirt shop or a bucket

of warm spit. The tidal wave does not ask permission from the house it will soon wash to sea.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>  
>Nope, I got that you said value when you meant price. Thanks for  
>clarifying that earlier.  
>  
>Just wanted to add the point that we shouldn't confuse content with  
>carrier. Lowered carrier cost is an opportunity for expanded content  
>distribution, rather than an automatic devaluing of the content. Demand

>for content and services is what is driving the efficiency of the carrier.

>  
>Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> www.JamieKrutz.com

>  
>  
>  
>TCB wrote:

>> Jamie,  
>>  
>> You're confusing 'value' with 'price.'  
>>  
>> TCB

>>  
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>> If you're saying costs of delivering data is decreasing, that's  
>>> certainly true, and predictable.

>>>  
>>> But the primary driver of the decrease in data transmission costs is  
the

>>  
>>> value of the content and services that people are seeking. The demand

>>> creates opportunity. Consequently, delivery capacity is added by the

>>> marketplace. Adding more delivery capacity doesn't necessarily devalue

>>> the products being delivered. Rather, it's a consequence of the demand

>>> for the content and services. Without compelling content and useful  
>>> services, no one would be online.

>>>  
>>> Gutenberg's invention sparked a huge new marketplace of books. It

>>> increased rather than reduced value. You can call books "commodity" but  
>>  
>>> they aren't like an interchangeable computer part. There must be value  
  
>>> in the content itself for anyone to seek out a particular book. It's  
not  
>>  
>>> just a wad of paper.  
>>>  
>>> I don't believe the dynamic of a growing marketplace is something to  
  
>>> fear. People are becoming more involved with content, not less. Content  
>>  
>>> has value when people want that content. The challenge is to grow that  
  
>>> demand and build workable business models around that value.  
>>>  
>>> Apple has done pretty well, for example, with iPods and the iTunes  
>>> online store. They sell music encoded as ones and zeros, but they are  
  
>>> not marketing the ones and zeros, that's merely the carrier (a carrier  
  
>>> with some major advantages over plastic disks). They are marketing  
>>> portable, quick and convenient music and video playback hardware as a  
  
>>> fashion accessory, and the artists are getting paid.  
>>>  
>>> Another model is the one you suggest, selling ancillary products and  
  
>>> playing live. Those ideas won't work for every artist (especially  
>>> composers who don't play live), but they aren't the only possibilities.  
>>>  
>>> Along those lines, it's a bit tiresome for independent musicians to hear  
>>  
>>> that music should be given away for free to promote live shows, and live  
>>  
>>> shows should be done at a loss to promote the music. It would be easy  
to  
>>  
>>> burn the candle at both ends with that combination of common armchair  
  
>>> advice. Also, not every artist aspires to be a T-shirt shop.  
>>>  
>>> As for the RIAA, they are not a forward thinking bunch. I think we would  
>>  
>>> agree about that.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,

>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>> Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data decreases,  
>>>> but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations where  
>>>> prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily)  
breached.  
>>>> Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg  
invented  
>>>> movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA  
to  
>> produce,  
>>>> but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum  
>> it  
>>>> was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over 1000  
>> printing  
>>>> shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years  
the  
>>>> output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on their  
>>>> way to being commodity items.  
>>>>  
>>>> I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic  
>> with  
>>>> the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales  
>> because  
>>>> it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy the  
>> CDs  
>>>> to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.  
>>>>  
>>>> If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how that  
>> price  
>>>> dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus  
>> price  
>>>> control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one place  
>> at  
>>>> a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music can  
>> be  
>>>> stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's just  
>> the  
>>>> way things are going to go.  
>>>>  
>>>> TCB  
>>>>  
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>>>> "As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."



>>>>>  
>>>>> That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the supply  
>>>>> of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It  
>>>>> doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees, they  
>>  
>>>>> are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price has  
>> an  
>>>>> impact but it isn't the main value.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.  
>>  
>>>>> When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing or  
>>  
>>>>> acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they  
>>  
>>>>> wouldn't bother with it.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's  
>>>>> a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.  
>>  
>>>>> Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio and  
>> TV,  
>>>>> and with web content.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>>>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't  
>> been  
>>>>>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae  
>>>> dubplates.  
>>>>>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12"  
>> copies  
>>>>>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall  
>> dweebs  
>>>>>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright  
>> law  
>>>>>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin  
>>>> with.  
>>>>>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told  
we

>> owe  
>>>>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of  
>> data  
>>>>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity  
in  
>>>> microeconomics.  
>>>>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu.  
700MB  
>>>>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my  
work  
>>>> network  
>>>>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
>>>>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other  
>>>> research  
>>>>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest  
link  
>>>> in  
>>>>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
>>>> Soon  
>>>>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available  
>>>>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>>>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
>>>>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long  
>> it  
>>>>>> takes to download...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>>>>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> DC  
>>>>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 01:35:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

TCB wrote:

> Except that the world has never worked that way. I didn't say with enough  
> bandwidth everything is free, I said that as bandwidth (and storage) increase  
> the price of data will inevitably decrease. It might not be a linear relationship  
> and it might not happen right away, but it's the way the world works.

We agree that costs are going down.

I think where I part ways with you on this one is the vague translation from "content" to "data." It's as if a field of vegetables and a field of nuclear waste were combined into the single description of "dirt." It's not all just "dirt." What's actually in the field matters.

Likewise all content and services can't be merely hand waved away as "data." What's actually encoded into the bitstream matters.

I see higher data bandwidth as being beneficial to producing and distributing content and services, not detrimental. Potentially better for price, for increased consumer and artist choices, and certainly better for value. And as costs go down for moving bits around, woohoo, that's lower overhead.

There are companies being built on the increasing bandwidth and making money. Bigger bandwidth means better content and services can be offered. The internet is growing as the content and services improve and the demand continues to increase.

This month, rumor has it, iTunes will start renting movies. Making more money on the increasing bandwidth available.

> And it doesn't matter whether an artist wants to be a T-Shirt shop or a bucket  
> of warm spit. The tidal wave does not ask permission from the house it will  
> soon wash to sea.

Nor does the independent artist have to be either a T shirt shop or a bucket of warm spit. They can do traditional merch if it fits, or they can find another business model. Instead of a destructive tidal wave, you could just as well visualize continuing technical improvements as a welcoming thermal to soar higher. An engine for success. Or back to your waves analogy, surf's up!

The artist needs to develop a fan base willing to pony up something for the art, and the low cost of moving bits around can help facilitate that connection between artist and fan. The ponying up can be direct

purchase, it can be purchase through a digital music portal, it can be presale, sponsorship, fan club dues, clicking through ads on the artist's site or (your great idea here). As bandwidth increases and data costs go down, more possibilities open up for creative thinkers. Out of transformational chaos will arise the next thing, because THAT'S the way the world works. :^)

Bottom line, the decrease in costs to move data can help artists. It doesn't have to hurt artists. To assume it would necessarily hurt artists (if that's what you're assuming) reveals a possible creativity gap. Much like the one traditional record companies are struggling with, as they strive to protect the selling of exclusive and often mediocre mass-market content on plastic disks in an increasingly digital and niche market world.

Call me an optimist, but bandwidth improvements are due to a growing market and growing demand. And digital distribution has a huge upside in efficiency and scalability. Do we really disagree about this?

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

> TCB

>

> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>> Nope, I got that you said value when you meant price. Thanks for  
>> clarifying that earlier.

>>

>> Just wanted to add the point that we shouldn't confuse content with  
>> carrier. Lowered carrier cost is an opportunity for expanded content  
>> distribution, rather than an automatic devaluing of the content. Demand

>

>> for content and services is what is driving the efficiency of the carrier.

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

>>

>>

>>

>> TCB wrote:

>>> Jamie,

>>>

>>> You're confusing 'value' with 'price.'

>>>

>>> TCB

>>>

>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>> If you're saying costs of delivering data is decreasing, that's

>>>> certainly true, and predictable.

>>>>

>>>> But the primary driver of the decrease in data transmission costs is

> the

>>>> value of the content and services that people are seeking. The demand

>

>>>> creates opportunity. Consequently, delivery capacity is added by the

>

>>>> marketplace. Adding more delivery capacity doesn't necessarily devalue

>

>>>> the products being delivered. Rather, it's a consequence of the demand

>

>>>> for the content and services. Without compelling content and useful

>>>> services, no one would be online.

>>>>

>>>> Gutenberg's invention sparked a huge new marketplace of books. It

>>>> increased rather than reduced value. You can call books "commodity" but

>>>> they aren't like an interchangeable computer part. There must be value

>

>>>> in the content itself for anyone to seek out a particular book. It's

> not

>>>> just a wad of paper.

>>>>

>>>> I don't believe the dynamic of a growing marketplace is something to

>

>>>> fear. People are becoming more involved with content, not less. Content

>>>> has value when people want that content. The challenge is to grow that

>

>>>> demand and build workable business models around that value.

>>>>

>>>> Apple has done pretty well, for example, with iPods and the iTunes

>>>> online store. They sell music encoded as ones and zeros, but they are

>

>>>> not marketing the ones and zeros, that's merely the carrier (a carrier

>

>>>> with some major advantages over plastic disks). They are marketing

>>>> portable, quick and convenient music and video playback hardware as a

>

>>>> fashion accessory, and the artists are getting paid.

>>>>

>>>> Another model is the one you suggest, selling ancillary products and

>

>>>> playing live. Those ideas won't work for every artist (especially

>>>> composers who don't play live), but they aren't the only possibilities.

>>>>

>>>> Along those lines, it's a bit tiresome for independent musicians to hear  
>>>> that music should be given away for free to promote live shows, and live  
>>>> shows should be done at a loss to promote the music. It would be easy  
> to  
>>>> burn the candle at both ends with that combination of common armchair  
>  
>>>> advice. Also, not every artist aspires to be a T-shirt shop.  
>>>>

>>>> As for the RIAA, they are not a forward thinking bunch. I think we would  
>>>> agree about that.  
>>>>

>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>

>>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>>> Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data decreases,  
>>>>> but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations where  
>>>>> prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily)  
> breached.  
>>>>> Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg  
> invented  
>>>>> movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA  
> to  
>>> produce,  
>>>>> but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum  
>>> it  
>>>>> was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over 1000  
>>> printing  
>>>>> shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years  
> the  
>>>>> output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on their  
>>>>> way to being commodity items.  
>>>>>

>>>>> I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic  
>>> with  
>>>>> the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales  
>>> because  
>>>>> it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy the  
>>> CDs  
>>>>> to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.  
>>>>>

>>>>> If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how that  
>>> price  
>>>>> dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus

>>> price  
>>>> control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one place  
>>> at  
>>>> a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music can  
>>> be  
>>>> stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's just  
>>> the  
>>>> way things are going to go.  
>>>>  
>>>> TCB  
>>>>  
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>>>> "As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."  
>>>>>  
>>>>> That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the supply  
>>>>> of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It  
>>>>> doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees, they  
>>>>> are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price has  
>>> an  
>>>>> impact but it isn't the main value.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.  
>>>>> When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing or  
>>>>> acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they  
>>>>> wouldn't bother with it.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's  
>>>>> a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.  
>>>>> Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio and  
>>> TV,  
>>>>> and with web content.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>>>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't  
>>> been  
>>>>>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade reggae  
>>>> dubplates.  
>>>>>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen 12"  
>>> copies

>>>>>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall  
 >>> dweebs  
 >>>>>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright  
 >>> law  
 >>>>>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to begin  
 >>>>> with.  
 >>>>>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told  
 > we  
 >>> owe  
 >>>>>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
 >>>>>>  
 >>>>>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value of  
 >>> data  
 >>>>>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity  
 > in  
 >>>>> microeconomics.  
 >>>>>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu.  
 > 700MB  
 >>>>>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my  
 > work  
 >>>>> network  
 >>>>>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
 >>>>>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some other  
 >>>>> research  
 >>>>>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest  
 > link  
 >>>>> in  
 >>>>>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
 >>>>> Soon  
 >>>>>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be available  
 >>>>>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
 >>>>>>  
 >>>>>> TCB  
 >>>>>>  
 >>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
 >>>>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into your  
 >>>>>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how long  
 >>> it  
 >>>>>>> takes to download...  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
 >>>>>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
 >>>>>>>



>>>>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> DC  
>>>>>>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 20:17:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

TCB wrote:

> The question we were discussing was not whether bandwidth is good or bad for  
> a certain kind of artist, or good or bad for a particular industry, or good  
> or bad for 'content and services' which means I'm not sure what. What I said,  
> and what you're basically agreeing to, is that as bandwidth increases data  
> gets cheaper.

Cheaper to move. Which makes it cheaper to deliver content. Which also  
makes it possible to sell content that uses more data, like movies.  
Maybe we agree on that, too.

> Now then, obviously if one is making horrible music the 'content' is less  
> likely to draw customers to use some of their bandwidth to get/purchase it.

Yep. Although actually, LCD mass market content, some of it qualifying  
as "horrible" IMO, does get sold. Granted, that's a matter of taste. :^)

But with more bandwidth, niche markets with more of a quality focus can  
be better served.

> However, even if you have the super bitchingist content ever you will still  
> be subject to the price dynamic--i.e. the easier it is to get the lower the  
> price you will get for it. You can try to create some artificial scarcity  
> but so far the only two ways tried (DRM and suing your customers) have been  
> dismal failures.

Dismal failures? Better define that.

iTunes has sold \_billions\_ of downloads at a set price that hasn't gone  
down. Independent artists get a \_higher\_ percentage from iTunes than  
from a record company. Other download services are also selling music.

CD Baby and other independent companies seems to be doing pretty well  
selling CDs over the internet and feeding mp3s to pay-for-download sites.

These approaches are \_enabled\_ by having more available bandwidth. Not slowed down by it.

> To use the book example again. Illuminated manuscripts are, in my opinion,  
> some of the most beautiful objects ever created by the mind of man. If I  
> ever get rich I will certainly own a few. I'm sure your Medieval Scribes  
> Local 310 saw the first printed books and scoffed saying, 'Our content and  
> services are SO much better than this trash we don't even need to worry.  
> Who would want one of these hideous things, even if they are cheap?' And  
> 50 years later there were probably more printed books in circulation than  
> had been produced by hand in the history of Europe, and the scribe business  
> was in serious trouble.

Was it? Judging by you there's still a demand, and as you say, very few can be produced. So it doesn't take much of a demand to keep it going. Somewhere, someone is scribing away as we speak, betcha.

At the same time, a new market for printed books was born and grew into what we have today.

The "bandwidth" has increased, delivery costs have dropped. Yet books themselves still have a purchase price, the cost has not dropped to where selling books loses money. They still have a value that people pay money for, enough to fund profits. It's very much a viable business. Probably some of the viability is due to the technology improvements that help grow the market, and not despite them.

Has the price of an average book dropped in the last few years?

> Track the history of the internet from Compuserve  
> and AOL through MSN and the telcos down to google and bittorrent and MySpace  
> and you'll see it getting stupider, easier, cheaper, and more filled with  
> porn.

Porn was a media tech driver long before the internet.

The progression of the internet shows growth, true. But it's not a blueprint for the failure of music as a business which, despite any denials you seem to be implying. Track the history and you'll see a new medium for marketing and distribution. So as data gets cheaper, the opportunity for content distribution has gone up.

Although I think what you're really afraid of is piracy. That's what the record companies are afraid of.

> I'm not saying whether this is right or wrong, for that you'll have  
> to consult someone confident about such things like an ethicist or DC,

If you mean piracy, it's wrong. But if you mean exposure as a marketing vehicle for the artist, it's right.

Nice dig at Don, now he's going to have to jump in and explain the connection between internet piracy and Darwin...

> I'm  
> just pointing out the way things have worked so far, not just with the internet  
> but other technologies as well. I don't see whey something as simple as music  
> distribution will be able to make the rain fall up when it comes to the dynamics  
> of price and scarcity.

I think I see where you're coming from. But I prefer to be more optimistic and allow for innovation, and recognize potential new markets and new business models.

So if your entire point is that lower overhead can bring end-user prices down, I agree, to a point. But if you are implying that lower overhead means the end of the music business or other content businesses online, I would disagree. It's a time of opportunity.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

> TCB  
>  
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>> TCB wrote:  
>>> Except that the world has never worked that way. I didn't say with enough  
>>> bandwidth everything is free, I said that as bandwidth (and storage) increase  
>>> the price of data will inevitably decrease. It might not be a linear relationship  
>>> and it might not happen right away, but it's the way the world works.  
>  
>> We agree that costs are going down.  
>>  
>> I think where I part ways with you on this one is the vague translation  
>  
>>from "content" to "data." It's as if a field of vegetables and a field  
>> of nuclear waste were combined into the single description of "dirt."  
>> It's not all just "dirt." What's actually in the field matters.  
>>

>> Likewise all content and services can't be merely hand waved away as  
>> "data." What's actually encoded into the bitstream matters.  
>>  
>> I see higher data bandwidth as being beneficial to producing and  
>> distributing content and services, not detrimental. Potentially better  
>> for price, for increased consumer and artist choices, and certainly  
>> better for value. And as costs go down for moving bits around, woohoo,  
>> that's lower overhead.  
>>  
>> There are companies being built on the increasing bandwidth and making  
>> money. Bigger bandwidth means better content and services can be  
>> offered. The internet is growing as the content and services improve and  
>  
>> the demand continues to increase.  
>>  
>> This month, rumor has it, iTunes will start renting movies. Making more  
>  
>> money on the increasing bandwidth available.  
>>  
>>  
>>> And it doesn't matter whether an artist wants to be a T-Shirt shop or  
> a bucket  
>>> of warm spit. The tidal wave does not ask permission from the house it  
> will  
>>> soon wash to sea.  
>> Nor does the independent artist have to be either a T shirt shop or a  
>> bucket of warm spit. They can do traditional merch if it fits, or they  
>> can find another business model. Instead of a destructive tidal wave,  
>> you could just as well visualize continuing technical improvements as a  
>  
>> welcoming thermal to soar higher. An engine for success. Or back to your  
>  
>> waves analogy, surf's up!  
>>  
>> The artist needs to develop a fan base willing to pony up something for  
>  
>> the art, and the low cost of moving bits around can help facilitate that  
>  
>> connection between artist and fan. The ponying up can be direct  
>> purchase, it can be purchase through a digital music portal, it can be  
>> presale, sponsorship, fan club dues, clicking through ads on the  
>> artist's site or (your great idea here). As bandwidth increases and data  
>  
>> costs go down, more possibilities open up for creative thinkers. Out of  
>  
>> transformational chaos will arise the next thing, because THAT'S the way  
>  
>> the world works. :^)

>>  
>> Bottom line, the decrease in costs to move data can help artists. It  
>> doesn't have to hurt artists. To assume it would necessarily hurt  
>> artists (if that's what you're assuming) reveals a possible creativity  
>> gap. Much like the one traditional record companies are struggling with,  
>  
>> as they strive to protect the selling of exclusive and often mediocre  
>> mass-market content on plastic disks in an increasingly digital and  
>> niche market world.  
>>  
>> Call me an optimist, but bandwidth improvements are due to a growing  
>> market and growing demand. And digital distribution has a huge upside in  
>  
>> efficiency and scalability. Do we really disagree about this?  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>> TCB  
>>>  
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>>> Nope, I got that you said value when you meant price. Thanks for  
>>>> clarifying that earlier.  
>>>>  
>>>> Just wanted to add the point that we shouldn't confuse content with  
>>>> carrier. Lowered carrier cost is an opportunity for expanded content  
>  
>>>> distribution, rather than an automatic devaluing of the content. Demand  
>>>> for content and services is what is driving the efficiency of the carrier.  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> You're confusing 'value' with 'price.'  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>>>>> If you're saying costs of delivering data is decreasing, that's

>>>>> certainly true, and predictable.

>>>>>

>>>>> But the primary driver of the decrease in data transmission costs is

>>> the

>>>>> value of the content and services that people are seeking. The demand

>>>>> creates opportunity. Consequently, delivery capacity is added by the

>>>>> marketplace. Adding more delivery capacity doesn't necessarily devalue

>>>>> the products being delivered. Rather, it's a consequence of the demand

>>>>> for the content and services. Without compelling content and useful

>

>>>>> services, no one would be online.

>>>>>

>>>>> Gutenberg's invention sparked a huge new marketplace of books. It

>>>>> increased rather than reduced value. You can call books "commodity"

> but

>>>>> they aren't like an interchangeable computer part. There must be value

>>>>> in the content itself for anyone to seek out a particular book. It's

>>> not

>>>>> just a wad of paper.

>>>>>

>>>>> I don't believe the dynamic of a growing marketplace is something to

>>>>> fear. People are becoming more involved with content, not less. Content

>>>>> has value when people want that content. The challenge is to grow that

>>>>> demand and build workable business models around that value.

>>>>>

>>>>> Apple has done pretty well, for example, with iPods and the iTunes

>

>>>>> online store. They sell music encoded as ones and zeros, but they are

>>>>> not marketing the ones and zeros, that's merely the carrier (a carrier

>>>>> with some major advantages over plastic disks). They are marketing

>

>>>>> portable, quick and convenient music and video playback hardware as

> a

>>>>> fashion accessory, and the artists are getting paid.

>>>>>

>>>>> Another model is the one you suggest, selling ancillary products and

>>>>> playing live. Those ideas won't work for every artist (especially

>>>>> composers who don't play live), but they aren't the only possibilities.

>>>>>

>>>>> Along those lines, it's a bit tiresome for independent musicians to

> hear

>>>>> that music should be given away for free to promote live shows, and

> live

>>>>> shows should be done at a loss to promote the music. It would be easy

>>> to

>>>>> burn the candle at both ends with that combination of common armchair

>>>>> advice. Also, not every artist aspires to be a T-shirt shop.

>>>>>

>>>>> As for the RIAA, they are not a forward thinking bunch. I think we  
> would  
>>>>> agree about that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>>> Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data  
> decreases,  
>>>>> but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations  
> where  
>>>>> prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily)  
>>> breached.  
>>>>> Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg  
>>> invented  
>>>>> movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA  
>>> to  
>>>>> produce,  
>>>>> but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum  
>>>>> it  
>>>>> was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over  
> 1000  
>>>>> printing  
>>>>> shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years  
>>> the  
>>>>> output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on  
> their  
>>>>> way to being commodity items.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic  
>>>>> with  
>>>>> the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales  
>>>>> because  
>>>>> it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy  
> the  
>>>>> CDs  
>>>>> to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how  
> that  
>>>>> price  
>>>>> dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus  
>>>>> price  
>>>>> control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one

> place  
 >>>>> at  
 >>>>>> a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music  
 > can  
 >>>>> be  
 >>>>>> stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's  
 > just  
 >>>>> the  
 >>>>>> way things are going to go.  
 >>>>>>  
 >>>>>> TCB  
 >>>>>>  
 >>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
 >>>>>>> "As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the  
 > supply  
 >>>>>>> of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It  
 >  
 >>>>>>> doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees,  
 > they  
 >>>>>>> are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price  
 > has  
 >>>>> an  
 >>>>>>> impact but it isn't the main value.  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.  
 >>>>>>> When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing  
 > or  
 >>>>>>> acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they  
 >>>>>>> wouldn't bother with it.  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's  
 >>>>>>> a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.  
 >>>>>>> Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio  
 > and  
 >>>>> TV,  
 >>>>>>> and with web content.  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> Cheers,  
 >>>>>>> -Jamie  
 >>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>> TCB wrote:  
 >>>>>>>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't



>>>>> been  
 >>>>>>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
 >>>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade  
 > reggae  
 >>>>>>> dubplates.  
 >>>>>>>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen  
 > 12"  
 >>>>> copies  
 >>>>>>>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall  
 >>>>> dweebs  
 >>>>>>>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright  
 >>>>> law  
 >>>>>>>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to  
 > begin  
 >>>>>>> with.  
 >>>>>>>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told  
 >>> we  
 >>>>> owe  
 >>>>>>>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
 >>>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>>>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value  
 > of  
 >>>>> data  
 >>>>>>>>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity  
 >>> in  
 >>>>>>> microeconomics.  
 >>>>>>>>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu.  
 >>> 700MB  
 >>>>>>>>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my  
 >>> work  
 >>>>>>> network  
 >>>>>>>>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
 >>>>>>>>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some  
 > other  
 >>>>>>> research  
 >>>>>>>>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest  
 >>> link  
 >>>>>>> in  
 >>>>>>>>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
 >>>>>>> Soon  
 >>>>>>>>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be  
 > available  
 >>>>>>>>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
 >>>>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>>>> TCB  
 >>>>>>>>>  
 >>>>>>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into  
> your  
>>>>>>>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how  
> long  
>>>>> it  
>>>>>>>>> takes to download...  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>>>>>>>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> DC  
>>>>>>>>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 20:27:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The question we were discussing was not whether bandwidth is good or bad for a certain kind of artist, or good or bad for a particular industry, or good or bad for 'content and services' which means I'm not sure what. What I said, and what you're basically agreeing to, is that as bandwidth increases data gets cheaper.

Now then, obviously if one is making horrible music the 'content' is less likely to draw customers to use some of their bandwidth to get/purchase it. However, even if you have the super bitchingist content ever you will still be subject to the price dynamic--i.e. the easier it is to get the lower the price you will get for it. You can try to create some artificial scarcity but so far the only two ways tried (DRM and suing your customers) have been dismal failures.

To use the book example again. Illuminated manuscripts are, in my opinion, some of the most beautiful objects ever created by the mind of man. If I ever get rich I will certainly own a few. I'm sure your Medieval Scribes Local 310 saw the first printed books and scoffed saying, 'Our content and services are SO much better than this trash we don't even need to worry. Who would want one of these hideous things, even if they are cheap?' And 50 years later there were probably more printed books in circulation than had been produced by hand in the history of Europe, and the scribe business

was in serious trouble. Track the history of the internet from Compuserve and AOL through MSN and the telcos down to google and bittorrent and MySpace and you'll see it getting stupider, easier, cheaper, and more filled with porn. I'm not saying whether this is right or wrong, for that you'll have to consult someone confident about such things like an ethicist or DC, I'm just pointing out the way things have worked so far, not just with the internet but other technologies as well. I don't see whey something as simple as music distribution will be able to make the rain fall up when it comes to the dynamics of price and scarcity.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>TCB wrote:

>> Except that the world has never worked that way. I didn't say with enough  
>> bandwidth everything is free, I said that as bandwidth (and storage) increase  
>> the price of data will inevitably decrease. It might not be a linear relationship  
>> and it might not happen right away, but it's the way the world works.

>

>We agree that costs are going down.

>

>I think where I part ways with you on this one is the vague translation

>from "content" to "data." It's as if a field of vegetables and a field  
>of nuclear waste were combined into the single description of "dirt."  
>It's not all just "dirt." What's actually in the field matters.

>

>Likewise all content and services can't be merely hand waved away as  
>"data." What's actually encoded into the bitstream matters.

>

>I see higher data bandwidth as being beneficial to producing and  
>distributing content and services, not detrimental. Potentially better  
>for price, for increased consumer and artist choices, and certainly  
>better for value. And as costs go down for moving bits around, woohoo,  
>that's lower overhead.

>

>There are companies being built on the increasing bandwidth and making  
>money. Bigger bandwidth means better content and services can be  
>offered. The internet is growing as the content and services improve and

>the demand continues to increase.

>

>This month, rumor has it, iTunes will start renting movies. Making more

>money on the increasing bandwidth available.

>

>

>> And it doesn't matter whether an artist wants to be a T-Shirt shop or a bucket  
>> of warm spit. The tidal wave does not ask permission from the house it will  
>> soon wash to sea.  
>  
>Nor does the independent artist have to be either a T shirt shop or a  
>bucket of warm spit. They can do traditional merch if it fits, or they  
>can find another business model. Instead of a destructive tidal wave,  
>you could just as well visualize continuing technical improvements as a  
  
>welcoming thermal to soar higher. An engine for success. Or back to your  
  
>waves analogy, surf's up!  
>  
>The artist needs to develop a fan base willing to pony up something for  
  
>the art, and the low cost of moving bits around can help facilitate that  
  
>connection between artist and fan. The ponying up can be direct  
>purchase, it can be purchase through a digital music portal, it can be  
>presale, sponsorship, fan club dues, clicking through ads on the  
>artist's site or (your great idea here). As bandwidth increases and data  
  
>costs go down, more possibilities open up for creative thinkers. Out of  
  
>transformational chaos will arise the next thing, because THAT'S the way  
  
>the world works. :^)  
>  
>Bottom line, the decrease in costs to move data can help artists. It  
>doesn't have to hurt artists. To assume it would necessarily hurt  
>artists (if that's what you're assuming) reveals a possible creativity  
>gap. Much like the one traditional record companies are struggling with,  
  
>as they strive to protect the selling of exclusive and often mediocre  
>mass-market content on plastic disks in an increasingly digital and  
>niche market world.  
>  
>Call me an optimist, but bandwidth improvements are due to a growing  
>market and growing demand. And digital distribution has a huge upside in  
  
>efficiency and scalability. Do we really disagree about this?  
>  
>Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>

>  
>  
>> TCB  
>>  
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>> Nope, I got that you said value when you meant price. Thanks for  
>>> clarifying that earlier.  
>>>  
>>> Just wanted to add the point that we shouldn't confuse content with  
>>> carrier. Lowered carrier cost is an opportunity for expanded content  
>>> distribution, rather than an automatic devaluing of the content. Demand  
>>  
>>> for content and services is what is driving the efficiency of the carrier.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>  
>>>> You're confusing 'value' with 'price.'  
>>>>  
>>>> TCB  
>>>>  
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>>>> If you're saying costs of delivering data is decreasing, that's  
>>>>> certainly true, and predictable.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> But the primary driver of the decrease in data transmission costs is  
>> the  
>>>>> value of the content and services that people are seeking. The demand  
>>  
>>>>> creates opportunity. Consequently, delivery capacity is added by the  
>>  
>>>>> marketplace. Adding more delivery capacity doesn't necessarily devalue  
>>  
>>>>> the products being delivered. Rather, it's a consequence of the demand  
>>  
>>>>> for the content and services. Without compelling content and useful  
>>>>> services, no one would be online.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Gutenberg's invention sparked a huge new marketplace of books. It  
>>>>> increased rather than reduced value. You can call books "commodity"

but

>>>> they aren't like an interchangeable computer part. There must be value  
>>

>>>> in the content itself for anyone to seek out a particular book. It's  
>> not

>>>> just a wad of paper.

>>>>

>>>> I don't believe the dynamic of a growing marketplace is something to  
>>

>>>> fear. People are becoming more involved with content, not less. Content  
>>>> has value when people want that content. The challenge is to grow that  
>>

>>>> demand and build workable business models around that value.

>>>>

>>>> Apple has done pretty well, for example, with iPods and the iTunes

>>>> online store. They sell music encoded as ones and zeros, but they are  
>>

>>>> not marketing the ones and zeros, that's merely the carrier (a carrier  
>>

>>>> with some major advantages over plastic disks). They are marketing

>>>> portable, quick and convenient music and video playback hardware as  
a  
>>

>>>> fashion accessory, and the artists are getting paid.

>>>>

>>>> Another model is the one you suggest, selling ancillary products and  
>>

>>>> playing live. Those ideas won't work for every artist (especially  
>>>> composers who don't play live), but they aren't the only possibilities.

>>>>

>>>> Along those lines, it's a bit tiresome for independent musicians to  
hear

>>>> that music should be given away for free to promote live shows, and  
live

>>>> shows should be done at a loss to promote the music. It would be easy  
>> to

>>>> burn the candle at both ends with that combination of common armchair  
>>

>>>> advice. Also, not every artist aspires to be a T-shirt shop.

>>>>

>>>> As for the RIAA, they are not a forward thinking bunch. I think we  
would

>>>> agree about that.

>>>>

>>>> Cheers,

>>>> -Jamie

>>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>>> Well, maybe I put that incorrectly. I should say the price of data  
decreases,  
>>>>> but I stick to it. Just as there are some microeconomic situations  
where  
>>>>> prices can behave oddly, on occasion this rule can be (temporarily)  
>> breached.  
>>>>> Technological innovations in general are hard to contain. Gutenberg  
>> invented  
>>>>> movable type in 1452. Even with typesetting books were a major PITA  
>> to  
>>>> produce,  
>>>>> but in comparison to copying them by hand using tempura ink on vellum  
>>>> it  
>>>>> was a serious step in the right direction. By 1500 there were over  
1000  
>>>> printing  
>>>>> shops in Europe producing 20 million books yearly. So in fifty years  
>> the  
>>>>> output went from nearly zero to 20 million, and books were well on  
their  
>>>>> way to being commodity items.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I don't see how the 'content providers' are going to fight that dynamic  
>>>> with  
>>>>> the internet. OpenBSD used to make a lot of their money from CD sales  
>>>> because  
>>>>> it was a huge PITA to download over a slow connection. I still buy  
the  
>>>> CDs  
>>>>> to support the project, but I download the ISOs if I need them.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> If you're in the business of selling one and zeros I don't see how  
that  
>>>> price  
>>>>> dynamic doesn't eventually win out. You can create scarcity (and thus  
>>>> price  
>>>>> control) with a live show (no band/artist can be in more than one  
place  
>>>> at  
>>>>> a time) a T-Shirt, and a lot of other things, but as long as music  
can  
>>>> be  
>>>>> stored as 1s and 0s, which means for the foreseeable future, it's

just  
>>>> the  
>>>>> way things are going to go.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> TCB  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>>>>> "As bandwidth increases the value of data decreases."  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> That's not automatically true. That would be like saying when the  
supply  
>>>>>> of trees goes up, the value of books and newspapers goes down. It  
  
>>>>>> doesn't necessarily work that way. You're not just selling trees,  
they  
>>>>>> are a carrier for the content you are selling. The carrier price  
has  
>>>> an  
>>>>>> impact but it isn't the main value.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> As long as there is a demand for the content itself, there is value.  
>>>>>> When people show an interest in your content by listening/viewing  
or  
>>>>>> acquiring it, they are reaffirming that it has value. Otherwise they  
>>>>>> wouldn't bother with it.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Granted, when content becomes easier to acquire without paying, there's  
>>>>>> a marketing and business model challenge. But it's not insurmountable.  
>>>>>> Companies have created viable businesses with over-the-air radio  
and  
>>>> TV,  
>>>>>> and with web content.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> TCB wrote:  
>>>>>>> Are you even the \_tiniest\_ bit surprised by this? If so, you haven't  
>>>> been  
>>>>>>> watching the RIAA closely enough.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> There are a few online places where friends of mine and I trade  
reggae  
>>>>>>> dubplates.



>>>>>>> We're talking super obscure records that had maybe a half dozen  
12"  
>>>> copies  
>>>>>>> made for sound systems. They're hard to find but for true dancehall  
>>>> dweebs  
>>>>>>> like me they might as well be made of gold. On top of that copyright  
>>>> law  
>>>>>>> in Jamaica is roughly on par with that of Macedonia and China to  
begin  
>>>>>> with.  
>>>>>>> But we all are terrified we'll get sued at some point and be told  
>> we  
>>>> owe  
>>>>>>> \$10k/song for records nobody else wants.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> And this will only get crazier. As bandwidth increases the value  
of  
>>>> data  
>>>>>>> decreases. It's as simple and unchangeable as the laws of scarcity  
>> in  
>>>>>> microeconomics.  
>>>>>>> I recently did a bittorrent download of the new version of Ubuntu.  
>> 700MB  
>>>>>>> on a cable modem line and it was done in less than an hour. On my  
>> work  
>>>>>> network  
>>>>>>> (100 mb/s pretty clean until it hits the student network) file transfers  
>>>>>>> to/from other universities (we have quicker fiber links to some  
other  
>>>>>> research  
>>>>>>> institutions) can get close to theoretical maximum of the weakest  
>> link  
>>>>>> in  
>>>>>>> the network chain, in our case the 100 mb connection on our firewall.  
>>>>>> Soon  
>>>>>>> enough that kind of bandwidth, or something close to it, will be  
available  
>>>>>>> at home. Not sure what the RIAA will be doing then.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> TCB  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122800693.html>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Given the fact that the only way to get uncompressed audio into  
your  
>>>>>>>> computer or iPod is to copy it from a CD, this is bad news indeed.

>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Where am I supposed to buy a 16/44.1 download? Never mind how  
long  
>>>> it  
>>>>>>>> takes to download...  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> We have always been able to copy our own records and CD's to cassette  
>>>>>>>> for use in the car, why not for the iPod?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> DC  
>>>>>>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: oh swell...  
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 04 Jan 2008 02:37:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:  
>Track the history of the internet from Compuserve  
>and AOL through MSN and the telcos down to google and bittorrent and MySpace  
>and you'll see it getting stupider, easier, cheaper, and more filled with  
>porn. I'm not saying whether this is right or wrong, for that you'll have  
>to consult someone confident about such things like an ethicist or DC, I'm  
>just pointing out the way things have worked so far, not just with the internet  
>but other technologies as well. I don't see whey something as simple as  
music  
>distribution will be able to make the rain fall up when it comes to the  
dynamics  
>of price and scarcity.

Of course, the question remains as to whether the technology  
influences the culture or the culture influences the technology.

To completely disregard the ethics of stealing music is to  
disregard the forces that make those manuscripts you like  
so valuable. Scarcity, yes, but quality too.  
Stealing music reduces the likelihood of more good music  
being made. The worst are not the kids. They simply are doing  
what kids do. The utter lack of good parenting, compounded  
by the would-be-hip older folks and their brave-new-digital-world  
have left a vacuum of moral reasoning in the culture that kids  
will only amplify. In this Lord of the Flies world of youth worship  
how could it be otherwise?

OTOH, most young people have a friend or classmate in a band or rapping. How hard is it to tell them that it is wrong to steal from their friend? How hard is it to make the larger point that stealing hurts music, once you have made the smaller point that stealing hurts their friend?

Kids are smarter than we imagine and they look for us as leaders.

Unfortunately we are usually total crap at that job.

(and a bunch of us are running for president)

DC

---