

They just don't have it.


Mikel R. Nieto

October 20, 2014, in the Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)

A place for my thoughts

Types of luggage sets and features

March 23, 2014 by leaed



There are different types of luggage sets which will let you carry various kinds of items and maintain style as well. You will be well organized by going for the most appropriate luggage set. It is possible to select luggage sets as per your personality and all items will be in well secured condition. Luggage sets are available in various budgets, sizes and shapes. There are large as well as small luggage sets. If you are aware of different kinds of luggage sets, you will be able to select the right kind of luggage set to your requirements.

Factors that affect the selection of a luggage set

Recent Posts

- [Weight Loss Package Guide](#)
- [The best ways to Ensure Baby Gets His Best Sleep And Avert Sudden Infant Death Syndrome](#)
- [A Simple Analysis Of Picking Out Primary Aspects For Myths About Christian Dating](#)
- [Fat Loss 4 Idiots As A Fast Weight Loss Diet – Hold Your Expectation](#)
- [Fat Loss 4 Idiots As A Fast Weight Loss Diet – Hold Your Expectation](#)

Talking about music is a succession of battles; it's an entire war; every battle is an attempt to define the unattainable, the unfathomable part of the human being. Every war is a war lost, in advance; writing about music is definitely not practical, it is an internal struggle in text form. Music is not written, it is inscribed in our memory, by perception, by listening. Why write about music, then, if it alone describes itself? It is engraved in our experience, in our perception, in our hearing, in our memory. *In memoriam*. Writing about music is a tribute, in the past, in the present without a future. Then, when I take a book and read a text that tells me about music, I listen, I appreciate it; especially because I feel reflected, within human limitation, to describe the indescribable, beyond perception, beyond our limits. (a)¹ A reality. One possible fiction. Or two or three.

We try to meet its terms, its borders, its limits, to understand it, to think it. We limit ourselves to thinking; we think of limiting it, narrowing it, marginalizing it, finishing it, but do not conceive that its boundaries are our own limits: the limits of our perception. We project onto music all our possibilities, all our knowledge, the condition of possibility, in the same way that our projections about the unknown are based upon what was previously known. There is nothing new. We can imagine what it is; but it is in the act, in the act of listening, where absolutely all of our thoughts vanish. We listen.

¹ (a) – The letters stand for quotations from other authors that accompany the text, located at the end.

(1) – The numbers are for the footnotes.

We listen to the other, not without passion, not without desire. We listen to ourselves, not without pain, not without remedy. We listen without thinking; but we do not think without listening. We hear. We listen to our thoughts, our lyrics, our texts, our readings. We read, abstracting the words of the text, without realizing that our listening is never exhausted. It is inevitable to surrender to it, listening, without condition, without redemption, without remedy. Drowning.

We still believe that we can define music, but it is music that defines us, our societies, our politics, our worldviews. There is nothing in it that does not reflect who we are, reflections, Narcissus. Look into the water, into infinity, into the waves that modulate the reality we know; enter into the unknown. Listen. Let us be brave, for a moment, let us look at the reflection, let us recognize the music that exists in the depths. That music that calls us from afar. That music that touches us, in silence, that we frame, we produce, we sell. That music, that product, is a lie. Music, for someone who loves it unconditionally, hopelessly, is pain, is passion, is desire. Music whispers in our ear what we do not want to hear, tells us what is to come. Music is our omen. Or two or three.

This text does not intend to talk about music; simply, it does not intend to do anything. This text is a collection of more or less organized thoughts, ideas and sketches. Reflections. Subjectivities. Collectives. This text has been *a place for my thoughts*. This text is definitely not a list, nor is it a collection. Neither. Any coincidence with real life is pure coincidence. This text is not to read, but to hear. This text is a tribute to all netlabels, to all projects that have grown and have made us grow with them. Thanks to them we now have a reason to write and read this text. Or two or three.

The dissipation of the term (b)

There is an etymological relation² between the word 'netlabel' and 'record labels'³. This relation, a priori, leads us to believe that physical labels were adapted to the online digital format, resulting in netlabels. Nothing could be further from the truth. Netlabels are not just the result of a change in format between the physical and digital; they are not the binary children of CDs. Netlabels are not a new format. The essence of netlabels is not in the format but in the activity of exchange and its norms. The word 'netlabel' is more complex than it may seem; if we really wish to understand what a netlabel is we must know some details of its short but intense history: what historical references influenced it, what agents were involved, what relations arose within the music industry, what issues were raised and from what perspective. In this sense, interpretations of what is or is not a netlabel are not innocent. It is up to us to find in netlabels something more than just a system

² The word 'netlabel' is of Anglo-Saxon origin and consists of two terms: first, 'net' which refers to the word 'network' or 'red' in Spanish, and that relates to a decentralized set of communication networks interconnected using different protocols, i.e., what is commonly referred to as the Internet; on the other hand, the translation to Spanish of the noun 'label' could be misleading, since it could be translated as

of music distribution on the Internet because in their idiosyncrasies lies a harbinger of the changes that will subsequently be established in society. It depends on us.

Today, the definition of the word 'netlabel' remains open. The possibility of finding a definition that pleases everyone involved has become exhausting, and the interpretation of the term 'netlabel' as an adaptation or a format change is insufficient, since this amnesic definition doesn't consider the variety of possible and existing interpretations. The enthusiasm for sharing creations, and the motivation that this generates, have been the driving force behind the creation of these autonomous networks. This action has allowed grassroots growth of a community with common interests far removed from capital, regulation, control and power. The foundations of netlabels are simply different. Based on the desire to share musical creations without any pretense or economic pressure, netlabels are evidence that an autonomous system of creation without apparent regulation is able to establish a new regime outside the range established by the market. Their labour differs from the models of capitalist work; they are independent of capital. Netlabels were established autonomously, without regulation or authorization or authority.

The network defines itself, in the process, in its own lack of definition. The term 'netlabel' has dissipated. The origin of this dissipation is in two issues that affected both netlabels and the music industry and have become apparent during the transition between formats. On the one hand, the economic matters involved in the consumption of publications and, on the other, the distribution licensing of publications. Both issues mined the ground. The consequences were different for netlabels and the music industry: for netlabels, an autonomous system of unregulated creation where the debate remains open and constantly growing, whose goal is not to be a product but a process of creation; while in the case of the music industry, the wound was closed as soon as possible so that market restructuring could be immediate and so could capital recovery. This war on two fronts has been open for years, in which fighting has been raging between those who were closer to the music industry and those who wanted to differentiate from it radically. The discussion remains open in order to find which aspects define their identity, closer to or farther from the model proposed by the music industry, by capital. But how can we differentiate a netlabel if we cannot define it? How is it possible that netlabels have died if we have not yet managed to define them? Is the dissipation of an indefinite term possible? In this sense, this text does not intend to establish a definition of 'netlabel' but try to understand its practice: I do not want to think what a netlabel *is*; I want to think *through* it.

The term 'netlabel' conceals political aspects in its publications that serve as an ideological motor for each decision. Aesthetic

'seal' or 'tag', which implies an internationally recognized standard. The sum of two terms, 'net' and 'label' is usually translated into Spanish as '*sello de discos en internet*' ('online record label'), where we should distinguish between the website of a record label on the Internet and a website where music is distributed on the network. The first has a physical analogue version and the second does not. If we interpret the term as a 'online record label' we are referring to the music industry adapted to the network. However, if we understand the word 'netlabel' as a platform for online music distribution we can understand that there is a desire to share one's own sound creations or those of others through the Internet, which is outside the standards of the music industry and does not follow any market model.

³ The Napster case is paradigmatic: a group of enthusiasts created a communication network that allowed sharing music files between users. The network began to grow until it reached the ears of the music industry, which, with Metallica and Dr. Dre at the helm, decided to sue the creators of the network. Shortly after, Napster became another platform for promoting artists in the music industry and Metallica published some online work trying to emulate the viral effect of the Napster network.

considerations, content and times are decisions that indicate obvious differences between netlabels and *converted* commercial physical labels. The word 'netlabel' interpreted from simple etymological logic does not reveal all the depth and complexity that it possesses. The most important aspect of netlabels is the network, a web of communication to share sound creations. Therefore, it is worth considering that the network is what defines the netlabel and not the medium it uses, or the format it has. The network is what has allowed creators to share their creations for the benefit of their knowledge, enriching themselves as creators. This is their label: the network as label. If we put this issue in perspective, we see that in the 1980s this exchange already existed within the cassette underground, which no one named 'cassette-label', but, originally, the International Cassette Network. Its members had no greater purpose than to share and hear their creations. There was no commercial zeal. Nor was collecting possible, it could not be completed, it was simply too vast. There was no complete catalogue of numbered creations. They were not products, it was a network of creators, from creator to creator.

The avant-garde of the industry

Let me stress that the networks, netlabels and the International Cassette Network, have remained outside of the music industry, capital, control and power; and this marginalization is suitable to autonomous systems of music creation and distribution that have no need of a regulation or standardization nor a definition. The members of the network are the ones who set the rules: meritocracy has been the system used to define the value of the content of the creations and their forms. The networks' members are the ones who establish their validity and value. The value, growth and opportunities reside in the horizontal exchange between creators. As history has shown, this autonomous system of network creation shook the standards of music consumption and simultaneously showed the steps to follow (2). Music, or rather the sound of music, overtook social change, and guided it. Jacques Attali knew this well and described it well in his book 'Noise'.

"Today, it is unavoidable, as if, in a world now devoid of meaning, a background noise were increasingly necessary to give people a sense of security. And today, wherever there is music, there is money. (...) Music, an immaterial pleasure turned commodity, now heralds a society of the sign, of the immaterial up for sale, of the social relation unified in money. It heralds, for it is prophetic."

This marginalization, or rather avant-garde, in which netlabels grew and developed became a model for the music industry. The change to the binary system meant a questioning at the heart of the music industry, but not so for exchange networks between creators. The netlabels did not need to adapt; they themselves adapted the means, the code, and they succeeded with the available means, putting them at their service. They found pathways, protocols, to communicate and share information. Their growth and expansion were based on personal and social satisfaction produced by the act of sharing. This flow of information, communication and creation is vital in a process of constant growth where the knowledge of the other is as important and valid as one's own. Once again, feedback in the network is essential in a horizontal and delocalized landscape.

File defragmentation (c)

The needs of netlabels and the music industry were born at different times, from different sources and different cycles. Their history, therefore, is also different. The comfort in which the music market lived in its physical format postponed any changes until they had become inevitable and economically necessary. Music had moved ahead. The record industry took inspiration from the independent platforms which had previously appeared. The time for change had come. They quickly bought the code, established their own economic policies of neoliberal capitalism and saw their power flourish again. The industry incorporated both the revolutionary and the marginal into their system, expanding their profiles and cashing in on the conflict. All resistance is profitable and all opposition becomes a source of earnings and inspiration for capitalism. The music industry cannot afford to stop making money, so it also capitalized on the process of change.

The power structures of the music industry adapted to the new, socially consumed formats. They capitalized on their popularity and their results, socialization and sociability. They bought the decentralized platforms popularly used to share music files. The system based on decentralized networks, from port to port (peer to peer or P2P) was the starting point for sharing music files between the first Internet natives. The empire of the music industry in the digital world was born using these platforms, incorporating a payment for rights. Paying entitles users to a play – exclusive, personalized and profiled – or to a high quality, high-class play.

The possibilities of the Internet began to flow and the music industry jumped at the opportunity. Users started paying intermediaries, new publishers, as it has always been. In short, the methods, processes and strategies used by netlabels and traditional

record labels are different even though both use the same media through which information travels: ones and zeros. The differences are profound in their foundations, in their policies; these differences provoked debate and general confusion. Neither the public nor some musicians knew what was happening, what position to take or which front to fight on. A battle ensued that demonstrated the principles of the two models. The netlabels do not seek direct economic benefits: they do not sell products; the word 'market' is not in their vocabulary. However, the music industry perpetuates and enforces the need to capitalize on musical creation and the social relations that music provides, as well as its publishing and reproduction; for the first time in history, they centralized power in a socialized medium that allows production, distribution and consumption, all at the same time.

The socialization of the media preceded the creation and spread of music distribution networks. Socialized media allowed more immediate communication and the possibilities grew over time. Users opened their collections to the world and the world became sound. Shared folders were an inexhaustible source of files and their possibilities multiplied exponentially. The revolution of the digital age was in cloned bits of information. Files were equal to each other. Every bit was equal to its neighbour and both had the same value. The copy exceeded the original. The same bits were distributed to generate the same music in different parts of the world. A new radio, without a tangible body, was born in sin. (d)

The necessity of conflict (e)

Internet music began to take shape, to be present, to fade in fragmented bits and scattered to different players in different parts of the world. Originals and copies began to resemble each other, to become identical: at the binary level they contain the same data, the same bits of information; there is no difference between the original and the copy. So, the music industry decided to use this scenario to highlight the vulnerable situation in which they find their concepts concerning intellectual property and copyright. They used their ability to be omnipresent through the media with the aim of strengthening among the social mass the concepts and the specific terms of a war. A strong dialectic and fierce strategy always add allies: *point to the enemy and atomize the conflict*. (f) The result: the *pirate* is the enemy to fight, all together. Neutrality is not possible. Rights are being violated. Digital crime is born. According to them, the music industry was being unfairly attacked by millions of users because none of them paid their fees. Habits had changed, but the licences remain the same: profits for publishers and intermediaries.⁴ Today, we still suffer the consequences of a fragmented and

⁴ Lars Ulrich, drummer of the popular heavy-metal group Metallica and visible face throughout the lawsuit against Napster, offered

unresolved debate that governments and copyright management companies have established in their own interests.⁵ Fragmenting the debate and preventing it from taking place makes it possible to reap profits indefinitely; wars and crises are a good example of this: they are a good opportunity for making money and gaining strength, especially during the process of change.

The opportunities offered by 'new technologies', as discussed below, imply acceptance of an invisible war scenario. The battle for the defence of copyright assumes a sense of ownership of the work that must be protected and safeguarded. Intellectual property is an outdated concept that establishes a monopoly for printers and publishers, excluding the authors of the works from having control over the printed work and its use. Do not forget that the idea of authorship assumes us to be creators of an original, new content, which, at least, is questionable. Is there possibly any original work separate from any possible previous reference? There is no creation without imitation. Every work is a result of the flow of knowledge and therefore is part of human knowledge. The right question is: what creation is not in the public domain? The concepts of authorship and intellectual property, both used in industrial patents and cultural creations, benefit middlemen who make sure that their rights are respected through the payment of the fees that they set themselves. Governments and copyright collectives use terminology suited for interpretation that is consistent, according to them, with the rules and laws that they themselves have previously established in their own interests. Obviously. These interpretations of culture and its transmission turn us, ideally, into authors, creators and owners, special beings, almost divine, with the ability to create completely from scratch. Now, despite being almost divine beings, according to them, we require the defence of a property that, in practice, is not actually ours, fortunately.

In the same way, and the same instant that there is an effort to defend a property, a security system exists that protects and enforces the law on offenders as well as suspects. In many cases, the direct application of security systems is based on suspicion and prevention. Who is potentially a suspect of breaking the law? All users with digital storage devices, i.e., everyone. We are all suspects. Everyone can copy, we can all share, and above all, we can all do it without having to pay a tax for it. This is the problem, this is their problem. With this pretext, based on security and prevention, a compulsory fee was established for all digital hardware which allow file sharing. The result is that the user becomes potentially guilty of copyright violation and needs to pay a fine, or at least compensation for those who do break the law. This discourse leads to the implementation of a security policy whereby everyone is guilty until proven innocent: currently, platforms that allow free publishing of

numerous press conferences and led numerous mass public events where he expressed his opinion about failing to receive a percentage of money for the exchange of Metallica music files between users: 'The argument I hear a lot, that "music should be free", must then mean that musicians should work for free. Nobody else works for free. Why should musicians?'

⁵ The debate raised by some governments, such as the Spanish government, and by copyright and editorial rights management companies harks back to earlier times full of social injustices and abuses of power. Currently, the strategy is to maintain control over the power structures and the media for efficient manipulation of public opinion on an issue raised using a not-so-innocent dialectic: the pirates are those who do not pay the fees officially established as appropriate. There are no privateers, no. There are only pirates – and it's not them. In fact, when Spain's copyright collecting agency, SGAE, have been referred to as pirates, they have felt defamed and filed lawsuits for 'damage to reputation', as happened after an article published in 2007 by Trebor Escargot.

sound files apply rules, much like airports do, under which we have to prove we are not guilty of a future offense. This security policy, typical of repressive systems, allows them to offer 'greater security' to the user in exchange for accepting conditions of use that are at least questionable if not quite possibly abusive, arguing, always, that it is for our own safety. (g)

The dictatorship of suspicion (h)

There is a paradigmatic case in the world of netlabels which clearly shows the contradictions of this control system and its possible interpretations. The artist Anki Toner, a.k.a. 'file under toner', published a series of songs created from the silences that vinyl records have at the beginning, end and between songs. These supposed silences were amplified and modified to yield an album of 36 songs. The album, 'This is the end, beautiful friend', was published by the netlabel Hazard Records and licensed in the public domain on Internet Archive, offering free downloads.⁶ With this release the power of suspicion to impose censorship, by law and for security, became present. On September 29, 2010, Anki Toner's album was removed from Internet Archive servers for alleged 'violation of copyright'. Under this interpretation, the silences that are present by default on vinyl records are also copyrighted and therefore must also be respected, just like the songs published under the same copyright license.

This idea implies that in every record, each musician creates new works composed of silence to later separate his or her songs with. We all know that this does not happen: no composer writes several works a few seconds long containing only silence to separate their songs; nor is this work then performed, nor recorded, nor included physically on the record. These silences exist to give the ears a break, they are the doors that separate the spaces inhabited by the songs; they indicate the beginning and end of songs, the album and the music. These silences are not creations simply because they have not been proposed as such, as works, as pieces of music, as moments to listen to. However, censorship takes shape with prevention, silences are muted and loopholes are interpreted. The contradictions arise quickly: if no author has registered the musical scores of these works, composed of silence and only seconds long, what makes them the rightful owners of a non-property? If there is no record of intellectual property of these works, then neither can there exist, logically, any violation of intellectual property, in its own terms.

The situation that arose from this record demonstrates that the application of laws and their security systems take priority over common sense: the law can be applied even against all logic. Any

⁶ The album 'This is the end, beautiful friend' is available on Internet Archive at the following link: <https://archive.org/details/hr061b>

copyright is justified by the common good, typical of a paternalistic, restrictive and controlling system. Imposing limits of creation is a sign of the desire to establish control over the boundaries of the world and what happens in it.

The manifesto of the Hazard Records netlabel, written in 1999, predicts the contradictions that would later become apparent in implementing a legislative anachronism on the activity of digital music and contemporary culture. The full manifesto is available on its website.⁷

Intellectual property is not only THEFT (like all property, said Proudhon), but ABUSE, a DISGRACE and tool of CENSORSHIP.

The copyright collecting agencies, of compulsory membership (in Spain, SGAE), do not defend the rights of the creator but the owners of the work (if not other, darker interests). These entities are a SCAM.

Therefore we launch the HAZARD RECORDS label under the following conditions:

HAZARD RECORDS albums will be published in CD-R (compatible with all CD players). By making the discs on demand, we eliminate fixed costs. This allows for making short runs without increasing the price of the discs. It is similar to the method used by cassette labels in the 80s.

(...)

Records published by HAZARD RECORDS are to be in the PUBLIC DOMAIN, i.e., free of COPYRIGHT. This applies both ways: neither do we care about the hypothetical or legal provenance of the content of our records nor will we question in any case its future use in other contexts. (Though we would appreciate being cited for it). We note however that for the same reason that we are not concerned about the legality of our records, we cannot be held responsible to any third parties that believe to have rights to the ideas contained in them, nor to any judges who might have to decide on the matter.

Using a similar work model to the cassette labels of the 80s is no accident. Proposing an updated version of this work model values the policies implicit in this model developed in previous decades. The approach taken by netlabel Hazard Records is commendable, as they have managed to see beyond the established discourse. (i)

Reproducing hopes (j)

As we can see, the emergence of new music-reproduction systems also produces new systems of power and control, and these always leave the creator on the outside; inevitably, it is the publishers and

⁷ The following link is the official website of Hazard Records: www.hazardrecords.org

managers who take over the power of music: they manage it, at the time it is performed and at the time it is reproduced. Possession of the medium, the format, the reproduction systems and distribution is a way to strengthen a system of control and power, as well as to establish new licenses and new terms that are in line, always, with their restrictive policies. If we look at the reproduction systems we shall see that they are accompanied, every so often, by new formats and new players that require us to invest our savings or our time in this hope-filled transition.

In this way, the music industry has procured a new form of reproduction every so often, a new standard, a new hope, even if they are detrimental to the quality of listening. In the digital format it is more evident than ever that the priority is not quality. The digital compression format par excellence, mp3, was created from a lossy algorithm that allows music to travel more lightly through the network. Its quality standards are reflected in its codes: the priority is not quality of listening, but the ability to share quickly and have more in less time. Currently established as a universal format for online digital music, mp3 is the extension of the omnipresence of the music industry who wrote the compression and decompression codes for digital music files which are currently the most widely used. (k) We must not forget that music reproduction is linked to its corresponding reproduction system, to a player, transmitter and receiver. This strategy has been repeated with each change of format, requiring users to acquire new players suitable to new formats. Thus, users' music collections also have to be bought again in line with the new format of the new player. The new formats are accompanied necessarily by new machines, new reproduction engines and new sales, as well as promises, possibilities and hopes.

Conditions of possibility (l)

New technologies and their possibilities provide new scenarios for thought and for neoliberal capitalism, where battles are fought for the power and control which is derived, in this case, from music and socialization. New technologies are presented with their ability to make us enjoy the illusion of freedom and success provided by new machines. The advertising campaigns of new technological devices essentially stress that our time will be more profitable and productive with new media; they will provide us, therefore, with better quality of life (but not better quality of listening), thanks to the new possibilities they bring about. The promises of greater freedom, greater productivity and greater success come hand in hand with new technologies. The promise of technology emphasizes the possibilities that we can develop because of them.

The formula for success they offer is increased productivity in less time, also including socializing as a productive and profitable act: the socialization of our successes increases our profitability in the world; we become potentially successful beings to the extent that we have greater opportunities to socialize our possessions, our achievements and even our downloads.

This idea of measuring success by the number of downloads, visits or sales has been applied since the beginnings of music reproduction. The number of sales indicates how successful a hit is. The number of visits to a webpage indicates the size of the potential audience that an artist can draw.⁸ We download, organize, number, measure, calibrate, annotate, but we most assuredly do not listen. In the digital domain there is no doubt that the number of downloads does not necessarily mean the number of listenings and it is in this quantitative difference between downloading and listening where the question of the ownership of the file arises – and its ability to regulate power. Evidence that downloads, understood as the ability to complete an entire music collection, are not inherent to netlabels was made clear in the proposal of a netlabel called ‘bajarmusika.tk’. On February 23, 2011, the following post appeared in a collaborative portal for the dissemination of sound art⁹, where the authors of this netlabel anonymously made their proposal public:

*HELLO,
WE HAVE CREATED A LABEL FOR MUSIC YOU CAN
DOWNLOAD.
WWW.BAJARMUSICA.TK
WE UPLOAD EVERYTHING.
YOU ONLY HAVE TO SEND YOUR MUSIC TO THIS E-MAIL:
sellobajarmusica@gmail.com
IF YOU LIKE, DO NOT HESITATE TO FORWARD THIS MESSAGE
THANK YOU, LOVE TO ALL
[<http://www.artesonoro.org/archives/7303>]*

This ironic text was the public presentation of the netlabel ‘bajarmusika.tk’; its simple proposal brought to light some important tensions in netlabels such as free media and the ability to upload and download all possible music online. These two aspects are found in the following three elements: first, the free domain ‘.tk’ for the New Zealand archipelago of Tokelau, which allows people to create their own domain at no cost; second, the free hosting of files online made possible by Internet Archive servers; and third, the name of the netlabel, ‘bajarmusika.tk’ (‘downloadmusik.tk’) is also telling: the proposal is to upload ‘everything’ in order to make it all publicly available. The act of uploading and downloading music gains value simply because the media permit it, as well as allowing for amassing

⁸ For years the social network for musicians, Myspace, regulated the success of a musical group based on the visits that the group’s page showed. Sales opportunities and the group’s success were measured by the number of visits and not in terms of quality or group affinity within the space of representation. The priority: capital.

⁹ The collaborative portal referred to, for the dissemination of sound art, is: www.artesonoro.org

a complete body of the possible, of the finite. The free domain, the free web hosting and the name 'bajarmusika.tk' symbolize the radically enhanced possibilities offered by the media in the act of sharing and in the volume of what is shared. Its hallmark is the vertical movement of the file.

The disappearance of the curator

The important thing, clearly, is the ability to do it, the possibilities of the available resources, rather than the content or the discourse. In fact, the discourse is an apparent lack of discourse. The consequences of the act of publishing 'everything', or at least proposing to do so, is evidence of the desire for the disappearance of the curator, who curates the label by proposing a discourse, a line of publication, a coherent filter between the artist and the listener through the content. This problem is present from the moment in which there is not a mediator to tell us what publications to listen to: if there is no filter, nor a curator, neither is there discourse. In other words, if the premise is to publish 'everything', a curator is not necessary. We can publish 'everything', unfiltered, unfettered, without mediators or intermediaries, raw. If we are 'free' to publish 'everything', then why not do it?

Curators are no longer needed because the media allow doing without them, their tastes, their approaches and their discourse. But this apparent absence means that this curatorial work, or selection of content, is transferred to other actors, such as the artist, who creates, and the listener, who listens. They will both have the power of final decision on creation offered and the creation heard. The feigned disappearance occurs in a selection process between creator and listener, but the selection will continue to happen in both processes: publishing and listening. In addition, the disappearance of the curator is not complete; in 'bajarmusika.tk' it is a game of concealment that allows the transformation of the curator in a process of repetitive *ad infinitum* publication. The curator as an officer of file uploads, as a vertical content machine. A harbinger of what will later happen globally in corporate online publishing platforms. The invisibility of the filtering process, the purification process. This process, seemingly automatic, is anonymous. Nobody knows who it is and knowing does not matter either. But what is the point of uploading and downloading music with no apparent criteria and without an ethic governing the publication policy? The proposed netlabel 'bajarmusika.tk' revises the figure of the curator and begins to interpret it from an experimental perspective.

Music is synonymous with freedom (m)

As we shall later see, the music industry also incorporates this system of making curators invisible in online music publication platforms but with a very different goal: to give artist and listener a greater role, making services profitable, capitalizing on visits, popularity. If in the absence of a commissioner it is the artists and listeners who perform the tasks of sorting, filtering and purification, it emphasizes the need for ethics in relation to the volume of online publications. But is it necessary to select files from an endless sea of possible listenings? The answers are mixed, as with the International Network of Cassettes. The words of the artist Rafael Flores in this regard are very lucid:

*'By 1991 I'd had enough. The network became overwhelming. It became impossible to distinguish so many cassettes sent and received.'*¹⁰

This feeling of being overwhelmed would be repeated if not multiplied with the arrival of digital online formats. In fact, this inability to embrace 'everything' in listening would be grounds for charges against netlabel operators of having an excessively wide filter, an excessively open door. The curatorial work would be attacked for its absence. In this blog article by *eldino* we find a direct attack on netlabels for their inability to filter content publishing and the implications this has on the community:

*'The biggest part of netlabels out there publish tons of shit, they don't know or care a fuck about applying some quality filter to their releases. There is [not] any "firewall" between the demos they get in their inboxes and the releases they publish. That's why most part of netaudio scene sucks.'*¹¹ (o)

The idea that the volume of publications directly harms their quality and therefore also harms the so-called 'netlabel scene' makes a generalization that is unfair, as all generalizations are, about something completely subjective: the taste for music. Remember that the ultimate responsibility for what we hear comes, no doubt, from who chooses what to hear, from us, from our decision immediately prior to listening: the act of pressing a button and hearing what we have chosen cannot be disregarded in the least, therein lies the essential difference between music and noise. Your music is my noise; my music is your noise. The desire to get a sound to our ears is triggered at the same time as a song that we have chosen in a player. The final decision before listening is what matters: the user decides.

What we must learn from this inability to take in the entire

¹⁰ The full interview with Rafael Flores is available at this link: <http://www.vice.com/es/read/de-red-en-red-806-v5n5>

¹¹ The full article is available at the following link: <http://eldino.wordpress.com/2010/08/04/en-the-4th-secret-of-netlabels-slim-down-your-releases-and-make-your-catalogue-better/>

volume of publications is the difference in times, in the pace of our lives and the rate of publication. This situation reveals that netlabel publication rates far outpace a person's lifetime listening capacity: the time required to listen to netlabel publications is tremendously greater than a person's lifetime. We can deduce, on the one hand, that sound creations require time to be heard, and, on the other, the listening time necessary to make use of all the creations published in the netlabels transcends the time of our own lives. Lifetimes and netlabel times, for publication and for listening, are just different. The problem with playing music, either digital or analog, is twofold: first, we believe we need more time than we have in life to hear 'everything'; somehow when we see a music collection it awakens the desire to hear it, to embrace it, to possess it, but this desire is where the second problem begins: we do not fully take in the fact that the sound or music, with the implicit desire and curiosity to listen, transcends our own lifetimes.

The netlabel 'bajarmusica.tk' reminds us with these gestures that we are 'free' to publish it all, compulsively, without moderation, everything possible. There is a precedent, the 'desetxea' netlabel¹². Since its first publication in 2003 it has published about 200 records. This volume, a priori, could be readily manageable for listening to in a lifetime; however, the name of the netlabel, 'the house of waste' in Basque, does not encourage us to do so; the value of its publications is at a level one would expect of an obscenely bulimic policy of publication, without any apparent ethic. (p)

¹² The link to the netlabel 'desetxea' is as follows: <http://www.mattin.org/desetxea.html>

'Do whatever the fuck you want with this files' (SIC)

This is the proposition of the netlabel 'desetxea' directed by Basque sound artist Mattin, who intends to critically question the established systems in the scope of the practice of experimental music, both in publication and distribution licenses. With this sharp statement, he gives us absolute 'freedom' with the netlabel's publications as listeners and creators: *we can do whatever the fuck we want with these files*. But what can we do with a collection of waste? (q) We can download, archive and sort it; we can listen 'freely' deciding what files to listen to and when; we can distribute them 'freely'; we can remix them and use them 'freely' in new creations. We can, 'freely'. The possibilities are endless. The 'freedom' is absolute. So is the pressure of the blank sheet. Would it be possible in the music industry to make a proposal of this caliber? It probably would be, but only in appearance, in an advertisement, in a claim; I've heard this argument repeatedly to sell technology, devices or services: 'The possibilities are endless. The "freedom" is absolute.' In this case, there is no blank sheet applying pressure, but oppression. The differences in meaning

that the same propositions take on, depending on who makes them, who voices them, are considerable. So are the differences in essence.

Both netlabels, 'bajarmusica.tk' and 'desetxea', remind us that in essence we are 'free'. In essence. Both proposals healthily question the limits of the sound artist and the curator, and of listening, publication and licenses. They put us on edge, as creators and as listeners. Both conceive the work of the curator as an artistic and experimental work, leaving the door open, perhaps too open. Thus, the flow of creations is huge, as is the network in which they are inscribed. Thus, the quality of the flow is as questionable as the taste, subjective, personal and not transferable. Thus, the speed of the flow, just as the 'freedom' to do as we please, speaks for us, speaks of our time, of our media, of the contemporaneity in which we are inscribed. It speaks for itself.

The need for speed

Nowadays all bodies, living or inert, travel faster around the globe. Long distances have shrunk considerably, increasing speed. Bodies travel, compressed, over time. The inherent quality of the network of networks is the speed of digital bodies and immediacy with which we can have them. This has been the most significant change between physical exchange networks and digital ones: the speed at which the digital file travels and the immediacy with which we obtain it. The digital body is infinitely faster than the physical body. Their times are undoubtedly different. New technologies allow us to send, receive and store a larger amount of information in less time. Never before in history have we had so much information so quickly; but to travel, send, receive, access, accumulate and archive so quickly also has its consequences. What does such speed imply?

Delivery speed is equivalent to the rate of loss or dissipation of bodies. Files, people, concepts disappear at the same speed at which they travel through space. The faster, the more fragile. The increase in speed leads to an increased risk of the degree of loss. All travel involves risk and this risk increases when the speed is higher. Plane crashes are a clear reflection of this degree of loss, leaving fewer survivors. Our bodies, our information, our concepts, our ideas and our projects are more fragile and ephemeral, when the speed is higher. In data transmission issues, increased speed also involves an increase in the risk of the degree of data loss. We can send a greater volume of information at higher speed, but we can lose it at the same speed we sent it at, either by a transmission error, accident or a lack of interest or attention. The loss can be of many types.

Having an increased amount of information in less time means that the information we receive is subject to replacement as quickly as it came. The new information awaits in our minds, in our computers,

to be processed, replacing the old information. Digital bulimia. The bodies, projects, ideas, are more ephemeral to allow the flow to continue in an iterative process of transmission. The flow is greater. The priority in this system is the flow of bodies and knowledge. The greater the movement, the greater the capacity to represent life and, therefore, greater profitability. The rhythms of the economy are the rhythms of transmission flow of information and bodies. Speed is an important factor for a system based on the possession and the power of downloadable files. Do not forget that, for the system, speed is important, as is possession.

We have developed faster speeds, now the question is whether we, our bodies, our minds and our economy, are capable of keeping pace with the immediate and bearing the consequences. Let's not forget that with increasing transmission speed we also increase our possibilities and risks. The rates and digital times of trade, production and economics are different. If we increase the speed of our activities, we must also increase the craving for what is in movement. In musical terms, obtaining the complete discography of the Beatles in minutes, for example, does not at all mean listening to it; this process, of listening, is not a priority and, as we have seen, involves a long time, longer than desired for the capitalist system. The priority is the process of exchange and data transmission: the journey. Possession is justified by a potential listening. Thus, having a full discography satisfies us as long as the data transmission lasts and in some cases less time: as soon as a new possibility of possession, a new transmission or a new discography appears, and with it the desire to possess it immediately, regardless of any old, previous download. Repeating the process of transmission, owning and archiving, manages to satisfy and increase the craving to consume. Repetition maintains order and stabilizes the world, creating more desire. Repetition is profitable. Repetition. Profitability. The desire for repetition increases depending on the capacity of possession, which necessitates compression of the file, of the digital body, of time. Successful repetition of the transmission of compressed time increases the craving for the same process all over again. Infinite success, repeated, repeatedly. The desire for success is profitable.

Maximun space minimized

If we increase the data transmission rate, we must also increase the storage capacity. The space required to store the files are maximized in the digital dimension and minimized to the bodily dimension. Hence we have huge spaces in tiny devices. Digital storage formats are minimized and allow greater storage than physical formats. The sizes and weights of digital files, as mentioned, are smaller

than analogue ones. When compared to analogue format, the digital format allows us to accommodate thousands of hours in the size of a cassette. The minutes have grown longer and the inches shorter. Probably never before in history have we had so much information, so accessible, so immediate and in such a minimized space. We have compressed devices, we have expanded storage spaces and above all, we have compressed transmission times between devices and between users; but we have also had to compress our listening, for economic reasons, in attention, i.e., in time, i.e., money. (r) Statistically, fifty percent of people are unable to maintain their attention on a piece of information online after one minute. It is also true that the transition from the cassette to the CD broadened the uninterrupted listening time. The transition between a digital file on a local hard drive and the constant flow of data in the cloud has allowed us to increase to infinity, if possible, uninterrupted listening time. Today the flow, digital, is eternal. This vastness, in every way, has meant that interruption in playback does not come from the format itself but from the user, in attention, in interest or desire. Our limitations are now above technical or technological limitations. We need, more than ever, to previously generate our attention, our desire, our listening.

Compressed listening

In this sense, one of the netlabels that has highlighted the need for greater speed in listening, increased production of desire and greater access to their entire collection, is the netlabel 'slices'¹³, an ephemeral project that in 20 days had 46 publications in its catalogue. The purpose of this netlabel is to publish records only seconds long, greatly facilitating the work of listening and allowing their entire catalogue to be taken in completely. The netlabel 'slices' is ideal for anyone interested in hearing 'everything' and thus complete a listening to a collection; it is compact and manageable. The netlabel's first publication contains three songs of no more than two second each: a clear declaration of intentions. (s)

The compression of listening time and the ability to own, but above all listen to, the entire collection of the netlabel 'slices' means the value of the time spent on this act corresponds to the value of time nowadays. Compressed files. Liquid times. Likewise, the fact that the netlabel was active only 16 days, from December 22, 2010, to January 7, 2011, makes it clear how fleeting and ephemeral these projects are, a characteristic of the Internet itself. The duration of netlabels, projects, formats, and the knowledge needed to carry them out, all have a very early expiration date. They tend to disappear more and more quickly. Internet life is short, compressed and liquid. Never

¹³ The link to the netlabel 'slices' is the following: <http://lonch.myweb-community.org/>

before has it been so costly, in effort, expertise and time, to make us see that we exist and are still alive.

The mega-netlabel

Digital technologies, as we have seen, allow us to increase the speeds of files and of exchange. Now we have to consider the consequences of this speed in our lives, in our activities and in our thinking, but speed is not all that has come into our lives at the hands of digital technologies. The digitization of archives has necessarily involved the creation of large files, large voids, large servers where we file, manage and conserve human creations and knowledge. If there exists in the world of netlabels an archive par excellence, that is Internet Archive. Since late 1996, Internet Archive has been an online platform with a clear mission to collect and store the public materials online or files donated by individuals and institutions. Its aim is to provide historians, researchers, academics and the general public access to their collection of data and ensure the longevity of this information.

At its inception, Internet Archive undertook to collect, preserve and provide access to historically significant films that are available elsewhere. So the surprise was maximum when they realized that their servers were being used as a medium to accommodate the new music collections that were being born: netlabels. It currently houses the largest flow of donated music online, which gives great it power and at the same time a great responsibility. Its policy on donations is clear, practical and functional, as are the licenses that allow content to be published on their servers. Its policies match perfectly with the netlabels and for that reason Internet Archive is the greatest empty space that a netlabel might wish to fill. The number of netlabels it contains is colossal, enormous, measureless. Internet Archive, in itself, is a mega-netlabel: it contains thousands of netlabels, its browser provides access to the netlabels' collections and the content is sorted and numbered. What would have become of netlabels without a platform like Internet Archive?

Corporate libraries

The metamorphosis of the tangible into the intangible, in music, clearly shows some problems rooted in the publishing industry for centuries, as we have seen. This transition between formats, still latent, has perpetuated previous patterns in the 'new media'. The netlabels have shown the capitalist market the possibilities in the networks of musical exchange. Once again, the economy has been

inspired by music. Therefore, it is not gratuitous that the networks that were intended for exchange between creators and for the publication of their musical works currently result in business for companies offering free services of music distribution and the corresponding socialization. The bill for this gratuity is now on the table: the free services make products out of their users, forcing them to accept their licenses, policies and terms. What is free is suspect.

Corporations, dressed in soft sheep's clothing, offer 'the same' but in their domains, under their control, extending their power and collection. The contemporary musical heritage is installed in their domains, or rather their subdomains, and not in the National Archives; their servers host broader, richer and more up-to-date contemporary music collections than the National Library of any state. Corporations are the new states, the new religions. (t)

Promises of freedom

The benefits offered to musicians by these corporate platforms coincide, in many cases, with the promises of new technologies: immediacy, ease and beauty. Heaven on earth. These features will increase the chances of becoming a profitable person, a divine being, a social creature accepted by the community and therefore having a greater chance of being a success. Being God. Let's see how these platforms and services work. Publications by the musicians are immediate, firstly, because the medium allows it, and secondly, because there is no need for moderation: the artist is the label. The curator disappears: he becomes the artist and vice versa, especially, vice versa. The moderation of publications is based on copyright, as seen above, and on respect for the laws and rules of common benefit; we have the right if not the obligation to point out the suspect and thus become part of the long arm of the law. We all share in the moderation of the content published online, we are all the law. But the fact that there is no curator or that the artist performs such a filtering feature in his work, is a subtle way to understand the artist as a unique and original entity who does not need to copy; the artist turns out to be, at least, a deity. Who does not want to be divine, almighty and eternal?

The authorship and the identity of artists are given value by defining their domain in the corporate platform: artists will have their own domain, their new, free work office. No need to pay for their services, not yet. The payment to the platform is made through consumption and depending on success, appearing as a free service, initially. The work space is infinite and will host the capitalization of the social being. The possibilities are endless. The 'freedom' is maximum. Artists no longer have limits on the space to share their creations, they will be able to share and create whatever they want.

Who does not want to create everything? Who would not want to be 'free'? (u)

The more activity there is in the artists' profile, in their virtual office, in their status, the more noise is generated online and the more attention they will get. Attention: more activity becomes more success and this means more profit. Attention: profit. Attention. The more social you are, the greater presence you have, the more pervasive it is, the more noise is created and the more chances of success are generated. Be omnipresent, be God. The artist is only concerned with creating. In order to do this, the publishing tool available free of charge is so friendly and easy to use and design. The content managers are buttons at our service. The designs, homogenized, are customized 'freely' with existing proposed models. Nothing new. A dystopia available to everyone. We will be freer, more successful, the more we update our profile, our status and the more we are part of it. (v)

The dystopian present (w)

All these apparent benefits attract more and more users to these free, corporate and centralized platforms. With so many apparent benefits it is advisable not to be naïve and to have a certain critical sense to make us see what the possible consequences are of accepting the terms and conditions that they propose, invisibly. (x) These are some of the possible consequences: in the first place, accepting the gratuity of a service means becoming a product; secondly, we as product inevitably adopt a more corporate identity in our public image, our public profile and our publications, in other words, our essence reflects the corporate identity in which we frame our creations; thirdly, to accept their terms and conditions involves strengthening the formats proposed by the music industry, by capital and power: whether it is a lossy compression format such as mp3 or restrictive publishing licenses; fourthly, accepting a subdomain is christening oneself, somehow, as a subordinate, as a vassal and a dependent. What happens when, for whatever reason, the platform where we host our work online ceases to be available and our published works disappear with it? Or almost worse, what happens when, for whatever reason, the platform where we host our work online is no longer fashionable? Will we do it all again?

Remember what has happened from time to time, and continues to happen from time to time, with old and new formats in the physical world: once a new format appears, the format in use, hitherto the format of fashion, becomes immediately obsolete and deprecated, it is forgotten – until, with luck, it makes a comeback, a revival, a renaissance. This marketing strategy has permitted sales

of new machines, new music collections, with the resulting costs for users, for consumers, for listeners. Now with digital media, the new machines are the online content-management platforms that require users to repeat the same act of publishing and updating their profiles, their status, their files, their collections, with the consequent investment of time in a process of absolute absorption. I publish, therefore I am. I insist. The social act is a profitable repeated act, in fact, it is profitable because it is also controllable and beneficial under the model imposed by capital. Repetition. Control. Benefit. (y)

If we put this in perspective with the International Cassette Network, which we discussed above, we find that these corporate online platforms are built with the contemporary musical heritage, in return offering only their services, their 'freedoms', their possibilities. This was not possible in the physical format, with cassettes. Unthinkable. No cassette manufacturing company ever offered the distribution of a musical creation under the condition that the work became part of the company archive, together with its copyright, of course, and its publication and distribution. Impossible. It is not analogous. Today, companies possess the hosting and online distribution. All in the same medium. All at the same time. This gives them more power to covertly offer, not without perversion, their great services, alienating, full of promises of freedom and success. The same system, the same, is repeated: the musicians create for free, hoping one day that the promises of success will come true. This situation is not new; it has happened before, again and again, for example with jazz musicians: their music began to be recorded, published and distributed by the music industry in exchange for being recorded, published and distributed free of charge. Thus, the benefit was in the possibilities brought about implicitly by being recorded, published and distributed. Hopefully, their music would be heard and they would begin to get a direct economic benefit, providing they were successful, which obviously not only depended on whether their music was good or bad, far from it, but on the programme established by the agents that make up the music industry according to their own interests. In some cases, unfortunately just the lucky ones, they were paid poorly for their compositions, to which they lost all rights as they passed into the hands of the editors, once again.

Although currently most of these platforms remove no copyright on artists' creations in a direct or obvious way, they always do after we accept their terms and conditions to enjoy their services. If we look back at the short but intense history of these corporate netlabels, abuses have occurred one after another, until corporations found a perverse and less obvious system that allows them to profit from the use of their platforms. Historically, lest we forget, these services on numerous occasions have made claims in court over the copyright of some compositions published on their network, because they were

later physically published by record labels. To accept, in the end, is to submit. Conditions that users accepted on this network of musicians, their 'space'(*), meant losing the rights to the works uploaded to its servers. Directly, this time. The benefits of having greater visibility on their network, its operators said, justified the loss of all rights as creator. The network, the visibility, the visits, continued to grow, but not the plays, and even less so the careful listeners, an endangered species. We are more visible, yes, but are not necessarily heard more. Where, then, is the priority, to be more visible, more social, more accepted, more popular, more desirable, more downloaded, more capitalized, or simply to be heard?

These are some of the possible consequences, not in all cases, not all people, not all netlabels, and they come from accepting conditions and a few words that are never read, never questioned, and which clearly submit us, resignedly, to the perpetuation of an anachronistic editorial system. The new slaves are the users of free services and applications for an increased productivity of our time, our 'free' time.

The hiatus becomes apnea

As Tony Wilson said in the film '24 Hour Party People', the change between the format of the musical group – with the divine creators up onstage in front the public – and the musical selector – the DJ, the *medium*, at the pulpit and invisible – has meant a change in aesthetics, form and listening situation. We are witnessing a historic time of change, a key moment, a hiatus:

'The history of popular music is like a double helix. They are two waves that intertwine. When one wave does so, the other does so. We have two waves that do this. One does so, and the other as well. When a musical movement descends, the other rises. We are now at a crossroads, like a hiatus.'

This hiatus, in the case of netlabels, does not apply only to a time of change in musical style, a cosmetic change, but goes deeper into the essence of their activity. Many know that what sells today as netlabels are merely perverse neoliberal capitalist versions of a format originally conceived as a liberator from the music industry and its canons. Ironically, it was precisely these free services online, for the socialization of sound creations offered by corporations, who were responsible for the death foretold of netlabels. The irony of capitalism has also taken the form of netlabel. This hiatus, now converted into apnea, contains in essence a little death, and at the same time, a rebirth.

The new renaissance

There is no possible reconciliation in the internal battle of netlabels which began at the moment when the music industry models were reflected in them. Interestingly these online platforms proposed, from the start, a model that would allow sharing equally and not profit from distribution. The stage is set for conflict. Many of those involved have debated openly about the need for a clear definition of the term 'netlabel'¹⁴. There has been no success. The variety of possibilities and views on the matter do not allow consensus, either. Surely one of the reasons why the term is so fluid and escapes definition is because there is no model of a 'netlabel'. The differences prevail everywhere. Netlabels propose variety, heterogeneity and difference as a model¹⁵. Meanwhile, the industry imposes homogeneity.

The body of death is but the breath of corporations, where nothing escapes being published, controlled – and not heard. The history of formats reiterates that deaths are just part of a new birth, a resurgence, a dimension left behind, forgotten amid so much novelty, amongst the controlled noise of the show. Silently, the old format adds value to its essence, its characteristics, its peculiarities, its differences, sacrificing what is not its own. A necessary cleansing for the revival of the formats forgotten and despised by the market.

In essence, switching between formats has led to the resurgence of the same problems between music and capital. Therefore, we cannot ignore the relationship between netlabels and the music industry. The disappearance of netlabels seems to have been coming for some time, especially if we consider the statistics of recent years in which one can read a change: they indicate that the creation of independent platforms for publishing music online has significantly decreased, while online music publishing in corporate domains has increased exponentially. The more corporate identities, the fewer netlabels.

Now, we can certify that the debate has moved to a more fruitful ground, (z) where it is not necessary to talk about what is or is not a netlabel, its definitions or boundaries. The debate now focuses on whether the netlabel has died or not, indicating that this is a new turning point. We are facing a change, a crossing of trends and inertia. That hiatus we talked about before is the solution of continuity, the interruption or the spatial or temporal separation of the activity. Therefore, a new scenario opens, full of possibilities that mean the netlabel is at a historic moment: its rebirth.

¹⁴ In August 2009, Audio-lab organized a meeting of netlabels called 'Netlabels: música enredada' ('Netlabels: tangled music') in Arteleku (San Sebastián, Gipuzkoa). This one-week encounter was attended by various netlabels, sound artists and curators who highlighted the vagueness of the term 'netlabel' and the inability to reach consensus on the definition. This question of definition, or rather lack of definition, was publicly attended by David Domingo of netaudio.es, the platform that has promoted netlabel culture for seven years but is currently inactive. Nevertheless, we can find the post made by David at the following link <http://www.animatek.net/2009/09/reflexion-que-es-un-netlabel/>, which reflects the situation well at that time, when consensus was not possible.

¹⁵ A netlabel manual was published by the addsensor netlabel in 2010 as a practical guide for creating netlabels. It is available at the following link: http://addsensor.com/referencias/addSensor018/addsensor018_Manual-Netlabel.pdf.

REFERENCES IN THE FORM OF FOOTNOTES FROM A TO Z.

(a) - *'Who ever thought he was writing something other than fiction?'* - Michel Foucault.

(b) - The first definition of the word 'netlabel' on Wikipedia, dating from January 26, 2004, was published by Phlow.net [<http://phlow.net/>] and reads: *'A netlabel, also called online label, web label, mp3 label, distributes its music in digital formats on the web. It works like a classic record label with the only difference, that there are actually no hardware releases like vinyl or CD available'*. The complete definition and corresponding links are available in the following link: [<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Netlabel&oldid=2234467>].

The latest update of the definition of the word 'netlabel' on Wikipedia, dating from September 21, 2014, and published by 75.71.169.189, reads: *'A netlabel (also online label, web label, digi label, MP3 label or download label) is a record label that distributes its music through digital audio formats (such as MP3, Ogg Vorbis, FLAC, or WAV) over the Internet. While similar to traditional record labels in many respects, netlabels typically emphasize free distribution online, often under licenses that encourage works to be shared (e.g., Creative Commons licenses), and artists often retain copyright. Netlabels may have a considerably lower staff count than traditional record labels, in some instances being only a single individual in control of his/her music, maintaining sole ownership. Physical LPs, for example, are rarely produced by a netlabel, relying entirely on digital distribution and means of the Internet to provide the product. Having no physical product makes the running costs of a netlabel considerably less than a traditional record label and some netlabels have abandoned any financial model altogether and instead, running the netlabel as a hobby. Some employ guerrilla marketing to promote their work'*. The complete definition and corresponding links are available at the following link: [<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Netlabel&oldid=626470004>]

(c) - *'But wasn't radio broadcast the first dematerialization of music?. (...) By dematerialization in radio broadcast, I obviously refer to a lack of an additional physical medium for the listener (the record). Radio broadcast of recorded material was typically produced from physical records and then, later on, from tapes. The equivalents of today are, of course, the hard disks and servers for the online dematerialization of music'*. - Francisco López. 'Music dematerialized?' Published by Carvalhais, Miguel and Pedro Tudela (eds.) (2014). Mono #2 - Cochlear Poetics: Writings on Music and Sound Arts. Porto: i2ADS; and available online at the following link: [<http://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/87923/87924>].

This manual is not a model to follow, but a set of wise practical recommendations or possibilities for the creation of a netlabel, without coveted or alleged successes. At the time of its publication, this modest document was a great contribution to the community because it clarified some concepts which were then not clear and which are now better assimilated.

(d) - *'In terms of ownership, when the "original" is digital and non-representational, any listener with a "copy" has exactly the same thing as the composer/artist'*. - Francisco López. 'Music dematerialized?' Published by Carvalhais, Miguel and Pedro Tudela (eds.) (2014). Mono #2 - Cochlear Poetics: Writings on Music and Sound Arts. Porto: i2ADS; and available online at the following link: [<http://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/87923/87924>].

(e) - *'Your security is our commitment'* - Corporate anonymous.

(f) - *'Just three days removed from these events, Americans do not yet have the distance of history. But our responsibility to history is already clear: to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil. War has been waged against us by stealth and deceit and murder. This nation is peaceful, but fierce when stirred to anger. The conflict was begun on the timing and terms of others. It will end in a way, and at an hour, of our choosing.'* Speech delivered by U.S. President George W. Bush in Washington, D.C., on September 14, 2001, which uses the same argument used by Jesus, Lenin, Darth Vader and Spanish copyright collecting agency SGAE: *'You're either with me or against me'* - For more information see the following link: [http://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Est%C3%A1s_conmigo_o_est%C3%A1s_contra_m%C3%AD].

(g) - *'The (non-technological) legal practices of digital companies that impose unfair conditions on their customers show us once again how digital culture is mostly a "low cost" service (with the same vices of airlines so labelled) whose economic behaviour cannot hide its many flaws with the supposed brilliance of its technologies'*. - José Luis Pardo. Citation from the following article published by *El País*: [http://cultura.elpais.com/cultura/2012/09/11/actualidad/1347386518_629455.html]

(h) - The use of suspicion to prevent a criminal act has increased since the attacks of September 11, 2001, in New York, where there was evident failure in US safety; a strategic plan of global security has since developed based on crime prevention and identification of the suspect. The stand-out text is titled *'Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism'*, the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001, which is available at this link: [<http://epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>]

(i) - *'We believe many things that we could question: (...) that music is songs; that in silence nothing is heard; that acquiring albums costs money. (...) "This is the end, beautiful friend" defies all these generalities. (...) A gift for learning to read between the lines'* - Elena Cabrera.

(j) - *'This possibility follows everyone like a shadow and*

changes their lifestyle; because (and this is another well-known elementary definition in existential mathematics) any new possibility that existence acquires, even the least likely, transforms everything about existence' - Milan Kundera.

(k) - 'The media have accustomed to certain social sectors to listening only to what "flatters the ears".' - John Paul II.

(l) - 'The a priori conditions of a possible experience in general are at the same time conditions of the possibility of objects of experience'. - Immanuel Kant.

(m) - 'Music is synonymous with freedom, to play what you want and how you want, as long as it's good and passionate, let music be the food of love'. - Kurt Cobain

(n) - 'Love is a cassette that should be listened to on both sides'.
- Anonymous

(o) - 'Love is like a song, if you listen too much it annoys you'.
- Anonymous

(p) - 'Freedom is the ontological condition of ethics. But ethics is the considered form that freedom takes when it is informed by reflection'. - Michel Foucault

(q) - 'Extraordinary how potent cheap music is'. - Noël Coward

(r) - 'Remember that time is money'. - Benjamin Franklin

(s) - Or as the saying goes: *What's good, if brief, is twice as good.*
- Anonymous

(t) - 'The gospel initiates man in this generosity when, following the example of God, he invites to sit at his table those who may not be able to return the invitation' - *Religion at the dawn of the 21st century*
- Various authors

(u) - 'Information doesn't want to be free; only the transmission of information wants to be free. Information, like culture, is the result of a labor and devotion, investment and risk; it has a value. And nothing will lead to a more deafening cultural silence than ignoring that value and celebrating ... [companies like] Napster running amok.'
- Edward Rothstein in *The New York Times*.

(v) - 'The reason of State. It is characterized by concentrating

all social practices, enhancing life, ensuring the optimum use of resources, and exercising proper management of the population in order to create the conditions for (...) exercising a policy of control over the social institutions, natural resources and, above all, the life of the subjects, so as to ensure the centralization of power and economic growth'. - Immanuel Kant

(w) - 'There is no better antidote to the dystopian future than the very dissemination of dystopia'. - Marc Pastor

(x) - 'As for disciplinary power, it is exercised by becoming invisible, whilst those subject to it are rendered visible'. - Michel Foucault.

(y) - 'Whoever is able to design and operate in one way or another the process of socialized communication – communication that can reach the entire world – possesses one of the keys of power'. - Manuel Castells.

(z) - 'A culture only poses those problems that it is prepared to solve'. - Michel Foucault.

RECOMMENDED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Attali, Jacques (1977) *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*, University of Minnesota Press.

Benjamin, Walter (1969) 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction'. In *Walter Benjamin, Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* (pp. 217-252), New York: Schocken Books.

Foucault, Michel and Jeremy Carrette (1999) *Religion and Culture*, Manchester University Press.

Foucault, Michel (2002) *Vigilar y castigar, nacimiento de la prisión*, Siglo XXI Ed. Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Foucault, Michel (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books: Random House, New York.

Galuszka, Patryk (2012) 'The rise of the nonprofit popular music sector: the case of netlabels'. In *Music, Business and Law: essays on contemporary trends in the music industry*, <http://iipc.utu.fi/MBL/Galuszka.pdf>

Galuszka, Patryk (2009) 'Research on Netlabels'. http://phlow-magazine.com/wp-content/uploads/research_on_netlabels_by_patryk_galuszka_cc-by-nc-sa.pdf

Hartmann, Björn (2004) 'Netlabels and the Adoption of Creative Commons Licensing in the Online Electronic Music Community', in *International Commons at the Digital Age*, eds. Danièle Bourcier et al., Romillat, Paris.

Lessig, Lawrence (2004) *Free Culture*, Penguin Press, New York.

Lovink, Geert (2005) *The Principle of Networking: Concepts in Critical Internet Culture*. <http://www.hva.nl/lectoraten/documenten/ol09-050224-lovink.pdf>

Sterne, Jonathan (2003) *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Sterne, Jonathan (2012) *MP3: The Meaning of a Format*, Duke University Press.

Timmers, Bram (2005) *Netlabels and Open Content: Making the Next Step Towards Extended Cultural Production*. www.c3.hu/~bram/Netlabels_and_Open_Content.pdf

(*) [Translator's note] – The author uses the Spanish 'mi espacio' here to refer, with certain irony, to networks offering musicians a place to publish their music, unwittingly relinquishing control over their work. The literal English translation, 'my space', would appear to refer only to one of these platforms (spelling notwithstanding), so 'their "space"' seemed to be the best way to preserve the ironic yet general critique intended in the phrase.



Public Domain