

This is what I said in an interview with CNet when asked whether i was interested in the LA News Service.

" "They are the first company to cover news in high definition in LA," Cuban said via e-mail. "That's very valuable to me."

This is what Businessweek turned it into:

"Verbally bashing YouTube is apparently not enough for billionaire "blog maverick" Mark Cuban. Now the Dallas Mavericks owner and tech entrepreneur is reportedly considering acquiring the independent news agency that's suing the video-sharing site for copyright violations. The brash move, if it goes through, would undoubtedly escalate Cuban's war of words with Google ([GOOG](#)), which closed its \$1.65 billion stock purchase of YouTube Nov. 13. In fact, it could force Cuban to put his money where his outspoken mouth has been."

and

"By becoming involved in a Google fight, Cuban risks exposing himself to embarrassment in addition to costly legal fees. After all, with all the noise he has made on his blog, Cuban is already facing a big "I told you so" from Google if YouTube turns out to be wildly successful. The more invested he becomes in seeing YouTube lose a copyright battle, the more vulnerable to bad publicity Cuban becomes if YouTube wins. The headline is almost too obvious: "Cuban, Who Is Crazy Now?"

Now that is reporting at its best isnt it ? No speculation there at all.

and this is the actual email chain with my response to his original email first

" And tell me more about what you can do and what it would cost. I'm interested"

>

>

> On Mon, 30 Oct 2006 1:54 pm, Robert Tur wrote:

>> Dear Mark,

>>

My name is Bob Tur (The newsman that's taken YouTube to Court) and I'm credited with creating modern helicopter news-gathering. I worked with Dan Rather on occasion from KCBS TV in Los Angeles. During my 26 years in Los Angeles as a reporter, pilot, and camera operator, I broke nearly every major breaking news story there was, and for the past three years I have been producing HD News from around the globe for VOOM's HD News operation. I want to work for you and Dan. I have a complete HDCAM 750 system and editing here in Los Angeles. How about a Los Angeles Bureau?

"

Sounds like serious M&A talk doesn't it ?

Or as I told Forbes when asked about the topic... " I dont have anything to say, its too much fun reading all the speculation"

Which actually means, the more they write, the more fun it will be to write this blog post defining the reality of the situation.

I have no interest in buying a company in order to sue Google. If thats something I wanted to do, I would have plenty of opportunity to do so using our movies and TV Shows. We have sent takedown notices. We have gotten email and IP Addresses. We know that Youtube makes a ton of money of the advertising around infringing content. We know how they use their adscripts with doubleclick to serve ads by category and track all ads served by who uploaded the content. We checked the scripts when UFC ads popped up around the WEC videos we found. (cagefights from HDNet.) UFC ads above WEC infringing videos seemed too much of a coincidence Its all right there with a viewsource of a youtube page. Why look ? Because of curiosity about the process. Not because I want to sue.

Im not out to get Youtube or Google. If anytihng I am out to get the DMCA. I think its a terrible law.

As I told CNet. Copyright Law and in particular the DMCA has been something I have been involved with since 1995. Some of my fondest moments in business involve fighting the RIAA and their perspective on the DMCA. My worst moment in business was not fighting the DMCA harder. The last speeches I gave while at Broadcast.com were all about how terrible a law it would be.

There is so much stupidity in that law, including the safe harbor acts. You should have heard me back in the day . This is what Webcasters face under the DMCA

"2. *Sound recording performance complement.* A webcaster may not play in any three-hour period...

- more than three songs from a particular album, including no more than two consecutively, or
- four songs by a particular artist or from a boxed set, including no more than three consecutively.

This limit is called the "sound recording performance complement."

The same people that brought you the safe harbor provisions brought you the above. Those of you who want to argue about it "being different now" for copyright law. Where are you when it comes to the above stupidity in law ? Do you realize that you cant have an all Elvis, or all Led Zeppelin Webcast ? You cant play a CD in a webcast radio station ? Dumb, dumb , dumb shit like that. Check out the [RIAA site for more greatest hits](#)

So my picking on the DMCA and how its applied is old news.

Feel free to check out a search [<Mark Cuban DMCA -Youtube>](#) which has a ton of examples dating back years and years. Or you can check out pre Google _ Youtube mentions in my [blog](#)

You see, the thing about a blog is that its a great place to write about things you are interested in. Its a great place to generate discussion.

Im interested in Copyright and how the laws around it are enforced and have been for a longtime. I dont claim to be an expert , but its a topic I find interesting. And probably always will.