

Apple Music Versus Taylor Swift

Written by Marco Attard
23. 06. 2015

The upcoming Apple Music launch hit something of a bump when Taylor Swift revealed the company was not going to pay artists during the service's 3-month free trial-- leading to a swift policy change announcement from SVP Eddy Cue.



Taylor Swift took to Tumblr to describe the the decision not to pay artists during the free trial as "shocking, disappointing, and completely unlike this historically progressive and generous company." The pop artiste also revealed the policy is the reason her album, 1989, will not be available on Apple Music. To think the album's availability was used as proof of superiority to the biggest Apple Music rival, Spotify!

After all, Swift famously burnt bridges with Spotify after accusing them of not paying artists enough...

However damage control arrived soon enough in the shape of Eddy Cue, who used Twitter to reveal Apple will "make sure that artists are paid," even during the free trial.

Apple Music is available as a subscription-only service, following the aforementioned 3-month free trial. According to Re/code Apple will pay 71.5-73% of subscription revenues to music owners (in turn divided between artists, music labels and publishers as per byzantine contracts). As a result the Apple service is more attractive to the music industry than Spotify, whose free streaming option leads to less revenues.

Apple Music Versus Taylor Swift

Written by Marco Attard
23. 06. 2015

We will learn if Apple manages to dominate the music streaming industry once Music launches on 30 June 2015 as part of the iOS 8.4 update.

Go [To Apple, Love Taylor](#)

Go [Eddy Cue on Twitter](#)

Go [Here's What Happens to Your \\$10 After You Pay for a Month of Apple Music \(Re/code\)](#)