

SECOND  
EDITION

AND

# Intellectual Property Law and Interactive Media

FREE FOR A FEE

Edward Lee Lamoureux

Steven L. Baron

Claire Stewart

**Edward Lee Lamoureux, Steven L. Baron, and Claire Stewart**

# **Intellectual Property Law AND Interactive Media**

**FREE FOR A FEE**

**SECOND EDITION**



PETER LANG

New York • Bern • Frankfurt • Berlin  
Brussels • Vienna • Oxford • Warsaw

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Baron, Steven L., author.

Intellectual property law and interactive media: free for a fee /  
Edward Lee Lamoureux, Steven L. Baron, Claire Stewart. — Second Edition.  
pages cm. — (Digital formations; volume 95)  
Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Copyright—Interactive multimedia—United States.
  2. Multimedia systems—Law and legislation—United States.
  3. Copyright and electronic data processing—United States.
- I. Lamoureux, Edward Lee, author. II. Stewart, Claire, author. III. Title.  
KF3030.1.B37 346.7304'8—dc23 2015018542  
ISBN 978-1-4331-2464-8 (paperback)  
ISBN 978-1-4539-1670-4 (e-book)  
ISSN 1526-3169

Bibliographic information published by **Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**.  
**Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek** lists this publication in the "Deutsche  
Nationalbibliografie"; detailed bibliographic data are available  
on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de/>.

Cover design concept by Edward Lee Lamoureux  
Synopsis written by William J. Benman

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability  
of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity  
of the Council of Library Resources.



© 2015 Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York  
29 Broadway, 18th floor, New York, NY 10006  
[www.peterlang.com](http://www.peterlang.com)

All rights reserved.

Reprint or reproduction, even partially, in all forms such as microfilm,  
xerography, microfiche, microcard, and offset strictly prohibited.

Printed in the United States of America

---

## Preface to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition

These prefatory remarks meet two general goals: (1) Emphasize important changes in the new media environments where IP laws operate, and (2) Describe new approaches to the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

First, this preliminary section presents a brief yet important review of changes in the socio-cultural environments for intellectual property law in the contemporary United States of America.<sup>1</sup> The situation has changed, considerably, from “the way(s) we were” prior to our 1<sup>st</sup> edition.

What was new media (digital, computational, networked communication technologies) when we published the 1<sup>st</sup> edition is now considerably more the mundane, everyday condition. Much of the giddy euphoria associated with the onset of the personal computer and the Internet was in recognition that these could lead to a reorganization of the means for production and distribution of the content protected by intellectual property law. The shift appeared to be toward users and away from “big content,” those professionalized corporations and outlets that, prior to the information revolution, controlled the production and distribution of most news, information, entertainment, and artifacts of popular culture.

Advocates of the position that new media would shift content production and distribution from professionalized commercialism to everyday users were particularly enthralled by changes in the Internet often referred to as Web 2.0. The programming and applications that changed the static Web 1.0 into an interactive version seemed to redefine the WWW by promoting “co-creativity and the idea of an equivalence or mutuality in the power relationship in the generative process that allegedly erases the old divisions between ‘producers’ and ‘consumers’” (Lister et al. 208). Among many others, MIT Professor of Humanities and Media Studies Henry Jenkins proposed that “participatory culture, contrasts with older notions of passive media spectatorship. Rather than talking about media producers and consumers as occupying separate roles, we might now see them as participants who interact with each other according to a new set of rules that none of us fully understands” (Jenkins 3).

Written at a time deeply influenced by these perspectives, the 1<sup>st</sup> edition presented intellectual property law not only as the rules that are supposed to be followed, but also highlighted the weaknesses

in those structures as they failed to keep up with technological innovation and as they failed to clarify and empower the position of the everyday user in the media equation.

However, many of the initial assumptions concerning the democratizing effects of the new media were naïve and misguided. As one might have expected, but not everyone recognized, “old media” were not about to give up the cash cow without a fight. As noted by a number of researchers, authors, and pundits whose ideas will be discussed within this volume, numerous professionalized and commercialized forces have reasserted authority over the production and distribution of media content. In some instances, digital technologies are leveraged as control features. At times, control has been leveraged via data collection and analytics. In other cases, legal structures, including IP law, are the principle control factors.

Many intellectuals interested in cyberspace have long warned of the control factors that are built into, and available for use as a result of, the digital nature of new media technologies. In his 1999 book, *Code*, Lawrence Lessig noted that new media would probably overprotect intellectual property and underprotect privacy. George Washington University Law School professor Daniel J. Solove wrote extensively in his 2004 book, *The Digital Person*, about the lack of efficacy of extant laws to constrain the ways that digital technologies can be used to collect information about people without providing adequate privacy protections.

The Edward Snowden affair drew mass attention to the roles of surveillance and data collection sponsored by the US government and intelligence community, particularly activities of the NSA (Gidda). However, Solove (in *The Digital Person*) and many others had discussed the clandestine role of the NSA and the degree to which surveillance and intelligence activities are aided and abetted by digital technologies long before the 2013 revelations by Snowden hit the headlines. Here, digital technologies are leveraged as control features.

Joseph Turow (*The Daily You*), Andrew Keen (*Digital Vertigo*), and Matthew Crain (*The Revolution Will Be Commercialized*) present detailed descriptions of how the marketing, advertising, and Internet industries collaborate to leverage information collected about users for the purpose of improving, especially the profitability of, targeted marketing. Here, control has been leveraged via data collection and analytics.

Additionally, the everyday user has proven to be somewhat less interested in the production and distribution of content than was originally anticipated by those who expected a lot of cultural change from computational technologies, networks, and the Internet. Although it is the case that enormous amounts of user-generated content (UGC) are created and distributed using computational technologies, networks, and the Internet (for example, via social media), the role of everyday users as potential producers and distributors of professional grade materials has been clarified, somewhat, in a direction that reestablishes their role as consumers rather than producers and distributors. Significantly, the single largest repository of UGC, Google’s YouTube, is spending tens of millions of dollars developing professional quality content. John Kennedy notes that their \$50 million acquisition of Next New Networks

could be instrumental in enabling YouTube partners to monetize online and also help the video site face off competition from popular video service rivals like Hulu, iTunes and NetFlix. The move also signals a potential move away from the short videos that characterise most of YouTube’s content in the direction of content people will watch for hours on end, such as movies and documentaries.

In short, the days of UGC driving Internet profitability have receded in favor of the re-emergence of professional grade, corporate generated, big content. That re-emergence calls for re-energizing and refocusing intellectual property law protection of creative content.

Further, consider the role played by the switch from desktop and laptops to tablets and mobile devices. Hamblen notes that “The combined value of paid apps, app-enabled purchases of goods and services, and in-app advertising is expected to double to \$151 billion in the US by 2017” (Hamblen).



One of the principle features of apps is that they are dedicated to one activity (as compared to computer applications that are multi-functional). Although there are apps that enable users to create a wide variety of content, apps are primarily used to consume content rather than to create and distribute intellectual property. Dana Blankenhorn notes: “An app has limited functionality. It’s designed to do one thing, not as a means to an end but an end in itself” (Blankenhorn).

Combine that with the fact that tablet sales are projected to overtake laptop and desktop sales by 2015 (Cheng). Forrester’s Frank Gillett writes, “Tablets aren’t the most powerful computing gadgets. But they are the most convenient ... And tablets are very good for information consumption, an activity that many of us do a lot of” (Gillett). Not only are apps and tablets more useful for consumption than production, they can be prodigious collectors of information about users (Faughnder; Singer).

Finally, note the dramatic upward trend in media consumption (Bohn and Short; Coldewey; Wolford). By almost every measure, Americans consume more media than ever. Edison Research estimated the increase in total media consumption merely between 2010–11 to be in the 20% range (Webster). Some research estimates that the average American consumes, roughly, 8 ½ hours of media content daily, a number that towers over the 4–6 hours of TV watching attributed to American viewers in even the most robust years of mass television viewing. Contrary to predictions by commentators such as Clay Shirky, who argued that watching less television and sharing more UGC would produce enormous cognitive surpluses that could be “spent” solving significant (humanitarian) global problems (Shirky), Americans are once again rushing to become the most media saturated consumers on the planet.

In short, new media users are moving toward mobile devices, tablets, and apps and away from personal computers and applications as they consume an increasing amount of media. These trends work against the new media environment serving as a place where users primarily leverage opportunities to create and distribute content in competition with professionally produced material. While everyday users exchange tremendous amounts of personal information via social networks, the material is not of the type that users are apt to protect with intellectual property registrations and law.

The importance of these changes in context should not be understated. While it is still the case that the authors strongly support the efforts of everyday citizens to use computational technologies, networks, and the Internet in creative and innovative ways, there is a burgeoning realization that regulatory structures are reasserting control over the general communication environment. While new media continue to hold much promise and potential for the democratization of content production and distribution, many of the legal structures that were challenged by the development of computational technologies, networks, and the Internet have been strengthened and reasserted in favor of big content. Many of the activities that challenged the conventional orders associated with professionalized, corporate media practices have been addressed via structures of constraint and punishment found within intellectual property law.

When we published the 1<sup>st</sup> edition, music piracy seemed rampant and virtually unstoppable, websites like the Pirate Bay appeared to be out of the reach of legal/judicial interventions, and long-standing industry actors had provided few alternatives to illegal file sharing. The Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) appeared to be determined to find and litigate against any and all illegal downloaders. The movie industry was not yet deeply touched by online/digital piracy although illegal bootlegging and mass duplication (mostly overseas) of videotapes and early DVDs were serious problems for the movie industry. Patent litigation was just beginning to recognize and deal with the massive profusion of new media patents issued by the US Copyright and Patent Office early in the development of digital media. Later we would come to understand that many patented items and processes had not really been new and useful and that far too many inappropriate patents had been issued. The year 2014 saw major changes in these important aspects.

Although action against one website does not in any way constitute the end of illegal downloading, the fact that Pirate Bay cofounders Jonas Nilsson and Peter Althin were found guilty, by a Swedish

district court, of copyright infringement, were fined millions of dollars, and were forced into exile by an impending prison term is but one example of the successful use of intellectual property law and enforcement regimes against illegal downloading (Nate Anderson, "Pirate Bay"; Farivar, "European Court").

For years, the RIAA took direct legal action against individual downloaders. Across almost a decade of litigation, featuring perhaps thousands of out-of-court settlements, the RIAA was victorious in the two lawsuits that went completely through the legal system. Jamie Thomas-Rassert lost a trial, numerous appeals, and was ordered, in 2012, to pay \$222,000 in fines (Farivar, "Minnesota File-Sharing"). Joel Tenenbaum also lost trial and appeal cases and faces a \$675,000 damages fine (Balasubramani, "1<sup>st</sup> Circuit Reinstates"). These two cases cannot be said to serve as indication of the end of illegal downloading. Quite to the contrary, there is evidence that it is virtually impossible to accurately estimate the total amount of illegal downloading in the US (Nate Anderson, "US Government"). However, the three cases (noted above) indicate that although copyright law and the justice system may not have kept up with the rapid changes brought about by digital technologies, the legal constraints and practices that are in place can be used against everyday users and new media operators who would seek to overturn big content's control over the mediascape. After all, digital leaves tracks.

It also appears that despite extravagant claims about losses due to piracy, industries relying on copyright law are alive, well, and prospering (Nate Anderson, "Piracy Problems?"). Companies in both the music and film industries have had substantive conversations with the most successful peer-to-peer technology company, BitTorrent, in efforts to improve streaming technologies for delivering content to users (Brodkin, "In World"). Success in the Pirate Bay case continues the trend set by Napster and Grokster litigation, as well as action against many file sharing sites (Limewire, etc.). Although it is not possible to curtail illegal downloading, intellectual property law can be, and is, used in litigation against identifiable large volume offenders. Additionally, the same technologies that once "empowered" everyman can now be used by big content to further their control over production and distribution.

Big content has also re-emerged as providers of content in ways that both meet legal requirements and move toward satisfying consumers' desires. By collaborating with new media industries, traditional music and film companies, for example, have finally begun to provide viable alternatives to illegal downloading. The iTunes store has been wildly successful in distributing both audio and video; Hulu, Netflix, Spotify, Pandora, Shoutcast, and similar services, have made significant inroads toward meeting consumer needs while satisfying industry demands for profit and copyright protection.

While there is still a very strong sense among many that US intellectual property law is in desperate need of wide-ranging revision, there is also a realization that most of the changes that have occurred in IP law since the publication of the 1<sup>st</sup> edition have tilted toward further advantaging big content at the cost of everyday users. Just as it is the case that having more information is not always better, likewise, making changes in the legal structures surrounding intellectual property often results in unintended consequences. Advocating for changes in intellectual property law is a somewhat risky business if one is hoping to support innovation and creativity on the part of every-person.

For example, the single largest change to intellectual property law, since the publication of the 1<sup>st</sup> edition, is the broad update, in 2011, of the US patent law system (Leahy-Smith America Invents Act [AIA]). Among other important changes, the system was revised from a preference for "first to invent," to "first to file." This, and other revisions, may well advantage large, corporate content developers. It is easy to understand that large corporate entities with significant stables of lawyers will have a much easier time navigating the patent application process more quickly than will single, unaffiliated inventors. Large corporations can also more afford the costs for patent filing, especially in an environment that gives preference to quick filing and payment. Although the law lowered filing rates for small entities, the "first to file" provision, the major change in the law, advantages large corporate entities. University of California, Berkeley intellectual property law professor Robert Barr notes that "Now it's really important to be the first to file, and it's really important to file before somebody else puts a product

out, or puts the invention in their product ... [this creates] a new urgency on the part of everyone to file faster—and that's going to be a problem for the small inventor" (Hurst).

One of the standard truisms presented in the 1<sup>st</sup> edition was the claim that "everything has changed, nothing has changed" (Lamoureux, Baron, and Stewart 1). This maxim was presented as an indication that while so-called new media presented numerous challenges to the legal status quo of intellectual property law, extant legal structures were in place, functioning, and should not be ignored by students and practitioners, even during advocacy for revisions.

The realities suggested by that maxim remain in place and are, perhaps, accentuated by the continued resurgence of big content. Even more, big content now has a partner in "big data." The lifeblood of the Internet is, and has always been, information. However, the information that was thought to be central to the information revolution is not, primarily, the information that now fuels the Internet. Early prognostications about the value of computational technologies, networks, and the Internet suggested that the most important feature would be the vast informational resources available to everyone. In a sense, this dream is reality, as people in all walks of life and across every sort of enterprise and endeavor now have access to far more information than one could have imagined. Further, combining big data with big content aligns some corporations (and industries) that were previously new media companies with traditional big content and previously old mass media interests.

Market forces have produced an alternative reality as to what kinds of information have real value on the Internet, and why. The need for funding sources for the Internet and the capitalist drive for profits have combined to bring heretofore new media companies—for example, Google, Apple, and Facebook—more in line with the old media companies than had been the case in the early days of the Internet. Many of those who might have previously sought to move power from corporate structures to everyday people are now fully enmeshed in the American capitalist, corporate system and their principal interests are concerned with how to maximize profit from the information provided by users without giving users credit for the value of that information, all the while doing so in an environment where law does not (much) protect everyday users. The new media information pyramid has been turned on its head; the value of the Internet no longer rests with the vast amount of information everyday people can retrieve. Rather, the Internet pays off for companies that collect information about users in the process of data analytic-driven targeted marketing.<sup>2</sup> The information of value, in new media, is now information about users.

In short, the new media landscape that provides contexts for intellectual property law has changed significantly since publication of the 1<sup>st</sup> edition. Technology always advances; law always trails. Late twentieth and early twenty-first century digital, computerized, networked technologies continue to challenge efforts to keep legal regimes up to date. And although new media continues presenting rapidly changing and challenging circumstances, forces allied with big content exert pressures to pull intellectual property back from the brink of anarchy once implied by computational technologies and networks. In many ways, these changes re-invigorate the functions and importance of intellectual property law and its significant role in the legitimate circulation of mediated content. Because, although "information still wants to be free," big content and big data prefer that using new media is frictionless for consumers while remaining profitable for producers and distributors and therefore *Free for a Fee*.

Second, this preliminary section specifies the changes that we have made in this 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. We have worked hard to update the information and we have adjusted our approaches to the material in an effort to deliver the content for efficient and effective improvement of learning outcomes.

Readers will find the following changes:

- Every chapter is updated: Laws, cases, and circumstances have evolved since the 1<sup>st</sup> edition was published. Changes indicated in the "Chapter Updates" sections of *freeforafee.com* are incorporated and extended.



- Each chapter includes a new section that clearly introduces the fundamentals of the IP law aspect highlighted in the chapter. In the 1<sup>st</sup> edition, we depended on the overall “Introduction” chapter to explain how given areas of the law, later covered in the individual chapters, operate. The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition previews these matters in the “Introduction,” but also provides needed details at the start of each chapter.
- Each chapter includes a new section dedicated to “Emerging Issues.” The 1<sup>st</sup> edition stopped at “what’s the law and how does it work?” The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition details the emerging trends that one could expect through the next 3–5 years.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition presents “Open Source and Open Access” (Chapter Four). The 1<sup>st</sup> edition made brief mention of the open source movement in the patent chapter. That material has been moved, expanded, and joined to content detailing the open content movement. These areas are important to new media developers and to people who consume content that was previously available only via proprietary print sources (for example, researchers, teachers, librarians). The roles for media conservators are changed by open content initiatives.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition expands the chapter on virtual worlds to include games (Chapter Ten). The 1<sup>st</sup> edition depended on the unique features of *Second Life* as illustration in a discussion of IP law in virtual worlds. At the time of the 1<sup>st</sup> edition, *Second Life* had the potential for being one of the “next big things.” That did not come to pass. *SL* is still interesting for its unique features among virtual worlds; however, games are the most important virtual environments and the ways that IP laws work within them cannot be ignored in favor of an outlier.
- The last chapter summarizes IP law in new media. The 1<sup>st</sup> edition used the virtual worlds chapter as capstone (“since we’ve now covered the outlier material, we can wrap things up”). The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition includes a chapter that provides a unifying theme, summary, and closure.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition presents learning objectives for each chapter. Whereas the 1<sup>st</sup> edition featured questions for discussion, the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition includes learning objectives at the end of each chapter. These help students target learning on core concepts in addition to integrating knowledge into contexts and conceptual relationships.
- Case coverage is revised in two important ways. First, the bulk of the case analyses have been moved to a second volume, *Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media* (Baron, Lamoureux, and Stewart). References to cases, in the primary text, direct readers to pertinent sections in the new book. Second, some of the case coverage in the 1<sup>st</sup> edition was overly complex with legal technicalities and did not clearly focus on the principle learning/implications for new media. The revised sections, in the new volume, highlight the central findings taken from each case and the implications for digital media technologies. Technical legal analysis is minimized and presented only when crucial to understanding.
- A list of online resources for the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition is included on [freeforafee.com](http://freeforafee.com).
- Readers should take note of the use of non-standard stylistic practices in this volume. The text and reference section follow *MLA* documentation style. However, cases are listed (both within the analytical sections in the text and in the reference list of cases at the end of the work) following the practices of *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation*, 19<sup>th</sup> ed. (2010), the preferred style guide (within the legal community) for legal documents.

The authors thank Mary Savigar at Peter Lang Publishing and series editor, Professor Steve Jones, for their patient and enduring support. The authors extend gratitude and special recognition to Tracia Leacock for her extraordinary editing; the authors bear responsibility for remaining errors. The authors thank their professional and academic colleagues, as well as the people who lead those units, for continued institutional support. The authors thank their families for offering patience, support, energies, and love. Most importantly, we thank our students, past, present, and future, for giving us good reasons to write this text.

---

# Contents

Preface to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition . . . . .	xiii
Introduction . . . . .	1
Shifting between Public and Private Interests . . . . .	1
Nine Important Developments in the Intellectual Property Landscape . . . . .	2
Property Law Governing Products of the Mind . . . . .	6
Information Stewards' Rights and Responsibilities . . . . .	8
Types and Categories of Intellectual Property Law . . . . .	11
Finding, Reading, and Analyzing the Sources of Intellectual Property Law . . . . .	14
Organization of the US Court System . . . . .	15
Specialized Tribunals for Certain Intellectual Property Disputes . . . . .	16
How to Locate Intellectual Property Law . . . . .	17
Reading the Law . . . . .	18
Important Terminology for Understanding Court Processes and Cases . . . . .	22
Issues and Facts . . . . .	22
Terms Referring to the Parties to Civil Actions . . . . .	23
Parts of the Case File . . . . .	23
Preview . . . . .	24
Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	24
<hr/>	
1 Copyright . . . . .	25
Introducing Complexities in Copyright Law . . . . .	25
Developing Copyright Law . . . . .	27
Introduction to Copyright Basics . . . . .	28
Establishing Copyright Protection . . . . .	28
Copyright Ownership . . . . .	30

The Rights Conferred . . . . .	30
Exceptions . . . . .	30
Compulsory Licensing . . . . .	32
Duration . . . . .	34
Infringement and Punishment. . . . .	35
Cease and Desist Notifications and Injunctions. . . . .	35
Notice and Takedown Protocols under the DMCA. . . . .	35
Legislative Development of US Copyright Law. . . . .	36
Copyright Legislation: 1780–1910 . . . . .	36
<i>Early English Influences.</i> . . . .	36
<i>Early American Scene</i> . . . . .	37
US Copyright Legislation: 1913–1950 . . . . .	40
US Copyright Legislation: 1950–1976 . . . . .	41
US Copyright Legislation: 1976–1998 . . . . .	42
US Copyright Legislation: 1998 . . . . .	44
<i>The Copyright Term Extension Act (CTEA) of 1998.</i> . . . .	45
<i>The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) of 1998.</i> . . . .	46
US Copyright Legislation: 1999–2013 . . . . .	49
Emerging Trends in Copyright Law and Litigation . . . . .	50
Expiration of the Term Extension in 2018. . . . .	50
Potential Widening of Copyright Termination . . . . .	51
Conflicts between the Derivative Right and Transformative Fair Use. . . . .	52
Using International Trade Negotiations as Leverage for Domestic Lawmaking . . . . .	52
Relief from the DMCA’s Anti-Circumvention Limitations in Situations of Private Use. . . . .	53
Copyright and Cloud-Based Services . . . . .	53
X Strikes and You Are Disconnected? . . . . .	53
What Behavior Should the Safe Harbors Protect? . . . . .	53
Scraping and Aggregating Content . . . . .	54
Consequences of the Google Books/Search/Universal Library Project . . . . .	55
The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> ,	
“Chapter One: Copyright Cases” . . . . .	55
Summary. . . . .	58
Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	59
2 Three Copyright Issues . . . . .	60
Introducing Three Special Copyright Issues. . . . .	60
Fair Use. . . . .	61
Purpose and Character of the Use in Parody: 2Live Crew . . . . .	63
Nature of the Work: J. D. Salinger’s Unpublished Letters . . . . .	64
Amount and Substantiality: Cake-Decorating Instruction Booklets. . . . .	65
Market Effect: <i>Hustler v. Moral Majority</i> . . . . .	65
Fair Use in Practice . . . . .	66
<i>De minimis</i> Use and Private Use . . . . .	66
Market Failure. . . . .	67
Transformative Use . . . . .	68
<i>Transformative Use in Action: Authors Guild, Inc. v. HathiTrust</i> . . . . .	69
Perhaps Written Guidelines Are the Answer? . . . . .	70
Public Domain . . . . .	71
Orphaned Works. . . . .	73

Emerging Trends in Three Copyright Issues. . . . .	74
Fair Use: Friend of Criticism, Foe of Praise . . . . .	74
Repair of the DMCA-Mandated Takedown Protocols . . . . .	75
Reconfiguration of the Relationships between Copyright and the Public Domain . . . . .	75
Postmortem Right of Publicity and the Public Domain . . . . .	75
The Status of International Orphaned Works . . . . .	76
The End of the Google Books/Search Litigation May Amplify the Orphaned Books Issue . . . . .	76
The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , “Chapter Two: Three Copyright Issues Cases” . . . . .	76
Summary. . . . .	78
Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	78
3 Patent . . . . .	80
Patent Our App? Aren’t Patents Too Expensive to Pursue? . . . . .	80
Acquiring Patents . . . . .	82
Patent Categories and Types . . . . .	82
Patent Procedures . . . . .	83
Conditions for Obtaining Patents . . . . .	85
Legislative Development of US Patent Law . . . . .	86
Patent Legislation, 1400–1780 . . . . .	87
<i>Early Influences</i> . . . . .	87
<i>Early England</i> . . . . .	87
Patents in Colonial America and Early US . . . . .	88
Patents in Nineteenth-Century US . . . . .	88
Patents in Twentieth-Century US . . . . .	88
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (AIA) . . . . .	91
Emerging Trends in Patent Law and Litigation . . . . .	92
Ramifications of the Changes Brought about by the AIA . . . . .	92
Patent Trolls and Investment Portfolios . . . . .	92
Contested Patent Categories: Business Methods/Process . . . . .	94
Contested Patent Categories: Software . . . . .	95
Contested Patent Categories: Genetic Materials . . . . .	95
Lack of Insurance or Indemnity for Patent Infringement Claims . . . . .	96
The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , “Chapter Three: Patent Cases” . . . . .	97
Summary. . . . .	99
Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	100
4 Open Source and Open Access . . . . .	101
Varieties of Openness . . . . .	101
Brief History of Open Source Software in the United States . . . . .	102
Legal Foundations for Open Source . . . . .	103
Brief History of Open Access in the United States. . . . .	104
Open Access: Origins and Motivations . . . . .	104
Mandates, Legislation, and Rulemaking . . . . .	106
Emerging Trends in Open Source and Open Access . . . . .	107
Contestation over Unix and Linux Kernels . . . . .	108
Down with the Trolls. . . . .	108
Voluntary v. Forced Participation in Open Access Publishing . . . . .	108



	The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , “Chapter Four: Open Source Cases”	109
	Summary	110
	Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions	111
5	Trademarks	112
	Trademarks: Shifting on Stable Ground	112
	Acquiring Trademarks	113
	Infringement, Dilution, and Penalties	115
	Legislative Development of US Trademark Law	116
	Trademark Laws and Their Concerns	116
	Early History of Trademarks	116
	Modern Trademark Legislation and Development	118
	Emerging Trends in Trademark Law and Litigation	120
	Steady Growth in the Numbers of Trademark Applications	120
	New Generic Top-Level Domain Designations (gTLDs)	121
	Use of Trademarks by Celebrities and in Politics	122
	Trademarks in Search and Keyword Advertising	124
	Using Trade Dress to Protect Website Designs	125
	Inappropriate Uses of Trademarks in Virtual Worlds	126
	The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , “Chapter Five: Trademark Cases”	127
	Summary	129
	Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions	129
6	Trade Secrets	131
	Trade Secrets: “And Who Can You Tell?”	131
	Defining, Establishing, and Maintaining Trade Secrets	132
	Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs), Confidentiality Agreements, and Non-Competition Agreements: Covenants Governing Employee/Employer Behavior and Trade Secrets	134
	Non-Disclosure Agreements	134
	Confidentiality Agreements	136
	Non-Competition Agreements	137
	Remedies and Penalties	138
	Legislative Development of US Trade Secret Law	138
	Early Influences	138
	Restatement of Torts, 1939	139
	Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA) 1968–1985	139
	Fine Points of the UTSA	140
	Economic Espionage Act of 1996 (EEA)	141
	Emerging Trends in Trade Secret Intellectual Property Law	141
	Increases in Trade Secret Litigation and Skyrocketing Awards	142
	High Profile Criminal Prosecutions	142
	Trade Secrets in a Social Media World	143
	The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , “Chapter Six: Trade Secrets Cases”	143
	Summary	145
	Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions	146
7	Tort Laws for Intellectual Property of the Persona	147
	Historical Touch Points	147

Tort Liability in New Media . . . . .	149
Emerging Trend in Tort Laws for Intellectual Property of the Persona:	
Reconsideration of Section 230 Immunity . . . . .	150
Intellectual Property Law of the Person and New Media: Right of Publicity . . . . .	151
Is It All About You? . . . . .	151
Important Exceptions to the Right of Publicity . . . . .	151
Foundations for the Right of Publicity . . . . .	152
Emerging Trends in Right of Publicity Law and Litigation . . . . .	154
Right of Publicity and the Sports Image . . . . .	154
Images of Private Citizens in Commercial Environments . . . . .	155
Scrutiny of Differing State Statutory Publicity Rights Standards . . . . .	155
Ownership/Control over Workplace Social Media Accounts . . . . .	156
The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and</i>	
<i>New Media</i> , “Chapter Seven: Tort Laws for Intellectual Property of the Persona Cases” . . . . .	156
Summary. . . . .	159
Intellectual Property Law of the Person and New Media: The Right of Privacy in the Persona . . . . .	160
Did I Give You Permission to Look at My Stuff? . . . . .	160
Foundational Legislative Developments in Privacy Rights of the Persona. . . . .	161
Constitutional Protections. . . . .	161
Statutory Privacy Developments . . . . .	164
Emerging Trends in Privacy of the Person in New Media. . . . .	167
Difficulties When Legislating Privacy Protections . . . . .	167
Controversies over Genetic Materials as Intellectual Property . . . . .	167
The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and</i>	
<i>New Media</i> , “Chapter Seven: Tort Laws for Intellectual Property of the Persona Cases” . . . . .	168
Summary. . . . .	170
Intellectual Property Law of the Person and New Media: Defamation. . . . .	170
“What’s That You Said about Me?” . . . . .	170
Emerging Trends in Defamation in New Media . . . . .	172
Inconsistent Application of CDA Section 230 or First Amendment in Defamation Cases. . . . .	172
Businesses Are Fighting Back against Unfavorable Reviews . . . . .	172
Reduce the Risk of Successful Defamation Claims; Provide Hyperlinked Citations. . . . .	173
Bloggers and Social Media Posters with Traditional Press Rights . . . . .	173
Federal Consolidation of State-Based Anti-SLAPP Laws Is Needed . . . . .	173
The Global Nature of the Internet Equals “Virtually Limitless” Online Defamation . . . . .	173
The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and</i>	
<i>New Media</i> , “Chapter Seven: Tort Laws for Intellectual Property of the Persona Cases” . . . . .	174
Summary. . . . .	175
Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	176
8 International Intellectual Property Laws and Systems . . . . .	179
Complexities of the International Scene . . . . .	179
US Intellectual Property and Global Economic Trends . . . . .	180
Global Intellectual Property Benefits and Risks . . . . .	180
US Intellectual Property and Governmental Trade Policies . . . . .	182
Resistance to the US Intellectual Property Regime. . . . .	184
The Internet Changes Everything . . . . .	186
The International Legal Environment for Intellectual Property Law . . . . .	188
Emerging Trends in International Intellectual Property Law and Litigation. . . . .	190

	US Efforts to Legislate against Global Piracy . . . . .	190
	US Efforts to Prosecute Pirates . . . . .	191
	X Strikes and You're Out! . . . . .	191
	Technological Solutions to New Media Problems . . . . .	191
	We're Number 2; We're Number 3; We're Number X? . . . . .	192
	The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , "Chapter Eight: International Intellectual Property Laws and Systems Cases" . . . . .	192
	Summary . . . . .	193
	Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	194
9	Digital Rights Management . . . . .	195
	Forget the Zombie Apocalypse; It's Digital Rights Management That's Everywhere! . . . . .	195
	How DRM Works. . . . .	196
	Acts vs. Tools. . . . .	197
	Strange but True: A Tale of Digital Rights Management—The Secure Digital Music Initiative (SDMI) . . . . .	198
	Exemptions from the DMCA . . . . .	199
	Triennial Rulemaking . . . . .	199
	A Turning Tide? . . . . .	200
	DRM's Effectiveness . . . . .	201
	Emerging Trends in Digital Rights Management . . . . .	202
	WWW Standards that Facilitate DRM . . . . .	202
	Gamers Hate DRM, or, They Are Resigned to It . . . . .	203
	Mobile Phones: Locked v. Unlocked . . . . .	204
	The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , "Chapter Nine: Digital Rights Management Cases" . . . . .	204
	Summary . . . . .	204
	Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	206
10	Intellectual Property Law in Virtual Worlds and Games . . . . .	207
	Ten Intellectual Property Law Issues for Virtual Worlds and Games . . . . .	207
	Definitions and Conceptual Distinctions . . . . .	210
	Games, Virtual Worlds, and the Magic Circle . . . . .	212
	The Nature of Content Ownership in Games and Virtual Worlds . . . . .	212
	The Assignment of Rights Ownership and Control . . . . .	213
	The Intellectual Property Rights Implicated in Games and Virtual Worlds . . . . .	214
	Copyright . . . . .	214
	Patents . . . . .	215
	Trademarks . . . . .	215
	Trade Secrets . . . . .	216
	Torts of the Persona . . . . .	217
	Control Mechanisms: Jurisdiction and EULAs/ToS. . . . .	217
	Ownership, Rights, and Control Illustrated by <i>Second Life</i> . . . . .	219
	Some of the Issues Raised by How Linden Lab Treats Intellectual Property . . . . .	223
	<i>Rampant Infringement or Transformative Fair Use?</i> . . . . .	224
	<i>The DMCA Safe Harbor: Online Game and Virtual World Companies as ISPs or Content Providers?</i> . . . . .	225
	Emerging Trends in Intellectual Property Law in Games and Virtual Worlds. . . . .	226
	Open Source Games and Virtual Worlds . . . . .	226
	Online Fan Culture, Modders, and Co-developers Challenge Intellectual Property Rights . . . . .	226

Realistic Imagery in Games and Virtual Worlds. . . . .	227
First-Sale Doctrine and Transmission. . . . .	228
Long-Term Impacts of Athletes' Right of Publicity Cases . . . . .	228
The Following Cases Are Analyzed in <i>Case Analyses for Intellectual Property Law and New Media</i> , "Chapter Ten: Intellectual Property Law in Virtual Worlds and Games Cases" . . . . .	228
Summary. . . . .	230
Learning Objectives and Discussion Questions . . . . .	231
11 Surveying the Intellectual Property Landscape. . . . .	232
Eight Change Proposals. . . . .	233
Notes . . . . .	237
Glossary . . . . .	241
Works Cited . . . . .	243
Cases. . . . .	259
About the Authors. . . . .	263
Index. . . . .	265