

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right to Publicity

Introduction

The goal of this paper is to (i) discuss the tensions between the right to publicity, Intellectual Property law and the First Amendment, whilst also providing a brief background on the development and evolution of the right to publicity; and (ii) advocate an argument that a federal statutory right to publicity is not warranted, given the significant disparities between state laws and the novelty of such a property right. Both reasons for and against adoption of a federal right to publicity will be debated and discoursed. Common justifications for the right as well as responses to them shall be examined.

Part A will start by discussing an overview of the development of the right to publicity from its foundation in the common law tort of privacy in California, the State that shall be the main focus of this essay because of the right's historical underpinning and large pop culture and music/entertainment industry. It should be noted here before we proceed that California is not typical, for in some respects it has the broadest rights in comparison to all other states. The beginning portion will thus define the right, its scope and limitations, and ultimately will illustrate the breadth given to the right to publicity in the US. Part B will go on to reflect the proposed federalization of the right to publicity dilemma. As a result of the divergence on right of publicity issues in numerous jurisdictions, many commentators have argued that the best solution would be for Congress to enact a federal statute comparable to trademark and copyright law. This would consequently furnish much clarity to quite a grey area of the law, especially in light of new technological advances. However, this thesis argues against such a proposition.

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

Since only half of the states have adopted such a right enacting a federal statute governing the same seems to be a rash and premature decision. Hence, this section will go on to address the main objections of a right to publicity, and support the right of states to choose not to create this property right and therefore allow them to create/define the right for themselves, using for instance choice of law conflicts whereby state courts are more likely to compensate their own residents than out-of-state residents injured within their borders, ultimately delimiting the right geographically and using its situs/domicile as a guide in choice of law questions. It will finally also discuss how a state-based system where rights of publicity are not universal can be functional, particularly since the right to publicity is in the end a property right, and property rights are state-created rights. A significant part of this discussion will be premised upon the issue of how rights of publicity in one state can potentially affect another state, and so we will be discussing whether the states with the strongest rights can effectively be controlling and thus alleviate the need for a federal right of publicity.

Part A – The Evolution of the Common Law Right of Publicity

The right of publicity has its foundation in the right to privacy¹. Privacy has been defined as "the right of a person and his or her property to be free from unwarranted public scrutiny or exposure."² In broad terms, the right to publicity protects a celebrity from having various aspects of his persona used for commercial gain without his authorization. Protection of this public persona was given substance in the 1950's in the case of Haelan Laboratories v. Topps Chewing Gum³. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals held that "a man has a right in the publicity value of his photograph, i.e., the right to grant the exclusive privilege of publishing his picture."⁴ The court went on to say "that many prominent persons (especially actors and ballplayers), far from having their feelings bruised through public exposure of their likeness, would feel sorely deprived if they no longer received money for authorizing advertisements."⁵ The court, realizing this potentially powerful economic right existed independent of the right of privacy, suggested calling it a "right of publicity."⁶

The Supreme Court of the United States discussed the right to publicity in 1977 in Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.⁷. The Court recognized the need to protect the

¹ *Lugosi v Universal Pictures* 25 Cal3d 813, 819 (1979)

² *Black's Law Dictionary* 712 (1999)

³ 202 F.2d 866, at 868 (2nd Cir. 1953)

⁴ *Id.* at 868

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ 433 U.S. 562, at 563 (1977)

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

commercial value of an entertainer's reputation. It used as its rationale the same economic philosophy that underlies copyright law⁸. The Court held "that the protection provides an economic incentive for him [the performer] to make the investment required to produce a performance of interest to the public."⁹

California

In California, the right of publicity is governed both by legislation and common law. Both causes of action, as is true elsewhere across the nation, trace their origins to the right to privacy¹⁰. In 1931, a common law right to privacy was recognized in the well-known case of Melvin v. Reid¹¹. In Melvin, the plaintiff sought damages from a producer who had made a movie "The Red Kimono" based on the plaintiff's past life. The court held that the plaintiff's complaint stated facts that were sufficient to establish a cause of action. Due to a lack of uniformity in the early privacy cases, the court reasoned that the label put on the right, which the cause of action was based upon, was immaterial.

What the court emphasized was that Californian law recognized "the right to pursue and obtain safety and happiness without improper infringements thereon by others."¹² Later, Dean Prosser detailed the four distinct torts that gave rise to a cause of action under the privacy rubric.

⁸ *Id.* at 576

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Wendt v. Host International, Inc.*, 125 F.3d 806, 811 (9th Cir. 1997)

¹¹ 112 Cal. App. 285, 297 (1931)

¹² *Id.* at 292

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

The four tort causes of action are: "(1) intrusion upon the plaintiff's seclusion or solitude; (2) public disclosure of private facts; (3) placing the plaintiff in a false light in the public eye; and (4) appropriation, for defendant's advantage, of plaintiff's name or likeness."¹³ It was from Prosser's fourth tort classification, appropriation of plaintiff's name or likeness for use or benefit by the defendant, that the right of publicity developed¹⁴. Since recognized as a separate right, controversy has existed in regard to which aspects of persona identify individuals.

The codified version of California's appropriation statute is contained in the state's Civil Code, section 3344¹⁵. Voice and signature were not in the statute as originally codified but were added in the 1984 amendment. By choosing to plead a cause of action pursuant to section 3344, a plaintiff does not forfeit his right to also plead the tort under common law, and hence it can be said that the statute does not preempt use and development of a common law cause of action.

Decisions in causes of action stemming from this statute have not generated the controversy that has resulted from the statute's common law counterpart. In 1983, in Eastwood v. Superior Court¹⁶, the California Court of Appeals stated the elements needed to plead a right of publicity under common law. The elements are: "(1) the defendant's use of the plaintiff's identity;

¹³ *Motschenbacher v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company*, 498 F.2d 821, 824 (citing Prosser, *Privacy*, 48 CALIF. L. REV. 383 (1960))

¹⁴ Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition, Appropriation of Trade Values: Right of Publicity 46 (1995)

¹⁵ California Civil Code Section 3344 (West 1999), "Any person who knowingly used another's name, voice, signature, photograph, or likeness, in any manner, on or in products, merchandise, or goods, or for purposes of advertising or selling, or soliciting purchases of, products, merchandise, goods or services, without such person's prior consent, shall be liable for any damages sustained by the person or persons."

¹⁶ 149 Cal. App.3d 409, 417 (1983)

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

(2) the appropriation of plaintiff's name or likeness to defendant's advantage, commercially or otherwise; (3) lack of consent; and (4) resulting injury."¹⁷ The distinction between the statutory and common law actions were also explained by this court. Section 3344(a) "requires a knowing use whereas under case law, mistake and inadvertence are not a defense against commercial appropriation."¹⁸ Furthermore under section 3344(g) "its remedies are cumulative and in addition to any provided by law."¹⁹ In its list of differences there was no mention of other means of appropriating one's identity that would be available in one cause of action over the other.

Generally, a federal court, in deciding a case based on state law, applies the law as it believes the highest court in the state would apply it²⁰. However, the California Supreme Court has not had the opportunity to decide a right of publicity case since 1979²¹. As a result, the Ninth Circuit has become the 'voice', as it were, for California in this area. It seems not to have been content with the California court's narrow and restrictive interpretations of its own state laws, and hence has proceeded to overrule their cases and rewrite the common law tort with their expansive interpretations, as will be demonstrated in the following cases.

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Erie R.R. v. Tomkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 90 (1938)

²¹ *Guglielmi v. Spelling-Goldberg Prods.*, 25 Cal.3d 860 (1979)

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

In Midler v. Ford Motor Co.²², a former back-up singer to Bette Midler was hired to record a song made famous by Midler for a radio commercial, and to imitate Midler as closely as possible. The ad agency had properly acquired the rights to the song from the copyright holder. Neither Midler's name nor picture was used in the advertisement. The district court held that there was "no legal principle preventing imitation of Midler's voice" and granted summary judgment for Ford Motor Co.²³ The Ninth Circuit, however, held differently, stating that Midler had a cause of action under common law. Its rationale behind the decision was that to impersonate her voice was akin to pirating her identity. The court took this stance even though the California legislature had recently chosen not to add voice impersonation to their amended right of publicity statute²⁴. The court also ignored the fact that Midler had failed to satisfy the second prong needed for a common law right of publicity claim as stated earlier in Eastwood i.e. the appropriation of plaintiff's name or likeness to defendant's advantage, commercially or otherwise.

With this decision, it should be noted that this court also contradicted one of its own earlier decisions. In Sinatra v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.²⁵, faced with essentially the same facts as in Midler, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that the defendant "paid a very substantial sum to the copyright proprietor to obtain the license for the use of the song and all its arrangements."²⁶

²² 849 F.2d 460, 461 (9th Cir.1988)

²³ *Id.* at 462

²⁴ *Infra* note 15

²⁵ 435 F.2d 711, 717-18 (9th Cir. 1970)

²⁶ *Id.*

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

In essence, the court was stating that it creates an impermissible burden to have the proprietor obtain permission from every artist who sang the chosen song. The Midler court was suggesting that Ford Motor Co. and its advertising agency needed a license because (i) Midler sang the song, and (ii) because they imitated her voice so closely that people thought she was singing in the advert. Nonetheless, Midler's common law right to publicity seemed to have trumped any license right to use the song. The Midler decision started a trend by this court of giving very little deference to federal copyright law.

Waits v. Frito-Lay²⁷ followed closely on the heels of Midler. An ad agency had hired a singer to record a song in the style of the gravelly-voiced Tom Waits. The ad agency, like the one in Midler, had properly acquired the rights to the song. This fact had little import in the trial, as had also been the case in Midler. Waits was successful in his voice misappropriation and right of publicity claim under common law, as was Midler. Once again the second prong of the common law tort as set forth in Eastwood was disregarded by this court.

The ultimate expansion of this law came in White v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.²⁸ This case arose from an advertisement for Samsung's videocassette recorders. The marketing message was that Samsung recorders would still be in use. The particular ad which prompted the controversy depicted a game board, which, according to the court, instantly called to mind "The Wheel of Fortune" television game show. A robot, adorned in an evening gown, jewelry and

²⁷ Waits v. Frito-Lay, 978 F.2d 1093, 1098 (9th Cir.1992)

²⁸ 971 F.2d 1395 (9th Cir. 1992)

with a blonde wig on top, was posed next to the board. The caption contained in the ad read "Longest running game show. 2012 A.D." Vanna White, a well known hostess of the "Wheel of Fortune" game show, brought suit against Samsung and their advertising agency. Nowhere in the ad was White's name or picture. The district court rejected White's right of publicity claim under both section 3344 and common law. In rejecting the common law claim, the court specifically stated that White had failed to satisfy the second prong name and likeness requirement as stated in Eastwood²⁹. However, the Ninth Circuit stated that White did have a claim under common law. The court reconciled the name and likeness issue by simply stating that the specific means of appropriation are not confined to those articulated in previous case law³⁰. The result of this holding seems to be that anything that brings to mind a celebrity may be actionable under the identity prong.

Kozinski's Dissent

After the court's decision, the Ninth Circuit was notified of a petition for rehearing en banc, which was subsequently denied³¹. In Judge Kozinski's dissent, he argued that the court's "broad application of the right of publicity put state law on a collision course with the federal rights of the copyright holder."³² This situation in White was still hypothetical at the time. It is

²⁹ *Id.* at 1397

³⁰ *Id.* at 1398

³¹ *White*, 989 F.2d at 1512

³² *Wendt*, 197 F.3d at 1285

against this backdrop that Wendt made its way into the Ninth Circuit. At issue in this case however was the copyright issue touched upon in Midler, Waits, and Kozinski's dissent.

Judge Alex Kozinski, joined by Judges O'Scannlain and Kleinfeld, issued a vigorous dissent in White in which he attacked the panel's holding on several grounds. Much of the dissent focused on the need to balance publicity rights against free speech rights granted by the First Amendment and argued that the panel had not properly done so here³³. The dissent, however, also suggested that such a broad right of publicity offends more of the Constitution than just the First Amendment³⁴. Invoking the dormant Copyright Clause, Kozinski noted that the Supreme Court has held that "state intellectual property laws can stand only so long as they do not "prejudice the interests of other States.""³⁵ Kozinski asserted that an out-of-state advertiser would be subject to the publicity law of a plaintiff's domicile state even if the advertiser took care not to display the complained-of advertisement there because "[a] right of publicity created by one state applies to conduct everywhere."³⁶ Kozinski continued:

"The broader and more ill-defined one state's right of publicity, the more it interferes with the legitimate interests of other states. A limited right that applies to unauthorized use of name and

³³ *Id.* at 1512–17, 1519–21 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

³⁴ *Id.* at 1517–19 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

³⁵ *Id.* at 1518 (Kozinski, J., dissenting) (quoting *Goldstein v. California*, 412 U.S. 546, 558 (1973))

³⁶ *White*, 989 F.2d at 1518 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

likeness probably does not run afoul of the Copyright Clause, but the majority's protection of "identity" is quite another story."³⁷

He also complained that the panel failed to analyze whether the restriction it was divining from the common law was "unconstitutionally vague," suggesting it may not have sufficiently defined "identity" so as to satisfy the requirements of due process.³⁸

In the early 1990's, Wendt v. Host International, Inc.³⁹ made its way into the Central District Court of California. At issue was a celebrity's right to control the use of his likeness in the commercial marketplace. At stake was the potential profit to be gained from the copyright of the popular television show Cheers. Host acquired from Paramount Pictures Corporation the right to replicate the Cheers tavern setting, familiar to viewers of the long running series, in a chain of airport bars across the country. At each location Host placed two animatronic robots on seats around the bar. These robots named Norm and Cliff were based on two characters of the same name that were usually found at the Cheers bar. They also were copyrightable components

³⁷ *Id.* at 1519 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

³⁸ *Id.* at 1519–20 (Kozinski, J., dissenting) (citing *Posada de P.R. Assocs. v. Tourism Co.*, 478 U.S. 328, 347 (1986)). The Supreme Court has repeatedly applied the void-for-vagueness doctrine with stricter scrutiny to laws that threaten First Amendment freedoms. *See, e.g.*, *Coates v. Cincinnati*, 402 U.S. 611, 614 (1971) (ordinance was "unconstitutionally vague because it subjects the exercise of the right of assembly to an unascertainable standard"); *Smith v. California*, 361 U.S. 147, 151 (1959) ("[S]tricter standards of permissible statutory vagueness may be applied to a statute having a potentially inhibiting effect on speech; a man may the less be required to act at his peril here, because the free dissemination of ideas may be the loser."); *Winters v. New York*, 333 U.S. 507, 509 (1948) ("It is settled that a statute so vague and indefinite, in form and as interpreted, as to permit within the scope of its language the punishment of incidents fairly within the protection of the guarantee of free speech is void, on its face, as contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment.").

³⁹ *Wendt*, 125 F.3d at 814

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

of the show and were properly attained by Host. It is important to note that Host also changed the robots' appearance so that they did not look like the actors, and changed their names to "Hank" and "Bob" in a half-hearted way to avoid litigation. As a result, the actors who portrayed the Norm and Cliff characters, George Wendt and John Ratzenberger, sued Host for the alleged misappropriation of their respective identities in the design of the robots.

The district court granted summary judgment in favor of the defendant Host, and applicant in intervention Paramount Pictures Corporation⁴⁰. The court compared photographs of the robots to Wendt and Ratzenberger, finding, as a matter of law, that their likenesses were insufficient to state a cause of action under both California statute and common law. The actors appealed the decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. On remand the robots were viewed in court and again summary judgment was granted. The court held that it could not "find, by viewing both the robotics and the live persons of Mr. Wendt and Mr. Ratenberger, that there is any similarity at all except that one of the robots, like one of the plaintiffs, is heavier than the other. The facial features are totally different [from those of the plaintiff]."⁴¹ The actors appealed the second grant of summary judgment, and the court once again remanded the case to the district court. In this trial, Host and Paramount based their defense on the rights guaranteed them by federal copyright law. Each time the case was before the Ninth Circuit, the court rejected Host's and Paramount's assertion that the actor's claims were pre-empted by federal copyright law. The court held that as long as the actor's claims "contain elements, such as the invasion of

⁴⁰ Wendt v. Host, 1995 WL 115571 (9th Cir.1995); *Id.*, Paramount is the holder of the copyright for the show and the characters.

⁴¹ Wendt, 125 F.3d at 809

personal rights that are different in kind from copyright infringement" the claims are not pre-empted⁴².

Federal Copyright Pre-emption

Judge Kozinski, joined by two other judges Kleinfeld and Tashima, issued a dissent after the court failed to rehear this case en banc⁴³. The dissent criticized the majority's favored treatment of the common law right of publicity in regard to federal copyright law⁴⁴. Kozinski reiterated many of the concerns he expressed in White, although he seemed even more disturbed by this case because Host had acquired a license to use the *Cheers* copyrights⁴⁵. Kozinski argued that these rights, granted by the federal Copyright Act, should preempt whatever publicity rights the plaintiffs have under the facts of this case.⁴⁶ He also pointed out that the court's decision put it in conflict with the Seventh Circuit, which had held that the Copyright Act preempts the right of publicity when the latter would prevent ordinary use of the copyrighted work.⁴⁷ Kozinski then elaborated on his dormant Copyright Clause concern from White, which preempts state intellectual property laws to the extent they "prejudice the interests of other States"⁴⁸, asserting that permitting California's expansive publicity right to set the national standard for permissible

⁴² *Id.*, quoting *Waits v. Frito-Lay, Inc.*, 978 F.2d 1093, 1100 (9th Cir. 1992)

⁴³ *Wendt*, 197 F.3d 1284

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 1285

⁴⁵ 197 F.3d at 1285 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

⁴⁶ *Id.* at 1285–87 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 1287 (Kozinski, J., dissenting) (discussing *Baltimore Orioles, Inc. v. Major League Baseball Players Ass'n*, 805 F.2d 663 (7th Cir. 1986))

⁴⁸ *Goldstein v California*, 412 U.S. 546, 558, 93 S. Ct. 2303, 37 L.Ed.2d 163 (1973)

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

use of a licensed derivative work creates a “constitutional conundrum.”⁴⁹ He also took the panel to task for applying California’s publicity laws to Host’s out-of-state activities. Thus, Kozinski suggested a potential Commerce Clause violation might exist when a state applies its anomalous laws extraterritorially.⁵⁰ By analogy, in Kassel v. Consolidated Freightways Corp.⁵¹ the Court held that a state law that regulated the length of trucks was invalid under the dormant Commerce Clause if it substantially interfered and/or posed an undue burden on interstate commerce; here, Kozinski argued that California’s right of publicity should be held invalid, in the same way as the state law in Kassel, if it substantially interfered with federal copyright law, absent preemptive legislation.

It is the opinion of the author of this paper that Judge Kozinski’s pre-emption analysis was more persuasive than the majorities’. Although the following was not mentioned in Kozinski’s opinion, the preemption doctrine stems from the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution. Under the Supremacy Clause, when Congress acts under one of their enumerated powers, any state regulation that conflicts with the resulting federal law is pre-empted. Congress, in enacting the various components of the Copyright Act derives its power from the Copyright Clause of the Constitution.⁵²

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 1288 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

⁵⁰ *Wendt*, 197 F.3d at 1288 (Kozinski, J., dissenting)

⁵¹ 450 U.S. 662, 674, 101 S.Ct. 1309, 67 L.Ed.2d 580 (1981)

⁵² U.S. CONST. art. I, cl. 8

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

17 U.S.C. 301 states the basis for the two-prong preemption test. The relevant part provides:

“all legal or equitable rights that are the equivalent to any of the exclusive rights within the general scope of copyright as specified by section 106 in works of authorship that are fixed in a tangible medium of expression and come within the subject matter of copyright as specified by sections 102 and 103 are governed exclusively by this title. Thereafter, no person is entitled to any such right or equivalent right in any such work under the common law or statutes of any state.”

17 U.S.C.A. 301 (West 1995).

Therefore, in order for preemption to occur, first, the subject of the claim must be a work "fixed in a tangible medium of expression and come within the subject matter", or scope of copyright protection as described in sections 102 and 103. Second, the right asserted under state law must be equivalent to the exclusive rights contained in section 106.

In Wendt, the subject matter of the claim are the two robots named Norm and Cliff, two fictional beings. "Original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression" is defined in section 102 to include dramatic works when embodied in a copy sufficiently permanent or stable to permit it to be perceived⁵³. Once the show 'Cheers' was put on television the dramatic work was fixed in a tangible medium of expression and fell under copyright protection. Section 106 provides the copyright holder with the exclusive right to create derivative

⁵³ 17 U.S.C.A. §102 (West 1995)

works⁵⁴. The robots Norm and Cliff are based on the show's characters of the same name. The first prong is hence satisfied. The second prong depends on whether the state created right encompasses elements personal to the actor that are different in nature from those contained in copyright. The subject matter being litigated is fictional. These robots, based on fictional television characters, do not possess any personal attributes. Since this is the case, the state right is void of any extra elements such as defamation and should thus accordingly be preempted by the Copyright Act. Judge Kozinski hence asserted that copyright held by defendants preempted whatever state law rights the plaintiffs claimed, insofar as state law would prevent ordinary use of the copyrighted work. His rationale was that plaintiffs' right to control the use of their likeness should be preempted by Paramount's right to exploit the Norm and Cliff characters, and if the plaintiffs wished to control how the characters were portrayed on the show then they should have negotiated previously. Further, Kozinski argued that a copyright licensee should be able to exercise rights that are intrinsically federal without the concern that 50 other states will burden them. He went on to say that this is precisely what the majority approves of here i.e. by allowing plaintiffs to use California law to prevent Host from displaying a copyrighted work in Kansas City/Cleveland, and ultimately in effect enforce California's right of publicity beyond its own state borders.

Conclusion

To conclude this section, as a result of its decisions over the last fifteen years, the Ninth Circuit has expanded California's common law right of publicity without any real basis for doing

⁵⁴ 17 U.S.C.A. §106 (West 1995)

so. Their rationale seems to have been that the common-law right of publicity, in light of growing pop culture and unfair competition concerns, should protect indicia such as the celebrity's name, persona, voice, likeness, image, and evocation-of-identity. They seem to have attached more importance to whether a defendant, for instance, actually appropriated a celebrity's identity rather than to how identity was appropriated.

Nonetheless, the court has proceeded in this manner even in the absence of California case-law supporting as liberal an interpretation as that taken by the Ninth Circuit. The actions of the California Legislature also do not provide support for the Ninth Circuit's expansion of the common law right. During this same fifteen-year period, the legislature has not made any amendments to the statutory counterpart indicating a desire to limit the scope of the law; though, presumably it could have amended the law if it was unhappy with either the White or Wendt decisions. The Ninth Circuit with this expansion of the common law right has put more and more hurdles before those who attempt to use copyright. The exclusivity of ownership that is inherent to a copyright becomes compromised if actors acquire similar legal rights to a character simply by portraying it. This potential situation also threatens the holder's right to benefit financially from derivative works. If the actor refuses to consent to how the character is used, the derivative work ultimately becomes jeopardized. For many, derivative works are the avenue taken to recover the monetary expenditure invested in the copyright. Since the cases are not coming before California courts, but rather before federal courts, it can be seen how easy it is to argue that it now seems appropriate that the legislature should now step in and provide clarity on the subject matter.

Recently, the right of publicity received recognition in the American Law Institute's Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition⁵⁵. For the first time, the Restatement incorporates a right of publicity as an independent component of unfair competition law and intellectual property law. The Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition expressly recognizes the commercial dimensions of the right of publicity. The protected interest is characterized as "the commercial value of a person's identity."⁵⁶ Because this interest is protected, unauthorized advertising or merchandising using an individual's identity are actionable. Up until today however, Wendt has not been explicitly overruled and remains to be good law in this area. Henceforth, it is from such a point where we formulate the basis for our next section, Part B.

⁵⁵ [Restatement \(Third\) Of Unfair Competition, §46-49](#) (1993)

⁵⁶ *Id.* The text of section 46 reads:

“Appropriation of the Commercial Value of a Person's Identity: The Right of Publicity

One who appropriates the commercial value of a person's identity by using without consent the person's name, likeness, or other indicia of identity for purposes of trade is subject to liability for the relief appropriate under the rules stated in 48 and 49.”

Part B – The Federalization Debate of the Common Law Right of Publicity

The right of publicity at the present time varies widely from state to state. It is indeed a right crafted by states, either through statute or common law. 27 states presently have some form of the right⁵⁷. Others do not recognize the right at all. Even among states that recognize the right, its boundaries dramatically differ. For example, in Florida, publicity rights last 40 years after the death of a celebrity⁵⁸. The States of Kentucky, Texas and Nevada for instance provide rights that will lapse after 50 years, whereas California's right lapses after 70 years⁵⁹. The right in both Indiana and Oklahoma, on the other hand, survives 100 years after the death of a celebrity⁶⁰. Tennessee and Nebraska allow the right to continue indefinitely, though in the former the rights will terminate if they are not used for 2 consecutive years⁶¹. There are also differences in terms of the aspects of persona that are protected i.e. voice, and whether the right is assignable or descendible, to name but a few. As a result of such differences, a federal right to publicity for example would reduce costs to potential defendants, who would otherwise have to investigate the laws of each state in which they wished to market or advertise⁶². It would also reduce the

⁵⁷ Bruce P. Keller & David H. Bernstein, *The Right of Publicity: Towards a Federal Statute?* 532 PLI/PAT 413, 418 (1998)

⁵⁸ Bruce P. Keller, *The Right of Publicity: Past, Present and Future*, 808 PLI/COMM 159, 181 (2000)

⁵⁹ *Id.*

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ *Id.*

⁶² Usha Rodrigues, *Race to the Stars: A Federalism Argument for Leaving the Right of Publicity in the Hands of the States*, VIRG.L.REV. (2001)

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

confusion occasioned by state differences as to whether the commercial value of the persona must be exercised, unless it be deemed waived⁶³.

One might suggest that, given the enforcement and choice of law difficulties, limiting plaintiffs to state causes of action diminishes the essence of the right of publicity; but, there is no requirement that national law be changed to maximize state causes of action. Property is traditionally an area reserved to the states, and the state-varied property regime of community property has existed since time immemorial. The fact that the law of the right of publicity is not clearly settled does not lead to the conclusion that the federal government must step in to resolve the disputed issues. An equally plausible reading of the current situation is that the states are still trying to work out the proper contours of a relatively young right and the federal government should wait until state law has matured. Most states have addressed cases of commercial appropriation of identity rarely, if at all⁶⁴. Some examples are Alaska, Minnesota, and New Hampshire⁶⁵. Although twenty-seven states have recognized a form of the right of publicity, “only about a dozen have taken unambiguous steps to create a true property right.”⁶⁶

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ Diane Leenheer Zimmerman, *Who Put the Right in the Right of Publicity?* 9 DEPAUL-LCA J. ART & ENT. L. 35, 36 (1998), at 40.

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ *Id.* at 41; Zimmerman only lists California, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Nevada, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas, however.

THE CASE FOR FEDERALIZING THE RIGHT TO PUBLICITY

I. Confusion amongst States

Considering over 40 years have passed since Haelan, the time may have come for a federal authority to take a second look at the issue of divergence. It has been argued by a multitude of legal academic commentators that the best solution is a federal statute comparable to trademark and copyright law. Such a law, often discussed but not implemented, might be beneficial in regard to the large differential on right of publicity issues in the numerous jurisdictions that recognize the right. With new-media technologies, choice of law issues may become crucial as the exploitation of identity can occur much more easily and quickly at the national level(s) (e.g. via the Internet). A consensus on this grey area of the law would ultimately promote certainty and consequently reduce forum-shopping. The federal statute would have to obviously be drafted so that it is sensitive to technological advances and takes account of free speech concerns. Even if the right of publicity is a significant proprietary right, it must always defer to the constitutionally protected right of freedom of speech, found in the First Amendment to the US Constitution; this contention is strengthened by virtue of the fact that it is the free market forum which is sustained by the free exchange of ideas/speeches, that created the foundation from which all celebrities emerged in the first place, and still continue to do so today.

II. Confusion amongst Federal and State Laws

The majority of justifications for federalizing a right to publicity come from the justifications for actually having the requisite right, namely that of labor, unjust enrichment, personal autonomy, incentive, efficiency and consumer confusion⁶⁷. For instance, if one agrees that both personal autonomy and economic concerns outweigh freedom of expression, one would indeed accept the idea of federalizing the right of publicity. Having a First Amendment exception in this case could well then protect image use in the media⁶⁸. Another reason for federalization lies in the demarcation line between state and federal law. There is a confusing boundary which potential litigants face when bringing suit. Many plaintiffs usually tend to include federal claims in their causes of action i.e. based on Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, so as to get their cases heard before a federal court(s). Therefore, it can be stated with reasonable confidence that the majority of state law in this disputed area actually stems from federal courts hypothesizing about how a state court would rule upon such an issue⁶⁹.

There are additionally potential conflicts between state rights of publicity, federal copyright law, and the Lanham Act. As discussed before, Section 301 of the Copyright Act preempts state created rights that are equivalent to those created by the Copyright Act and that cover the same subject matter as the Act⁷⁰. While some commentators believe that the Act

⁶⁷ Rodrigues, *supra* note 62.

⁶⁸ *Id.*

⁶⁹ *Id.*

⁷⁰ 17 U.S.C. § 301 (1994)

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

preempts state rights of publicity, others disagree either because a persona is not a writing or because the right protects an interest different from copyright; also, any preemption analysis would conceivably depend on the scope of the state right of publicity. In any case, if the rights of publicity were to be federalized, other federal laws would not preempt it; though, it still would be limited by the First Amendment.

The Lanham Act is another area of potential conflict for right of publicity causes of action. A federal right of publicity may be required if plaintiffs cannot rely on the Lanham Act for full protection. The Act requires the involvement of goods and services, an effect on interstate commerce, and false designation of origin or description⁷¹. The Act also requires potential deception, so there are cases protected under the right of publicity that the Lanham Act would not protect. The Lanham Act, however, does not always apply to publicity cases because its application "is limited . . . to potential deception which threatens economic interests analogous to those protected by trademark law."⁷² In Carson v. Here's Johnny Portable Toilets⁷³, the Sixth Circuit denied relief under the Lanham Act because there was no likelihood of confusion, but granted relief under the right of publicity theory. The Lanham Act does not focus on injuries to persons that occur as a result of the misappropriation of that person's name, likeness, or identifying characteristics. The Act's "purpose is 'the protection of consumers and

⁷¹ 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (1994)

⁷² [Allen v. National Video, Inc., 610 F. Supp. 612, 625 \(S.D.N.Y. 1985\)](#)

⁷³ [698 F.2d 831 \(6th Cir. 1983\)](#).

competitors from a wide variety of misrepresentations of products and services in commerce.¹⁷⁴ If forced to solely rely on this Act, individuals with legitimate publicity claims may go uncompensated. Thus, those expropriated cannot always rely on the Lanham Act to vindicate their rights. However, to the extent deception is used in advertising by expropriating personas, Lanham Act values are important. Because the right of publicity is such a unique combination of varying rights, including, in a sense, trademark, the Lanham Act should be used only to protect what it was designed to protect. The Act's features which are relevant to a publicity right claim can be incorporated into the proposed publicity statute. In this way, all the varying policies can be accommodated.

III. Certainty in Litigation

The chief attraction of a uniform federal law of publicity is that it would solve the problems of uncertainty that both plaintiffs and defendants face in this area, as mentioned before above under part B's introduction. As we will see, the uncertainty occasioned by choice of forum and choice of law is also a major concern in these cases. The burden of nationwide enforcement is considerable if state court remedies are limited to 'in-state' infringement. Thus, a federal right of publicity would give celebrities the incentive to create by lowering the cost of enforcement related to protecting one's image. Those plaintiffs who still thought that the right of publicity was a questionable development in the law, could potentially still rely on either the Lanham Act and/or Copyright Act to protect the most egregious, false-endorsement type behavior; hence, conflicts with these federal statutes would no longer pose such a problem since individual

⁷⁴ [Allen, 610 F. Supp. at 625](#) (quoting [C.B.S. v. Springboard Int'l Records, 429 F. Supp. 563, 566 \(S.D.N.Y. 1976\)](#)).

plaintiffs would have a choice of which federal statute and cause of action to bring an action upon.

IV. Forum-Shopping and Choice of Law issues

Finally, courts are often more inclined to apply their own state's law even if other states have an interest in the outcome of a particular decision⁷⁵. The states of California, Kentucky, Florida, Oklahoma, Utah and Virginia have statutes which do not require the defendant or plaintiff to reside in the state, or require that the commercial exploitation/use take place in the state. Therefore, the defendant theoretically can be brought in with a long-arm statute by selling products or even showing advertisements within the state. Thus, it can be seen how a state can have a large scope of permissible power over actions in other states. As a result of this dilemma, many defendants unfortunately have no way to predict when they will be liable.

Nonetheless, the courts have been overcoming forum-shopping for plaintiffs by imposing a requirement that there exist a real connection to the state. In Cairns v. Franklin Mint Co., 24 F. Supp. 2d 1013, 1029 (C.D. Cal. 1998), a federal court denied a claim under California law because the claimant sued on behalf of Princess Diana, who, at the time of her death, was

⁷⁵ See *Groucho Marx Productions v. Day and Night Co.* 689 F.2d 317 (2d Cir. 1982). This case involved a Broadway musical called *A Day in Hollywood, A Night in the Ukraine* and three performers who reproduced the comic style of Groucho, Chico, and Harpo Marx. The District Court for the Southern District of New York ruled that New York law governed, since the play ran longest there, and the Marx Brothers characters were originally developed in New York. The Second Circuit reversed, ruling that a New York court would apply California law, since the Marx Brothers were California residents at their deaths, and the plaintiff was a California corporation. Further, before his death Groucho assigned his right of publicity to the plaintiff with a contract executed in California. Finally, Chico's estate did the same eighteen years after his death. NB. Cases in which a trial court is reversed on appeal for failing to consider choice of law constraints, or for ruling incorrectly on them, are fairly common.

domiciled in Britain, which does not recognize the right of publicity. Applying California law, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the finding that this claim failed because Great Britain, the Princess's domicile at the time of her death, did not recognize a post-mortem right. While this was not an Internet case, it illustrates the complexities of jurisdictional and choice of law issues that are commonly faced in cases involving Internet usage. Even when a court decides which state's law applies, it usually struggles over the scope of the injunction. Even within the same circuit, courts have differed about the scope of injunctions in right of publicity cases⁷⁶.

This brings us to the obstacle concerning remedies. Theoretically, according to the current state-based system, plaintiffs may have to bring 50 suits so as to prevent commercial exploitation of their persons across the country. In the alternative, damages could be reduced to those within the state declaring judgment, or defendants might be able to convince a court to limit damages to the amount available in states where the plaintiff has won or could potentially win. Even still, such an analysis would consist of a very burdensome examination of the law of all 50 states⁷⁷. Another problem with state-based rights of publicity is the uncertain surrounding remedies. If an injunction was sought and granted in one state, what would be the jurisdictional reach of it in other states? As noted by Eric J. Goodman in his article entitled *A National Identity Crisis: The Need For a Federal Right of Publicity Statute*:

⁷⁶ Compare *Carson v. Here's Johnny Portable Toilets, Inc.*, 698 F.2d 831 (6th Cir. 1983) (nationwide injunction), and *Herman Miller v. Palazzetti Imports and Exports*, 270 F.3d 298, 327 (6th Cir. 2001) (injunction limited to certain states because of disparities in their laws)

⁷⁷ Keller, *supra* note 58.

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

“There is also a question of whether an injunction issued under one state's law will have any effect on activities in another state. An injunction may easily be obtained in Tennessee, but it is not clear how far that injunction will reach. In New York, for example, courts have held that the state's publicity law does not extend to violations involving out-of-state sales. Lawyers cannot give their clients anything even resembling an unqualified opinion under the current scheme of various state laws.”⁷⁸

Overall, the disparity in state law impacts potential defendants as much as potential plaintiffs. With national advertising and the Internet, the rights of publicity laws of all states come into play. For example, consider a firm preparing a national marketing campaign - not only must that firm review potential liability along the ‘axis’ of states that do and do not recognize the right, but it also must consider how the variation in the contours of the right from state to state impacts that potential liability, and then consider how states' different conflict of laws rules further complicate the matter.

"It has become very difficult for lawyers to properly advise their clients on right of publicity matters because parties tend to forum shop."⁷⁹

Given such complexity, companies and advertising firms face unpredictable outcomes in potential litigation over the use of names, photographs, voices, or other indicators of an individual's identity when they have not sought the individual's consent. This is especially true when identities are used on the Internet, where it is often unclear what state's laws apply.

⁷⁸ Goodman, 9 J. ART & ENT. LAW 227, 244 (1999)

⁷⁹ *Id.*

This clout above buttresses the idea about having a national right, especially if states are extending their reach beyond their borders. This notion plays heavily against letting states innovate their own rights to publicity, since there is a risk of allowing them to overstep their constitutional and jurisdictional boundaries and limits. To some extent, the use of any single state's law to govern a controversy with significant multistate consequences will inherently be arbitrary. It has been argued that this could be solved, howsoever, by discerning the state of greatest infringement. In this scenario, we would apply the law of the state of greatest infringement to the right of publicity controversy, which may be less arbitrary than applying law selected via a choice of law factors which do not focus on the situs of the alleged injury⁸⁰.

Currently, however, the dominant U.S. choice-of-law rule is that right of publicity cases are decided using the law of the jurisdiction in which the plaintiff lives, or in which s/he was living when s/he died. That means that if for example John Ashcroft moves back to Missouri, and someone writes a novel or produced a movie in which one of the characters is named John Ashcroft and consequently Ashcroft sues, even outside Missouri, then a majority of courts would apply Missouri law. Ashcroft might therefore win if the jury decides that the novel or movie used his name primarily for "commercial" purposes, rather than "expressive" or "artistic" purposes. Even if for instance Ashcroft had to sue in a Missouri court, he could still probably get jurisdiction over the defendants, even if the defendants did not have any personal connection to

⁸⁰ *Infra* note 83, at 663.

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

Missouri. Ashcroft could certainly get jurisdiction over, for example, US media companies that publish and distribute the alleged infringing work. Thus, Missouri law ultimately would affect anyone who could create commercially distributed books, movies, and so on, whether in Missouri or not. *See, e.g., Downing v. Abercrombie & Fitch*⁸¹, (applying California right of publicity law when Hawaiian plaintiffs sued in federal court sitting in California).

⁸¹ 265 F.3d 994, (9th Cir. 2001), at 1005-07

THE CASE AGAINST FEDERALIZING THE RIGHT TO PUBLICITY

I. Flexibility with State-based System leading to Competition

On the other hand, since half of the states have not recognized the right of publicity, there is no clarity that protection of the right would be a clear benefit. Different states currently have the flexibility to experiment with a variety of forms of the right and can enact one that meets their present needs. Another criticism of federalization in this contested area is that states would be discouraged from competing for celebrities, as they do for corporations⁸². A response to this is that they might; despite tax revenues, by having a significant celebrity population, a state might increase its tourism and exposure. Further, if celebrity domicile is a matter of indifference, then states will not compete for celebrity domicile but will for other areas. However, the current variation in state law suggests that some competition might in fact exist.

It has been suggested that the problems of a multistate publicity action could be solved by adopting a similar method to one applied to defamation and privacy actions⁸³. In such multistate cases, where there was for instance publication in several states, courts adopted out of practical necessity only a single cause of action governed by the law of one state i.e. the law of the plaintiff's domicile⁸⁴. This strategy, if adopted in the right of publicity context, may drive states to compete with each other for celebrity residency, as they do for banks and corporations. In

⁸² Rodrigues, *supra* note 62.

⁸³ Richard Cameron Cray, *Comment, Choice of Law in Right of Publicity*, 31 UCLA L. REV. 640, at 665-66 (1984)

⁸⁴ *Id.* at 666

federalism terms, this would allow states to vary the protection celebrities receive within their borders. It might well be in a state's interest to encourage in-state individual enterprise and creativity by vigorously enforcing celebrities' rights of publicity.

II. Prematurity of Right to Publicity

Given the various criticisms that can be said of a national federal right to publicity, and the varying definitions of the same, it seems premature to choose one state's system over another's and enact it as a national law. Further, another factor to consider is the precise form in which the federal right should take. State regimes today differ enormously as to assignability, protected features and survivorship⁸⁵. An analogy can be drawn here to corporate law in the US. Every state has its own corporation's law. Delaware is deemed to be the best and most favored state in which to incorporate since its features such as a sophisticated judiciary and well-developed case-law leads to a level of shareholder protection that is optimal for wealth maximization. Relatedly, federalism is significant in the right to publicity context, because via competition, the best form of right to publicity can emerge. Now, one could potentially argue here that states would never compete for celebrities in the way they would for corporations. The choice of domicile for celebrities is likely to be driven by factors such as convenience, personal preferences, career concerns and ambitions than by the perceived urgency of protecting one's own persona and image. Hence it can be said that it is unlikely a celebrity would use their right of exit as speedily as a corporation would. Notwithstanding this, it is true that film stars live in

⁸⁵ Keller, *supra* note 57.

California both because it has broad publicity rights, and because that is where the majority of Hollywood studios, movie producers, screen-writers and entertainment industry professionals are based.

As follows, Judge Mansfield in a dissent in Factors Etc. v. Pro Arts, 652 F.2d 278, 288 (2d Cir. 1981), has asserted this practical reality, “[I]t would be rational for the Tennessee courts to adopt a policy enhancing the continued growth of Nashville and Memphis as centers for the lives and activities of music industry personalities.”⁸⁶ Such comment is important in that it recognizes the protection of stars in order to encourage a state entertainment industry as a legitimate state goal. State experimentation can also be said to be beneficial to the nation as a whole, according to conventional notions of federalism. Judge Brandeis⁸⁷ viewed states as laboratories that experiment and discover the best national solution⁸⁸. In our context, the “best” would conceivably mean an ideal balance of free speech protection and celebrity protection that does not increase the price of the relevant goods, namely the price a celebrity demands, by a large amount. The federalism argument allows different approaches to different states, realizing that different situations and jurisdictions might have in mind different solutions to the same problem⁸⁹. Because no firm consensus has to date come about on what makes the most effective

⁸⁶ Factors Etc. v. Pro Arts, 652 F.2d 278, 288 (2d Cir. 1981) (Mansfield, J., dissenting)

⁸⁷ David L. Shapiro, *Federalism: A Dialogue* 81 (1995) (citing Richard Revesz, *Rehabilitating Interstate Competition: Rethinking the “Race-to-the-Bottom” Rationale for Federal Environmental Regulation*, 67 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1210, 1234 (1992))

⁸⁸ See New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann, 285 U.S. 262, 311 (1932) (Brandeis, J., dissenting)

⁸⁹ Shapiro, *supra* note 87

right to publicity system, such a federalism model as advocated here would keep the issue within state hands. Finally, it must be mentioned that states traditionally define property rights. Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth⁹⁰ states, “Property interests, of course, are not created by the Constitution. Rather they are created and their dimensions are defined by existing rules or understandings that stem from an independent source such as state law.”⁹¹

In the end, there is no agreement on the level of protection celebrities should be granted. As mentioned previously, until a general consensus is reached, it would be premature to enact one version of the right to publicity as a federal law. Instead, we should let the several states experiment, as it were, with rights of publicity models. The fact that half of the states have adopted some kind of the right means that it is likely that the right will exist in the future and there may be a nationalization of the property right in persona. The problem in recognizing such right however can be said to lie in defining the contours and limitations of the same. It is the opinion of the author of this paper that in order to achieve this, states should take into account the justifications for having the right and their counter-arguments, when it comes to deciding how broad⁹² or narrow to make the right. For example, if the states’ rationale for the right is one

⁹⁰ 408 U.S. 564 (1972)

⁹¹ *Id.* at 577

⁹² California has a state law regime that many think is expansive, as exemplified by *White v. Samsung Electronics America*. There, a robot dressed with a blonde wig, evening gown, and jewelry was deemed to infringe on Vanna White’s right of publicity. One scholar, Professor Arlen W. Langvardt, rejects the idea that the Wheel of Fortune set pictured in the advertisement was a personal attribute of Ms. White. If anyone should sue, he argues, it should be the copyright holder in the show. One of the dangers he sees in the White decision is the prospect of an “Orwellian” world where attenuated reference is enough to trigger liability. Another danger is that it creates a property right without limits. This enhances copyright conflicts and threatens freedom of expression. Potential defendants may also have no notice that they are infringing. Professor Langvardt suggests instead that the right be limited to personal and

of personal autonomy, then thus the right should terminate upon death, when individual autonomy no longer needs protection⁹³. If such justification is incentive based, then states may want to look at the decreasing marginal utility of extending the rights for decades after a celebrity's death⁹⁴, or indeed at licensing opportunities. On the other hand, if a state decides to support the right with a labor theory, then maybe the fruit of the celebrity's hard work should have a degree of continuity post-mortem⁹⁵, possibly in perpetuity.

III. State-created solutions

One possible solution that courts have used is the domicile factor, on the basis that states are more likely to compensate their own residents than foreigners injured within their borders⁹⁶. This approach may be criticized as artificial, given the intangible nature of the property in question here. Though if a state makes the right of publicity a property right, the next step is to try to limit it geographically and use its situs as a guide in choice of law queries. Also problematic is the fact that this approach is more akin to privacy actions, where the cause of action is necessarily related to the celebrity; in right of publicity, on the other hand, it may be

unique attributes, that the law require proof of the likelihood of confusion, and that there be more of an effort to accommodate First Amendment interests.

⁹³ Rodrigues, *supra* note 62.

⁹⁴ *Id.*

⁹⁵ *Id.*

⁹⁶ *Id.*

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

assigned away or survives the death of the public figure⁹⁷. The attraction of this approach is that, as referred to previously, it would allow states to compete with each other to attract celebrities to reside within their borders, so long as it is worth their while to do so, and to custom-tailor their own regimes so that they are most likely to meet their constituents' needs. The downside to this is that it would allow celebrities to shop for the most protection, or to strike a balance between other factors determining domicile and degree of publicity protection⁹⁸.

Some states use the law of the plaintiff's domicile in such cases. This choice of law discussion indicates that the solution to the problem is possible. If courts treat the right as traditional property, they can use the state of domicile of the celebrity. If they wish to take into account its status with regard to 'place', they can choose the place of 'greatest infringement'. Either rule is predictable and permits states to mould their own policies. Choosing the state of domicile may even drive states to compete with each other for celebrity residency⁹⁹.

⁹⁷ Cray, *Supra* note 83, at 655

⁹⁸ Rodrigues, *Supra* note 62, at 1224

⁹⁹ Rodrigues, *Supra* note 62, at 1225

Conclusion

The notion of federalism of incrementally solving a problem in piecemeal fashion until a workable model emerges is one that is highly relevant in the rapidly changing media exploitation markets. Property remains an area of the law traditionally dominated by the states. Given the right of publicity's debatable labor and incentive justifications, it is wise to avoid enacting on the federal level a legal right of persona protection for the reasons outlined above in this article. The increasing use of the marketing of famous figures' personas led to the re-thinking of rights of privacy. The earlier legal protections no longer seemed adequate to protect apparent 'public' figures. The solution of granting property rights in the marketing of one's persona gave celebrities power over their images, but that power was limited by state law and choice of law provisions. The strongest case against a federal right of publicity is that property rights are state-created rights. Hence, for the reason that these rights of publicity are relatively novel in the community property law context, to formulate a federal law out of them would indeed be a premature motion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Authorities/Citations:

- White v Samsung Electronics 989 F.2d 1512, Judge Kozinski's Dissent from order rejecting the suggestion for a rehearing en banc
- Wendt v Host International, 197 F.3d 1284, Judge Kozinski's Dissent from order
- Haelan Laboratories Inc. v Topps Chewing Gum, Inc., 202 F. 2d 866, 868
- Nimmer, The Right of Publicity, 19 Law & Contemp. Probs, 203 (1954)
- Professor William L. Prosser, Privacy, 48 Cal. L. Rev. 383, 398-407 (1960)
- California Civil Code, section 3344 and 990.
- Zacchini v Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co., 433 U.S. 562, 575 (1977).
- Eastwood v Superior Court
- Midler v Ford Motor Company
- Sinatra v Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
- Allen v National Video, Inc., 610 F. Supp 612, 630
- Ali v Playgirl, Inc., 447 F. Supp 723, 728
- Abdul-Jabbar v GM Corp., 85 F. 3d 407
- Montana v San Jose Mercury News Inc., 24 Cal. App. 4th 790
- "The Right of Publicity: Going to the Dogs?" by Russell Frackman and Tammy C. Bloomfield, UCLA Online Institute for Cyberspace Law and Policy
- "IP Expansion: The Good, the Bad, and the Right of Publicity" by K.J. Greene, 11 Chapman Law Review 521 (2008)

The Federalism Case Against a Federal Right of Publicity
By Krishan Thakker

- "Race to the Stars: A Federalism Argument for Leaving the Right of Publicity in the Hands of the States" by Usha Rodrigues, Virginia Law Review (2001)
- "What the Right of Publicity Can Learn from Trademark Law", Stacey Dogan and Mark Lemley, 58 Stan. L. Rev. 1161
- "Rights of the Dead", Kirsten Rabe Smolensky, The University of Arizona (2009)
- "IP Beyond IP rights? Merchandising Rights beyond IPRs?" Petteri Korhonen, University of Helsinki
- "Policing Elvis: IP Rights, legal action and the shaping of post-mortem celebrity culture as contested space", David S. Wall
- "Right of Publicity in the Digital Environment" Mark Conrad (Fordham)
- "Characters and Merchandising Rights", Masayasu Ishida
- "From Ashes to Fire: Trademark and Copyright in Transition" by Gerard N. Magliocca