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Legally Speaking from page 66

materials that are covered by the Federal copyright statute. The two cases also tell us that, while donation of unpublished items to a library does not constitute publication, sale of unpublished materials to a library may.

- John Fogerty showed us that an artist can’t plagiarize himself or herself; that style is an important part of our repertoire, and that you can’t sign away your right to individuality.
- The Beament case allows consumers to time-shift their favorite programs without violating copyright law. Because of this decision, we don’t become pirates every time we record a show.
- Chokrakarty showed us that genetic engineering was indeed an invention, and can indeed be patented as being something new under the sun.

Together these cases showed us what is allowed, what rights we have, and helped to define the field of intellectual property for the next hundred years. The significance of these cases is just now being seen, but they will affect our legal landscape for many years to come.

Legally Speaking Endnotes

74. Salinger at 100.
75. Wright at 109.
76. Wright at 110. The judge went on to say that even if the letters were considered unpublished, the use of quotations was allowed by the doctrine of Fair Use.
78. Wright II at 740.
79. Wright at 113.
82. CBS Sunday Morning, March 6, 2005.
84. Sony at 421.
88. Chokrakarty at 305, quoting the patent application.
89. Chokrakarty at 305.
90. Chokrakarty at 308-310.
91. This is a reference to Ecclesiastes 1:9, which reads: “The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun.”

Cases of Note — Work for Hire

Tarzan bundolo! Kree-ga kree-ga!

by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel) <strauchb@citadel.edu>


The 1909 Copyright Act sounds aged and hoary, but since it wasn’t replaced until 1976 and that act didn’t take effect until 1978, there’s still plenty of lingering issues from the old act.

Edgar Rice Burroughs began publishing the famous Tarzan series in 1912 and as it took off, he formed Edgar Rice Burroughs Inc. (ERB) to manage his business.

Burke Hogarth was hired by a comics syndicate to illustrate Sunday strips from 1937 to 1950. His distinctive style became iconic.

In 1960, ERB contracted Hogarth to put together a series of Tarzan books. ERB contracted Wason-Guptill as publisher with the responsibilities of ‘designing and producing the book’ and generally ‘supervising Mr. Hogarth’s work.’ ERB said in the writing ‘we cannot and do not presume to influence or control the work of Mr. Hogarth.’

Hogarth signed an agreement to produce each book for $2,500 up front and $2,500 on completion plus 50% of net monies realized.

I always have to pause and contemplate the ravages of inflation on the US dollar.

The book was to be copyrighted in the name of ERB and Hogarth granted them this plus the renewal rights which are the big issue under the 1909 Act.

They published the first book in 1972 and the second in 1976 with piddling sales for each.

Then along came Walt Disney and suddenly big money was at stake. In 1994, ERB licensed the right to the Tarzan character to Disney for the animated movie. ERB got $1.5 million. Hogarth died in 1996. The movie came out in 1999. Hogarth’s heirs saw $5 and their lawyer demanded Disney cease-and-desist showing the movie as it infringed their copyright in the books.

Now we can pause and imagine the Disney legal juggernaut leaping into action to crush these poor folks. Just how the movie infringed the books is never discussed. The case never got to that point.

Disney contended that Hogarth’s art work in the books was a ‘work for hire’ that ERB could validly license. The Hogarth trusts lost at the district court level and, the case went to the Second Circuit. The issues under the 1909 Act were ‘work for hire’ and the renewal term.

Renewal

The 1909 Act had a copyright term of 28 years and a renewal term of 28 if applied for within one year of expiration. The author could assign copyright, and could assign the renewal prior to 27 years running. But until year 27, it was an ‘expectancy’ which was voided by the author’s death prior to signing date. The renewal right would then belong to the estate. See Miller Music Corp. v. Charles N. Daniels, Inc., 362 U.S. 373, 374-78 (1960).

And they say the only math lawyers can do is divide a settlement by three. Let’s prove them wrong. 1996 (date of Hogarth’s death) – 1972 = 24. We were yet to 27 years, and the family saw their opening.

Of course, given the unequal bargaining power of publisher and author, the author would hand over copyright plus renewal long before the exploitation of the work could determine its value. Hence the only fortuitous event — from the heirs’ perspective — was the author’s death prior to renewal.

The 1976 Act improved on safeguarding authors by permitting termination of the grant within a period of five years beginning at the end of thirty-five years from the date of execution of the grant. 17 U.S.C. § 203(a)(3).

Of course, neither provision of the 1909 or 1976 Acts applied to “works for hire.”

Is Commissioned Art a Work for Hire?

ERB said Hogarth was not an employee but rather an independent contractor commissioned to do some work. Over sixty years, the Second Circuit has considered the issue of someone paid to create a copyrightable work and found that the hiree was almost invariably the “author” under the “work for hire” doctrine. The Fifth Circuit calls it “an almost irrebuttible presumption.” Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children v. Playboy Enterprises, 815 F.2d 323, 327 (5th Cir. 1987).

Yes indeed, that is a twisted sounding case. So much so I actually looked it up. It involves the creation of a Mardi Gras parade to promote Easter Seals. The film then got into the hands of Playboy that used part of the parade sequence in an “adult” film. ‘Candy, the Striper.’ Many of the volunteers in the scene were not pleased with the use and their recognizable faces.

The Fifth Circuit found the title “delightful” which is certainly a strange use of the continued on page 68
Copyright — 1909 Act Slowly Squeezed Out of Issue


Freelance artist Patrick Nagel created 285 works of art for Playboy between 1974 and 1984.

What? You never looked at the skin magazine in question during those years? Well then, you’ve probably seen these on calendars—silkscreens of über-babes in semi-erotic poses. They were big on squaring in high heels.

Nagel died in the last year just as he was starting to emerge as a major artist. He had been invited on a Good Morning show where he was coaxed into participating in what was then the new exercise called “aerobics,” and had a heart attack.

Nagel got $800 to $1,200 each during his life. After his death, Playboy marketed them as “The Playboy Collection by Patrick Nagel.” Being savvy, Playboy only sold the ones done after 1978.

The heirs did nothing, but an uneasy Playboy brought a declaratory judgment action asking for a ruling that it owned all the paintings that had appeared in the magazine.

The only chance the heirs had was a claim for the art under the 1909 Act which did not define “employer” or “work for hire” as clearly as the 1976 Act.

Which is to say that in the year 2002, they might have gotten the renewal rights to a few of the paintings. There’s that math again. 1974 + 28.

However, the Second Circuit had by then applied the “interest and expense” test to works for hire and said the test was met when the “motivating factor in producing the work was the employer who induced the creation.” Siegel v. National Periodical Publications, Inc., 508 F.2d 909, 914 (2d Cir. 1974). Also, “an essential element of the employer-employee relationship, [is] the right of the employer ‘to direct and supervise the manner in which the writer performs his work’.” Picture Music, Inc. v. Bourne, Inc., 457 F.2d 1213, 1216 (2d Cir. 1972).

In Siegel, Superman was held not a work for hire because, although it was revised at the request of publishers, it had existed fully blown long before the relationship was formed.

The district court held the Nagel paintings were not done at Playboy’s “expense” because Nagel as an independent contractor had his own tools and assistants. The Second Circuit held this flat wrong saying expense could be nothing more than the artist being paid. Royalties on the other hand weighed against work for hire. See Donaldson Publishing Co. v. Brigham, Vacco & Conn., Inc., 375 F.2d 639, 642 (2d Cir. 1967).

Subsequently, the Second Circuit held “the purpose of the [1909 Act] is not to be frustrated by conceptualistic formulations of the employment relationship.” Siegel v. National Periodical Publications, Inc., 508 F.2d 909, 914 (2d Cir. 1974). The “interest and expense” test has been applied to the “instance and expense” test in determining a work for hire. Picture Music, Inc. v. Bourne, Inc., 457 F.2d 1213, 1216 (2d Cir. 1972).

Independent contractors could now create works for hire and the agreement surrendering copyright was outside the renewal right question.

Plus, in the Hogarth case, the Tarzan Books were derivative works with ERB holding copyright to the originals. The Second Circuit had previously ruled that the copyright owner has the right to “direct and supervise” the artist, which if he directs and supervises sufficiently, makes it a work for hire. Id. at 1216.

Playboy actually controlled certain aspects of the paintings plus paid money meeting the “interest and expense” requirement.

And everything after 1978 Playboy got because in the later act work for hire was explicitly defined as something done in scope of employment or commissioned “if the parties expressly agree in a written instrument signed by them that the work shall be considered a work made for hire.” 17 U.S.C. § 101 (1988).

The evidence got a little flaky there, but Nagel had accepted checks which in each instance read “by endorsement, payee acknowledges payment in full for services rendered on a work-made-for-hire basis.”

Questions & Answers — Copyright Column
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QUESTION: Recently there has been discussion on several listserves about “orphanned works”. What are they?

ANSWER: The simple answer is that an orphaned work is a copyrighted work with no living parents. More specifically, it refers to works for which the copyright holder is unknown or whose holder is difficult or impossible to locate. Under the 1909 Copyright Act the problem was often solved by the renewal requirement. After the first 28 years of copyright protection, a copyright holder had the opportunity to extend the copyright an additional 28 years, but he had to apply for a renewal. Failure to renew meant that the work entered the public domain after the first term of copyright. Most orphaned works passed into the public domain after the first term due to failure to renew. While this has always been a problem for some older copyrighted works, with the extension of the copyright term to the life of the author plus 70 years or 95 years after date of first publication for works of corporate authorship, the problem is even more acute.

The Register of Copyrights is currently seeking comments from libraries and others about the problems encountered in dealing with orphaned works since the addition of 20 years to the copyright term extended the time in which obtaining permission to use orphaned works must continue to be sought. It may create an inappropriate burden on the users of copyrighted works to try to obtain permission to reproduce orphaned works since it is virtually impossible to do so. The Register hopes to be able to make a statutory recommendation to ease or eliminate this problem so that these works that are...