

UCLA

UCLA Entertainment Law Review

Title

[Front Matter]

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0j1974vz>

Journal

UCLA Entertainment Law Review, 13(1)

ISSN

1073-2896

Author

ELR, Editors

Publication Date

2005

DOI

10.5070/LR8131027078

Copyright Information

Copyright 2005 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

UCLA ENTERTAINMENT LAW REVIEW

Volume 13

Issue 1

Fall 2005

ARTICLES

Music Composition, Sound Recordings and Digital Sampling in the 21st Century: A Legislative and Legal Framework to Balance Competing Interests

Jeremy Beck 1

A new bright-line rule in copyright law in the Sixth Circuit digital sampling case of *Bridgeport Music v. Dimension Films* (decided in 2004 and rearticulated in June 2005) not only misinterprets legislative intent, but also demonstrates little understanding or knowledge of the larger history and methodology of music composition. Digital sampling and issues of copyright infringement continues to spark fervent debate; unfortunately, the literature tends to ignore or misunderstand the practice and precedent of music composition as it has existed in Western practice for over a thousand years. Sampling is merely a newer technique in the continuing development of that practice. This article analyzes and considers sampling within the larger history of music composition in order to provide a better sense of balance and perspective in the continuing discussion.

Additionally, the article argues that a broader middle ground - encompassing the doctrines of *de minimis* use and fair use as well as a compulsory license scheme in certain situations - would both satisfy competing economic interests and encourage the growth of a healthy creative environment and culture. In contrast to court decisions such as that of the Sixth Circuit, this legislative and legal framework better reflects the spirit and intent of the original purpose behind the copyright provision of the Constitution.

I Know, It's Only Rock and Roll, But Did They Like It?: An Assessment of Causes of Action Concerning the Disappointment of Subjective Consumer Expectations Within the Live Performance Industry

Brian A. Rosenblatt..... 33

What role should Judges and Juries play in addressing claims for disappointment of consumer expectations within the live concert industry?

The article was inspired by, and partially based on, a class action case successfully defended in the Chancery Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois. The case, *Berenz, et. al. vs. Creed Music, Inc. (Diamond Road, Inc.), USA Interactive (Ticketmaster), and Jeff Hanson Management & Promotions, Inc.*, No. 03 CH 07106, was filed by Plaintiffs over, ostensibly, a less than spectacular concert performance by the rock band Creed. The Plaintiffs essentially alleged that the band’s lead singer was either intoxicated or inebriated to the point that his performance was so lackluster that it was tantamount to a non-performance, and accordingly all patrons in attendance should have been entitled to a refund of the ticket price. While the article studies this case in particular, it also looks at the more global aspect of the viability of lawsuits based upon a disappointment of consumer expectations within the live performance industry. Equally applicable to live sporting events as well, the article diffuses the mysteries of exactly what a ticket constitutes, thereby defeating claims for breach of contract, and ultimately suggests that for disappointed consumers, their recourse lies not with the court system, but rather in the market. Fans and consumers are entitled to stop buying music from a specific artist, and can refuse to attend any further concerts, but our courts should not be playing the role of “rock critic”.

Flagrant Foul: Racism in “The Ron Artest Fight”

Jeffrey A. Williams 55

With under a minute left in the Indiana Pacers-Detroit Pistons basketball game, Pacer Ron Artest was called for a hard foul on Detroit star Ben Wallace, prompting Wallace to shove Artest forcefully with two hands. Thus began a brawl that would engulf the teams, the fans, and eventually the NBA, NBPA and the sports world nation-wide. Media reaction to the fight was clear in its focus on Artest but incautious in its entrance into the cultural contest, contributing to an acknowledgement that the incident was emblematic that lacked an understanding of what precisely it reflected.

Flagrant Foul focuses on the influence of racial bias in framing “the Ron Artest Fight” and its impact in the severe suspensions that followed. Criminological or economic explanations are lacking, lending clarity to the racial dimensions of the media and league responses. More, the reflection of market bias in addressing player misconduct is widespread, with racially charged incidents attracting increased scrutiny and violence against women and other ills often going unaddressed. League policies should be reformed to be less discretionary and more proportionate to the severity of the offenses even if, as in the steroids debate, federal legislative action is necessary.

COMMENTS

Balancing Free Speech Interests: The Traditional Contours of Copyright Protection and the Visual Artists’ Rights Act

Matt Williams 105

Does the First Amendment limit the parameters within which Congress can create copyrights and neighboring rights? In order to answer that question, this article explores the meaning of a controversial phrase used by the Supreme Court in the landmark copyright case *Eldred v. Ashcroft*, 537 U.S. 186 (2003). There, Justice Ginsburg stated that copyright statutes may require heightened First Amendment scrutiny should Congress ever “alter the traditional contours of copyright protection.” After concluding that the Court intended the traditional contours of copyright protection to refer to the ways in which copyright laws balance the First Amendment rights of authors and users of copyrighted works with those of the general public, the article asserts that the Visual Artists’ Rights Act of 1990 is an example of a statute that alters the traditional contours of copyright protection.

In the Shadow of Mt. Olympus: Could a Revision of 17 U.S.C. §§ 1202-1204 Bring Them Into Daylight?

Eric F. Harbert 133

In the seven years since passage of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), voluminous material relating to §1201 of the Act has been written as part of a war of culture and litigation. That war has yielded numerous lawsuits brought under §1201, and the section continues to be used for enforcement measures on behalf of intellectual property owners. Yet the neighboring sections of the Act have received less attention. Although §1202 has rarely been invoked in a court proceeding, it could grow in importance in the realm of digital content distribution, where intellectual property rights are being split into smaller and small slivers of ownership distributed on an increasing number of incompatible platforms.

This Comment looks at §1202 of the DMCA and the remedies sections, 17 U.S.C. §§ 1203-1204, their possible interpretations, their origins in World Intellectual Property Organization treaties, and prior U.S. law in this area to suggest revisions that will make them more effective, more robust, and less partial in their protection. Particular emphasis is accorded to section 1202 in an attempt to ameliorate the extraordinary complexity of liabilities the present version could create, and to clarify its intended purpose. A draft of the proposed statute is included as an appendix.

UCLA ENTERTAINMENT LAW REVIEW

Volume 13

Issue 1

Fall 2005

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Editors-in-Chief

MATTHEW HYDE
SEAN-PATRICK WILSON

Executive Editors

MARK SKOLNICK
STEPHANIE YU LIM

Chief Managing Editors

NICOLE GAMBINO
JACOB PATTERSON

Chief Submissions Editor

TORY MARNIELLO

Chief Articles Editor

ALEXANDRA MURRAY

Chief Business Editor

ERIN SPARKUHL

EDITORIAL BOARD

Managing Editors

JULIA BEGGS
JAIME COGHILL
ANAT DARDASHTI
VERONICA GUNDERSON
SABRINA KOTVAL
STEPHEN KRAUS
JENNIFER LEE
TODD MARTIN
DANIEL MCKENZIE
JEREMY MOEHLMAN
BLAKE NORVELL
ADI SCHNAPS
KIM SIM
JOY STRANSKY

Senior Articles Editors

KRISTEN GRACE
ELIZABETH OH
LUKE VANDERDRIFT

Articles Editors

ALEX FINEMAN
ALECIA LEAR
JAKE LEVY
SHONDELLA MCCLELLAN
MATTHEW MOORE
MONIQUE PARDO
MELANIE PHILLIPS
CYNTHIA TOLLETT
LYLE ZIMSKIND

Submissions Editors

JASON BREEN
MATTHEW DEMBLOWSKI
JAMES RAMSEY

Events Coordinator

CORIE ROSEN

Faculty Liaison

PAUL BATTAGLIA

Practitioner Liaisons

MATT BONOVICH
KIM MILLER

STAFF EDITORS

JENNIFER ALLISON
JOEY ANDERSON
PRESTON ASCHERIN
B.J. BECKETT
CASEY BOURKE
GREG BROEGE
ELIZABETH BURNSIDE
ZANDER CHEMERS
KATHRYN CONROY
BETH COOMBS
SCOTT D'AMBROSIO
STEPH D'AMATO
REGINA DU
MARISA DYE
LAURA EATON
ROBERT ESTRIN
RENEE FLOYD
AIMEE FRANK
KRIS FREDRICKSON

CHAD GUNDERSON
DANIEL GUTENPLAN
CAROL HU
EVAN HUNTER
SALLY JAMES
PETER JASINSKI
JENNIE KATZ
JONATHAN KEEN
LISA KOHN
JON LANDIS
AARON LAVINE
ZAC LOCKE
GREG MARTIN
KIM MILLER
JAMES MOLEN
ANTHONY NGUYEN
NANCY OLSON
KRISTIN PAIVA

JOHN PELLEGRINI
MEEHAN RASCH
NATASHA RIEGER
AMY RILEY
BRIAN ROSENBLATT
THOMAS RYAN
ALLA SAVRANSKAIA
JOSH SCHEIN
JONATHAN SEGAL
AMANDA SIMPSON
ALMUHTADA SMITH
MATT SPERLING
DEVIN STONE
MATT TOLNICK
JOSÉ TREJO
KATE TYLER
DAVID WEINBERG
KRISTY WIEHE
DANNY YADIDSON

Subscription Price: \$30.00 per year, \$17.50 for a single issue.

Published twice a year by the School of Law, University of California, Los Angeles. Subscriptions are accepted on a volume basis, starting with the first issue. If notice of termination is not received before the expiration of a subscription, it will be renewed automatically.

The *UCLA Entertainment Law Review* welcomes articles and student comments on topics of interest to the entertainment legal community. Manuscript submissions via electronic mail are preferred. They may be directed to <elrsubmissions@lawnet.ucla.edu>. Manuscripts may also be addressed to the Chief Submissions Editor, *UCLA Entertainment Law Review*, UCLA School of Law, P.O. Box 951476, Los Angeles, California, 90095-1476. Manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is provided. No responsibility will be assumed for unsolicited manuscripts. Address subscription inquiries to the Business Manager of the *UCLA Entertainment Law Review* <elr@lawnet.ucla.edu; Attn: Business Manager>. Please send all changes of address with the most recent mailing label to the Business Editor.

The views expressed in articles printed herein are not to be regarded as those of the *UCLA Entertainment Law Review*, the editors, The Regents of the University of California, or the Editorial Advisory Board. The *Review* has asked contributing authors to disclose any financial interests or other affiliations which may have affected the positions taken in their works. Such disclosure will be found in the author's footnote accompanying the article.

Citations conform generally to A Uniform System of Citation (18th ed.), copyright by the *Columbia*, *Harvard*, and *University of Pennsylvania Law Reviews* and the *Yale Law Journal*. Variations exist for purposes of clarity and at the editors' discretion.

Please cite this issue as 13 *UCLA ENT. L. REV.* __ (2005).

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

FACULTY ADVISOR

EUGENE VOLOKH
UCLA School of Law

ADVISORY BOARD

BARBARA D. BOYLE
Boyle-Taylor Productions

GARY O. CONCOFF
Troy & Gould

DAVID R. GINSBURG
Citadel Entertainment

SAMUEL N. FISCHER
Ziffren, Brittenham, Branca & Fischer

HELENE HAHN
Dreamworks SKG

LINDA LICHTER
Lichter, Grossman & Nichols

SHELDON W. PRESSER
Warner Bros.

MICHAEL S. SHERMAN
Jeffer, Mangels, Butler & Marmaro

LIONEL S. SOBEL
Loyola University School of Law

ALLEN E. SUSMAN
Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman

JOHN S. WILEY
UCLA School of Law

KENNETH ZIFFREN
Ziffren, Brittenham, Branca & Fischer

The *UCLA Entertainment Law Review* would especially like to thank the following groups that have contributed to the founding of this journal:

CONTRIBUTORS

Kenoff & Machtinger
Kramer & Goldwasser
Rogers & Harris
Shapiro, Posell, Rosenfeld & Close
Trope and Associates
Wolf, Rifkin & Shapiro
Wyman, Isaacs, Blumenthal & Lynne

PATRONS

Gipson Hoffman & Pancione

FOUNDERS

Ziffren, Brittenham, Branca & Fischer
The Matthew Bender Company, Inc.

The *UCLA Entertainment Law Review* would also like to thank the Graduate Students' Association for its support of this publication.