

Table of Contents

PART I. OVERVIEW

CHAPTER 1. OVERVIEW OF FAIR USE

I. GENERALLY

- § 1:1 Statutory provision
- § 1:2 The purpose and role of fair use
- § 1:2.50 No separate First Amendment defense

II. ORIGINS AND PURPOSE OF FAIR USE

- § 1:3 Generally
- § 1:4 Law vs. equity: right to jury trial
- § 1:5 The early English cases
- § 1:6 —*Burnet v. Chetwood*
- § 1:7 —*Lord Hardwicke*
- § 1:8 —*Tonson v. Walker*
- § 1:9 —*Dodsley v. Kinnersley*
- § 1:10 —*Macklin v. Richardson*
- § 1:11 —*Cary v. Kearsley*
- § 1:12 —*Roworth v. Wilkes*
- § 1:13 —*Wilkins v. Aikin*
- § 1:14 —*Whittingham v. Wooler*
- § 1:15 —*Mawman v. Tegg*
- § 1:16 —*Bramwell v. Halcomb*
- § 1:17 —*Bell v. Whitehead*
- § 1:18 —*Lewis v. Fullarton*
- § 1:19 Fair abridgment, fair use, and the 1911 UK Act
- § 1:20 *Folsom v. Marsh*
- § 1:21 Factors 1 and 2: “nature and object of the selections made”
- § 1:22 *Folsom v. Marsh*—Factor 2: “quantity and value of the materials used”
- § 1:23 —Factor 3: “degree in which the use may prejudice the sale, or diminish the profits, or supersede the objects, of the original work”

CHAPTER 2. STATUTORY PROVISION

I. STATUTORY RECOGNITION OF FAIR USE

- § 2:1 “Codification” versus “statutory recognition”:
why the distinction is important
- § 2:2 Fair use as a common-law analysis
- § 2:3 Common law copyright infringement actions
- § 2:4 Fair use is not an affirmative right
- § 2:5 Fair use as affirmative defense
- § 2:5.10 Declaratory judgments
- § 2:6 Fair use isn’t a checklist of equally weighted
factors
- § 2:7 Preliminary injunctions and fair use as an
affirmative defense
- § 2:8 De minimis uses

II. PREAMBLE TO SECTION 107

- § 2:9 Generally
- § 2:10 Preamble lists only illustrative uses

PART II. FAIR USE FACTORS

CHAPTER 3. PURPOSE AND CHARACTER OF THE USE

I. GENERALLY

- § 3:1 Justification for the use
- § 3:1.50 Transformative use—Judge Leval and Judge
McKeown’s 2023 Symposium Remarks, and
Romanova v. Amilus, Inc.
- § 3:2 Commercial uses
- § 3:3 —Legislative history of section 107(1) and its
treatment by the courts
- § 3:4 —Commerciality not absolute principle
- § 3:4.50 Commercial and non-commercial mixed-
character uses
- § 3:5 Noncommercial uses
- § 3:6 —Legislative history of nonprofit educational
purposes
- § 3:7 —*Campbell’s* treatment of noncommercial uses

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 3:8 Entertainment uses
- § 3:9 Transformative use: Time to drop the label?
- § 3:9.50 No need for a transformative use and no need to change the original when the use is transformative
- § 3:10 Parodies are themselves subject to protection
- § 3:11 First factor and law and economics

II. SPECIFIC TYPES OF USES

- § 3:12 Generally
- § 3:13 Abstracting and indexing
- § 3:14 —*Wainwright Securities v. Wall Street Transcript Corp.*
- § 3:15 —*New York Times v. Roxbury Data Interface*
- § 3:16 —*Nihon Keizai Shimbun v. Comline Business Data*
- § 3:17 Indexing by Internet search engines
- § 3:18 Advertisements
- § 3:19 —Advertisements that sell products
- § 3:20 —Online sales
- § 3:21 —Comparative advertising
- § 3:22 —Advertising parodies
- § 3:23 — —*Tin Pan Apple v. Miller Brewing and Eveready Battery v. Adolph Coors*
- § 3:24 — —*Leibovitz v. Paramount Pictures*
- § 3:25 — —*MGM v. American Honda Motor*
- § 3:26 — —*MasterCard International v. Nader 2000 Primary Committee*
- § 3:27 Appropriation art
- § 3:27.10 *The Andy Warhol Foundation v. Goldsmith*—
Meaning of meaning
- § 3:27.20 —Proceedings before the district court
- § 3:27.30 —Proceedings before the court of appeals
- § 3:27.40 —The Supreme Court decision
- § 3:27.50 —Amicus briefs
- § 3:27.60 Caselaw after *The Warhol Foundation*
- § 3:28 Architectural plans: completing the structure
- § 3:29 Biographies
- § 3:30 —*Toksvig v. Bruce Publishing*
- § 3:31 —*Eisenschiml v. Fawcett Publications*
- § 3:32 —*Greenbie v. Noble*
- § 3:33 —*Holdredge v. Knight Publishing*

- § 3:34 —*Rosemont Enterprises v. Random House*
- § 3:35 —*Estate of Hemingway v. Random House, Inc.*
- § 3:36 —*Meeropol v. Nizer*
- § 3:37 —*Rokeach v. Avco Embassy Pictures*
- § 3:38 —*Iowa State University Research Foundation v. American Broadcasting Cos.*
- § 3:39 —*Salinger v. Random House, Inc.*
- § 3:40 —*New Era Publications International ApS v. Henry Holt & Co.*
- § 3:41 —*Wright v. Warner Books*
- § 3:42 —*Norse v. Henry Holt & Co.*
- § 3:43 —*Nash v. CBS*
- § 3:44 —*Elvis Presley Enterprises v. Passport Video*
- § 3:45 —*Warren Publishing Co. v. Spurlock*
- § 3:45.50 *Red Label Music Publishing, Inc. v. Chila Productions*
- § 3:46 Blind persons
- § 3:47 Broadcasting and other forms of exhibition
- § 3:48 —Commercial broadcasts
- § 3:49 —Noncommercial broadcasts
- § 3:50 Calligraphers
- § 3:50.50 Catalogue raisonné and other museum uses
- § 3:51 Computers
- § 3:52 —Reverse engineering
- § 3:53 —Copying to extract data, including text & data mining
- § 3:53.10 — —*Thomson Reuters Enterprise Centre GmbH v. Ross Intelligence*
- § 3:53.20 — —*Kadrey v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*
- § 3:53.30 — —*Bartz v. Anthropic*
- § 3:53.40 — —*In re OpenAI, Inc.* copyright litigation
- § 3:53.50 — —*Anderson v. Stability AI, Midjourney, and Deviant Art*
- § 3:54 —Internet uses
- § 3:55 Criticism and comment
- § 3:56 —*Maxtone-Graham v. Burtchaell*
- § 3:57 —*Baraban v. Time Warner*
- § 3:58 —*Arica Institute v. Palmer*
- § 3:59 —*Twin Peaks Productions v. Publications International*
- § 3:60 —*Castle Rock Entertainment v. Carol Publishing Group*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:60.20 —*NXIVM Corp. v. Ross Institute*
 § 3:60.50 Class actions
 § 3:61 Criticism and comment—*Ty, Inc. v. Publications International*
 § 3:62 —*Chicago Board of Education v. Substance, Inc.*
 § 3:62.50 Documentaries
 § 3:63 File sharing
 § 3:64 Fortuitous and incidental reproduction
 § 3:65 Incidental, nonfortuitous uses
 § 3:66 —*Mura v. CBS*
 § 3:67 —*Amsinck v. Columbia Pictures Industries*
 § 3:68 —*House of Bryant Publications, LLC v. A&E Television Network*
 § 3:68.10 —*Bouchat v. Baltimore Ravens Limited Partnership*
 § 3:68.20 —*Splunk Inc. v. Cribl, Inc.*
 § 3:68.30 —The Townsquare Media Cases
 § 3:69 Freedom of Information Act requests
 § 3:70 Historical uses
 § 3:70.30 Homages
 § 3:70.50 Insurance claims
 § 3:71 Karaoke
 § 3:72 Governmental and litigation
 § 3:72.30 Libraries and archives
 § 3:73 News reporting
 § 3:74 News clipping services and rebroadcasts—*Pacific & Southern v. Duncan*
 § 3:75 —*Cable News Network v. Video Monitoring Services of America*
 § 3:76 —*Los Angeles News Service v. Tullo*
 § 3:77 —*Los Angeles News Service v. KCAL-TV Channel 9*
 § 3:78 —*Los Angeles News Service v. Reuters Television International*
 § 3:79 —*Los Angeles News Service v. CBS Broadcasting*
 § 3:80 —*Associated Press v. Meltwater U.S. Holdings, Inc.*
 § 3:81 —*Fox News Network v. TVEyes, Inc.*
 § 3:82 —*Swatch Group Management Services Ltd. v. Bloomberg L.P.*
 § 3:83 Off-air taping—*Bruzzone v. Miller Brewing*

- § 3:84 — *Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corp. v. Crooks*
- § 3:85 — *Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios*
- § 3:86 — — District court
- § 3:87 — — Court of Appeals
- § 3:88 The *Hopper* cases
- § 3:89 Off-air taping—*Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios*—Supreme Court
- § 3:90 Parody
- § 3:91 — What’s a parody?
- § 3:92 — Who decides whether it’s a parody?
- § 3:93 — Does the parody have to target the original?
- § 3:94 — May fair use parodies be vulgar or obscene?
- § 3:95 — Must the original be well-known?
- § 3:96 — The vehicle is not the message
- § 3:97 — Must the parody be funny or disparaging?
- § 3:98 — Post-*Campbell* parody cases
- § 3:99 — Parodies of the Barbie doll
- § 3:100 — Second fair use factor: separating sheep from goats
- § 3:101 — How much may a parody appropriate?
- § 3:102 — Fourth factor: how do you calculate harm from parodies?
- § 3:103 Conceptual and appropriation art
- § 3:104 Photocopying—Educational and government photocopying
- § 3:105 — — *Wihtol v. Crow*
- § 3:106 — — *Williams & Wilkins v. United States*
- § 3:107 — — *Addison-Wesley Publishing v. New York University*
- § 3:108 — — *Marcus v. Rowley*
- § 3:109 — — *Association of American Medical Colleges v. Mikaelian*
- § 3:110 — — *Association of American Medical Colleges v. Cuomo*
- § 3:111 — — *College Entrance Examination Board v. Cuomo*
- § 3:112 — — *Newport-Mesa Unified School District v. California*
- § 3:113 — — *National Association of Boards of Pharmacy v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:114 —Photocopying by copy centers—*Basic Books v. Gnomon Corp.*

§ 3:115 —Corporate photocopying—*Harper & Row v. Tyco Copy Service*

§ 3:116 ——*Harper & Row v. American Cyanamid Co.*

§ 3:117 — —*Harper & Row v. Squibb Corp.*

§ 3:118 — —*Pfizer*

§ 3:119 — —*Aircraft Technical Publishers v. Cessna Aircraft Corp.*

§ 3:120 — —*Schuchart & Associates v. Solo Serve Corp.*

§ 3:121 —Photocopying by copy centers—*Basic Books v. Kinko’s Graphics Corp.*

§ 3:122 — —*Princeton University Press v. Michigan Document Services, Inc.*

§ 3:123 — —*Blackwell Publishing, Inc. v. Excel Research Group, LLC*

§ 3:124 —Corporate photocopying—*Pasha Publications v. Enmark Gas Corp.*

§ 3:125 — —*Television Digest v. United States Telephone Association*

§ 3:126 — —*American Geophysical Union v. Texaco*

§ 3:127 — — —First factor: purpose and character of use

§ 3:128 — — —Second factor: nature of copyrighted work

§ 3:129 — — —Third factor: amount and substantiality of portion used

§ 3:130 — — —Fourth factor: effect of use on market for or value of copyrighted work

§ 3:131 — — —Judge Jacob’s dissent

§ 3:131.10 —*National Rifle Association of America v. Handgun Control Federation of Ohio*

§ 3:132 Political uses

§ 3:133 —*Keep Thomson Governor Committee v. Citizens for Gallen Committee*

§ 3:134 —*Chicago Lawyer v. Forty-Sixth Ward Regular Democratic Organization*

§ 3:135 —*New York Tribune v. Otis & Co.*

§ 3:136 —*NRA v. Handgun Control Federation of Ohio*

§ 3:137 —*Phoenix Hill Enterprises v. Dickerson*

§ 3:138 —*MasterCard International Inc. v. Nader 2000 Primary Committee, Inc.*

- § 3:139 —*Fairey v. Associated Press*
- § 3:140 —*Hill v. Public Advocate of the United States*
- § 3:140.50 —*Grant v. Trump*
- § 3:140.60 —Uses by citizens’ groups for political purposes
- § 3:141 Religious uses
- § 3:142 —*Wihtol v. Crow*
- § 3:143 —*Robert Stigwood Group v. O’Reilly*
- § 3:144 —*Worldwide Church of God v. Philadelphia Church of God*
- § 3:145 —*Penguin Books U.S.A. v. New Christian Church of Full Endeavor*
- § 3:146 —*Society of the Holy Transfiguration Monastery v. Archbishop Gregory of Denver, Colorado*
- § 3:146.10 —*In re DMCA subpoena to YouTube (Google, Inc.)*
- § 3:147 Social media uses
- § 3:148 Translations

CHAPTER 4. THE NATURE OF THE COPYRIGHTED WORK

- § 4:1 The Nature of the Copyrighted Work—Generally
- § 4:2 Unpublished works
- § 4:3 Published works
- § 4:4 Out-of-print works
- § 4:5 Orphan works

CHAPTER 5. AMOUNT AND SUBSTANTIALITY OF THE TAKING

- § 5:1 Generally
- § 5:2 Third factor and transformative use
- § 5:3 Copying entire work
- § 5:3.10 Artificial Intelligence Large Language Models (AI LLMs)
- § 5:4 Defining the “work”

CHAPTER 6. THE EFFECT UPON THE POTENTIAL MARKET FOR OR VALUE OF THE COPYRIGHTED WORK

- § 6:1 Generally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 6:2	Problems with <i>Sony</i>
§ 6:3	— <i>Sony</i> did not regard fair use as an affirmative defense
§ 6:4	— <i>Sony</i> “presumption”
§ 6:5	<i>Harper & Row’s</i> treatment of fourth factor
§ 6:6	No presumption of market
§ 6:7	Type of harm from copying and public benefit
§ 6:8	Type of harm to be weighed—Market need not be completely ‘usurped’
§ 6:9	Identifying the relevant potential market for the copyrighted work
§ 6:10	Circularity argument against licensing as market harm
§ 6:11	How much harm is too much?
§ 6:12	Widespread harm from small uses
§ 6:13	Lack of harm does not by itself result in fair use
§ 6:14	What if the use impacts favorably on market?
§ 6:14.50	Value of the copyrighted work
§ 6:15	The erroneous functionality test
§ 6:16	Fair use and the right to prepare derivative works

PART III. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CHAPTER 7. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

§ 7:1	Additional factors—Good faith/bad faith and custom/industry practice
§ 7:2	Aggregate assessment: actual fair use analysis
§ 7:3	Third-party claims
§ 7:4	Pleading
§ 7:5	Summary judgment, Rule 12(b)(6), Rule 12(c), Rule 12(f), and Rule 50 motions
§ 7:6	Appellate review: applying the proper standard
§ 7:6.10	Expert witnesses and fair use
§ 7:7	Media neutrality and fair use
§ 7:8	Statutory Provision Section 108. Limitations on exclusive rights: Reproduction by libraries and archives
§ 7:9	Library photocopying: section 108—Relationship between sections 107 and 108

- § 7:10 —Reports of Register of Copyrights on section 108—1983 report
- § 7:11 —Reports of Register of Copyrights on section 108-1988 report
- § 7:12 —Digital Millennium Copyright Act
- § 7:13 —Case law under section 108

PART IV. INTERNATIONAL LAW

CHAPTER 8. INTERNATIONAL LAW

I. IN GENERAL

- § 8:1 Introduction: limitations and exceptions to what?

II. TREATIES AND CONVENTIONS

- § 8:2 The Berne Convention “three-step test” and “limitations and exceptions”
 - § 8:2.10 Fair use is not “open-ended”
 - § 8:2.20 The three-step test
 - § 8:2.30 U.S. adherence and fair use compatibility
 - § 8:2.40 GATT/TRIPs questions about fair use
- § 8:3 [*Reserved*]
- § 8:4 The TRIPS agreement
- § 8:5 The 1996 WIPO copyright treaty

III. REVIEW OF VARIOUS COUNTRIES

- § 8:6 The United Kingdom
- § 8:7 Ireland
- § 8:8 Canada
- § 8:9 Australia
- § 8:10 India
- § 8:11 Israel
- § 8:12 Jamaica
- § 8:13 South Korea
- § 8:14 Singapore
- § 8:15 Conclusion on fair use versus fair dealing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**PART V. THE LEGISLATIVE
HISTORY OF FAIR USE**

**CHAPTER 9. THE LEGISLATIVE
HISTORY OF FAIR USE**

**I. THE PRELIMINARY STUDIES AND
REPORTS (1958-1963)**

- § 9:1 The Latman study
- § 9:2 The Varmer study
- § 9:3 The Register of Copyrights' Tentative Draft Report
- § 9:4 The Register's Official 1961 Report with
Discussions and Comments thereon
- § 9:5 The 1962 fair use circular
- § 9:6 The 1963 preliminary draft bill

**II. THE EARLY REVISION BILLS AND
HEARINGS (1964-1967)**

- § 9:7 The 1964 bills
- § 9:8 The Register's Supplementary Report and the
1965 bills
- § 9:9 The 1965 House hearings
- § 9:10 The 1965 Senate hearings
- § 9:11 The 1966 House bill, H.R. Report No. 2237, and
the June 1966 "summit" meetings
- § 9:12 The 1967 House bills and H.R. Rep. No. 83
- § 9:13 The 1967 Senate bill and hearings
- § 9:14 The 1967 House debates

III. THE PERIOD 1968-1972

- § 9:15 Legislative action 1968-1972
- § 9:16 Cosmos Club talks
- § 9:17 Dumbarton Oaks talks

**IV. THE FINAL REVISION BILLS AND
HEARINGS (1973-1976)**

- § 9:18 S. 1361 and the 1973 Senate hearings
- § 9:19 Senate Report No. 93-983
- § 9:20 The "Upstairs-Downstairs" talks

- § 9:21 The 1975 House hearings
- § 9:22 The Register's Draft Second Supplementary Report
- § 9:23 Senate Report No. 94-473
- § 9:24 The 1976 Senate debates
- § 9:25 Development of the agreed-to guidelines
- § 9:26 S. 22 as reported by the House subcommittee and H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476
- § 9:27 The 1976 House debates
- § 9:28 The conference report and passage of the bill
- § 9:29 Differences between the Senate and House reports

V. LIBRARY PHOTOCOPYING AND FAIR USE

- § 9:30 The relationship between Sections 107 and 108
- § 9:31 The reports of the Register of Copyrights on Section 108

VI. POST-1976 LEGISLATION AND PROPOSALS AFFECTING FAIR USE

- § 9:32 National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works
- § 9:33 The Betamax bills
- § 9:34 Semiconductor computer chip design bills
- § 9:35 The Visual Artists Rights Act of 1990
- § 9:36 Unpublished works
- § 9:37 Video clipping service bills

APPENDICES

- Appendix A. Statutory Evolution of Section 107
- Appendix B. Legislative Reports on Fair Use
- Appendix C. Statutory Evolution of Sections 108(f)(2) and (4)
- Appendix D. Legislative Reports on Sections 108(f)(2) and (4)
- Appendix E. Statutory Evolution of Section 118(f)
- Appendix F. Legislative Reports on Section 118(f)
- Appendix G. Statutory Evolution of Sections 504(c)(2)(i) and (ii)
- Appendix H. Legislative Reports on Sections 504(c)(2)(i) and (ii)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Appendix I. Visual Artists' Rights Act of 1990
- Appendix J. Legislative Report on Visual Artists' Rights Act of 1990
- Appendix K. Fair Use of Unpublished Works
- Appendix L. Legislative Reports on Fair Use of Unpublished Works

Table of Cases

Index