

Global overview

Rick Kurnit

Frankfurt Kurnit Klein & Selz PC

The right of publicity originates in the 'right of privacy' as first described in an 1890 law review article that advocated creation of a right to be left alone. This was a remarkable expansion of the recognised right to sue for trespass on one's property to a right to sue for invasion of one's person. The article advocated four related rights of privacy, three of which were extensions of known rights that were recognised in many cultures and actionable in private tort law: (i) the claim against other people for intrusion on private space; (ii) the claim of false light – false speech causing emotional injury; and (iii) the claim based on truth-ful publication of embarrassing private fact – protecting a reasonable person's secrets. The latter two extended the long recognised common law of defamation to go beyond the traditional false speech damag-ing reputation.

The most revolutionary suggestion was the last right – almost an afterthought – the right to sue for commercial appropriation of one's name or image. Initially, this was a corollary to the other two new claims. A claim for the individual's emotional anguish – anger or embarrassment in being commercially exploited without permission. Until the technologies of photography and the concurrent inclusion of images in advertising, there would have been little need for a claim based on unauthorised inclusion of one's image in advertising. But with the proliferation of advertising-supported publications, this privacy right gained popular support. Professional models and famous film stars lobbied legislatures and brought claims in court prodding com-mon law development. It seemed only natural that someone making money from another person's name or image should account for the value of that name or image. The right of privacy expanded to encom-pass damages for the unjust enrichment of a user at the expense of the person whose name or image was commercially appropriated. This led to the creation of the right of publicity.

The antipathy to advertising and the more egregious appropri-ations – using small children or including an unwitting person in sleazy marketing materials – fuelled the expansion of the private right to pre-vent unauthorised commercial appropriation. In 1903, the first statute was enacted in New York in response to a ruling by the state's highest court that the English and American common law did not recognise a claim for use of a person's picture in advertising and packaging. The case arose from a silk screen image of a young girl as part of the design on flour sacks. The response was to make it a crime punishable by up to six months in jail to use a person's 'name, picture or portrait for pur-poses of advertising or trade' without written permission and, in the case of a minor, that written permission had to come from the parent or guardian. The legislature took this so seriously that the legislation included a private right of action with a presumption of an injunction and a presumption of punitive damages. The right of privacy was the right of a living person to avoid the embarrassment or notoriety of being connected with anything as crass and objectionable as adver-tising and commerce. It was thus limited to living persons who would experience the presumed emotional injury.

The right of publicity developed as celebrities sought recognition for the far more lucrative claims for the value of their endorsement. Having relinquished much of their 'privacy' as far as being in media or participating in advertising and marketing, their focus was on the value of their endorsement. This authorisation – more of a license than a release – became extremely valuable.

All through its development, as new technologies for communi-cation were developed, the right expanded to encompass additional bases for celebrities to state a claim for compensation. Voice and voice imitation, signature or gesture were added to the aspects of identity that could be recognised as the basis for a claim. Ultimately, in a much criticised decision in 1992, the California Federal Court surmised that California common law would extend further than the recently enacted California Right of Publicity statute and held that no name, picture or likeness of an actual person was necessary to support a claim. The scene or subject of the content might be sufficient to give a celeb-erity a right of publicity claim – even where no living or actual person is depicted and there is no use of anyone's name, picture or portrait.

Also, over the past 20 years with the digital revolution in media and means of communication, the separation of advertising from other communication has eroded. Today, commercialisation of con-tent – branding, messaging or just brands seeking to enhance their rela-tionship with consumers, together with the need for content creators to monetise content beyond strictly separable paid media insertions – has collapsed most easily recognisable distinctions between adver-tising and editorial content. This has lead regulators and consumer protection advocates to demand that brand integration with content be disclosed in a manner that tends to classify everything as advertis-ing or commercial. The effort to do more than necessary to avoid any regulatory issue runs the risk of opening the door to right of publicity claims. Moreover, these claims could conceivably be based on no more than a celebrity claiming association with the cultural event or public phenomenon, or context alluded to in a generic depiction of a type of entertainment or cultural event.

The right of publicity continues to expand to encompass more elements of personality and more media and forms of communica-tion. Trained advertising professionals were previously included in the creation of advertising and were careful to obtain necessary licenses. Advertising agencies created advertising and also supplied the advertiser with insurance that covered such claims. Today, con-tent commissioned and paid for by advertisers is created outside advertising agencies and advertising professionals, including the media that previously created the editorial content in which advertis-ing was inserted. Today, professional content creators who are trained to create editorial content – where discussions of popular culture and celebrities are permitted to include names and likenesses of the people who are under discussion without requiring a license or permission – are creating advertising. At the least they are creating content commis-sioned by advertisers to advance their brand messaging – unfortunately called 'native advertising'. In response to regulators and consumer pro-tection advocates there is increasing interest in whether to label such content 'advertising'. One problem is that in doing so, the 'advertiser' is inviting a right of publicity claim from anyone who can argue that the subject matter or the context alluded to in the article appropriates the celebrity's identity.

Lawyers have much to do there – training and reviewing content, and considering the need to include references to the laws of many countries as the content is disseminated worldwide.