

## The Yale Law Journal Company, Inc.

---

Copyright Protectionism and Its Discontents: The Case of James Joyce's "Ulysses" in America

Author(s): Robert Spoo

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 108, No. 3 (Dec., 1998), pp. 633-667

Published by: [The Yale Law Journal Company, Inc.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/797499>

Accessed: 29/12/2011 11:05

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The Yale Law Journal Company, Inc.* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Yale Law Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## Note

### Copyright Protectionism and Its Discontents: The Case of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in America

Robert Spoo

In 1927, the expatriate American poet, Ezra Pound, then living in Italy, dispatched to the editor of *The Nation* a characteristically pugnacious letter containing what must have seemed an unusual declaration:

For next President I want no man who is not lucidly and clearly and with no trace or shadow of ambiguity against the following abuses: (1) Bureaucratic encroachment on the individual, as [in] the asinine Eighteenth Amendment, passport and visa stupidities, arbitrary injustice from customs officials; (2) Article 211 of the Penal Code, and all such muddle-headedness in any laws whatsoever; (3) the thieving copyright law.<sup>1</sup>

Three years later, in an article in *The Hound & Horn*, Pound returned to this list of “abuses,” now describing them as “[c]ertain specific laws and regulations [that] are contrary to the welfare of letters in America in 1930” and placing special emphasis on “our copyright law, originally designed to

---

1. Ezra Pound, Letter to the Editor, *THE NATION*, Dec. 14, 1927, at 684, 685, reprinted in 4 *EZRA POUND'S POETRY AND PROSE: CONTRIBUTIONS TO PERIODICALS* 393 (Lea Baechler et al. eds., 1991) [hereinafter *POETRY AND PROSE*]. What Pound refers to as “Article 211 of the Penal Code” was a special provision codified among offenses against the Postal Service and enacted as part of a sweeping revision of the United States penal laws. See Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, § 211, 35 Stat. 1088, 1129 (codified as amended at 18 U.S.C. § 1461 (1994)) (declaring “obscene” matter to be “nonmailable” on penalty of fine or imprisonment); see also Ezra Pound, *The Classics “Escape.”* *LITTLE REV.*, Mar. 1918, at 32, 33, reprinted in 3 *POETRY AND PROSE*, supra, at 64 (referring to section 211 as “the amazing, grotesque, and unthinkable, ambiguous law of our country”). Pound’s mention in *The Nation* of the “Eighteenth Amendment” hints at the powers that U.S. customs officials had to enforce the prohibition upon intoxicating liquors by discretionary seizures of offending goods.

favour the printing trade at the expense of the mental life of the country.”<sup>2</sup> During the 1920s and 1930s, Pound routinely expressed his exasperation, as an American author living abroad, with the trinity of legal forces that he believed was crippling the progress of literature and enlightenment in the United States: obscenity statutes, the discretionary powers of customs and postal officials, and the copyright law.<sup>3</sup>

Pound perceived clearly that literary modernism, if it was to thrive in the international context, required the freedom to cross borders. Quite simply, manuscripts and books by foreign-domiciled authors had to pass through customs and the mails before they could come to rest in the hands of American publishers, printers, and readers. Less literally, modernist border-crossing involved the transgressing of moral and ideological boundaries: Authors like Radclyffe Hall, D.H. Lawrence, and James Joyce sought to disturb social, sexual, and aesthetic complacencies.<sup>4</sup> Yet such transgressions could scarcely occur in the absence of the first kind of border-crossing. The artistic and ideological ambitions of authors were dependent upon the sociomaterial means of producing and disseminating texts. Transformation could not take place without transmission.

These prerequisites of the modernist project met their greatest challenge during the first half of the twentieth century, in the American legal forces that Ezra Pound so colorfully identified. While obscenity statutes sought to neutralize the transgressive power of modernist works, those same statutes—in concert with the discretionary acts of customs officials and a copyright law that required works seeking protection to be printed and manufactured in the United States—prevented many foreign-produced works in English from crossing American borders and taking their place in the cultural scene. When controversial books did manage to reach readers in the United States, they often did so through underground channels of piracy, or “booklegging,”<sup>5</sup> a practice that deprived authors of both financial rewards and the power to control the quality and dissemination of texts.

This Note traces the history of the American copyright in James Joyce’s *Ulysses* and argues that Pound’s trio of legal “abuses” combined to destroy Joyce’s chance of securing such a copyright within months of the book’s

2. Ezra Pound, Letter to the Editor, THE HOUND & HORN, July-Sept. 1930, at 574, 577, reprinted in 5 POETRY AND PROSE, *supra* note 1, at 228, 229.

3. For further examples of Pound’s ire on the subject of the American copyright law, see *infra* notes 54-55 and accompanying text.

4. *The Well of Loneliness*, a 1928 novel about lesbian experience by the English writer, Radclyffe Hall, was the subject of obscenity prosecutions in Britain and the United States. See EDWARD DE GRAZIA, GIRLS LEAN BACK EVERYWHERE: THE LAW OF OBSCENITY AND THE ASSAULT ON GENIUS 165-208 (1992). For a discussion of D.H. Lawrence’s controversial novels in the context of obscenity and literary piracy, see *infra* note 111.

5. See, e.g., R.F. Roberts, *Bibliographical Notes on James Joyce’s “Ulysses,”* 1 COLOPHON (n.s.) 565, 574 (1936) (referring to the cost of a pirated edition of *Ulysses* as a “booklegger’s price”).

initial publication in France in 1922. The choice of *Ulysses* to illustrate a problem that confronted many foreign-domiciled writers has several advantages. First, as a consequence of its early notoriety and subsequent fame, *Ulysses* has attained a nearly iconic status in modern culture<sup>6</sup> that gives its less familiar identity as intellectual property an intrinsic interest. Second, the case of *Ulysses* provides unusually detailed insight into the protectionist features of our copyright law in the years before the advent of more cosmopolitan legislation regarding literary property. Finally, the failure of American copyright law to protect *Ulysses* at the outset engendered a complicated history that has rendered the work's present copyright status an enigma and a source of controversy. Since it is often claimed that *Ulysses* is protected by copyright in the United States, and since these claims have a chilling effect on the activities of present-day publishers, scholars, and readers,<sup>7</sup> a clarification of the copyright status of *Ulysses* in America is badly needed. Now that Congress has passed legislation to extend existing copyright terms by twenty years,<sup>8</sup> it is particularly important to determine whether the American copyright in *Ulysses* is fact or fiction.

One purpose of this Note, then, is to illustrate how vulnerable foreign-domiciled authors were to the parochial policies of the earlier American copyright law, particularly when copyright protection was sought for works deemed obscene. A second purpose is the more pragmatic one of arguing that, because *Ulysses* has never, or almost never, enjoyed genuine copyright protection in the United States—despite claims to the contrary—this epoch-making work should now be recognized for what in legal reality it is: one of the great treasures of the public domain.

The equities that once favored James Joyce and his heirs now favor the public domain.<sup>9</sup> Whereas the illusion of American copyright once helped to compensate Joyce for the privations he had suffered at the hands of protectionism and piracy, today that illusion serves only to sustain an extralegal monopoly that controls the availability of *Ulysses* and dictates the forms in which it may appear. Against the backdrop of international modernism and American publishing during the first half of the twentieth century, this Note examines a celebrated yet representative instance of the tension between literary monopoly and the public domain.

Part I of this Note adumbrates historical contexts for thinking about *Ulysses* as literature and as literary property. Part II sets forth the relevant

---

6. In 1998, *Ulysses* was voted number one in a list of this century's 100 greatest English-language novels. The selections were made by a committee of Modern Library, a division of Random House. See Paul Lewis, 'Ulysses' at Top as Panel Picks 100 Best Novels, N.Y. TIMES, July 20, 1998, at E1.

7. See *infra* notes 128, 149-152, 157-159 and accompanying text.

8. See *infra* notes 155-156 and accompanying text.

9. See discussion *infra* Parts IV and V.

portions of the 1909 Copyright Act—specifically, the manufacturing and ad interim provisions—and shows that, because it failed to satisfy these stringent requirements, *Ulysses* was injected into the public domain in America shortly after its publication in France. Part III discusses the phenomenon of trade courtesy that has endowed *Ulysses* with a kind of de facto “copyright” since its legalized publication in America in 1934. Part IV questions the wisdom of continuing to credit this courtesy copyright now that Congress has passed legislation to extend existing copyright terms. Finally, Part V concludes that the cultural benefits of a public-domain *Ulysses* far outweigh any private interests in maintaining the illusion of a *Ulysses* protected by copyright in the United States.

### I. ULYSSES AS LITERATURE AND AS LITERARY PROPERTY

#### A. *Serial Publication in the United States: The Little Review*

The Dublin-born James Joyce first conceived *Ulysses* as a short story while residing in Rome in 1906,<sup>10</sup> but he did not begin serious composition for nearly a decade, by which time the work had grown in conception from a short story to a novel-length book. By late 1917, Joyce had completed the first three episodes (or chapters).<sup>11</sup> He mailed typescripts of these portions to the editors of a New York literary magazine, *The Little Review*, who, with Ezra Pound’s encouragement, had agreed to print episodes of the novel-in-progress as Joyce produced them.<sup>12</sup> When installments began to appear in *The Little Review* in March 1918,<sup>13</sup> *Ulysses* was launched on its American copyright adventure.

The present copyright law grants protection to a work from the moment the work is created.<sup>14</sup> Under the 1909 Copyright Act,<sup>15</sup> however, a work did not acquire protection until it had been published with a notice of copyright affixed to each copy.<sup>16</sup> While publication with notice was sufficient to secure copyright,<sup>17</sup> the 1909 Act also required that copies of the work be deposited in the United States Copyright Office and that a claim of

10. See Letters from James Joyce to Stanislaus Joyce (Sept. 30 and Nov. 13, 1906), in 2 LETTERS OF JAMES JOYCE 168 & n.4, 189, 190 (Richard Ellmann ed., 1966).

11. See RICHARD ELLMANN, JAMES JOYCE 419-20 (rev. ed. 1982).

12. See *id.* at 421-22.

13. See *id.* at 421.

14. The 1976 Act defines creation of a work as fixation in a “tangible medium of expression” and provides that copyright protection arises upon fixation. 17 U.S.C. § 102(a) (1994).

15. Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, 35 Stat. 1075.

16. See *id.* § 9, at 1077.

17. See HERBERT A. HOWELL, THE COPYRIGHT LAW 75-76 (2d ed. 1948). Howell, who was Assistant Register of Copyrights earlier in this century, is a valuable authority on the 1909 Copyright Act.

copyright be registered there.<sup>18</sup> While issues of *The Little Review* containing installments of *Ulysses* were published regularly, each bearing a notice of copyright in the name of Margaret C. Anderson (the magazine's founder and coeditor), it is not certain that Anderson consistently complied with the deposit and registration requirements. The Copyright Office contains a record of registration for only the first four of twenty-three issues that serialized *Ulysses*.<sup>19</sup> Although failure to deposit and register the remaining issues would not have destroyed the copyrights in those issues,<sup>20</sup> it might well have impaired their enforceability.<sup>21</sup> Anderson's seeming carelessness is therefore puzzling.

The anomaly may be explained by events that overtook *The Little Review* soon after *Ulysses* began to appear in its pages. Between January 1919 and January 1920, Post Office authorities suppressed three different issues, each containing a portion of Joyce's novel, by revoking the magazine's second-class postage privileges.<sup>22</sup> An issue of *The Little Review* had been declared nonmailable once before, in October 1917, when the Postmaster of the City of New York decided that a short story by the modernist author Wyndham Lewis was "obscene, lewd, or lascivious" within the meaning of the Federal Criminal Code.<sup>23</sup> The absence of copyright registration records for issues of *The Little Review* after the middle of 1918 may be the direct result of the Post Office's obscenity suppressions. Nonmailable issues could not readily have been deposited in the Copyright Office, of course. Once the magazine had acquired the stigma

18. See Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, §§ 10, 12-13, 35 Stat. 1075, 1078.

19. Issues of *The Little Review* for March, April, May, and June 1918—containing the first four episodes of *Ulysses*—were assigned registration numbers B412274, B412276, B413421, and B414990, respectively, by the Copyright Office. Since separate copyrights were not taken out in Joyce's name for the individual episodes of *Ulysses*, those episodes were protected by the general copyright of the issues in which they appeared. See HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 80-81. The general copyrights were in Margaret Anderson's name, and there is no record of an assignment of copyright by Anderson to Joyce or his heirs. An amendment to the 1909 Act, effective March 15, 1940, however, permitted authors or their heirs to renew the copyright in a periodical contribution even though no separate copyright had ever been registered in that contribution and no assignment had occurred. See *id.* at 104-05. Accordingly, copyrights in the *Ulysses* episodes were properly renewed in the name of Joyce's widow on January 13, 1946 (renewal entries 751 to 755 in the Copyright Office), whereupon the original 28-year term of protection for those episodes was extended for another 28 years. See Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 23, 35 Stat. 1075, 1080. I wish to thank Mary E. Aldridge for her generous assistance, evident here and elsewhere in this Note, in searching the Copyright Office onsite card catalogue and archives.

20. See HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 75-76.

21. See *infra* notes 32-34 and accompanying text.

22. The issues suppressed were those for January 1919, May 1919, and January 1920. See PAUL VANDERHAM, JAMES JOYCE AND CENSORSHIP 1-2 (1998).

23. See *id.* at 18. The provision under which the October 1917 issue was declared nonmailable by the Postmaster was section 211 of the U.S. Criminal Code, the "Article 211" that Ezra Pound decried as one of the three American "abuses." See *supra* note 1 and accompanying text. The suppression of that issue was upheld by Judge Augustus Hand in *Anderson v. Patten*, 247 F. 382 (S.D.N.Y. 1917).

of obscenity, moreover, the Register of Copyrights had a ground for refusing to register claims of copyright in its issues.<sup>24</sup>

Matters soon grew worse for *The Little Review* and for Joyce. In the autumn of 1920, the Secretary of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice filed an official complaint against the magazine's two editors for publishing the July-August issue, which contained the section of *Ulysses* in which its hero, Leopold Bloom, masturbates while observing a young woman on the seashore.<sup>25</sup> The New York Court of Special Sessions found the editors guilty of publishing obscenity within the meaning of the state's penal code<sup>26</sup> and fined them fifty dollars each.<sup>27</sup> With this new setback, Joyce's still unfinished novel had gone from suffering the sporadic suppressions of postal officials to receiving the formal condemnation of a court of law.

Predictably, American publishers began to back away from the idea of publishing a book version of *Ulysses*. Shortly after the *Little Review* trial, the New York publisher B.W. Huebsch wrote John Quinn, the attorney who had defended the magazine's editors, that he would not risk defying the judgment of the Court of Special Sessions by publishing *Ulysses* "unless some changes are made in the manuscript."<sup>28</sup> He added: "In view of your statement that Joyce declines absolutely to make any alterations, I must decline to publish it."<sup>29</sup> Other publishers followed suit.<sup>30</sup>

Thus, after the appearance of thirteen episodes in *The Little Review*, *Ulysses* had run aground on the shoals of the obscenity law. With his masterpiece far from complete, Joyce found his hopes for further American publication dashed. The copyright protection for those portions of the novel that had appeared serially was unsatisfactory at best: Had Joyce wished to bring an action for copyright infringement, he would have been forced to make do with a general copyright in each issue of the magazine, as distinct from a separate copyright in his own contributions. The magazine's

24. The ground for refusal of copyright registration would have been that no copyright could exist in an immoral work. See, e.g., *Hoffman v. Le Traunik*, 209 F. 375, 379 (N.D.N.Y. 1913) (stating that to be entitled to copyright, a work must be "free from illegality or immorality"); cf. HOWELL'S COPYRIGHT LAW 45 (Alan Latman ed., rev. ed. 1962) ("While the [1909] Copyright Act contains no . . . provision [precluding registration of copyright in immoral matter], protection has in some cases been denied to works deemed offensive to public policy."). But see *infra* note 80 (discussing the Copyright Office's "rule of doubt" as creating an administrative presumption in favor of works submitted for copyright registration).

25. See VANDERHAM, *supra* note 22, at 41-42; see also ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 502 (discussing the complaint filed against the editors).

26. See N.Y. PENAL LAW § 1141 (Consol. 1909) (declaring "obscene prints and articles" to be illegal) (current version at N.Y. PENAL LAW § 235.05 (Consol. 1984)).

27. See VANDERHAM, *supra* note 22, at 53; see also ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 502-04 (recounting the events of the trial of *The Little Review*'s editors).

28. VANDERHAM, *supra* note 22, at 56 (quoting Huebsch).

29. *Id.*

30. See *id.*

copyrights, moreover, were not in Joyce's name but in the name of its owner, Margaret Anderson. Finally, copyright registration seems to have been lacking for most of the issues in which Joyce's novel appeared.<sup>31</sup> Although not fatal to the copyrights themselves, these lacunae would have made an infringement action hard to pursue,<sup>32</sup> because a certificate of registration, being prima facie evidence of ownership of a valid copyright,<sup>33</sup> was a condition precedent to bringing suit.<sup>34</sup> As bleak as the situation seemed in early 1921, however, Joyce's American copyright troubles were only beginning.

### B. *French Publication and American Piracy*

Despairing of publication in the United States or in Britain, Joyce gratefully accepted the offer of Sylvia Beach, an American who ran a bookstore in Paris called Shakespeare and Company, to act as publisher of *Ulysses* in France. Joyce and Beach agreed on a Dijon printer and a first edition of 1000 copies,<sup>35</sup> whereupon Joyce set about finishing his book.<sup>36</sup> After several delays, *Ulysses* was published in France on February 2, 1922.<sup>37</sup> The copyright page bore the notice "Copyright by James Joyce."<sup>38</sup>

The book version of *Ulysses* differed substantially from the version that had appeared serially in *The Little Review*. No longer under pressure to meet magazine deadlines, Joyce found time to add four lengthy episodes to his novel.<sup>39</sup> Of the published book's 732 pages, more than 300 had never appeared in any form in *The Little Review*. Other episodes Joyce amplified

31. See *supra* note 19 and accompanying text.

32. See B.L. REID, *THE MAN FROM NEW YORK: JOHN QUINN AND HIS FRIENDS* 452 (1968) (reporting the Joyce Estate's concession that, given the American piracies of *Ulysses* in the 1920s, "[t]he *Little Review* copyright was not as helpful as [Ezra] Pound expected").

33. See Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 55, 35 Stat. 1075, 1086 ("[T]he said certificate shall be admitted in any court as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein."). The language of section 55 of the 1909 Act is echoed in the present Act. See 17 U.S.C. § 410(c) (1994).

34. See Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 12, 35 Stat. 1075, 1078 ("No action or proceeding shall be maintained for infringement of copyright in any work until the provisions of this Act with respect to the deposit of copies and registration of such work shall have been complied with."); *Lumiere v. Pathé Exchange, Inc.*, 275 F. 428, 430 (2d Cir. 1921) ("Deposit of copies and registration is each a condition precedent of the right to maintain an action for infringement."); HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 82-84 (discussing deposit and registration as conditions precedent to maintaining a copyright infringement action). The present Act still makes registration a prerequisite to bringing suit in the case of United States authors. See 17 U.S.C. §§ 411-412 (1994).

35. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 504.

36. See *id.* at 519.

37. See *id.* at 524.

38. JAMES JOYCE, *ULYSSES* (1922).

39. The opening section of "Oxen of the Sun," the 14th episode, was the last of *Ulysses* to be published in *The Little Review*. It appeared in the September-December 1920 issue. In the following year, Joyce completed the 15th through 18th episodes. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 442.



or recast to fit his changing conception of the work, sometimes altering them radically from their serial appearance. Only a handful of episodes remained relatively unchanged.<sup>40</sup> This new *Ulysses*, in its quest for protection in the United States, could expect only limited assistance from *The Little Review's* copyrights, even if they were found to be enforceable.<sup>41</sup>

America dealt Joyce another blow by refusing to allow the book version of *Ulysses* to be imported. Five hundred copies were seized by customs authorities in New York in the latter part of 1922.<sup>42</sup> This destruction of a supply for which there was a clear demand set the stage for piracy, and in 1926 a New York publisher named Samuel Roth began to print unauthorized episodes of *Ulysses*, brazenly expurgated to foil the censors, in his magazine *Two Worlds Monthly*.<sup>43</sup> In all, Roth printed fourteen episodes from Joyce's book and may also have been responsible for a forgery of the ninth edition of the Shakespeare and Company text.<sup>44</sup>

Joyce's response to these piracies, significantly, was not to bring an action for copyright infringement. Instead, his lawyers in America sought and won an injunction barring Roth and his publishing company "from using the name of the plaintiff [Joyce] for advertising purposes or for purposes of trade."<sup>45</sup> The ground of this decision by the Supreme Court of the State of New York is unstated in the laconic court order, though it must have been some form of unfair competition.<sup>46</sup> Joyce had told his lawyer in Paris prior to the decision that if there was "no case against [Roth] under copyright or property laws . . . I suggest at least that [the New York lawyers] press for some judgment . . . which, when recorded, may establish a precedent in case law in favour of unprotected European writers, whose cause in this instance is mine also."<sup>47</sup> Joyce had extracted a measure of

40. See *id.* at 519.

41. See *supra* notes 31-34 and accompanying text.

42. See Letter from James Joyce to Bennett Cerf (Apr. 2, 1932), reprinted in 3 LETTERS OF JAMES JOYCE, *supra* note 10, at 241, 243; VANDERHAM, *supra* note 22, at 4. The 500 confiscated copies were from the Egoist Press edition, an English edition that was printed in France because English printers refused to set *Ulysses*. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 490; Roberts, *supra* note 5, at 570.

43. See Roberts, *supra* note 5, at 572.

44. See *id.* at 574-75.

45. Joyce v. Roth (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Dec. 27, 1928) (order granting injunction), in 3 LETTERS OF JAMES JOYCE, *supra* note 10, at 185, 185. This court order, issued by Justice Richard H. Mitchell, is unreported. Two earlier memorandum decisions—*Joyce v. Roth*, 223 N.Y.S. 878 (N.Y. App. Div. 1927) (mem.), and *Joyce v. Roth*, 225 N.Y.S. 842 (N.Y. App. Div. 1927) (mem.)—may be related to the 1928 decision, but they recite only procedural facts and do not indicate the cause of action.

46. See generally W. PAGE KEETON ET AL., PROSSER AND KEETON ON THE LAW OF TORTS § 130, at 1015-16 (5th ed. 1984) (stating that passing off, a form of unfair competition, "may be accomplished by using the plaintiff's name with literal accuracy in connection with the defendant's product but in a way that nevertheless suggests that the product is the plaintiff's or that he had a role in it").

47. Letter from James Joyce to Benjamin Conner (Sept. 1, 1928), in 3 LETTERS OF JAMES JOYCE, *supra* note 10, at 181, 181.

protection from the American courts, but it was protection against the deceptive use of his name, not against the copying of his literary creation.<sup>48</sup>

Joyce also pursued an extralegal remedy against Roth. In the latter part of 1926, he hit upon the idea of an international protest and sent copies of a draft statement to notable authors around the world for their subscription.<sup>49</sup> More than 160 signatures were gathered, and the protest was issued to the press in February 1927.<sup>50</sup> The opening sentences show that Joyce was fully aware of his American copyright problems:

It is a matter of common knowledge that the ULYSSES of Mr. James Joyce is being republished in the United States, in a magazine edited by Samuel Roth, and that this republication is being made without authorization by Mr. Joyce; without payment to Mr. Joyce and with alterations which seriously corrupt the text. This appropriation and mutilation of Mr. Joyce's property is made under colour of legal protection in that the ULYSSES which is published in France and which has been excluded from the mails in the United States is not protected by copyright in the United States.<sup>51</sup>

Whether, under American law, there could be an "appropriation" of an author's "property" when that property was "not protected by copyright" was a nice question that the protest did not address.<sup>52</sup> The statement confined itself to pointing to the equities of the situation and branding Roth as unscrupulous and buccaneering. Although Roth continued to print *Ulysses* for another eight months,<sup>53</sup> Joyce's resourceful self-help at least had the effect of bringing his plight to the attention of American readers and, more importantly, American publishers.

One writer who did not sign the protest was Ezra Pound. "I consider it misdirected," he wrote Joyce. The blame for Joyce's sufferings lay not with Roth, Pound explained,

48. The injunction may have served only to drive Roth's operations underground. American piracies of *Ulysses* continued, and some scholars believe that Roth was responsible. See, e.g., Leo Hamalian, *Nobody Knows My Names: Samuel Roth and the Underside of Modern Letters*, 3 J. MOD. LITERATURE 889, 895, 897 (1974); Roberts, *supra* note 5, at 573-74.

49. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 585-86.

50. See *id.* at 586.

51. Statement to the Press Regarding the Piracy of *Ulysses*, reprinted in 3 LETTERS OF JAMES JOYCE, *supra* note 10, at 151.

52. See *infra* Section II.C and Part V (discussing the public domain); cf. JOHN FEATHER, PUBLISHING, PIRACY AND POLITICS: AN HISTORICAL STUDY OF COPYRIGHT IN BRITAIN 154 (1994) (discussing the unauthorized reprinting of British books by American publishers during the 19th century and noting that "the reprinters, despite the fact that British authors and publishers always referred to them as 'pirates,' were not acting illegally in their own country").

53. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 587.

but with the infamous state of the American law which not only tolerates robbery but encourages unscrupulous adventurers to rob authors living outside the American borders, and with the whole American people which sanction the state of the laws. The minor peccadillo of Mr. Roth is dwarfed by the major infamy of the law.<sup>54</sup>

Pound was thinking again of his three legal “abuses”—obscenity statutes, customs/postal seizures, and the copyright law—but chiefly of the third member of the trinity. In a letter to the European edition of the *Chicago Tribune*, he rehearsed the facts of Roth’s piracy but hastened to finger the real culprit: “Our copyright ‘law’ permits, and by permission, encourages such procedure.”<sup>55</sup>

Pound was right. For foreign-domiciled authors writing in English, especially those challenging conventional taste and morality, the American copyright law was often the enemy behind the enemy—the “major infamy,” to use Pound’s terminology, behind the “minor peccadillo” of piracy.

## II. COPYRIGHT PROTECTIONISM AND THE INDIVIDUAL TALENT

It is one measure of Joyce’s anxiety to see *Ulysses* in print that he allowed it to be published first in France, knowing that this event might place the work’s American copyright in jeopardy. In the fall of 1920, more than a year before the French edition appeared, the New York publisher B.W. Huebsch met with Joyce in Paris to urge him to bring the book out first in the United States. Because no legitimate American publisher could risk handling a book chargeable with obscenity, however, Joyce would have to delete or revise certain strong passages. Joyce flatly refused to discuss the question of alterations.<sup>56</sup>

Huebsch explained that publishing the book first in France, although it would spare Joyce the pain of expurgating his text, might well cost him his American copyright. Huebsch described the meeting for the lawyer John Quinn:

---

54. Letter from Ezra Pound to James Joyce (Dec. 25, 1926), in POUND/JOYCE: THE LETTERS OF EZRA POUND TO JAMES JOYCE WITH POUND’S ESSAYS ON JOYCE 226, 226 (Forrest Read ed., 1967).

55. Ezra Pound, Letter to the Editor, CHI. TRIB. (Eur. Ed.), May 26, 1928, at 4, reprinted in 5 POETRY AND PROSE, *supra* note 1, at 30.

56. Huebsch and Joyce gave separate accounts of their meeting, which took place probably in September or October of 1920. See Letter from B.W. Huebsch to John Quinn (Dec. 22, 1920) (unpublished photostat on file in the Richard Ellmann Papers, McFarlin Library, University of Tulsa); Letter from James Joyce to Ezra Pound 2-3 (Nov. 5, 1920) (Ezra Pound Papers, Beinecke Library, Yale University); Letter from James Joyce to John Quinn (Nov. 17, 1920), in REID, *supra* note 32, at 451-52. These letters show that Joyce was considering publishing *Ulysses* in France several months before Sylvia Beach is said to have offered to publish the book there. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 504 (discussing the Beach offer).

My conversation with Joyce related to the manner in which the book might be published without sacrificing his American rights and as these depend upon manufacturing the book in the U.S., I wanted him to understand that he was jeopardizing the thing that he holds most dear, namely, the publication of the book intact, by printing it in Paris, because that would leave the book free for a pirate after sixty days, and the pirate, in order to overcome the objections that now lie against it, would eliminate the offensive passages. Thus Joyce would lose not only his property but that which as an artist I presume he cherishes even more.<sup>57</sup>

With the canny prescience of a publisher who had to know the laws of obscenity and copyright in order to navigate their intricate courses,<sup>58</sup> Huebsch foresaw the activities of American pirates six years before Samuel Roth began appropriating and mutilating Joyce's work.

Huebsch's argument to Joyce was a flawless piece of legal prediction, lucid and arrestingly simple: Joyce could publish first in the United States, but, to avoid running afoul of the obscenity law, he would have to expurgate. Alternatively, Joyce could publish first in France and keep his work intact there, but in doing so he would risk never securing a copyright in the United States and inviting the depredations of pirates. And the pirates, to avoid running afoul of the obscenity law, would expurgate.<sup>59</sup>

Thus, whether Joyce published first in the United States or in France, he would have to live with a sanitized American *Ulysses*. The difference was that if he chose the former course, he could control the alterations to the text, and his work would enjoy copyright protection in the United States. Joyce, with an obstinacy born of many encounters with the censor,<sup>60</sup> refused to compromise his creative integrity by changing a word.

57. Letter from B.W. Huebsch to John Quinn, *supra* note 56, at 1. (Huebsch's phrase, "the objections that now lie against [*Ulysses*]," referred to the criminal case then in progress against *The Little Review's* editors.) Joyce's version of the meeting stressed Huebsch's flippancy, which the beleaguered Irish author felt was menacing. Upon hearing Joyce's plan to publish an edition of *Ulysses* in Paris for sale in Europe, Huebsch shot back, "'Oh, in that case I could print it off in New York from that edition and pay you nothing.'" Letter from James Joyce to John Quinn, *in* REID, *supra* note 32, at 451 (quoting Huebsch). Joyce saw in Huebsch's instructive pleasantry a threat to "defraud" him. Letter from James Joyce to Ezra Pound, *supra* note 56, at 3.

58. See B.W. Huebsch, *Footnotes to a Publisher's Life*, 2 COLOPHON (n.s.) 406, 407-09 (1937) (describing his encounters as a young publisher with obscenity laws and Post Office suppressions of books during World War I).

59. Ironically, Roth's bowdlerizing of *Ulysses* did not keep him out of trouble with the obscenity law. In March 1927, he appeared in New York City's Jefferson Market Court to defend against a complaint filed by the Clean Books Committee of the Federation of Hungarian Jews in America, which alleged that Roth was "poisoning" the minds of readers by printing *Ulysses* in *Two Worlds Monthly*. *Roth's Magazine Accused*, N.Y. TIMES, Mar. 10, 1927, at 2.

60. See Letter from James Joyce to the Press (Aug. 17, 1911), *reprinted in* 2 LETTERS OF JAMES JOYCE, *supra* note 10, at 291, 291-92 (describing the author's early encounters with publishers and censorship).

Huebsch's account of the meeting left one point unclear, however: Why should publishing *Ulysses* initially in France threaten the American copyright? The publisher actually hinted at the answer, but so telegraphically as to be intelligible only to a lawyer acquainted, as Quinn was,<sup>61</sup> with the world of authors and literary rights. Huebsch's fleeting mention of "manufacturing the book in the U.S." and his cryptic prophecy about pirates getting to work "after sixty days" alluded to two statutory pitfalls that awaited authors like Joyce: the manufacturing and ad interim provisions of the 1909 Copyright Act.

#### A. *Codified Protectionism: The Manufacturing Clause*

Section 15 of the 1909 Act, popularly known as the "manufacturing clause," provided that, in the case of printed books or periodicals,

except the original text of a book of foreign origin in a language or languages other than English, the text of all copies accorded protection under this Act . . . shall be printed from type set within the limits of the United States, either by hand or by the aid of any kind of typesetting machine, or from plates made within the limits of the United States from type set therein, or, if the text be produced by lithographic process, or photo-engraving process, then by a process wholly performed within the limits of the United States, and the printing of the text and binding of the said book shall be performed within the limits of the United States . . . .<sup>62</sup>

The exception for foreign-language books of foreign origin was an innovation of the 1909 Act.<sup>63</sup> Under the previous law—the Chace International Copyright Act of 1891<sup>64</sup>—foreign works in any language could gain protection in the United States only if they were reprinted from type set within this country and if two copies of the reprint were deposited in the Copyright Office on or before the date of first publication anywhere else.<sup>65</sup>

This stringent requirement of the 1891 Act, demanding nothing less than first or simultaneous publication in the United States of foreign books in *any* language, was relaxed when the 1909 Act allowed foreign works in *foreign* languages to gain American copyright protection without being

61. See generally REID, *supra* note 32.

62. Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 15, 35 Stat. 1075, 1078-79.

63. See Dorothy M. Schrader, *Ad Interim Copyright and the Manufacturing Clause: Another View of the Candy Case*, 16 VILL. L. REV. 215, 241, 247-48 (1970) (discussing the legislative history of the 1909 Act's exemption of foreign-language works of foreign origin from the manufacturing requirement).

64. Act of Mar. 3, 1891, ch. 565, 26 Stat. 1106.

65. See *id.* § 4956, at 1107-08.

reprinted here.<sup>66</sup> Because foreign-language books would have only a limited readership in the United States, it was reasoned, American artisans would suffer no appreciable loss. Works with broad appeal would almost certainly be translated into English and “hence become subject to the manufacturing clause and thus give American labor its due.”<sup>67</sup>

Clearly, the legislative purpose behind the manufacturing clause, in both its 1891 and its 1909 incarnations, was protection of American labor from the effects of foreign importation. The purpose “was avowedly not protection for authors,” observes one noted authority, for the clause “exemplifies shortsighted and parochial tendencies that have proven destructive of the best interests of both copyright creators and users.”<sup>68</sup> Since works that could not comply with the manufacturing clause enjoyed no copyright protection, the clause helped create the conditions necessary for book piracy—a fact that led Ezra Pound to complain of “the thieving copyright law.”<sup>69</sup>

#### B. *Strait Is the Gate: Ad Interim Copyright Protection*

The 1909 Act exempted from the manufacturing requirement foreign-language books of foreign origin, but not all books of foreign origin. Books first published abroad in the *English* language formed a separate category that required special treatment in light of the manufacturing clause: Such books would still have to be printed and manufactured within the limits of the United States. To mitigate the harshness of this requirement, the manufacturing provision carved out a further exception for “books

66. See Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 15, 35 Stat. 1075, 1079.

67. HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 85.

68. MELVILLE B. NIMMER & DAVID NIMMER, 2 NIMMER ON COPYRIGHT § 7.22[D], at 7-218 to 7-219 (1998) [hereinafter NIMMER]; see also HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 84 (“This requirement . . . has proved to be the real stumbling block to our joining the family of nations in what is commonly called the International Copyright Union.”); Charles Rembar, *Xenophilia in Congress: Ad Interim Copyright and the Manufacturing Clause*, 69 COLUM. L. REV. 770, 790 (1969) (“Congress was seeking to preserve, and if possible to enlarge, the American market for American printers.”); Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 282 (“The Copyright Office looks forward to the day when the supporters of the clause realize that its supposed benefits to them are illusory or, at least, not appropriate in a copyright statute . . .”). Repeal of the manufacturing clause, originally set for July 1, 1982, as provided by the 1976 Act, see Act of Oct. 19, 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-553, § 601(a), 90 Stat. 2541, 2588, was postponed to July 1, 1986, by congressional amendment. See Act of July 13, 1982, Pub. L. No. 97-215, 96 Stat. 178, 178 (current version at 17 U.S.C. § 601(a) (1994)); see also 2 NIMMER, *supra*, § 7.22[A], at 7-213 (“[W]orks as to which all copies were manufactured on and after July 1, 1986, have full copyright protection regardless of the place and manner of such manufacture.”).

69. Ezra Pound, Letter to the Editor, THE NATION, Dec. 14, 1927, at 684, 685, reprinted in 4 POETRY AND PROSE, *supra* note 1, at 393.

published abroad in the English language seeking ad interim protection under this Act.”<sup>70</sup>

Ad interim protection was defined in a separate section of the 1909 Act:

[I]n the case of a book first published abroad in the English language, . . . the deposit in the copyright office, not later than sixty days after its publication abroad, of one complete copy of the foreign edition, with a request for the reservation of the copyright and a statement of the name and nationality of the author and of the copyright proprietor and of the date of publication of the said book, shall secure to the author or proprietor an ad interim copyright, which shall have all the force and effect given to copyright by this Act, and shall endure until the expiration of four months after such deposit in the copyright office.<sup>71</sup>

Once a copy of the foreign edition reached the Copyright Office for deposit within sixty days of publication abroad, ad interim protection began from the date of receipt<sup>72</sup> and endured for four months. Then, as further provided by section 22 of the 1909 Act:

[W]henever within the period of such ad interim protection an authorized edition of such book shall be published within the United States, in accordance with the manufacturing provisions . . . and whenever the provisions of this Act as to deposit of copies, registration, filing of affidavit, and the printing of the copyright notice shall have been duly complied with, the copyright

---

70. Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 15, 35 Stat. 1075, 1079. Congress had earlier enacted two ad interim provisions that resembled the 1909 version in certain respects. See Act of Mar. 3, 1905, ch. 1432, 33 Stat. 1000 (providing for a one-year term of protection for foreign-language works deposited in the Library of Congress within 30 days of first publication abroad); Act of Jan. 7, 1904, ch. 2, 33 Stat. 4 (providing for a two-year term of “interim copyright” for works of foreign origin intended for exhibition at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition). Like their 1909 successor, these provisions attempted to strike a legislative balance between international comity and protection of domestic labor by providing a “grace period for compliance with the manufacturing requirement.” Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 234; cf. Rembar, *supra* note 68, at 780 (“The original ad interim provisions were passed to help out foreign authors of foreign-language books, who found it difficult to comply with the requirements of the manufacturing clause . . .”).

71. Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 21, 35 Stat. 1075, 1080, *as amended* by Act of Dec. 18, 1919, ch. 11, § 21, 41 Stat. 368, 369. Under the original 1909 Act, applicants had only 30 days from publication abroad to secure ad interim protection, which lasted for 30 days from the date of deposit. Under the 1919 amendment, the time periods were extended to 60 days and four months, respectively. These changes were deemed necessary to alleviate hardships in the postwar period, particularly as these affected friendly and neutral nations. See Rembar, *supra* note 68, at 783. Under a later amendment, the time periods were extended further to six months and five years, respectively. See Act of June 3, 1949, ch. 171, § 2, 63 Stat. 153, 154.

72. See HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 90 (“[T]he ad interim copyright cannot begin until the copy is received in the Copyright Office.”).

shall be extended to endure in such book for the full term elsewhere provided in this Act.<sup>73</sup>

Thus, by satisfying the requirements of several linked provisions, the author of an English-language book published abroad could acquire statutory copyright protection in the United States for the full twenty-eight-year term, starting from the date of foreign publication.<sup>74</sup> Ad interim protection was, when it worked, a stepping-stone to full protection.

But it did not always work. A false step at any point along the tortuous path leading from publication abroad to reprinting here might spell doom for the American copyright. Failure to mail the foreign edition for deposit in the Copyright Office, or mailing it too late for receipt within the specified two-month window, would result in loss of the ad interim opportunity.<sup>75</sup> Even if ad interim protection were secured, failure to reprint in the United States in accordance with the manufacturing clause would result in termination of copyright protection once the narrow four-month gate slammed shut.

Even under ideal publishing conditions, compliance with these requirements was a test of a foreign-domiciled author's legal knowledge, practical resourcefulness, and literary prestige.<sup>76</sup> A writer without an established reputation, or with a sullied one, might not be able to find an American publisher. James Joyce had everything a European writer needed to brave the complexities of our copyright law, except a reputation for publishability. In 1922, no legitimate American publisher was willing to take a risk on his masterpiece.

### C. *The Failure of American Copyright: Ulysses and Candy*

*Ulysses* was published in France on February 2, 1922, Joyce's fortieth birthday. On that day, he received his first author's copy of the handsomely printed book.<sup>77</sup> Apart from typographical errors,<sup>78</sup> unavoidable in

73. Act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, § 22, 35 Stat. 1075, 1080.

74. See 2 STEPHEN P. LADAS, *THE INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION OF LITERARY AND ARTISTIC PROPERTY* § 352, at 769 (1938) ("Evidently . . . the copyright [in a work reprinted in the United States within the ad interim period] starts from the date of first publication abroad.")

75. See HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 90-91 (noting that delay or postal mishap would not excuse failure to comply with ad interim terms).

76. See BRUCE ARNOLD, *THE SCANDAL OF ULYSSES* 81 (1991) (describing briefly the problems that the ad interim and manufacturing provisions created for Joyce and noting that "[i]t does not require a great effort of imagination to see how good the author's timing or that of his publishers in the United States had to be, in order to satisfy the strict timetable under the terms of the [1909] Act"); Warren St. John, *James Joyce and the Nutty Professor*, N.Y. OBSERVER, Dec. 29, 1997, at 1 (stating that *Ulysses* may not have been protected under "the protectionist Copyright Act of 1909").

77. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 523-24.

78. See *id.* at 526 (quoting Joyce's reference to numerous printing errors in the 1922 edition).



circumstances that required French printers to set a difficult, extensively-revised English text, the book had been spared mutilations of the kind introduced to appease the censor. Joyce had his unexpurgated text.

Within the American copyright arena, French publication of the book started the ad interim clock ticking. There is no record in the Copyright Office or elsewhere that Joyce or any representative sought to deposit a copy of the Paris edition with the Register of Copyrights.<sup>79</sup> Lacking such deposit, *Ulysses* lost any chance it might have had of gaining American copyright protection after April 2, 1922. Without ad interim protection, Joyce could not avail himself of the small four-month window for producing an American reprint and extending the temporary copyright to the full twenty-eight-year term. It seems reasonable to infer that in the wake of the 1921 obscenity trial, Joyce despaired of getting the requisite deposit copy of *Ulysses* past a vigilant United States customs check, through the mails, and into the hands of the Register of Copyrights, who might in any case refuse to allow deposit and registration on the ground of obscenity.<sup>80</sup> With no chance of a legitimate American reprint, efforts to secure an ad interim copyright in *Ulysses* would have been virtually meaningless anyway.

The practical consequence of Joyce's inability to acquire an American copyright was piracy and disfigurement of his work, as the publisher Huebsch had prophesied in the fall of 1920.<sup>81</sup> What precisely the legal consequence might have been is less easy to determine. Scholars have divided on the question of abortive ad interim copyright, many claiming that failure to comply with the provision injected a work into the public domain;<sup>82</sup> others, that the copyright in that work was merely unenforceable.<sup>83</sup>

---

79. In addition to this negative evidence of Joyce's noncompliance with the ad interim requirement, there is resoundingly positive evidence in unpublished court documents relating to Joyce's litigation against Samuel Roth. Question 23 in a list of written cross-interrogatories, prepared by Roth's New York attorney for administration to Joyce in Paris, asked: "Have you ever applied for a copyright of the book 'Ulysses' in the United States of America?" Defendant's Cross-Interrogatories on Commission at 4, *Joyce v. Roth* (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Dec. 27, 1928) (Ezra Pound Papers, Beinecke Library, Yale University). Joyce's response, given in a sworn deposition at the U.S. Consulate General in Paris, was "No." Plaintiff's Deposition at 6, *Joyce* (Ezra Pound Papers, Beinecke Library, Yale University). For the court order in *Joyce*, see *supra* note 45 and accompanying text (discussing the court's ruling).

80. See *supra* note 24 and accompanying text. *But see* Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 218 n.10 (stating that, under the "rule of doubt," the Copyright Office "will register a claim if some reasonable doubt exists as to the ruling a court would make on validity of the copyright").

81. See *supra* notes 56-59 and accompanying text; see also ARNOLD, *supra* note 76, at 83 ("The original edition of 1922 could not be deposited at Washington; and certainly, within four months [the period of ad interim protection in 1922], no subsequent American edition could be brought out, since the book was banned.").

82. See, e.g., RICHARD ROGERS BOWKER, COPYRIGHT: ITS HISTORY AND ITS LAW 147 (1912) (noting that failure to comply with the 1909 Act's ad interim provision injected a foreign work into the public domain); Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 281 (discussing the ad interim and manufacturing provisions and concluding that "the overwhelming weight" of decisional and

The two positions stake out more than an academic distinction without a practical difference. When a work entered the public domain, as it did naturally upon expiration of its copyright term or unnaturally upon failure to satisfy certain statutory requirements,<sup>84</sup> it ceased to exist as intangible personal property. It was transformed from a private monopoly into a public resource, and the benefits once enjoyed by the creator passed to the user.<sup>85</sup> Except in very rare circumstances, a work cannot be resurrected from the public domain, because “a temporary public domain [is] foreign to United States copyright concepts.”<sup>86</sup>

If failure to comply with the ad interim provision, and hence with the manufacturing requirement, rendered a work’s copyright merely unenforceable, however, that copyright would arguably be not invalid but only “in suspension,”<sup>87</sup> awaiting an event that would render it enforceable. One such triggering event might be the effective date of the 1976 Copyright Act, which, in light of that Act’s attenuated manufacturing requirements, some scholars regard as sufficient to release the copyright from suspended enforceability.<sup>88</sup> The majority of commentators writing before the 1976 Act, however, believed that failure to obtain ad interim copyright cast a work irrevocably into the public domain.<sup>89</sup>

secondary authorities supports the contention that “copyright [is] secured or lost depending upon compliance with the statute at the time of first publication, whether this occurred here or abroad”).

83. *See, e.g.*, 2 NIMMER, *supra* note 68, § 7.23[E][1], at 7-226 (suggesting that failure to comply with the ad interim requirement might cause a work’s copyright to be not invalid, but merely “in suspension”).

84. *See, e.g.*, 1 PAUL GOLDSTEIN, COPYRIGHT § 3.18, at 3:150 (2d ed. 1996) (“If noncompliance forfeited copyright, any work published in violation of the manufacturing requirement before the effective date of the 1976 Act, January 1, 1978, would be in the public domain, and thus unprotectible, under the 1976 Act.”).

85. *See American Code Co. v. Bensinger*, 282 F. 829, 833 (2d Cir. 1922) (“Publication of an intellectual production without copyrighting it causes the work to fall into the public domain. It becomes by such publication dedicated to the public, and any person is thereafter entitled to publish it for his own benefit.”); HOWELL’S COPYRIGHT LAW, *supra* note 24, at 48 (“If a work is in the ‘public domain’ it is of course free to anybody’s use.”); *see also* Edward Samuels, *The Public Domain in Copyright Law*, 41 J. COPYRIGHT SOC’Y 137, 138-50 (1993) (surveying definitions and theories of the public domain).

86. HOWELL’S COPYRIGHT LAW, *supra* note 24, at 103. *But see* the discussion of recently restored copyrights *infra* Part IV.

87. 2 NIMMER, *supra* note 68, § 7.23[E][1], at 7-226.

88. *See id.* (speculating that suspended enforceability resulting from noncompliance with the 1909 Act’s manufacturing clause might be removed by the termination of that Act “because the scope of the manufacturing clause under the current [1976] Act is much narrower than under the 1909 Act”); *see also* 1 GOLDSTEIN, *supra* note 84, § 3.18, at 3:150-51 (“If the copyright were only unenforceable, copyright would have subsisted in the work on the effective date of the 1976 Copyright Act and would thus be fully enforceable under the terms of the 1976 Act.”).

89. *See, e.g.*, BOWKER, *supra* note 82, at 147 (asserting that failure to comply with the 1909 Act’s ad interim provision “will forfeit the right to obtain copyright protection and throw the foreign work into the public domain”); SAMUEL SPRING, RISKS & RIGHTS IN PUBLISHING, TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, ADVERTISING, AND THE THEATER 105 (1952) (stating that, where no American reprint is produced within the period of ad interim protection, “the work is in the public domain in, and all rights are lost in, the United States”); PHILIP WITTENBERG,

Even more persuasively, the courts took this view. There is remarkably little published case law on the question of noncompliance with the ad interim provision, but that little has tended to vindicate the Copyright Office's position<sup>90</sup> that noncompliance would result in injection of the work into the public domain. Of the handful of pertinent court decisions, most address ad interim copyright only indirectly or by way of dictum. But all affirm the inescapable condition of American manufacture for works falling within the ad interim provision.<sup>91</sup>

Despite the paucity of decisional law, one well-documented case involving ad interim copyright and booklegging contains facts astonishingly similar to those of Joyce's predicament. In 1958, a novel by two Americans, Terry Southern and Mason Hoffenberg, appeared in France under the title of *Candy*. The pseudonymous book was published in English and bore a notice of French copyright. Like Joyce, Southern and Hoffenberg neither sought ad interim copyright in the United States nor attempted publication here within five years of the French publication.<sup>92</sup>

---

THE PROTECTION OF LITERARY PROPERTY 80 (1968) ("Should [an] ad interim application not be filed, then the work falls into the public domain and there is no valid copyright subsisting in the United States."); Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 280-82 (summarizing the consensus of primary and secondary authorities regarding compliance with the ad interim provision); Samuel W. Tannenbaum, *The U.S. Copyright Statute—An Analysis of Its Major Aspects and Shortcomings*, 10 N.Y.L.F. 12, 19 (1964) (noting that an author who fails to comply with the ad interim provision "loses his United States copyright"). *But see* HOWELL, *supra* note 17, at 92 (speculating that noncompliance with the ad interim provision might still leave the author with "a fighting chance" to publish in the United States and "to be protected at least from that time on"); 2 LADAS, *supra* note 74, at 766 (contending that noncompliance "does not invalidate the copyright" but only prevents the author from bringing an infringement action); *cf.* 2 NIMMER, *supra* note 68, § 7.23[E][1], at 7-226 ("If . . . the copyright was merely unenforceable under the 1909 Act—in suspension, as it were—then with the termination of the 1909 Act, the suspension will have been removed, and the copyright thus becomes enforceable."); Rembar, *supra* note 68, at 775 (contending that the ad interim provision is "merely an alternative" to securing copyright by the ordinary route of publication with notice).

90. See Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 220, 280-82.

91. See *Olympia Press v. Lancer Books*, 267 F. Supp. 920, 922-23, 925-26 (S.D.N.Y. 1967) (stating that under the 1909 Act, an English translation, first manufactured and published in France, of a French work would be in the public domain because of failure to comply with the ad interim provision, unless the French publisher could prove that it was the "author" of the work as the translator's employer in a work made for hire); *Grove Press v. Greenleaf Publ'g Co.*, 247 F. Supp. 518, 523 (E.D.N.Y. 1965) (assuming *arguendo* that an English translation, first manufactured and published in France, of a French work was in the public domain because of noncompliance with the ad interim provision); *Encyclopædia Britannica Co. v. Werner Co.*, 135 F. 841, 846 (C.C.D.N.J. 1905) (holding that the Copyright Act of 1904, which granted two years of ad interim protection to foreign-produced works intended for the Louisiana Purchase Exhibition, did not extend to an encyclopedia in English that had been published in the United States prior to the Act), *aff'd sub nom.* *Encyclopædia Britannica Co. v. American Newspaper Ass'n*, 142 F. 966 (3d Cir. 1906). *But see* *Bentley v. Tibbals*, 223 F. 247, 257 (2d Cir. 1915) (refusing to decide whether a British book in the American public domain, which contained some copyrighted matter but gave no notice of what was copyrighted and what was not, had lost all copyright).

92. See *G.P. Putnam's Sons v. Lancer Books*, 239 F. Supp. 782, 783 (S.D.N.Y. 1965) (recounting the history of the French publication of *Candy*). Five years was then the ad interim

*Candy* was a mildly erotic satire and picaresque romp, loosely patterned after Voltaire's *Candide* and intended as a spoof of American female innocence. The wholesome heroine, Candy Christian, "Good Grief!"'s her way through a series of bizarre adventures, repeatedly encountering the importunate desires of men and tripping over her own unsuspected libido.<sup>93</sup> Sometime prior to 1964, copies of the book intended for importation into the United States were seized by customs authorities under the Tariff Act, "presumably on moral grounds."<sup>94</sup> Like *Ulysses* forty years before, *Candy* suffered the interdiction of two of Ezra Pound's American "abuses": the obscenity law and customs officials.<sup>95</sup>

Pound's third abuse entered the picture in 1964, when, following a determination by the Bureau of Customs that the book was admissible under the Tariff Act, Southern and Hoffenberg published a slightly revised version of *Candy* with G.P. Putnam's Sons ("Putnam") in the United States.<sup>96</sup> The authors deposited copies of the Putnam edition in the Copyright Office and, on the strength of evasive answers on their application, received a certificate of copyright registration for the revised book.<sup>97</sup> The copyright notice cited a string of dates that included the French copyrights along with the newly claimed American one: "Copyright © 1958, 1959, 1962, 1964 . . ."<sup>98</sup> Marketed in hardcover at five dollars per copy, the book quickly became a bestseller in the United States.<sup>99</sup>

In January 1965, Lancer Books ("Lancer") published an unauthorized paperback edition of *Candy* retailing at seventy-five cents per copy. This bookleg version, "copied word for word from the French edition," did not incorporate the revisions made to the American Putnam edition.<sup>100</sup> Putnam, together with Southern and Hoffenberg, sued Lancer for copyright infringement, seeking a preliminary injunction barring Lancer from publishing and distributing its pirated version of *Candy*. Unlike Joyce, who had contented himself with an action for unfair competition against Samuel

---

period within which an author could acquire a standard American copyright by reprinting in accordance with the manufacturing clause. See discussion *supra* note 71.

93. See, e.g., TERRY SOUTHERN & MASON HOFFENBERG, *CANDY* 29 (G.P. Putnam's Sons rev. ed. 1964) ("Oh, Daddy! Really! It's the greatest *honor* to be invited to Professor Mephesto's office, and have a drop! I've *told* you that a dozen times! Good Grief!"). An epigraph attributed to Voltaire hints that *Candide* is a source for this ribald pastiche. See *id.* at 11.

94. *G.P. Putnam's Sons*, 239 F. Supp. at 783.

95. In this case, the two "abuses" were combined in the same provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, which permitted seizure of imported goods deemed immoral or obscene. See Act of June 17, 1930, ch. 497, tit. 3, § 305, 46 Stat. 590, 688 (codified as amended at 19 U.S.C. § 1305 (1994)).

96. See *G.P. Putnam's Sons*, 239 F. Supp. at 783.

97. See *id.* at 783-84.

98. *Id.* at 784.

99. See *id.*

100. *Id.*

Roth,<sup>101</sup> the authors of *Candy* decided to test the validity of their French copyright in the United States.<sup>102</sup>

The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York denied the plaintiffs' request for a preliminary injunction. Suspecting that the French edition of *Candy* was in the public domain, the court noted that the language of the 1909 Copyright Act "gives rise to a permissible inference that if the book is not published in the United States until after the five-year period has expired [even supposing that the work had obtained ad interim protection], no permanent copyright on it can be secured."<sup>103</sup> Confining itself, however, to the undisputed fact that "[p]laintiffs never applied for registration of copyright on the French edition and hence . . . never obtained one," the court held that "under Section 13 [the deposit and registration provision] they may not sue for infringement of something which they do not have."<sup>104</sup>

The plaintiffs took the hint and applied for registration of a claim to ad interim copyright in the French edition as well as for registration of an ordinary copyright in an American edition of substantially the same text.<sup>105</sup> The Copyright Office refused to register either claim, on the basis that the authors had not complied in a timely manner with the ad interim and manufacturing provisions.<sup>106</sup> When the action returned to the Southern District of New York for injunctive relief and damages, the court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss on the same grounds as its earlier denial of a preliminary injunction.<sup>107</sup> The court specifically refused to consider the plaintiffs' constitutional challenge to the ad interim requirement and their argument that their early failure to comply with that provision had been unavoidable since "the novel [had been] banned by the Customs Bureau until after the time limitations of [ad interim protection] had expired."<sup>108</sup>

The plaintiffs' sole remedy now lay in an action in the nature of mandamus seeking to compel the Register of Copyrights to register a copyright claim in the work he had lately rejected for failure to comply with the statutory provisions. In a brief per curiam opinion, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled that "[s]ince the novel 'Candy' was first published and printed abroad in the English language and there is

---

101. See *supra* notes 45-48 and accompanying text.

102. The authors of *Candy* also sought relief on a theory of unfair competition, but the court denied a preliminary injunction on the ground that case law had established "the principle that state law may not forbid, on a theory of unfair competition, the copying of an article which is not protected by federal patent or copyright." *G.P. Putnam's Sons*, 239 F. Supp. at 788.

103. *Id.* at 787.

104. *Id.*

105. See *Hoffenberg v. Kaminstein*, 396 F.2d 684, 685 (D.C. Cir. 1968) (per curiam) (discussing the plaintiffs' efforts to register editions of *Candy* with the Copyright Office).

106. See *id.*

107. See *G.P. Putnam's Sons v. Lancer Books*, 251 F. Supp. 210, 214 (S.D.N.Y. 1966).

108. *Id.*

no ad interim registration of that edition, registration of the American edition was properly refused.”<sup>109</sup> As for the plaintiffs’ challenge to the validity of a Copyright Office regulation giving force to the ad interim provision, the court tersely remarked that the regulation “is not only not inconsistent with the pertinent sections of the Copyright Code, but in our judgment it accurately reflects the intention of Congress.”<sup>110</sup>

The implications of the extended *Candy* litigation are unmistakable: The French edition of *Candy* was not protected by copyright in the United States. Equally unprotected was any version of the novel based on the French edition, with the exception of such revisions as had been printed in the United States in compliance with the manufacturing clause. The public domain had unceremoniously claimed *Candy*; for all practical purposes, the work was free for the pirating—though “piracy” can scarcely be ascribed with legal accuracy to the use of literary expression that has lost its status as private property.

Samuel Roth in 1926 had done no more and no less than Lancer Books did forty years later: He had taken advantage of an author’s inability to comply with the strict protectionist requirements of the 1909 Copyright Act. As with *Candy*, so with *Ulysses*: The copyright code, the obscenity law, and customs officials—Pound’s trinity of abuses—had combined to strip Joyce of his literary property rights in America. Like other works in English first published abroad,<sup>111</sup> *Ulysses* had entered the public domain—prematurely, but nonetheless surely.

---

109. *Hoffenberg*, 396 F.2d at 685.

110. *Id.*

111. It is impossible to know how many works were claimed by the public domain in the manner of *Ulysses* and *Candy*. Most authors in Joyce’s position probably resigned themselves, as he did, to the loss of their copyrights in the United States. D.H. Lawrence, for example, was notoriously vulnerable to American pirates. “Lawrence’s last novel [*Lady Chatterley’s Lover*] was not protected by copyright, in England or the United States, and publishing pirates easily undersold the edition that Lawrence had privately printed in Italy with the help of the Florentine printer Pino Orioli.” DE GRAZIA, *supra* note 4, at 56. For a rare instance in which foreign-based authors or publishers challenged their exploitation by American publishers in circumstances similar to Joyce’s, see *Olympia Press v. Lancer Books*, 267 F. Supp. 920, 926 (S.D.N.Y. 1967). In *Olympia Press*, the court expressed doubt, in light of the ad interim and manufacturing provisions, as to the validity of the American copyright in an English translation made by an American and published in France. For a similar instance, see *Grove Press v. Greenleaf Publishing Co.*, 247 F. Supp. 518, 523 (E.D.N.Y. 1965), in which the court assumed *arguendo* that an English translation published in France and not securing ad interim copyright was cast into the public domain in the United States.

### III. *ULYSSES* LEGALIZED IN AMERICA: ILLUSORY COPYRIGHT

#### A. *Publication in the United States*

The story of the fight to lift the obscenity ban on *Ulysses* in the United States has been told often.<sup>112</sup> Ten years after the publication of *Ulysses* in France, Bennett Cerf, the head of Random House in New York, and Morris L. Ernst, the noted lawyer and crusader against censorship, combined forces to deliver Joyce's novel from its prison house of official condemnation.<sup>113</sup> Their efforts resulted in the monumental decision handed down by federal district Judge John M. Woolsey declaring *Ulysses* to be "nowhere . . . an aphrodisiac" and therefore admissible into the United States.<sup>114</sup>

Within minutes of the announcement of the Woolsey decision, Bennett Cerf's typesetters were at work on a legitimate, and now legal, American edition of Joyce's novel.<sup>115</sup> The first copies of the Random House *Ulysses* reached Cerf in January 1934.<sup>116</sup> He deposited two copies with the Register of Copyrights and submitted an affidavit attesting to the edition's American manufacture. According to Copyright Office records, a claim of copyright was registered for the edition.<sup>117</sup>

It is unclear from these records, however, precisely how much of the Random House *Ulysses* was claimed for copyright.<sup>118</sup> In the months before publication, Cerf had expressed great concern over the vulnerability of the forthcoming book: "I want to stress again," he wrote Joyce's secretary, "the importance of having as much copyrighted material in our edition as is humanly possible, in order to combat possible pirated editions which will undoubtedly come along to vex us all."<sup>119</sup> Cerf was referring to an unpublished chart of symbolic correspondences that Joyce had prepared for

112. See, e.g., ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 666-67; JOSEPH KELLY, OUR JOYCE: FROM OUTCAST TO ICON 92-140 (1998); VANDERHAM, *supra* note 22, at 87-131.

113. See generally THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. ONE BOOK ENTITLED "ULYSSES" BY JAMES JOYCE (Michael Moscato & Leslie Le Blanc eds., 1984) [hereinafter ONE BOOK ENTITLED "ULYSSES"] (providing a detailed documentary account of the Cerf-Ernst collaboration).

114. *United States v. One Book Called 'Ulysses,'* 5 F. Supp. 182, 185 (S.D.N.Y. 1933), *aff'd sub nom. United States v. One Book Entitled Ulysses by James Joyce*, 72 F.2d 705 (2d Cir. 1934).

115. See ELLMANN, *supra* note 11, at 667.

116. See *id.*

117. Copyright Office records show that two deposit copies of the Random House edition were received on January 27, 1934. The affidavit of American manufacture was received on February 23, 1934. The edition was assigned registration number A70193.

118. Neither the application for copyright registration in *Ulysses* nor a copy of the copyright registration certificate appears to be available in the records at the Copyright Office. A search by Mary E. Aldridge of the Office's onsite archives, February 23-25, 1998, followed by several later inquiries to Office personnel, turned up nothing.

119. Letter from Bennett Cerf to Paul Léon (Oct. 30, 1933), in ONE BOOK ENTITLED "ULYSSES," *supra* note 113, at 278-79.

private circulation among select admirers of *Ulysses*.<sup>120</sup> Cerf wanted to include this explanatory chart in the Random House edition, partly as a way of enhancing the marketability of Joyce's famously difficult book, but chiefly to incorporate as much indisputably copyrightable matter "as is humanly possible." Joyce refused to allow the supplement on aesthetic grounds;<sup>121</sup> he was still willing to sacrifice legal protection to artistic pride.

Cerf did manage, however, to include an unpublished letter by Joyce in the book's front matter. Ironically, the letter, written to Cerf during the planning stage of the campaign to liberate *Ulysses* from the censor, complained of the very problem that its inclusion was meant to ameliorate:

I was unable to acquire the copyright in the United States since I could not comply with the requirements of the American copyright law which demands the republication in the United States of any English book published elsewhere within a period of six months after the date of such publication . . . .<sup>122</sup>

Joyce's summary shows that bitter experience had schooled him in the rigorous fine points of the Copyright Code's manufacturing and ad interim provisions.

The copyright notice in the 1934 Random House *Ulysses* confessed *sotto voce* to the same problem: "Copyright, 1918, 1919, 1920, by Margaret Caroline Anderson. Copyright, 1934, by the Modern Library, Inc."<sup>123</sup> The first string of dates referred to the serial installments of *Ulysses* in *The Little Review*,<sup>124</sup> and the final date indicated the Random House edition.<sup>125</sup>

120. The chart has since been published in various places. See, e.g., *id.* at 276-77.

121. See Letter from Paul Léon to Bennett Cerf (Oct. 21, 1933), *in id.* at 278 (asserting that *Ulysses*, as a "piece of belle lettres," should not contain "explanations").

122. Letter from James Joyce to Bennett Cerf (Apr. 2, 1932), *in* JAMES JOYCE, *ULYSSES* at xvi (1934).

123. *Id.* at v.

124. Since issues of *The Little Review* published during 1919 and 1920 were apparently not registered for copyright, enforceability of the copyrights in those portions of *Ulysses* would have been problematic. See *supra* notes 19-21, 31-34 and accompanying text. Later Random House printings of *Ulysses* dropped "1919" and "1920" from the copyright notice; a typical notice from a later printing reads: "Copyright, 1914, 1918, by Margaret Caroline Anderson. Copyright, 1934, by the Modern Library, Inc. Copyright, 1942, 1946, by Nora Joseph Joyce." See, e.g., JAMES JOYCE, *ULYSSES* at iv (1961). The puzzling addition of "1914," a date irrelevant to any phase of the publishing history of *Ulysses*, is explained by the fact that Margaret Anderson sought and received registration of the copyrights for her first six issues of *The Little Review*, all published in 1914 (Copyright Office registration numbers B299661, B301407, B302631, B304723, B310978, B307749). For some reason, the Joyce Estate in March 1942 attempted to renew these copyrights in the name of Joyce's widow (renewal entries 107026 to 107030), even though these issues contained nothing by Joyce. The attempted renewals were therefore a nullity.

125. Since the original application for registration of the copyright claim in the 1934 Random House *Ulysses* is not available in Copyright Office archives, it is impossible to know how much of the 1934 text Cerf claimed for copyright. See *supra* note 118. That the Copyright Office granted Cerf a certificate of registration and 27 years later permitted Joyce's children to renew the 1934 "copyright" for a second 28-year term (registration number R281082, dated August 30, 1961)



Delicately omitted was “1922,” the date of the Paris edition—the only date relevant, in light of the ad interim and manufacturing provisions, to protection of the entire edition within the United States. The copyright notice in the 1934 edition was thus a kind of *in terrorem* red flag to would-be pirates, one that a determined competitor might confidently have ignored.<sup>126</sup>

### B. *The “Courtesy Copyright” in Ulysses*

If the copyright claimed by Random House in *Ulysses* was illusory and the work was actually in the public domain, why were Bennett Cerf’s fears of pirated editions never realized? Indeed, since 1934, there have been almost no challenges to Random House’s exclusive right to publish *Ulysses* in the United States.<sup>127</sup> When the rare challenger has come along, it has promptly backed down in the face of protests by the Estate of James Joyce.<sup>128</sup> The possibility of legal entanglement has no doubt been the strongest deterrent in recent years to the appearance of competing versions of *Ulysses*. No publisher wishes to invest more money in defending a suit than it can reasonably expect to recover in book sales, and the American market for *Ulysses*, though substantial, may not be large enough to justify going to law to establish the work’s public-domain status. But the question remains why Random House’s hegemony was not challenged early on, when Joyce’s American market was still forming and knowledge of his copyright predicament was widespread in the publishing industry.

---

would not have guaranteed the enforceability of the copyright claimed in the edition. For a discussion of the Copyright Office’s “rule of doubt” in favor of registering works, see Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 218 n.10. The Random House edition was set up, ironically, from the text of the pirated Paris edition of *Ulysses* in which Samuel Roth may have had a hand. See Roberts, *supra* note 5, at 576-78. Since the pirated text was based on the public-domain 1922 edition, it could hardly have provided a basis for protectible expression in the 1934 edition.

126. For a brief discussion of the composite copyright notice in the 1934 *Ulysses*, see ARNOLD, *supra* note 76, at 84-85. Arnold also addresses the possible copyright implications of the various versions of *Ulysses*, offering tentative conclusions that resemble mine in certain respects. See *id.* at 85-86.

127. During the early 1970s and perhaps before, a pirated version of *Ulysses* appeared under the imprint of Collectors Publications of Industry, California, containing, in addition to the text of the 1960 British Bodley Head edition of *Ulysses*, 43 pages of advertisements for adult paperbacks, nude photographs, and sex devices. The volume sold at five dollars per copy. See John W. Van Voorhis & Francis C. Bloodgood, *Ulysses: Another Pirated Edition?*, 9 JAMES JOYCE Q. 436, 436-40 (1972).

128. In the early 1990s, the Oxford Text Archive planned to distribute Joyce’s works in electronic-text formats via the Internet and diskettes, but when the Joyce Estate protested that *Ulysses* would remain in copyright in the United States “until at least 1997,” the Oxford Text Archive ceased distributing the novel in electronic form. Message from Lou Burnard, Oxford Text Archive (posted on the Internet on February 1, 1993, to the Humanist Discussion Group) (hard copy on file with the author). The Humanist Discussion Group website has failed to archive several postings from February 1993, including Burnard’s. See *Humanist Archives* (visited Nov. 7, 1998) <[http://lists.village.virginia.edu/lists\\_archive/Humanist/v06](http://lists.village.virginia.edu/lists_archive/Humanist/v06)>.

The answer lies chiefly in the nineteenth-century tradition of “trade courtesy” among publishers, a tradition of which Joyce and Bennett Cerf availed themselves for the purpose of safeguarding the authorized American edition of *Ulysses*. Prior to the 1891 Copyright Act, the United States extended no copyright protection to works published abroad.<sup>129</sup> This legal vacuum inevitably gave rise to predatory activity on the part of American publishers. “There ensued the great Age of Piracy, in which books of several European countries, but particularly English novels, were appropriated and published [in the United States] in such quantities as to flood the market for a time.”<sup>130</sup>

To bring some measure of regulation and propriety to these practices, publishers began to observe “what they called a ‘courtesy copyright,’ in which the American reprinter [of a work first published abroad] had sole rights if he was the first to produce a book in this country . . . .”<sup>131</sup> According to the self-imposed code of trade courtesy, an American publisher would negotiate with a foreign author for the “right” to reprint a work or would simply announce its intention to publish as a way of putting competitors on notice.<sup>132</sup> Under this informal and wholly extralegal arrangement, a publisher’s claim to the uncopyrighted work of a foreign author would be respected by other publishing houses, which could in turn expect such courtesy to be extended to their own titles.<sup>133</sup>

The practice of trade courtesy among nineteenth-century American publishers is a vivid example of what Robert Ellickson has called “order without law,” a system of folkways peculiar to a group or community in which informal norms have come to take the place of formal legal rules.<sup>134</sup> Ellickson has argued that “[m]uch of the glue of a society comes not from law enforcement . . . but rather from the informal enforcement of social mores by acquaintances, bystanders, trading partners, and others.”<sup>135</sup> In

129. See Schrader, *supra* note 63, at 225 (“One hundred years were to pass before the Chace International Copyright Act of 1891 extended copyright protection, under certain conditions, to non-resident foreigners.”).

130. 1 JOHN TEBBEL, *A HISTORY OF BOOK PUBLISHING IN THE UNITED STATES* 208 (1972).

131. *Id.*

132. See 2 *id.* at 54-55 (quoting publisher Henry Holt’s account of the distinction between “first announcement” and “arrangement with the author” as modes of establishing a rightful publishing claim in accordance with the rules of trade courtesy).

133. See *id.* at 53-55; see also FEATHER, *supra* note 52, at 160 (“By what was known in the United States as the ‘courtesy of the trade,’ American publishers, or at least the respectable ones, did not pirate each other’s British books once they had been acquired and published from British publishers.”).

134. See generally ROBERT C. ELICKSON, *ORDER WITHOUT LAW* (1991) (arguing that people in close-knit communities frequently resolve their disputes in a cooperative fashion without resort to the laws that apply to those disputes).

135. Robert C. Ellickson, *Law and Economics Discovers Social Norms*, 27 J. LEGAL STUD. 537, 540 (1998). Having studied firsthand the modes of informal dispute resolution employed by rural landowners in Shasta County, California, Ellickson hypothesized that “members of a close-knit group develop and maintain norms whose content serves to maximize the aggregate welfare

rewarding conformity and frowning upon deviancy, American publishers employed the “carrots and sticks” of Ellickson’s taxonomy of remedial norms.<sup>136</sup> As “unofficial enforcers,” they used “punishments such as negative gossip and ostracism to discipline malefactors and bounties such as esteem and enhanced trading opportunities to reward the worthy.”<sup>137</sup>

Yet not all deviants from the norms of trade courtesy were responsive to the displeasure of their fellows. Novice publishers, for example, had strong incentives to engage in piracy as a way of establishing book lists, and trade courtesy failed to gain a foothold in the aggressive cheap book trade of the 1870s and 1880s.<sup>138</sup> Furthermore, with the expansion of American letters in the later nineteenth century, sales of British novels in the United States dropped off;<sup>139</sup> and the 1891 Copyright Act extended copyright protection, upon certain conditions, to works published abroad. As a consequence, trade courtesy began to decline in importance.

Joyce’s efforts to defend *Ulysses* from American piracy in the 1920s and 1930s gave new life to the practice. His campaign against Samuel Roth, widely discussed in the press,<sup>140</sup> had the effect of generating public outrage

that members obtain in their workaday affairs with one another.” ELLICKSON, *supra* note 134, at 167 (emphasis omitted). According to this hypothesis, members of such a group informally encourage cooperative behavior and discourage deviant behavior, with the result that the welfare of the whole group tends to be maximized. *See id.* at 167-83. Ellickson is careful to point out that “welfare” must be understood to include high social status and close personal relationships as well as material benefits. *See id.* at 170.

It should be noted that the publishing world in the 19th century, while cohesive enough to evolve an extralegal code of conduct, was more heterogeneous and volatile than the close-knit rural community of Ellickson’s study. Moreover, unlike his resourceful cattlemen who employ flexible social mores as an alternative to unwieldy or unfamiliar legal remedies, 19th-century publishers did not have the luxury of choosing between informal norms and legal entitlements, since the foreign-based authors whom they represented enjoyed no legal entitlements within the American copyright arena. These publishers were confronted instead with a starker choice between informal self-regulation and no regulation at all. The choice was not one between order with law and order without law, but, more fundamentally, between order and anarchy. The cost-efficiency incentives for adopting informal norms were therefore at a maximum.

136. ELLICKSON, *supra* note 134, at 207-29.

137. Ellickson, *supra* note 135, at 540. Practitioners of trade courtesy made liberal use of negative gossip and ostracism. In 1893, the publisher Henry Holt testified that “in the trade the words ‘pirate’ and ‘thief’ were freely applied to those who reprinted books already equitably in the hands of other publishers, and that the effect of such reprinting by Dr. Funk [an alleged transgressor] was ‘not favorable’ to his reputation in the trade.” 2 TEBBEL, *supra* note 130, at 54. Both the normativity, and the complexity of trade courtesy are indicated in Holt’s observations that “anybody is welcome who will behave himself,” *id.*, and “[t]rade courtesy is as full of exceptions as the law itself. It has grown up as a mass of decisions in particular cases, just as the common law has.” *Id.* at 55.

138. *See* 2 TEBBEL, *supra* note 130, at 505 (discussing the sharply differing attitudes of new and established publishers towards trade courtesy and its proper role in the cheap book trade).

139. *See id.* at 641 (noting the expansion of American writing and the decline in British creativity in the later 19th century).

140. *See, e.g., Joyce Says ‘Ulysses’ Is Pirated Here*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 19, 1927, at 4 (describing Joyce’s reaction to Samuel Roth’s piracy of *Ulysses*); *Joyce Testimony on ‘Ulysses’ Here*, N.Y. TIMES, May 20, 1928, at 12 (discussing the deposition given by Joyce in Paris “for use at the trial of the suit brought by Joyce last year against Samuel Roth”); *Printing of ‘Ulysses’*

at the conduct of Roth and his ilk. Joyce's resort to international protest and American press coverage was a carefully orchestrated form of what Ellickson calls "truthful negative gossip," whereby all but the most incorrigible deviants are shamed into conformity by an appeal to the "general obsession with neighborliness" within the given group.<sup>141</sup> Joyce's negative gossip targeted Roth specifically, but its deterrent effect rippled out concentrically from that human bull's-eye to influence the conduct of publishers generally.

With the publishing community ready to sympathize with Joyce, Bennett Cerf had less to fear from pirates than he thought. However attractive may have been the idea of competing with Random House for a share of the *Ulysses* market, the attempt was not worth the opprobrium that inevitably would follow from the Joyce publicity machine. No one in 1934 wanted to look like Samuel Roth.

If the rascality of Roth had begun to fade from the public's memory, Joyce's letter to Cerf, published in the opening pages of the Random House edition, was there to remind everyone of the particulars of that scandal. Placed strategically just after the text of Judge Woolsey's opinion lifting the obscenity ban on *Ulysses*, Joyce's letter recalled the Roth piracies, the international protest, and the injunction against using Joyce's name; moreover, it contained an explicit endorsement from Joyce: "I willingly certify hereby that not only will your edition be the only authentic one in the United States but also the only one there on which I will be receiving royalties."<sup>142</sup>

The letter went on to declare that through Random House American readers would be able "to obtain the authenticated text of my book without running the risk of helping some unscrupulous person in his purpose of making profit for himself alone out of the work of another to which he can advance no claim of moral ownership."<sup>143</sup> With an eye for the legal *mot juste*, Joyce carefully avoided saying "legal ownership," for no law stood in the way of an unauthorized competitor's helping itself to the public domain. Only the moral force of the arrangement between Cerf and Joyce, cleverly memorialized in the opening pages of the Random House edition, could dissuade challengers from entering the field. Joyce and Cerf had revitalized the practice of trade courtesy and used it to fashion for *Ulysses* a "courtesy copyright" in the United States.

---

*Here Causes Protest*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 18, 1927, at 21 (noting that Roth's "unauthorized" publication of *Ulysses* "has provoked a long and warmly worded protest to the American public, signed by 160 leading literary men of the world").

141. ELLICKSON, *supra* note 134, at 57.

142. Letter from James Joyce to Bennett Cerf (Apr. 2, 1932), in JOYCE, *supra* note 122, at xvii.

143. *Id.*

## IV. RESTORED COPYRIGHTS AND EXTENDED COPYRIGHT TERMS

This Note has shown that, because it could not comply with the protectionist provisions of the 1909 Copyright Act, *Ulysses* lost its chance for American copyright within months of its French publication in 1922 and was thrust into the public domain in the United States. *Ulysses* did enjoy one brief period of copyright protection here, however. Title V of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"), as incorporated into the present Copyright Code,<sup>144</sup> contains a provision for restoration of copyright in original works of authorship that entered the public domain in this country due to "noncompliance with formalities imposed at any time by United States copyright law, including . . . failure to comply with any manufacturing requirements."<sup>145</sup> The URAA thus makes rather belated amends for America's long history of copyright protectionism.

Copyrights restored under the URAA "subsist for the remainder of the term of copyright that the work would have otherwise been granted in the United States if the work never entered the public domain in the United States."<sup>146</sup> Joyce's novel, had it not entered the public domain, would have enjoyed a copyright term of seventy-five years from its French publication in 1922.<sup>147</sup> Thus, under the terms of restoration, *Ulysses*, after many adventures, salvaged two quiet, unremarked years of genuine copyright protection before lapsing—this time of natural legal causes—back into the public domain on January 1, 1998.<sup>148</sup>

But claims to copyright sometimes die harder than copyrights themselves. As the expiration of the restored 1922 copyright drew nigh, several American publishers announced plans to issue *Ulysses* under their own imprint.<sup>149</sup> The Estate of James Joyce, which had equivocated about

144. Uruguay Round Agreements Act [URAA], Pub. L. No. 103-465, 108 Stat. 4809, 4976-81 (1994) (codified at 17 U.S.C. § 104A (1994)). Joyce scholar John Kidd, anticipating to some extent my analysis of the URAA here, has been quoted as saying that the "'Global Agreement on Trades and Tariffs'" restored the American copyright in *Ulysses* until the end of 1997. St. John, *supra* note 76, at 1. Kidd presumably had in mind section 101(d)(1) of the URAA, *supra*, at 4814, which states that the URAA applies to the "General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT)." Cf. Paul J. Slevin & Eric J. Weisberg, *GATT Implementation Bill Restores Copyright in Foreign Works*, 42 J. COPYRIGHT SOC'Y 272, 273-81 (1995) (analyzing the language of 17 U.S.C. § 104A (1994)).

145. 17 U.S.C. § 104A(h)(6)(C)(i) (1994).

146. *Id.* § 104A(a)(1)(B).

147. *See id.* § 304(b).

148. *See id.* § 104A(h)(2)(A) ("The 'date of restoration' of a restored copyright is . . . January 1, 1996, if the source country of the restored work is a nation adhering to the Berne Convention or a WTO member country on such date . . ."). France, the source country of the 1922 *Ulysses*, is a Berne signatory. *See* INTERNATIONAL TREATIES ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY 358 (Marshall A. Leaffer ed., 2d ed. 1997).

149. Prior to January 1998, Oxford University Press, W.W. Norton, and Penguin Putnam had announced plans to market editions of *Ulysses* in the United States. *See* St. John, *supra* note 76, at 1.

the American copyright in the past,<sup>150</sup> now asserted that *Ulysses* was still protected in the United States. According to the Estate, the American copyright began in 1934 and thus should run for a statutory seventy-five years before expiring on January 1, 2010.<sup>151</sup> In response to these claims, some publishers retreated from their plans to bring out a public-domain *Ulysses*.<sup>152</sup> A few small houses issued facsimiles of the 1922 French edition, expensively priced so as not to compete with the Random House trade-edition monopoly in the United States.<sup>153</sup>

As a result of the assertions of the Joyce Estate and the cautious responses of publishers, the public-domain status of *Ulysses* in America remains misunderstood. The serviceable fiction of copyright that arose in 1934 threatens now to harden into unquestioned myth. This myth—or fiction turned seeming fact<sup>154</sup>—is all the more pernicious in that Congress has recently passed legislation that amends the 1976 Copyright Act by adding twenty years to existing copyright terms.<sup>155</sup> Works enjoying a

150. Stephen James Joyce, the author's grandson, stated in 1993:

In the United States [James Joyce's] writings are covered for seventy-five years from the year during which they were first copyrighted and published in America, *assuming formalities are met*. For example, it is the understanding of the Estate of James Joyce that *Ulysses* remains in copyright until 1997 and possibly beyond . . . .

Stephen James Joyce, Letter to the Editor, 30 JAMES JOYCE Q. 345, 347 (1993) (emphases added). I wish to make it clear that in referring to the Joyce Estate's assertions and equivocations regarding the American copyright in *Ulysses*, I am not ascribing deceptive motives to these individuals. The history of *Ulysses* in America is a complex and tortured one; a putative copyright owner can scarcely be blamed for asserting rights when the facts have been in doubt for nearly 80 years.

151. See St. John, *supra* note 76, at 1 ("Random House and the Joyce Estate say the [copyright] clock didn't start running until 1934, when, after overcoming an obscenity ban, *Ulysses* was published on U.S. soil."); cf. Robin Bates, *The Corrections Officer: Can John Kidd Save Ulysses?*, LINGUA FRANCA, Oct. 1997, at 38, 45 (quoting a Random House lawyer as stating that the "U.S. copyright [in *Ulysses*] does not lapse on 31 December 1997").

152. Following protests by Random House and the Joyce Estate's literary agent in the United States,

Oxford . . . pulled its edition. "We're holding off now and consulting," said Ellen Chodosh, Oxford's vice president and publisher of trade paperbacks. Penguin Putnam is also asking its counsel to advise . . . .

. . . .

. . . Norton has chosen a more diplomatic route. "We've chosen to try to arrange things with the Joyce Estate," said Victor Schmalzer, an executive vice president at Norton. "It's an ongoing discussion."

St. John, *supra* note 76, at 1. As of this writing, however, Yale University Press plans to release a modestly corrected edition of the 1922 text of *Ulysses* in the spring of 2000. Telephone Interview with a Representative from the Advertising Department, Yale University Press (Oct. 5, 1998).

153. For example, facsimile versions of the 1922 edition of *Ulysses* have been published by Orchises Press of Alexandria, Virginia at \$75.00, and by The First Edition Library of Shelton, Connecticut at \$37.50. The Orchises Press version appeared in 1998; the First Edition Library version is undated.

154. See FRANK KERMODE, *THE SENSE OF AN ENDING: STUDIES IN THE THEORY OF FICTION* 39 (1967) ("Fictions can degenerate into myths whenever they are not consciously held to be fictive.").

155. Act of Oct. 27, 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-298, § 102(d)(1)(B), 112 Stat. 2827, 2828 (to be codified at 17 U.S.C. § 304(b) (1994)) (West, WESTLAW). This legislation, known as the Sonny

copyright term of seventy-five years from the date of first publication will now enjoy a term of ninety-five years from the date of first publication.<sup>156</sup>

With copyright terms dramatically increased, the purported copyright in *Ulysses*, unless it is recognized as illusory, will likewise receive a twenty-year reprieve from the public domain and will continue to exert a chilling effect upon publishers well into the next century. The effects of monopoly will go on being felt: Readers will pay noncompetitive prices for Estate-approved editions of *Ulysses*; scholars will be discouraged from producing alternative versions of the novel in print and electronic-text formats. In particular, the benefits of digitalization and cyberspace will be lost or muted where *Ulysses* is concerned.<sup>157</sup> Although avant-garde authors like Joyce typically have a limited readership, recent evidence suggests that the copyright monopoly artificially depresses the market for modernism.<sup>158</sup> When more and cheaper editions of difficult works are in supply, the demand of the common reader may increase accordingly.<sup>159</sup> High culture

Bono Copyright Term Extension Act, passed in the House on October 7, 1998, as Senate Bill 505, 105th Cong. (1997), containing the same amending language with regard to term extensions as House Bill 2589, 105th Cong. (1998). For passage of Senate Bill 505 in the House, see 144 CONG. REC. H9946-9954 (daily ed. Oct. 7, 1998). House Bill 2589, one of whose sponsors was the late Sonny Bono (R-Cal.), was introduced in the House on October 1, 1997, and passed on March 25, 1998. For floor debate on and passage of House Bill 2589, see 144 CONG. REC. H1456-1483 (daily ed. Mar. 25, 1998). Senate Bill 505 was introduced in the Senate on March 20, 1997, by Senator Hatch (R-Utah).

156. See Act of Oct. 27, 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-298, § 102(d)(1)(B), 112 Stat. 2827, 2828 (to be codified at 17 U.S.C. § 304(b) (1994)) (West, WESTLAW).

157. Several CD-ROM versions of *Ulysses* are in preparation as of this writing, notably those by Michael Groden and by John Kidd. See Bates, *supra* note 151, at 45-46 (discussing Kidd's proposed "Annotated 'Ulysses' on CD-ROM"); Robert Spoo, *Preparatory to Anything Else*, 33 JAMES JOYCE Q. 491, 493-94 (1996) (discussing Groden's proposed "hypertext version of *Ulysses*").

158. Since most works of "high modernism" (the mature novels of Virginia Woolf or William Faulkner, for example) are still in copyright in the United States, it is too soon to tell whether public-domain accessibility will result in a substantial increase in the audience for these works. The existing evidence, however, suggests that this process is indeed under way. For example, Joyce's first novel, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, first published in the United States in 1916, entered the public domain here on January 1, 1992. See 17 U.S.C. § 304(b) (1994) (providing for a term of 75 years from the initial date of copyright for works in their renewal term before January 1, 1978). In 1991, three versions of *A Portrait* were in print in the United States: a Penguin paperback at \$4.95; a Penguin paperback with critical apparatus at \$9.95; and a reprint edition by Amereon Ltd. at \$17.95. See 6 BOOKS IN PRINT 1990-91, at 4924 (1990). In 1997, the same three versions were still in print, now retailing at \$7.00, \$14.95, and \$20.95, respectively; but the following versions were also available, most of them first published in 1991 or after: a Bantam paperback at \$3.95; a NAL-Dutton paperback at \$4.95; a Dover paperback reprint at \$2.00; a Holt student edition at \$10.00; a Knopf edition at \$17.00; a North Books large-type edition at \$24.00; a Buccaneer Books reprint edition at \$26.95; a Viking Penguin paper edition, with a new introduction and notes, at \$8.95; a St. Martin edition, with a revised text and critical essays, at \$35.00; a Garland hardcover, with a newly edited text and critical apparatus, at \$55.00; and a Random House paper edition of the same text at \$9.00. See 7 BOOKS IN PRINT 1996-97, at 6542 (1996). The last four titles give some idea of the scholarly creativity and industry that public-domain accessibility can unleash.

159. See Warwick Gould, *Predators and Editors: Yeats in the Pre- and Post-Copyright Era*, in 8 OFFICE FOR HUMANITIES COMMUNICATION PUBLICATION, TEXTUAL MONOPOLIES:

may lose some of its perceived exclusivity when it is made more economically accessible to mass culture.

V. CONCLUSION: A PUBLIC-DOMAIN *ULYSSES*  
FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

The adventures of *Ulysses* on the tossing sea of American copyright law have been many and dramatic, like those of the Homeric wanderer himself. *Ulysses* fell victim early on to that convergence of American legal forces—obscenity statutes, customs seizures, the copyright law—that seemed specifically designed for the torment of authors living abroad, as well as “contrary to the welfare of letters in America,” as Ezra Pound insisted.<sup>160</sup> Forced to steer between a copyright code framed to protect book manufacturers and an obscenity law written to prevent the public from encountering in print its own Jazz-Age energies, *Ulysses* ran aground upon the economic and moral isolationism of America in the first half of the twentieth century.

To keep pirates from boarding the wreck and plundering a treasure that in fact lay open to all, Joyce and Bennett Cerf had recourse to the benign fiction of courtesy copyright. Now, more than sixty years after Random House first published *Ulysses*, the legal reality of the work’s public-domain status continues to be obscured by the increasingly pointless and pernicious myth of copyright. The present uncertainty surrounding the status of *Ulysses* as intellectual property in the United States is the direct result of the novel’s tortured copyright history. The law’s failure to protect *Ulysses* in 1922 gave rise to confusions that in the course of time have all but eclipsed the truth that, as we near the millennium, Joyce’s work continues to enjoy a wholly extralegal form of protection. The public domain, once a threat to Joyce’s interests, now faces the reverse menace of an unreasonably protracted de facto copyright monopoly in *Ulysses*.

In 1934, the equities unquestionably favored Joyce and his exclusive American publisher. Having lost more than a decade of the American market for his book and watched while pirates exploited his helplessness,<sup>161</sup> Joyce was entitled to a kind of makeshift restitution awarded at the expense

---

LITERARY COPYRIGHT AND THE PUBLIC DOMAIN 69, 74-80 (Patrick Parrinder & Warren Chernaik eds., 1997) (documenting the vastly increased sales in the United Kingdom of inexpensive editions of W.B. Yeats’s poems following the expiration of Yeats’s U.K. copyrights in 1990).

160. Ezra Pound, Letter to the Editor, *THE HOUND & HORN*, July-Sept. 1930, at 574, 577. reprinted in 5 *POETRY AND PROSE*, *supra* note 1, at 228.

161. In his action against Samuel Roth, Joyce asked for damages of \$500,000, basing his estimate of lost American sales on “a minimum price of ten dollars a copy and with a royalty to me of fifteen or twenty per cent, with an English-reading population of a hundred and twenty millions.” Plaintiff’s Deposition at 8, *Joyce v. Roth* (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Dec. 27, 1928) (Ezra Pound Papers, Beinecke Library, Yale University).



of the public domain through the tacit agreement of publishers. His success in getting an entire industry to assist him in his self-help was a tribute to his flair for publicity and his talent for authorial self-fashioning. He managed to turn the cult of genius that had grown up around him into an intangible asset and to transfer the goodwill accumulated thereby to his literary creation, *Ulysses*.

In generating sympathy for his beset book, moreover, Joyce may have kindled an unarticulated respect among the American public for his moral rights as an author—his rights of “paternity” over *Ulysses*.<sup>162</sup> Largely unrecognized by American law, *le droit moral* nevertheless appeals to an intuitive sense of justice that, together with trade courtesy, may have helped win for *Ulysses* the protection that it was denied by the letter of the copyright law.<sup>163</sup>

Today, however, the equities have shifted decisively in favor of the public domain. Had Joyce complied with the ad interim and manufacturing provisions and secured an American copyright in *Ulysses* in 1922, that copyright would have expired on January 1, 1998.<sup>164</sup> The argument for 1934 as the commencement of a *Ulysses* copyright in the United States has no basis in law and has lost the justification it once had in informal equity. To lay claim to copyright protection where no copyright exists is to play upon the credulity of the public and to take advantage of the legal risk aversion of publishers. Worst of all, it is to cheat the public domain.

To conceive of the public domain solely in terms of the expiration of intellectual property rights, as a kind of absence or negation of entitlements, is to miss the vital structural role that it plays in cultural production. The

162. Moral rights are those rights of authorship, including rights of attribution (“maternity” or “paternity” in the work) and integrity (freedom from distortion or mutilation of the work), that are protected in many countries. The Berne Convention specifically recognizes these rights, which are based on natural law conceptions and differ markedly from Anglo-American intellectual property rights. See Russell J. DaSilva, *Droit Moral and the Amoral Copyright: A Comparison of Artists’ Rights in France and the United States*, 28 BULL. OF THE COPYRIGHT SOC’Y 1, 3-37 (1980) (discussing the overlapping categories of moral rights as they have developed in French law). Although the United States is a signatory to the Berne Convention, Congress has declared that the Berne provisions “do not expand or reduce any right of an author of a work, whether claimed under Federal, State, or the common law . . .” Act of Oct. 31, 1988, Pub. L. No. 100-568, § 3(b), 102 Stat. 2853, 2853 (codified at 17 U.S.C. § 101 note (1994)).

Congress did enact the Visual Artists Rights Act of 1990, however, which protects rights of attribution and integrity in works of visual art. See 17 U.S.C. § 106A(a) (1994). But these rights diverge from their European cousins by being limited by a specific durational term (life of the author), applicability of fair use, and right of waiver. See *id.* § 106A(a), (d)-(e).

163. James Joyce himself was a strong advocate of authors’ moral rights. See JAMES JOYCE, AN ADDRESS TO THE FIFTEENTH INTERNATIONAL P.E.N. CONGRESS (1937), reprinted in THE CRITICAL WRITINGS OF JAMES JOYCE 274, 274-75 (Ellsworth Mason & Richard Ellmann eds., 1959) (claiming that the court injunction obtained by Joyce against Samuel Roth’s use of his name implies that a writing belongs to its author by virtue of a natural right and can be protected just as the author’s name is protected against wrongful use).

164. See 17 U.S.C. § 304(b) (1994) (providing for a term of 75 years from the initial date of copyright for works in their renewal term before January 1, 1978).

public domain operates at once as a terminus for copyrights and as a common reservoir from which new works, and therefore new copyrights, may be drawn. While it indeed presides over the demise of individual entitlements, the public domain also promises a rich afterlife of unimagined creativity. James Boyle has described the public domain as containing “the raw materials which future creators need to produce *their* little piece of innovation.”<sup>165</sup> Yet Boyle also warns that a conception of the public domain as a positive value is far from being widely shared: “The structure of our property rights discourse tends to undervalue the public domain, by failing to make actors and society as a whole internalize the losses caused by the extension and exercise of intellectual property rights.”<sup>166</sup> Without an adequate appreciation of the public costs of private intellectual property rights, the meaning and function of the public domain will remain largely invisible to us: a submerged continent of cultural wealth.

A moment of historical reflection will reveal that this Note examines two very different faces of the public domain. In the past, American copyright protectionism made expedient use of the public domain to penalize noncompliance with the manufacturing requirements and to reward domestic publishers and printers with a dubious windfall of unprotected foreign works. It is important to distinguish this punitive perversion of the public domain from its normal salutary function. As a tool of protectionism, the public domain undoubtedly deserved being branded as the accomplice of a thieving copyright law, as a receiver of stolen cultural goods. In its proper function, however, the public domain is a vast archive of freely usable works, a mechanism for generating and distributing creative opportunities.

In recent years, the public domain has been quietly enriched through the expiration of American copyrights in works created in the first decades of the twentieth century. Because advances in technology and mass-marketing have given modern intellectual property a potential dollar value undreamed of in earlier periods, copyright owners have had strong incentives to seek term extensions, either by legislation or by obfuscation.<sup>167</sup>

---

165. James Boyle, *A Politics of Intellectual Property: Environmentalism for the Net?*, 47 DUKE L.J. 87, 98-99 (1997).

166. *Id.* at 111. Boyle analogizes the public domain to the environment, suggesting that the negative externalities resulting from the expansion of intellectual property rights should be analyzed as, for example, industry-generated pollution has been, in terms of costs spread over the public at large and benefits redounding to relatively few owners. *See id.* at 108-12.

167. *See Keeping Copyright in Balance*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 21, 1998, at A10 (arguing that “no matter how the supporters of [the term extension] bill [such as the Walt Disney Corporation and the Gershwin Family Trust] frame their arguments, they have only one thing in mind: continuing to profit from copyright by changing the agreement under which it was obtained”); *see also Copyright Term Extension Bill Gets Mixed Reaction in House Hearing*, 50 Pat., Trademark & Copyright J. (BNA) No. 1237, at 282, 283 (July 20, 1995) (reporting Prof. Dennis Karjala’s criticism of term extension as a harmful diminution of the public domain).

Since copyrights are often thought of as ordinary personal property,<sup>168</sup> it is difficult to enlist broad support for a robust public domain. Yet by countenancing the formal or informal extension of copyrights and the concomitant erosion of the public domain, we risk rendering ourselves passive consumers of culture rather than active users and creators.<sup>169</sup> Where owners of copyrights may control intellectual property for inordinately long periods of time, culture ceases to be fertile and participatory and becomes static and administered.<sup>170</sup>

The lesson of *Ulysses* in America from 1922 to the present is that special interests and copyright jurisprudence are mutually antagonistic. Prior to the 1976 Copyright Act, undue solicitude for domestic book manufacturers deprived foreign-domiciled authors like Joyce of the fruits of their literary labor; of late, exaggerated concern for copyright owners poses a danger to the public domain. In both instances, a misplaced emphasis on one set of economic interests within the larger process of cultural production threatens to upset the careful balance of copyright logic. Both forms of protectionism have generated systematic pathologies or discontents that have affected copyright owners and users in different ways.

Limited copyrights and a strong public domain are reciprocally related. In providing for the transfer of intellectual property to the public domain after a certain term, Anglo-American copyright jurisprudence ensures the just and fertile distribution of cultural wealth. In the ecology of copyright, creators create with the expectation of deriving benefits from their creations for a limited term; in due course, their creations become freely available to others, who, acting upon those resources as users, may become creators in their turn.<sup>171</sup> The two phases of original expression—initial monopoly

---

168. See Neil Weinstock Netanel, *Copyright and a Democratic Civil Society*, 106 YALE L.J. 283, 386 (1996) (contending that a neoclassic-economics conception of copyright as property “upends copyright’s delicate balance between author incentives and public access”); cf. Boyle, *supra* note 165, at 105 (“[I]ntellectual property is a particularly inappropriate area to talk about property rights as if they were both natural and absolute.”).

169. See William W. Fisher III, *Reconstructing the Fair Use Doctrine*, 101 HARV. L. REV. 1661, 1768 (1988) (asserting, in the context of copyright law and the fair use doctrine, that “[a]ctive interaction with one’s cultural environment is good for the soul” and that “[a] person living the good life would be a creator, not just a consumer, of works of the intellect”).

170. See Steve Zeitlin, *Strangling Culture with a Copyright Law*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 25, 1998, at A15 (criticizing proposed legislation to extend copyright terms and noting the observation of Don Adams and Arlene Goldbard that “authentic cultural democracy . . . requires active participation in cultural life, not just passive consumption of cultural products”); see also Netanel, *supra* note 168, at 288 (proposing a “democratic paradigm” that would concede to “authors a limited proprietary entitlement, designed to make room for—and, indeed, to encourage—many transformative and educative uses for existing works”).

171. See 1 GOLDSTEIN, *supra* note 84, § 1.14, at 1:40 (“The balance that copyright law strikes between the incentives that authors and publishers need to produce original works and the freedom that they and others need to draw on earlier copyrighted works rests on a judgment about social benefit.”). But see Lloyd L. Weinreb, *Fair’s Fair: A Comment on the Fair Use Doctrine*, 103 HARV. L. REV. 1137, 1150 (1990) (characterizing incentive rationales for copyright as

followed by public-domain accessibility—are both instrumental to the goal of copyright in our legal system: the generation of more original expression. Having fulfilled and outlived its purpose as private property in the United States, *Ulysses* should be allowed to realize its equally vital purpose as a common treasure of the public domain.

---

“utilitarian justification[s]” and advocating broader conceptions of social value and “fairness” in assessing doctrines involving the creator-user relationship).