

# 12-3200-CV

---

United States Court of Appeals  
*for the*  
Second Circuit

---

THE AUTHORS GUILD, INC.,

*Associational Plaintiff,*

BETTY MILES, JOSEPH GOULDEN and JIM BOUTON,  
Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

*Plaintiffs-Appellees,*

– v. –

GOOGLE, INC.,

*Defendant-Appellant.*

---

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, NO. 05-CV-8136 (CHIN, J.)

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* ACADEMIC AUTHORS IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT AND REVERSAL  
[Full list of *Amici* is in Appendix A]**

---

*On the Brief:*

PAMELA SAMUELSON  
Richard M. Sherman Distinguished  
Professor of Law and Information  
University of California, Berkeley

DAVID HANSEN  
Digital Library Fellow  
University of California, Berkeley

JENNIFER M. URBAN  
SAMUELSON LAW, TECHNOLOGY  
& PUBLIC POLICY CLINIC  
University of California, Berkeley,  
School of Law  
396 Simon Hall  
Berkeley, California 94720  
(510) 642-7338

*Attorney for Amici Curiae*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF AMICI.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	4
I.    The Trial Court Should Have Conducted a Meaningful Inquiry into Whether the Named Plaintiffs Are Adequately Representing the Interests of Academic Authors .....	4
II.   The Named Plaintiffs’ Interests Are in Fundamental Conflict with Those of Academic Authors .....	9
CONCLUSION .....	18

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases:</b>	
<i>Amchem Products Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	9-10
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , 282 F.R.D. 384 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	8, 9, 16
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , 770 F. Supp. 2d 666 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) .....	7
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. 05-8136 (DC) (S.D.N.Y. filed Sept. 20, 2005).....	5
<i>Authors Guild v. HathiTrust</i> , No. 11-6351 (HB), 2012 WL 4808939 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 10, 2012).....	15, 17
<i>Baffa v. Donaldson, Lufkin &amp; Jenrette Sec. Corp.</i> , 222 F.3d 52 (2d Cir. 2000) .....	9
<i>Bieneman v. City of Chicago</i> , 864 F.2d 463 (7th Cir.1988).....	10
<i>Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.</i> , 448 F.3d 605 (2d Cir. 2006) .....	15
<i>Field v. Google Inc.</i> , 412 F. Supp. 2d 1106 (D. Nev. 2006) .....	14
<i>Gen. Tel. Co. of the Sw. v. Falcon</i> , 457 U.S. 147 (1982).....	4
<i>Hansberry v. Lee</i> , 311 U.S. 32 (1940).....	10, 11
<i>In re Initial Pub. Offering Sec. Litig.</i> , 471 F.3d 24 (2d Cir. 2006) .....	4, 5, 9
<i>In re Literary Works in Elec. Databases Copyright Litig.</i> , 654 F.3d 242 (2d Cir. 2011) .....	10
<i>Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.</i> , 336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	14, 15

<i>Parker v. Time Warner Entm't Co., L.P.</i> , 331 F.3d 13 (2d Cir. 2003) .....	9
<i>Pickett v. Iowa Beef Processors</i> , 209 F.3d 1276 (11th Cir. 2000) .....	10
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes</i> , 131 S.Ct. 2541 (2011) .....	4
 <b>Statutes &amp; Other Authorities:</b>	
17 U.S.C. § 107 (2006) .....	17
17 U.S.C. § 107(4) .....	17
17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) (2006) .....	12
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4) .....	2, 9
Fed. R. App. P. 29(c)(5) .....	1
Local Rules of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Rule 29.1 .....	1
1 McLAUGHLIN ON CLASS ACTIONS § 4:30 (8th ed., Westlaw 2012) .....	10
ALMA SWAN & SHERIDAN BROWN, OPEN ACCESS SELF-ARCHIVING: AN AUTHOR STUDY 10 (2005) .....	14
Brian Lavoie & Lorcan Dempsey, <i>Beyond 1923: Characteristics of Potentially In-Copyright Print Books in Library Collections</i> , D-LIB MAG., Nov./Dec. 2009 .....	6
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, OCCUPATIONAL OUTLOOK HANDBOOK, 2012-13 EDITION, Writers and Authors, Postsecondary Teachers (2012) .....	6
Hannibal Travis, <i>Google Book Search and Fair Use: iTunes for Authors or Napster for Books?</i> , 61 U. MIAMI L. REV. 87 (2006) .....	15
Jonathan Band, <i>The Long and Winding Road to the Google Books Settlement</i> , 9 J. MARSHALL REV. INTELL. PROP. L. 227 (2009) .....	15
Maria Pallante, <i>Keynote Address: Orphan Works &amp; Mass Digitization: Obstacles &amp; Opportunities</i> , 27 BERKELEY TECH. L.J. ____ (forthcoming 2012) .....	13

Matthew Sag, <i>The Google Book Settlement and the Fair Use Counterfactual</i> , 55 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 19 (2010).....	15
Nari Na, <i>Testing the Boundaries of Copyright Protection: The Google Book Library Project and the Fair Use Doctrine</i> , 16 CORNELL J. L. & PUB. POL'Y 417 (2006) .....	15
Steve Lawrence, <i>Free Online Availability Substantially Increases a Paper's Impact</i> , 411 NATURE 521 (2000).....	14
STUDY OF OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING, HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE SOAP PROJECT SURVEY: WHAT SCIENTISTS THINK ABOUT OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING 3 (2011).....	13
TBI COMM., INTECH PUB., AUTHOR ATTITUDES TOWARDS OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING 7 (2011) .....	13
U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, REPORT ON ORPHAN WORKS: A REPORT OF THE REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS 127 (2006) .....	13
WRIGHT & MILLER, 7A FED. PRAC. & PROC. CIV. § 1768 (3d ed., Westlaw 2012).....	10
Letter from Pamela Samuelson to Judge Denny Chin (Feb. 13, 2012), available at <a href="http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Academic_authors_letter_to_Judge_Chin_021312_final.pdf">http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Academic_authors_letter_to_Judge_Chin_021312_final.pdf</a> .....	8

## INTEREST OF AMICI

*Amici Curiae* are academic authors who oppose the plaintiffs' legal position in this case on the merits and who want the Google Books project to continue to provide public access to snippets from our books and from those of other academic authors because this promotes the progress of science in keeping with the constitutional purpose of copyright law. *Amici* include numerous academic authors who believe ourselves to be members of the class that was certified below.<sup>1</sup> We write to urge this Court to reverse the lower court's ruling certifying the class because of the irreconcilable conflict that exists between the interests of the three individual plaintiffs who claim to represent all authors of books scanned as part of the Google Library Project and the actual interests of academic authors on whose behalf they claim to speak and whose works, we believe, make up a majority of the works at issue in this case.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This brief is filed pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a) with the consent of all parties. Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(c)(5) and Rule 29.1 of the Local Rules of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, *Amici* hereby state that none of the parties to this case nor their counsel authored this brief in whole or in part; no party or any party's counsel contributed money intended to fund preparing or submitting the brief; and no one else other than *Amici* and their counsel contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting this brief.

Defendant-Appellant Google has consented to this filing, and Plaintiff-Appellees stated that they do not object except "to the extent it purports to be filed on behalf of all academic authors." While the signatories to this letter cannot, of course, speak for all 1.756 million post-secondary academics, but only for themselves, we nonetheless believe that the views we express in this brief are typical of the views of academic authors more generally.

<sup>2</sup> Although we are not prepared at this time to intervene in this lawsuit, we want the Court to understand that the plaintiffs' claims are antagonistic to our interests.

## **SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

Class certification was improperly granted below because the District Court failed to conduct a rigorous analysis of the adequacy of representation factor, as Rule 23(a)(4) requires. The three individual plaintiffs who claim to be class representatives are not academics and do not share the commitment to broad access to knowledge that predominates among academics. Although the District Court, in rejecting the proposed Google Books settlement last year, recognized that the class representatives and their lawyers had not adequately represented the interests of academic authors when negotiating the proposed settlement, the court brushed aside concerns about adequacy of representation when the case went back into litigation, despite an academic author submission that challenged class certification because of inadequacies in the plaintiffs' representation of academic author interests. These concerns should have been taken seriously because academic authors make up a substantial proportion of the class that the District Court certified; most of the books that Google scanned from major research library collections were written by academics. Academic authors overall greatly outnumber generalist authors such as the named plaintiffs.

Academic authors desire broad public access to their works such as that which the Google Books project provides. Although the District Court held that the plaintiffs had inadequately represented the interests of academic authors in relation

to the proposed settlement, it failed to recognize that pursuit of this litigation would be even more adverse to the interests of academic authors than the proposed settlement was. That settlement would at least have expanded public access to knowledge, whereas this litigation seeks to enjoin the Google Book Search operations and shut down access to works of class members even though academic authors would generally favor greater public access to their works. Because of this, the interests of academic authors cannot be adequately accommodated in this litigation by opting out of the class, as the District Court assumed. Indeed, the only way for the interests of academic authors to be vindicated in this litigation, given the positions that the plaintiffs have taken thus far, is for Google to prevail on its fair use defense and for the named plaintiffs to lose.

For this reason, there is a fundamental conflict between the interests of the named class representatives and the interests of academic authors. Academic authors typically benefit from Google Books, both because it makes their books more accessible to the public than ever before and because they use Google Books in conducting their own research. Google's fair use defense is more persuasive to academic authors than the plaintiffs' theory of infringement. The plaintiffs' request for an injunction to stop Google from making the Book Search corpus available would be harmful to academic author interests.



In short, a “win” in this case for the class representatives would be a “loss” for academic authors. It is precisely this kind of conflict that courts have long recognized should prevent class certification due to inadequate representation. The District Court failed to adequately address this fundamental conflict in its certification order, though it was well aware of the conflict through submissions and objections received from the settlement fairness hearing through to the hearings on the most recent class certification motions. Because of that failure, the order certifying the class should be reversed.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. The Trial Court Should Have Conducted a Meaningful Inquiry into Whether the Named Plaintiffs Are Adequately Representing the Interests of Academic Authors.**

Supreme Court and Second Circuit precedents require courts to conduct a “rigorous analysis” to determine that each element of the Rule 23 standards for class certification has been satisfied. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 131 S.Ct. 2541, 2551 (2011); *Gen. Tel. Co. of the Sw. v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 160-61 (1982); *In re Initial Pub. Offering Sec. Litig.*, 471 F.3d 24, 29 (2d Cir. 2006). One of those standards is adequacy of representation by the class representatives. Determinations about adequacy and other factors “can be made only if the judge resolves factual disputes relevant to each Rule 23 requirement . . . and is persuaded to rule, based on the relevant facts and the applicable legal standard that the

requirement is met.” *In re IPO Sec. Litig.*, 471 F.3d at 41. Failure to engage in this kind of rigorous analysis constitutes an abuse of discretion.

Several submissions have brought to the District Court’s attention the likelihood that academic authors constitute a substantial part of the class. *See* Letter from Pamela Samuelson, Professor of Law and Information, UC Berkeley to Judge Denny Chin (Feb. 13, 2012), *available at* [http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Academic\\_authors\\_letter\\_to\\_Judge\\_Chin\\_021312\\_final.pdf](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Academic_authors_letter_to_Judge_Chin_021312_final.pdf) (“[S]o many of the books that Google has scanned are academic works that are out-of-print and/or orphan works.”); A95-A118 (Letter from Pamela Samuelson, Professor of Law and Information, UC Berkeley to Judge Denny Chin (Jan. 27, 2010) ECF No. 893) (“[Authors Guild members] are unrepresentative of the interests of academic authors whose books constitute most of the GBS corpus.”);<sup>3</sup> Letter from the American Association of University Professors to Judge Denny Chin (Sept. 4, 2009) ECF No. 398; Letter from Pamela Samuelson, Professor of Law and Information, UC Berkeley to Judge Denny Chin (Sept. 3, 2009) ECF No. 336; Letter from University of California Faculty to Judge Denny Chin (Aug. 13, 2009) ECF No. 134. This substantiality is, moreover, evident given that the Google Library Project, which is the focus of this litigation, involved

---

<sup>3</sup> Several of the documents cited herein are included in the docket from the record below, but not in the parties’ joint appendix. To aid the Court, we cite these documents in standard form followed by their CM/ECF docket number from the record of the case below, *Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.*, No. 05-8136 (DC) (S.D.N.Y. filed Sept. 20, 2005).

scanning of millions of books from the collections of major research libraries. Fourth Amd. Class Action Comp., at ¶3, ECF 985. One empirical study reports that scholarly works predominate in the collections of Google's library partners. See Brian Lavoie & Lorcan Dempsey, *Beyond 1923: Characteristics of Potentially In-Copyright Print Books in Library Collections*, D-LIB MAG., Nov./Dec. 2009, <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november09/lavoie/11lavoie.html> (reporting that 93% of the collections of three major academic partners in the Google Books project are nonfiction and that 78% of those are aimed at a scholarly audience). This proposition is bolstered by the fact that in the United States, academics far outnumber generalist writers (such as the named plaintiffs in this case)<sup>4</sup> by a factor of more than ten to one. See BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, OCCUPATIONAL OUTLOOK HANDBOOK, 2012-13 EDITION, Writers and Authors, Postsecondary Teachers (2012) (listing 145,900 writer and author jobs, as compared to 1,756,000 postsecondary jobs).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Representative Plaintiffs include Betty Miles, an author of children's and young adult fiction, Joseph Goulden, author of books such as *The Superlawyers*, and Jim Bouton, author of a baseball memoir. Fourth Amd. Class Action Comp., at ¶¶ 12, 15, 16, ECF 985.

<sup>5</sup> The survey of published authors on which Google relied in opposing class certification suggests that the class plaintiffs here may not even represent adequately the interests of non-academic authors. Dec. of Hal Poret in Support of Google's Opp. to Pltf's Mot. for Class Cert., at 6-12, ECF No. 1001 (showing that only a small minority of published authors object to Google's making snippets of their books available or think that snippet views are harmful to their interests).

The District Court’s failure to investigate class composition and the risks of inadequate representation is surprising given that the very same court had ruled only just over a year before that the very same lawyers and named plaintiffs had inadequately represented the interests of academic authors, among others, when they negotiated a proposed settlement of the class action lawsuit brought against Google for scanning books from major research library collections. *Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.*, 770 F. Supp. 2d 666, 679 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (“[T]he class plaintiffs have not adequately represented the interests of at least certain class members.”). The court cited inadequacy of representation as one of the major reasons why the proposed settlement had to be rejected. *Id.*

The court's decision quoted from an academic author submission that explained one of the key reasons for this inadequacy: “ ‘Academic authors, almost by definition, are committed to maximizing access to knowledge. The [Authors] Guild and the [Association of American Publishers], by contrast, are institutionally committed to maximizing profits.’ (Samuelson Letter 3 (ECF No. 893)).” *Id.* A footnote also observed that academic authors, unlike the named plaintiffs, thought that orphan works should be available on an open access basis. *Id.* at 679 n.16. The court further found that the named plaintiffs had inadequately represented the interests of authors of unclaimed works. *Id.* at 680.

Concerns about inadequacy of representation of the interests of academic authors were further brought to the District Court's attention during the pendency of the class certification motion through a letter submitted to the District Court. Letter from Pamela Samuelson to Judge Denny Chin (Feb. 13, 2012), *available at* [http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Academic\\_authors\\_letter\\_to\\_Judge\\_Chin\\_021312\\_final.pdf](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Academic_authors_letter_to_Judge_Chin_021312_final.pdf).

Despite the strong likelihood that academic authors constitute a substantial portion of the class and despite the court's previous recognition that the named plaintiffs had inadequately represented the interests of academic authors, the District Court did not undertake any fact-finding about class composition. Rather, it assumed the Rule 23 standard would be satisfied if the plaintiffs "are interested enough to be forceful advocates and [if] there is reason to believe that a substantial portion of the class would agree with their representatives were they given a choice." *Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.*, 282 F.R.D. 384, 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2012). The court was, however, merely speculating that this was so and presumed that the relief requested by the representative plaintiffs—a massive award of statutory damages and an injunction to stop, among other things, Google from offering snippets from in-copyright books in response to search queries—would benefit the class if forcefully sought by the plaintiffs. The court further assumed that insofar as some class members had different interests than the named plaintiffs, they

“could request to be excluded from the class,” presumably by opting out. *Id.* at 394, n.8. But the interests of academic authors cannot be satisfied by opting out of the class because academic authors will be harmed by the very injunctive relief that these plaintiffs seek.

This Court has previously remanded on the issue of class certification when the District Court certified a class based on “assumptions of fact rather than on findings of fact.” *Parker v. Time Warner Entm’t Co., L.P.*, 331 F.3d 13, 21 (2d Cir. 2003). While *In re IPO Litigation* makes clear that the full extent of the factual inquiry is largely within the discretion of the district court, *In re IPO Litig.*, 471 F.3d at 41, that discretion can be abused, as it was in this case. Given the persistence and prior notice of academic authors’ objections, the district court should have, at a minimum, made an inquiry into the nature of the works in the corpus and the types of authors who have interests in those works.

## **II. The Named Plaintiffs’ Interests Are in Fundamental Conflict with Those of Academic Authors.**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) requires that representative plaintiffs fairly and adequately represent the interest of all class members. Adequacy “entails inquiry as to whether . . . plaintiff’s interests are antagonistic to the interest of other members of the class.” *Baffa v. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette Sec. Corp.*, 222 F.3d 52, 60 (2d Cir. 2000). The Supreme Court in *Amchem*

*Products Inc. v. Windsor* explained that the focus of the inquiry is on uncovering “conflicts of interest between named parties and the class they seek to represent.” 521 U.S. 591, 625 (1997). The conflict “must be ‘fundamental’ to violate Rule 23(a)(4).” *In re Literary Works in Elec. Databases Copyright Litig.*, 654 F.3d 242, 249 (2d Cir. 2011).

Fundamental conflicts exist where “class members’ interests directly oppose those of the proposed representative.” 1 MCLAUGHLIN ON CLASS ACTIONS § 4:30 (8th ed., Westlaw 2012); *see also Pickett v. Iowa Beef Processors*, 209 F.3d 1276, 1280 (11th Cir. 2000) (“a class cannot be certified when its members have opposing interests or when it consists of members who benefit from the same acts alleged to be harmful to other members of the class”); *Bieneman v. City of Chicago*, 864 F.2d 463, 465 (7th Cir.1988). The Supreme Court’s decision in *Hansberry v. Lee*, 311 U.S. 32 (1940) has been characterized as “a classic example of the type of disqualifying conflict that can arise between representatives and some class members.” WRIGHT & MILLER, 7A FED. PRAC. & PROC. CIV. § 1768 (3d ed., Westlaw 2012). In *Hansberry*, the plaintiffs sought to enforce a racially restrictive covenant on behalf of a class of landowners, although some of these landowners objected to the enforcement of the covenant (most notable were the objections raised by African American landowners included in the class). *Hansberry*, 311 U.S. at 33-45. Concluding that class representation was

inadequate, Justice Stone (writing for the Court) explained that “[b]ecause of the dual and potentially conflicting interests of those who are putative parties to the agreement in compelling or resisting its performance, it is impossible to say, solely because they are parties to it, that any two of them are of the same class.” *Id.* at 44-45.<sup>6</sup>

Like *Hansberry*, the conflict in this case is not conjectural or speculative, but very real to those academic authors who face the prospect of losing access to Google Books and to the benefits that flow from greater public access to their works that Google Books has made possible. In addition, like the land-owners in *Hansberry* who objected to being included in a class that sought to enforce racially-restrictive covenants, *Amici* disagree with plaintiffs’ pursuit of this litigation both because of the immediate harm to their interests if the plaintiffs prevail and because we disagree in principle with litigation that seeks to restrict

---

<sup>6</sup> Justice Stone went on to explain: “It is one thing to say that some members of a class may represent other members in a litigation where the sole and common interest of the class in the litigation, is either to assert a common right or to challenge an asserted obligation. . . . It is quite another to hold that all those who are free alternatively either to assert rights or to challenge them are of a single class, so that any group merely because it is of the class so constituted, may be deemed adequately to represent any others of the class in litigating their interests in either alternative. Such a selection of representatives for purposes of litigation, whose substantial interests are not necessarily or even probably the same as those whom they are deemed to represent, does not afford that protection to absent parties which due process requires.” *Hansberry*, 311 U.S. at 44-45.



access to information and to reap a windfall from the defendant for uses that we consider beneficial.<sup>7</sup>

The plaintiffs have taken a position on the record about one conflict of interest between them and academic authors when they responded to an academic author objection to the proposed settlement in February 2010. The academic author objection asserted that orphan works should be available on an open access basis instead of being commercialized on restrictive proprietary terms through the end of the works' copyrights, as the proposed settlement would have done. Letter from Pamela Samuelson to Judge Denny Chin (Sept. 3, 2009) ECF No. 336; *see also* Letter from the American Association of University Professors to Judge Denny Chin (Sept. 4, 2009) ECF No. 398 (“The AAUP believes that open access to academic research and the ability to disseminate scholarly publications freely are essential to the academic enterprise.”). The plaintiffs responded by saying that “[t]he interests of ‘open access’ advocates, many of who initially shared Google’s expansive notions of fair use, plainly are *inimical* to the Class.’ Pltf’s Supp. Mem. Responding to Specific Objections 23, ECF No. 955 (emphasis in the original).

---

<sup>7</sup> In addition to injunctive relief, plaintiffs seek a statutory damage award in this case. Fourth Amd. Class Action Comp., at 14-15 ECF No. 985. A statutory damage award for an estimated 12 million in-copyright books that Google has scanned from research library collections could result in a minimum award of more than \$9 billion. 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) (2006) (setting the minimum statutory damage award for non-innocent infringement at \$750 per work infringed).

This statement plainly shows that the plaintiffs have a contrary view to academic authors on this important point.<sup>8</sup>

*Amici* and the academic objectors to which the Supplemental Memorandum responded are by no means alone in their support of open access principles. A 2011 survey of academic authors, which asked about attitudes toward open access publishing, showed that over 75% of the more than 8,000 respondents indicated that it was “ ‘very important’ or ‘important’ to be able to offer their work free online to a global audience.” TBI COMM., INTECH PUB., AUTHOR ATTITUDES TOWARDS OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING 7 (2011), [http://www.intechopen.com/public\\_files/Intech\\_OA\\_Apr11.pdf](http://www.intechopen.com/public_files/Intech_OA_Apr11.pdf). Indeed, support for open access is so strong that authors agree to this approach even when it might mean that the *author* rather than the *user* paid for accessibility. *Id.*; *see also* STUDY OF OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING, HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE SOAP PROJECT SURVEY: WHAT SCIENTISTS THINK ABOUT OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING 3 (2011), <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1101/1101.5260.pdf> (finding that 89% of nearly

---

<sup>8</sup> It is worth noting that the U.S. Copyright Office has taken the position that orphan works should be freely reusable. U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, REPORT ON ORPHAN WORKS: A REPORT OF THE REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS 127 (2006) (proposing a legislative amendment that would encourage the free use of true orphan works after a diligent search for their owners); *see also* Maria Pallante, *Keynote Address: Orphan Works & Mass Digitization: Obstacles & Opportunities*, 27 BERKELEY TECH. L.J. \_\_ (forthcoming 2012), available at [http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/2012-04-12\\_Pallante\\_Orphan\\_Works\\_Speech-1\(1\).pdf](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/2012-04-12_Pallante_Orphan_Works_Speech-1(1).pdf) (“We seem to have general agreement that in the case of a true orphan, where there is no copyright owner and therefore no beneficiary of the copyright term, it does not further the objectives of the copyright system to deny use of the work, sometimes for decades. In other words, it is not good policy to protect a copyright when there is no evidence of a copyright owner.”).

40,000 published researchers thought that journals publishing articles on an open access basis were beneficial to their field).

While academic authors reap many benefits from making their works available on an open access basis, *see, e.g.*, Steve Lawrence, *Free Online Availability Substantially Increases a Paper's Impact*, 411 NATURE 521 (2000), one of the primary motivations for academic authors to publish works on an open access basis is their support for “[t]he principle of free access for all readers.”

ALMA SWAN & SHERIDAN BROWN, OPEN ACCESS SELF-ARCHIVING: AN AUTHOR STUDY 10 (2005),

[http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded\\_documents/Open%20Access%20Self%20Archiving-an%20author%20study.pdf](http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/Open%20Access%20Self%20Archiving-an%20author%20study.pdf) (noting that this principle is the most oft-cited reason by survey respondents for publishing with journals whose policies allow for open access).

However, the most fundamental conflict of interest that warrants decertification of the class concerns the merits of the plaintiffs' claims. Academic authors like *Amici* find Google's fair use defense more persuasive than the named plaintiffs' theory of infringement. Making digital copies of works to index their contents and to make small portions more accessible is a transformative use that supports a finding of fair use. *Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.*, 336 F.3d 811, 818-20 (9th Cir. 2003); *Field v. Google Inc.*, 412 F. Supp. 2d 1106, 1115 (D. Nev. 2006);

*Authors Guild v. HathiTrust*, No. 11-6351 (HB), 2012 WL 4808939, at \*11-12 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 10, 2012); *see also Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.*, 448 F.3d 605, 609 (2d Cir. 2006). Most of the books in the Google Books corpus are non-fiction scholarly works which tends to favor fair use, especially when a use is transformative. *HathiTrust*, at \*12. Although Google scanned the contents of whole books, this factor does not weigh against fair use if it was necessary to do so in order to make the transformative uses at issue. *Id.* at \*12; *Arriba Soft*, 336 F.3d at 821. Because Google only displays a few short snippets of in-copyright works, there is unlikely to be any harm to the market for these works. *HathiTrust*, at \*13-14 (finding unpersuasive the Authors Guild's arguments about harm to licensing markets); *see also Bill Graham Archives*, 448 F.3d at 614-15 (copyright holders cannot preempt transformative markets). Indeed, academic authors benefit from greater accessibility to their works made possible by Google Books.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Google's fair use defense has found support with numerous legal commentators. *See, e.g.*, Jonathan Band, *The Long and Winding Road to the Google Books Settlement*, 9 J. MARSHALL REV. INTELL. PROP. L. 227, 237-60 (2009); Nari Na, *Testing the Boundaries of Copyright Protection: The Google Book Library Project and the Fair Use Doctrine*, 16 CORNELL J. L. & PUB. POL'Y 417, 434-45 (2006); Matthew Sag, *The Google Book Settlement and the Fair Use Counterfactual*, 55 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 19, 23 (2010); Hannibal Travis, *Google Book Search and Fair Use: iTunes for Authors or Napster for Books?*, 61 U. MIAMI L. REV. 87, 91-94 (2006). *See also* Br. of Amici Curiae American Library Association, et al., 4-10 ECF No. 1048 (describing in great detail the enormous educational and public benefits of GBS and how those benefits tend to tilt the analysis in favor of fair use).

*Amici* are, in other words, not authors who “prefer to leave the alleged violation of their rights unremedied,” as the District Court assumed. *Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.*, 282 F.R.D. 384, 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2012). There is, in our view, no infringement that requires the grant of injunctive or monetary relief. The only way that the named plaintiffs could adequately represent the interests of academic authors at this point would be by dropping this litigation.

The most recent evidence of a conflict between the interests of the plaintiffs in this case and the interests of academic authors is the fact that the plaintiffs' lawyers opposed the filing of an academic author amicus brief earlier this year to express a legal theory that directly contradicts the plaintiffs' position. Br. Digital Humanities and Law Scholars as Amici Curiae in Partial Support of Defendants' Mot. for Sum. Judg. or in the Alternative Sum. Adjud., ECF No. 1055; *see also* Plaintiffs' Mem.in Opp.to Mot. for Leave to File Amicus Briefs, ECF No. 1056. The District Court accepted the filing of this brief over plaintiffs' objection. Order dated Aug. 15, 2012, ECF. No. 1060. *Amici* in that brief observed that “[m]ass digitization, like that employed by Google, is a key enabler of socially valuable computational and statistical research (often called “data mining” or “text mining”),” Br. Digital Humanities and Law Scholars, at 1 ECF No. 1055, which allows researchers to discover and use the non-copyrightable facts and ideas that are contained within the collection of copyrighted works themselves.

The brief argued that copying of copyrighted works undertaken in order to gain access to facts and ideas they contain is fair use, not copyright infringement.

*Id.* The computational uses of the Google Books corpus that Google has pioneered have greatly enhanced public access to information and have promoted scholarship and research, all of which are favored uses under the first fair use factor, 17 U.S.C. § 107 (2006) (fair use “for purposes such as . . . scholarship, or research, is not an infringement”), while causing little (if any) harm to the market for the work. 17 U.S.C. § 107(4) (requiring the court to examine “the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work”). A virtually identical brief helped to persuade a District Court in the *Authors Guild v. HathiTrust* lawsuit to uphold the fair use defense of Google’s library partners because of the nonexpressive uses the latter were making of copyrighted works in the digital corpus that the libraries got from Google. *Authors Guild v. HathiTrust*, No. 11-6351 (HB), 2012 WL 4808939, at \*14 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 10, 2012) (characterizing the uses being made by the libraries as “fall[ing] safely within the protection of fair use”) and at \*11, n.22 (citing approvingly to the Digital Humanities and Law Scholars brief).

## CONCLUSION

In sum, a fundamental conflict of interests exists between the interests of the plaintiffs and the interests of academic authors. The former have not and cannot adequately represent the interests of the latter in this litigation. This Court should consequently reverse the District Court's decision to certify the class in this case.

Dated: November 16, 2012

/s/ Jennifer M. Urban  
Jennifer M. Urban  
SAMUELSON LAW,  
TECHNOLOGY  
& PUBLIC POLICY CLINIC  
University of California, Berkeley,  
School of Law  
396 Simon Hall  
Berkeley, California 94720  
510-642-7338

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FRAP 32(a)**

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B) and 29(d) because this brief contains 4,496 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).
2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in Times New Roman, 14 point font.

/s/ Jennifer M. Urban  
SAMUELSON LAW,  
TECHNOLOGY  
& PUBLIC POLICY CLINIC  
University of California, Berkeley,  
School of Law  
396 Simon Hall  
Berkeley, California 94720  
510-642-7338



## **ADDENDUM**

## APPENDIX A

List of *Amici* Academic Authors (whose academic affiliations are for identification purposes only):

**Harold Abelson**

Professor of Computer Science and Engineering  
MIT

*Author of:* STRUCTURE AND INTERPRETATION OF COMPUTER PROGRAMS (MIT Press, 1985)

**Steve Anderson**

Associate Professor, School of Cinematic Arts  
University of Southern California

*Author of:* TECHNOLOGIES OF HISTORY: VISUAL MEDIA AND THE ECCENTRICITY OF THE PAST (Dartmouth College Press, 2011)

**Eric Bakovic**

Associate Professor  
Linguistics

University of California, San Diego

*Author of:* BLOCKING AND COMPLEMENTARITY IN PHONOLOGICAL THEORY (Equinox Publishing, 2012)

**Ann M. Bartow**

Professor of Law  
Pace Law School

**Steven W. Bender**

Professor  
Seattle University School of Law

*Author of, among others:* RUN FOR THE BORDER: VICE AND VIRTUE IN U.S.–MEXICO BORDER CROSSINGS (NYU Press, 2012)

**Mario Biagioli**

Distinguished Professor of Law, Science and Technology Studies, and History  
University of California, Davis

*Author of:* MAKING AND UNMAKING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (with Martha Woodmansee & Peter Jaszi) (University of Chicago Press, 2011)

**James Boyle**

William Neal Reynolds Professor of Law  
Duke University School of Law

*Author of, among others:* THE PUBLIC DOMAIN: ENCLOSING THE COMMONS OF THE MIND (Yale University Press, 2008)

**Annemarie Bridy**

Associate Professor  
College of Law  
University of Idaho

**Dan L. Burk**

Chancellor's Professor of Law  
University of California, Irvine

*Author of:* THE PATENT CRISIS AND HOW THE COURTS CAN SOLVE IT (University of Chicago Press, 2009).

**Dwayne K. Buttler**

Evelyn J. Schneider Endowed Chair for Scholarly Communication  
Professor  
University Libraries  
University of Louisville

**L. Jean Camp**

Professor of Informatics  
Indiana University

*Author of, among others:* THE ECONOMICS OF FINANCIAL AND MEDICAL IDENTITY THEFT (with M. Eric Johnson) (Springer, 2012)

**Michael A. Carrier**

Professor of Law  
Rutgers School of Law-Camden

*Author of:* INNOVATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: HARNESSING THE POWER OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND ANTITRUST LAW (Oxford, 2009)

**Michael Carroll**

Professor of Law  
Director, Program on Information Justice and Intellectual Property  
Washington College of Law  
American University

**Eric Cheyfitz**

Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters  
Cornell University

*Author of:* THE POETIC OF IMPERIALISM: TRANSLATION AND COLONIZATION FROM  
THE TEMPEST TO TARZAN (Oxford University Press, 1991)

**Margaret Chon**

Donald & Lynda Horowitz Professor for the Pursuit of Justice  
Seattle University

*Author of:* RACE, RIGHTS AND REPARATION: LAW AND THE JAPANESE AMERICAN  
INTERMENT (Aspen Publishers, 2001)

**Michael J. Churgin**

Raybourne Thompson Centennial Professor in Law  
The University of Texas at Austin

**Daniel Cohen**

Associate Professor of History  
Director, Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media  
George Mason University

*Author of:* EQUATIONS FROM GOD: PURE MATHEMATICS AND VICTORIAN FAITH  
(Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007)

**Julie E. Cohen**

Professor of Law  
Georgetown Law Center

*Author of:* CONFIGURING THE NETWORKED SELF: LAW, CODE, AND THE PLAY OF  
EVERYDAY PRACTICE (Yale University Press, 2012)

**Kevin Emerson Collins**

Professor of Law  
Washington University School of Law

**Kenneth D. Crews**

Director, Copyright Advisory Office  
Faculty Member, Columbia Law School

*Author of, among others:* COPYRIGHT LAW FOR LIBRARIANS AND EDUCATORS:  
CREATIVE STRATEGIES AND PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS (3d ed., ALA Editions,  
2012).

**William M. Cross**

Director, Copyright and Digital Scholarship Center  
North Carolina State University Libraries

**Jonathan Culler**

Class of 1916 Professor of English  
and Comparative Literature  
Cornell University

*Author of:* ON DECONSTRUCTION: THEORY AND CRITICISM AFTER STRUCTURALISM  
(Cornell University Press, 1982)

**Robert Darnton**

Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor and  
University Librarian  
Harvard University

*Author of, among others:* POETRY AND THE POLICE: COMMUNICATION NETWORKS IN  
EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PARIS (Harvard University Press, 2010).

**Peter Decherney**

Associate Professor of Cinema Studies, English, and Communication  
University of Pennsylvania

*Author of, among others:* HOLLYWOOD'S COPYRIGHT WARS: FROM EDISON TO THE  
INTERNET (Columbia University Press, 2012)

**Peter DiCola**

Associate Professor  
Northwestern University School of Law

*Author of, among others:* CREATIVE LICENSE: THE LAW AND CULTURE OF DIGITAL  
SAMPLING (with Kembrew McLeod) (Duke University Press, 2011)

**David L Dill**

Professor  
Stanford University

*Author of:* TRACE THEORY FOR AUTOMATIC HIERARCHICAL VERIFICATION OF  
SPEED-INDEPENDENT CIRCUITS (ACM Distinguished Dissertation) (MIT  
Press, 2003)

**Danielle Dirks, Ph.D.**

Assistant Professor of Sociology  
Occidental College

*Author of:* HOW ETHICAL SYSTEMS CHANGE: LYNCHING AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT  
(with Sheldon Ekland-Olson) (Routledge, 2011)

**Holly Doremus**

James H. House and Hiram H. Hurd Professor of Law  
University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY LAW (with Albert C. Lin &  
Ronald H. Rosenberg) (6th ed. Foundation Press, 2012)

**Johanna Drucker**

Martin and Bernard Breslauer Professor of Bibliographical Studies  
Graduate School of Education and Information Studies  
University of California, Los Angeles

*Author of, among others:* SPEC LAB: DIGITAL AESTHETICS AND SPECULATIVE  
COMPUTING (University of Chicago Press, 2008)

**Paul Duguid**

Adjunct Professor  
School of Information  
University of California, Berkeley

*Author of:* THE SOCIAL LIFE OF INFORMATION (with J.S. Brown) (Harvard Business  
School Press, 2000)

**Joseph Dumit**

Director of Science and Technology Studies  
Professor of Anthropology  
University of California, Davis

*Author of, among others:* PICTURING PERSONHOOD: BRAIN SCANS AND BIOMEDICAL  
AMERICA (Princeton University Press, 2004)

**Jeffrey L. Elman**

Dean of Social Sciences  
University of California, San Diego

*Author of, among others:* RETHINKING INNATENESS: A CONNECTIONIST  
PERSPECTIVE ON DEVELOPMENT (MIT PRESS, 1996)

**Malcolm Feeley**

Claire Sanders Clements Dean's Professor  
University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* THE PROCESS IS THE PUNISHMENT (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1979, 1992)

**Edward Feigenbaum**

Kumagai Professor of Computer Science (Emeritus)  
Stanford University

*Author of, among others:* THE FIFTH GENERATION: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND JAPAN'S COMPUTER CHALLENGE TO THE WORLD (Addison Wesley, 1983)

**Brett Frischmann**

Professor of Law  
Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law

*Author of:* INFRASTRUCTURE: THE SOCIAL VALUE OF SHARED RESOURCES (Oxford University Press, 2012)

**William T. Gallagher**

Professor of Law  
Associate Dean for Faculty Scholarship  
Golden Gate University School of Law

**Laura N. Gasaway**

Paul B. Eaton Distinguished Professor of Law  
University of North Carolina School of Law

*Author of, among others:* COPYRIGHT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR INFORMATION PROFESSIONALS: FROM THE COLUMNS OF AGAINST THE GRAIN (Purdue University Press, 2012)

**Shubha Ghosh**

Vilas Research Fellow & Professor of Law  
The University of Wisconsin Law School

*Author of, among others:* UNDERSTANDING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW (with Donald S. Chisum, Tyler T. Ochoa, and Mary LaFrance) (2d ed. LexisNexis, 2011)

**Tarleton Gillespie**

Associate Professor

Department of Communication and Department of Information Science

Cornell University

*Author of:* WIRED SHUT: COPYRIGHT AND THE SHAPE OF DIGITAL CULTURE (MIT Press, 2007)

**Robert J. Glushko**

School of Information

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of:* DOCUMENT ENGINEERING: ANALYZING AND DESIGNING DOCUMENTS FOR BUSINESS INFORMATICS AND WEB SERVICES (MIT Press, 2005)

**Tanya Maria Golash-Boza**

Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

University of California, Merced

*Author of, among others:* DUE PROCESS DENIED: DETENTIONS AND DEPORTATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES (Routledge, 2012)

**Eric Goldman**

Professor of Law and Director, High Tech Law Institute

Santa Clara University School of Law

**Mary L. Gray**

Associate Professor

Indiana University

*Author of, among others:* OUT IN THE COUNTRY: YOUTH, MEDIA, AND QUEER VISIBILITY IN RURAL AMERICA (NYU Press, 2009)

**Bronwyn Hall**

Professor of the Graduate School

Department of Economics

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* HANDBOOK OF THE ECONOMICS OF INNOVATION (with Nathan Rosenberg) (North-Holland, 2010)



**Dina Francesca Haynes**

Professor

New England School of law

*Author of, among others:* ON THE FRONTLINES: GENDER, WAR, AND THE POST-CONFLICT PROCESS (with Fionnuala Ní Aoláin & Naomi Cahn) (Oxford University Press, 2010)

**Carla Hesse**

Dean of Social Sciences

Peder Sather Professor of History

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* THE OTHER ENLIGHTENMENT: HOW FRENCH WOMEN BECAME MODERN (Princeton University Press, 2001)

**Michael Heyman**

Professor

John Marshall Law School

**Peter B. Hirtle**

Senior Policy Advisor

Cornell University Library

Cornell University

*Author of, among others:* COPYRIGHT AND CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS: GUIDELINES FOR DIGITIZATION FOR U.S. LIBRARIES, ARCHIVES, AND MUSEUMS (with Emily Hudson and Andrew Kenyon) (Cornell University Library, 2009)

**Harry Hochheiser**

Assistant Professor

Department of Biomedical Informatics

University of Pittsburgh

*Author of:* RESEARCH METHODS IN HUMAN COMPUTER-INTERACTION (Wiley, 2010)

**Alan Hyde**

Distinguished Professor and Sidney Reitman Scholar

Rutgers University School of Law

*Author of, among others:* WORKING IN SILICON VALLEY: ECONOMIC AND LEGAL ANALYSIS OF A HIGH-VELOCITY LABOR MARKET (M E Sharpe, 2003)

**Lewis Hyde**

Richard L. Thomas Professor of Creative Writing  
Kenyon College

*Author of, among others:* COMMON AS AIR (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2010) and  
THE GIFT (Random House, 1983)

**Judith E. Innes**

Professor Emerita  
Department of City and Regional Planning  
University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* PLANNING WITH COMPLEXITY: INTRODUCTION TO  
COLLABORATIVE RATIONALITY FOR PUBLIC POLICY (with David Boohar)  
(Routledge, 2010)

**Dr. Pamela Irving Jackson**

Professor of Sociology  
Director, Justice Studies Program  
Rhode Island College

*Author of, among others:* MINORITY GROUP THREAT, CRIME, AND POLICING:  
SOCIAL CONTEXT AND SOCIAL CONTROL (Praeger, 1989)

**Peter Jaszi**

Washington College of Law  
American University

*Author of, among others:* RECLAIMING FAIR USE (with Patricia Aufderheide)  
(University of Chicago Press, 2011)

**Sarah Jeong**

Associate Librarian, Research & Instruction - Science  
Wake Forest University

**Matthew L. Jockers**

Assistant Professor of English  
Fellow, Center for Digital Research in the Humanities  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

**Douglas W. Jones**

Associate Professor  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Iowa

*Author of:* BROKEN BALLOTS: WILL YOUR VOTE COUNT (CSLI Publications, 2012)

**Faye E. Jones**

Director and Professor  
The Florida State University  
College of Law Research Center

**Russell Jones**

Professor of the Graduate School  
Department of Plant and Microbial Biology  
University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* THE MOLECULAR LIFE OF PLANTS (with Helen Ougham, Howard Thomas, and Susan Waaland) (Wiley-Blackwell, 2012)

**Dan Jurafsky**

Professor  
Stanford University

*Author of:* SPEECH AND LANGUAGE PROCESSING (Pearson 2009)

**Steven Justice**

Professor  
University of California, Berkeley

*Author of:* WRITING AND REBELLION: ENGLAND IN 1381 (University of California Press, 1994)

**Amy Kapczynski**

Associate Professor of Law  
Yale Law School

*Author of:* "Access to Knowledge: A Conceptual Genealogy," in ACCESS TO KNOWLEDGE IN THE AGE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (Krikorian & Kapczynski, eds.) (Zone Press, 2010).

**Dennis S. Karjala**

Jack E. Brown Professor of Law  
Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law  
Arizona State University

**Molly Keener**

Associate Librarian, Scholarly Communication  
Wake Forest University

**Christopher Kelty**

Associate Professor  
Information Studies Department  
UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies  
*Author of: TWO BITS: THE CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF FREE SOFTWARE* (Duke University Press, 2008)

**S. Bruce King**

Associate Provost of Research  
Professor of Chemistry  
Wake Forest University  
*Chapter author, among others, in: NITRIC OXIDE DONORS: FOR PHARMACEUTICAL AND BIOLOGICAL APPLICATION* (Peng George Wang et al., eds.) (John Wiley, 2010)

**Virginia Kuhn, PhD**

Associate Director  
Institute for Multimedia Literacy  
Assistant Professor  
School of Cinematic Arts  
University of Southern California

**Leslie Kurke**

Gladys Rehard Wood Professor  
Departments of Classics and Comparative Literature  
University of California, Berkeley  
*Author of, among others: AESOPIC CONVERSATIONS: POPULAR TRADITION, GREEK DIALOGUE, AND THE INVENTION OF GREEK PROSE* (Princeton University Press, 2011)

**Abdessadek Lachgar**

Professor of Chemistry  
Wake Forest University

**Lisa Lampert-Weissig**

Professor, Literature

Katzin Chair in Jewish Civilization

University of California, San Diego

*Author of, among others:* MEDIEVAL LITERATURE AND POSTCOLONIAL THEORY  
(University of Edinburgh Press, 2010)

**Michael B. Landau**

Professor of Law

Georgia State University College of Law

**David Lange**

Melvin G. Shimm Professor of Law

Duke University School of Law

*Author of:* NO LAW: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN THE IMAGE OF AN ABSOLUTE  
FIRST AMENDMENT (with H. Jefferson Powell) (Stanford University Press,  
2009)

**Thomas Laqueur**

Helen Fawcett Professor

Department of History

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* MAKING SEX: BODY AND GENDER FROM THE GREEKS TO  
FREUD (Harvard University Press, 1992)

**MaryJo Benton Lee, Ph.D.**

South Dakota State University

*Author of:* ETHNICITY MATTERS: RETHINKING HOW BLACK, HISPANIC AND INDIAN  
STUDENTS PREPARE FOR AND SUCCEED IN COLLEGE (Peter Lang Pub.)

**Thomas C. Leonard**

University Librarian

Professor

Graduate School of Journalism

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* ABOVE THE BATTLE: WAR MAKING IN AMERICA FROM  
APPOMATTOX TO VERSAILLES (Oxford University Press, 1978)

**Lawrence Lessig**

Roy L. Furman Professor of Law and Leadership

Harvard Law School

*Author of, among others:* FREE CULTURE: THE NATURE AND FUTURE OF  
CREATIVITY (Penguin Press, 2004)

**Harry R. Lewis**

Gordon McKay Professor of Computer Science  
School of Engineering and Applied Sciences  
Harvard University

*Author of, among others:* ELEMENTS OF THE THEORY OF COMPUTATION (with  
Christos H. Papadimitriou) (2d ed. Prentice-Hall, 1997)

**Jessica Litman**

John F. Nickoll Professor of Law  
University of Michigan Law School

*Author of, among others:* DIGITAL COPYRIGHT (Prometheus Books, 2001)

**Lydia Pallas Loren**

Kay Kitagawa & Andy Johnson-Laird IP Faculty Scholar & Professor of Law  
Lewis & Clark Law School

*Author of:* COPYRIGHT LAW IN A GLOBAL INFORMATION ECONOMY (with Julie  
Cohen, Ruth Okediji & Maureen O'Rourke) (3d ed. Aspen Publishing,  
2010)

**Lisa Alsing Macklin**

Director, Scholarly Communications Office  
Emory University

*Author of:* DIGITAL IMAGING OF PHOTOGRAPHS: A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO  
WORKFLOW DESIGN AND PROJECT (with Sarah L. Lockmiller) (American  
Library Association, 1999)

**Michael J. Madison**

Professor of Law  
University of Pittsburgh School of Law

**Donald J. Mastronarde**

Melpomene Professor of Classics

Department of Classics

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of:* THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF EURIPIDES' PHOINISSAI xv-444, vol. 27  
(with Jan Maarten Bremer) (University of California Publications: Classical  
Studies, Berkeley, 1982)

**Jarom McDonald**

Associate Research Professor

Director, Office of Digital Humanities

Brigham Young University

*Author of:* SPORTS, NARRATIVE, AND NATION IN THE FICTION OF F. SCOTT  
FITZGERALD (Routledge, 2007)

**Jerome J. McGann**

The John Stewart Bryan University Professor

University of Virginia

*Author of, among others:* RADIANT TEXTUALITY: LITERATURE AFTER THE WORLD  
WIDE WEB (Palgrave Macmillan, 2001)

**Henry W. McGee, Jr.**

Professor of Law, Seattle University

Professor Emeritus, UCLA

*Author of:* Kushner et al., HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: CASES AND  
MATERIALS (4th ed. Carolina Academic Press, 2010)

**Stephen McJohn**

Professor

Suffolk University Law School

*Author of:* INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: EXAMPLES AND EXPLANATIONS (4th ed.  
Aspen, 2012)

**Mark P. McKenna**

Professor of Law and Notre Dame

Presidential Fellow

Notre Dame Law School

**Kembrew McLeod**

Associate Professor  
Communication Studies  
University of Iowa

*Author of, among others:* CREATIVE LICENSE: THE LAW AND CULTURE OF DIGITAL SAMPLING (with Peter DiCola) (Duke University Press, 2011)

**Michael J. Meurer**

Abraham and Lillian Benton Scholar and Professor of Law  
Boston University School of Law

*Author of:* PATENT FAILURE: HOW JUDGES, BUREAUCRATS, AND LAWYERS PUT INNOVATORS AT RISK (with James Bessen) (Princeton University Press, 2008)

**Lateef Mtima**

Professor of Law and Director  
Institute for Intellectual Property and Social Justice  
Howard University School of Law

**Deirdre K. Mulligan**

Professor of Law  
School of Information  
Faculty Director of the Berkeley Center for Law and Technology  
University of California, Berkeley

**A. D. Nakhimovsky**

Associate Professor  
Computer Science  
Colgate University

*Author of, among others:* GOOGLE, AMAZON AND BEYOND: CREATING AND CONSUMING WEB SERVICES (with Tom Myers) (Apress 2003)

**Mary Beth Norton**

Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History & Stephen H. Weiss  
Presidential Fellow  
History Department  
Cornell University

*Author of, among others:* SEPARATED BY THEIR SEX: WOMEN IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE IN THE COLONIAL ATLANTIC WORLD (Cornell University Press, 2011)



**Geoffrey Nunberg**

Adjunct Full Professor

School of Information

University of California at Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* THE LINGUISTICS OF PUNCTUATION (University of Chicago Press, 1989)

**Michael A Olivas**

William B. Bates Distinguished Chair in Law

University of Houston

*Author of, among others:* HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE LAW: CASES AND MATERIALS ON COLLEGES IN COURT (3d ed. Carolina Academic Press, 2006)

**Pamela Oliver**

Professor

Department of Sociology

University of Wisconsin, Madison

*Author of:* THE CRITICAL MASS IN COLLECTIVE ACTION: A MICRO-SOCIAL THEORY (with Gerald Marwell) (Cambridge University Press, 2007)

**Aaron Perzanowski**

Assistant Professor

Wayne State University Law School

Visiting Associate Professor

University of Notre Dame Law School

**Thomas F. Pettigrew**

Research Professor of Social Psychology

University of California, Santa Cruz

*Author of, among others:* HOW TO THINK LIKE A SOCIAL SCIENTIST (Harper Collins, 1996)

**Thomas Pogge**

Leitner Professor of Philosophy and International Affairs

Yale University

*Author of, among others:* JOHN RAWLS: HIS LIFE AND THEORY OF JUSTICE (Oxford University Press, 2007)

**Malla Pollack**

*Author of, among others:* CALLMANN ON UNFAIR COMPETITION, TRADEMARKS & MONOPOLIES (with Louis Altman) (4th ed. Thomson-Reuters, 2011)

**Theodore M. Porter**

Professor

Department of History

University of California, Los Angeles

*Author of, among others:* KARL PEARSON: THE SCIENTIFIC LIFE IN A STATISTICAL AGE (Princeton University Press, 2004)

**David G. Post**

Professor of Law

Beasley School of Law

Temple University

**H. Jefferson Powell**

Professor of Law

Duke University School of Law

*Author of:* NO LAW: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN THE IMAGE OF AN ABSOLUTE FIRST AMENDMENT (with David Lange) (Stanford University Press, 2009)

**Lauren Pressley**

Associate Librarian, Head of Instruction

Wake Forest University

*Author of:* SO YOU WANT TO BE A LIBRARIAN (Library Juice Press, 2009)

**Margaret Jane Radin**

Henry King Ransom Professor of Law

University of Michigan, and

William Benjamin Scott & Luna M Scott Professor of Law, *emerita*

Stanford University.

*Author of:* BOILERPLATE: THE FINE PRINT, VANISHING RIGHTS, AND THE RULE OF LAW (Princeton University Press, 2012)

**Kaushik Sunder Rajan**

Associate Professor of Anthropology

University of Chicago

*Author of:* BIOCAPITAL: THE CONSTITUTION OF POST-GENOMIC LIFE (Duke University Press, 2006)

**Jerome Reichman**

Professor of Law

Duke University School of Law

*Editor of, among others:* Maskus and Reichman, eds., INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC GOODS AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY UNDER A GLOBALIZED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REGIME (Cambridge University Press, 2005)

**Matthew Sag**

Associate Professor

Loyola University Chicago School of Law

**Akbar Salam**

Associate Professor of Chemistry

Wake Forest University

*Author of:* MOLECULAR QUANTUM ELECTRODYNAMICS: LONG-RANGE INTERMOLECULAR INTERACTIONS (John Wiley, 2010)

**Pamela Samuelson**

Richard M. Sherman Distinguished Professor of Law and Professor of Information School of Law and School of Information

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of:* SOFTWARE & INTERNET LAW (with Mark A. Lemley, Peter S. Menell, Robert P. Merges, and Brian W. Carver) (4th ed. Wolters Kluwer, 2011)

**Natalia Sarkisian**

Associate Professor of Sociology

Boston College

*Author of:* NUCLEAR FAMILY VALUES, EXTENDED FAMILY LIVES: THE IMPORTANCE OF GENDER, RACE, AND CLASS (with Naomi Gerstel) (ROUTLEDGE, 2012)

**AnnaLee Saxenian**

Professor and Dean

School of Information

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* THE NEW ARGONAUTS: REGIONAL ADVANTAGE IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY (Harvard University Press, 2006)

**Niels Schaumann**

Dean and Professor of Law  
California Western  
School of Law, San Diego

**Rich Schneider**

Associate Professor  
University of California, San Francisco

**Jason Schultz**

Assistant Clinical Professor of Law  
UC Berkeley School of Law

**Stuart M. Shieber**

James O. Welch, Jr. and Virginia B. Welch Professor of Computer Science  
School of Engineering and Applied Sciences  
Harvard University

*Author of, among others:* PROLOG AND NATURAL-LANGUAGE ANALYSIS (CSLI  
Publications, 1987; Microtome Publishing, 2002)

**Jessica Silbey**

Professor of Law  
Suffolk University Law School

**Ronald C. Slye**

Professor  
Seattle University School of Law  
University of the Witwatersrand (South Africa)

*Author of, among others:* INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL LAW & ITS ENFORCEMENT  
(co-author with van Schaack) (2d ed. Foundation Press, 2010)

**Kevin L. Smith**

Director Copyright and Scholarly Communication  
Duke University  
Perkins Library

*Author of:* HANDBOOK ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY FOR SCHOLARS (forthcoming,  
University of Chicago Press)

**Susan Sharpless Smith**

Associate Dean

Z. Smith Reynolds Library

Wake Forest University

*Author of:* WEB BASED INSTRUCTION: A GUIDE FOR LIBRARIES (3d ed. ALA Editions, 2010)

**Eugene H. Spafford**

Professor and Executive Director

Purdue University CERIAS

*Author of:* PRACTICAL UNIX AND INTERNET SECURITY (with Simson Garfinkel & Alan Schwartz) (3d ed. O'Reilly, 2003)

**Christopher Jon Sprigman**

Class of 1963 Research Professor in honor of Graham C. Lilly and Peter W. Low  
University of Virginia Law

*Author of:* THE KNOCKOFF ECONOMY: HOW IMITATION SPARKS INNOVATION (with Kal Raustiala) (Oxford University Press USA, 2012)

**Philip B. Stark**

Professor and Chair

Department of Statistics

University of California, Berkeley

*Author of, among others:* "A Primer of Frequentist and Bayesian Inference in Inverse Problems" in LARGE SCALE INVERSE PROBLEMS AND QUANTIFICATION OF UNCERTAINTY (with L. Tenorio) (Biegler et al., eds.) (John Wiley & Sons, 2010)

**Jacqueline Stevens**

Professor, Political Science and Legal Studies Board Northwestern University

Director, Deportation Research Clinic

Buffett Center for International and Comparative Studies

*Author of, among others:* STATES WITHOUT NATIONS: CITIZENSHIP FOR MORTALS (Columbia University Press, 2009)

**Katherine J. Strandburg**

Professor of Law

New York University School of Law

**Peter Suber**

Director, Harvard Open Access Project  
Faculty Fellow, Berkman Center for Internet & Society  
Senior Researcher, Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition  
Research Professor of Philosophy  
Earlham College  
*Author of, among others: OPEN ACCESS (MIT PRESS, 2012)*

**Stephen D. Sugarman**

Roger J. Traynor Professor of Law  
University of California, Berkeley School of Law  
*Author of: DOING AWAY WITH PERSONAL INJURY LAW (Quorum Books, 1989)*

**Madhavi Sunder**

Professor of Law  
University of California, Davis  
*Author of: FROM GOODS TO A GOOD LIFE: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND GLOBAL JUSTICE (Yale University Press 2012)*

**Henry Sussman**

Visiting Professor  
Germanic Languages and Literatures  
Yale University  
*Author of, among others: AROUND THE BOOK: SYSTEMS AND LITERACY (Fordham University Press, 2011)*

**Lynn Sutton**

Dean, Z. Smith Reynolds Library  
Wake Forest University  
*Author of: ACCESS DENIED: HOW INTERNET FILTERS IMPACT STUDENT LEARNING IN HIGH SCHOOLS (Cambria Press, 2006)*

**Stefan Tanaka**

Professor of Communication  
Director, Center for the Humanities  
University of California, San Diego  
*Author of, among others: NEW TIMES IN MODERN JAPAN (Princeton University Press, 2004)*

**Timothy Tangherlini**

Professor and Chair

The Scandinavian Section

University of California, Los Angeles and

Professor

Department of Asian Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles

*Author of, among others:* TALKING TRAUMA (University Press of Mississippi, 1998)

**John Tehranian**

Irwin R. Buchalter Professor of Law

Southwestern Law School &

Biederman Entertainment & Media Law Institute

*Author of, among others:* INFRINGEMENT NATION: COPYRIGHT 2.0 AND YOU (Oxford University Press, 2011)

**Elizabeth Townsend Gard**

Associate Professor

Tulane University Law School

**Vilna Bashi Treitler**

Associate Professor

Department of Black & Hispanic Studies

Baruch College, City University of New York

and

Department of Sociology

Graduate Center, City University of New York

*Author of:* SURVIVAL OF THE KNITTED: IMMIGRANT SOCIAL NETWORKS IN A STRATIFIED WORLD (Stanford University Press, 2007)

**Rebecca Tushnet**

Professor

Georgetown Law

**Deborah Tussey**

Professor

Oklahoma City University School of Law

*Author of:* COMPLEX COPYRIGHT: MAPPING THE INFORMATION ECOSYSTEM (Ashgate, 2012)

**Jeffrey D. Ullman**

Stanford W. Ascherman Professor of Computer Science (Emeritus)

Stanford University

*Author of, among others:* DATABASE SYSTEMS: THE COMPLETE BOOK (with Hector Garcia-Molina and Jennifer Widom) (2d ed. Prentice Hall, 2008)

**Siva Vaidhyanathan**

Robertson Professor in Media Studies

Chair, Department of Media Studies

University of Virginia

*Author of, among others:* THE GOOGLIZATION OF EVERYTHING (AND WHY WE SHOULD WORRY) (University of California Press, 2011)

**Kathleen Vanden Heuvel**

Adjunct Professor of Law, Director of the Law Library

University of California, Berkeley School of Law

**Molly S. Van Houweling**

Professor of Law

University of California, Berkeley

**Barbara van Schewick**

Associate Professor of Law and (by courtesy) Electrical Engineering

Helen L. Crocker Faculty Scholar Director

Center for Internet and Society

Stanford Law School

*Author of:* INTERNET ARCHITECTURE AND INNOVATION (MIT Press, 2010)

**Katherine L. Vaughns**

Professor of Law

University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law

**Eric von Hippel**

T. Wilson Professor of Innovation

MIT Sloan School of Management

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

*Author of, among others:* DEMOCRATIZING INNOVATION (MIT Press, 2005)



**Dan Wallach**

Professor  
Department of Computer Science  
Rice University

**Thomas Wasow**

C.I. Lewis Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Linguistics  
Stanford University  
*Author of:* POSTVERBAL BEHAVIOR (CSLI Publications, 2002)

**Alan Weinstein**

Professor of the Graduate School  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California, Berkeley  
*Author of:* GEOMETRIC MODELS FOR NONCOMMUTATIVE ALGEBRAS (with A.  
Cannas da Silva) (American Mathematical Society, 1999)

**Mark E. Welker**

William L. Poteat Professor of Chemistry  
Wake Forest University  
*Chapter author, among others, in:* ADVANCES IN CYCLOADDITION VOL. 4 (Mark  
Lautens, ed.) (JAI Press, 1997)

**Emmet James Whitehead, Jr.**

Professor, Computer Science  
University of California, Santa Cruz  
*Author of:* COLLABORATIVE SOFTWARE ENGINEERING (Springer, 2010)

**Matthew Wilkens**

Assistant Professor  
Department of English  
University of Notre Dame

**John Willinsky**

Khosla Family Professor of Education  
Stanford University  
*Author of, among others:* THE ACCESS PRINCIPLE: THE CASE FOR OPEN ACCESS TO  
RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP (MIT Press, 2006)

**Terry Winograd**

Professor Emeritus  
Computer Science  
Stanford University

*Author of, among others:* UNDERSTANDING COMPUTERS AND COGNITION: A NEW FOUNDATION FOR DESIGN (with Fernando Flores) (Addison-Wesley, 1987)

**Richard Wittman**

Associate Professor  
Department of the History of Art & Architecture  
University of California, Santa Barbara

*Author of:* ARCHITECTURE, PRINT CULTURE, AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE (Routledge, 2007)

**Martha Woodmansee**

Professor of English and Law  
Case Western Reserve University

*Author of, among others:* THE AUTHOR, ART AND THE MARKET (Columbia University Press, 1994)

**Jonathan Zittrain**

Professor of Law  
Harvard Law School and  
Professor of Computer Science  
Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences