The music industry is an interesting phenomenon. It is a world that exists on image—and everyone has a say. For that very reason, the music industry is no stranger to critics. At its heart, they are what the industry is all about. Critics are the driving force in the business—their written and verbal exchange of ideas predicts the rise and fall of stars. Critics come in all shapes and sizes—they are the everyday consumer, the media at large, the hopeful artist, the record company executive, the legal scholar, and even our nation’s government.

This article will take you on a journey and show you what happens behind the scenes in the music industry. You will become a “fly on the wall” at a fictitious record company meeting where insiders are discussing the potential signing of a controversial artist, Sam Satyr. In this scenario, you will witness how the critics previously mentioned interact, and how their social and legal concerns are approached.
brainwashing.” She then goes on to compare rap artists to cult leaders since they both preach to young impressionable teens. She illustrates how some artists reach “idol” status just like the cult leader is an “idol.” She writes, “Kids go to bed with headphones on, listening to these rap artists ‘talk’ about using guns and drugs. Sam Satyr not only talks about it, he promotes it. In one song he sings over and over, ‘put a cap in the enemy—you have no friends—they are all the enemy. Get your gun—do it now. F—k them, they don’t understand you, they don’t listen. Nobody listens but they’ll hear the shots ring out.’” She also writes about how these songs are not healthy, calling the songs “lyrical brainwashing aimed at teens who will identify with the ‘nobody understands me, nobody listens’ message and who will believe that the only way people will listen is through violence.” This is just one of hundreds of letters and phone calls we have been receiving about Sam Satyr. What do you think?

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** Well, my first thought is that this is just one letter. However, you say there are hundreds of them coming in. I think we should call a meeting with the legal staff. We really haven’t had this kind of heat before. The media and the public are fascinated with Sam Satyr because his lyrics tend to be pretty brutal. So, here’s what I need you to do, Kathy: Send a memo around to the in-house counsel and Sam Satyr’s A&R² person. I want the attorneys to do some research on other recording artists who have run into legal problems. I need to know what—if anything—resulted from lawsuits. I want Sam Satyr’s A&R person at the meeting so that she can tell us what we are dealing with as far as Sam’s effect on the crowd when he performs and alert us to any controversial songs so we know how to handle him. Can you write something up to that effect and distribute it for me?

**Kathy Cole, Legal Secretary:** Sure. I will also include some of these letters so they have a better idea of what kind of complaints we have received.

---

**BIJOUX RECORDS Memorandum**

To: Business & Legal Affairs and A&R Department

From: Martin Winchester

Date: March 17, 2004

Re: Staff meeting regarding the signing of Sam Satyr

We are having a meeting on Friday, March 26th at 10:00 a.m. to discuss the feasibility of signing Sam Satyr. I am aware that we have not had this type of meeting before. However, in light of both the violent tragedy of September 11th and recent terror alerts in general, Bijoux Records is undergoing changes to recognize sensitivity to potential violence. The President of Bijoux Records, Carson Wedekind, has asked the Business and Legal Affairs Department to advise him on signing Sam Satyr. As you know, an issue such as this would usually be sent to outside counsel. However, Carson is going on the assumption that Sam Satyr is going to be a mega-star, and he doesn’t want Satyr to get grabbed by another label.

I want each of you to be prepared to discuss any lawsuits against artists or record companies. Specifically, I am interested in what liability, if any, we could be subject to if someone commits a violent act after listening to songs written or performed by Sam Satyr. Although Bijoux Records has not received any indication that violence would occur from listening to his songs, we have received angry letters from parental groups regarding him. I am aware that there have been various cases in the past on this issue with rock groups and rap artists. I want all legal angles covered including any legislation I should be aware of concerning this issue. Thank you.
SCENE 2

Friday, March 26, 2004
10:00 a.m.
Bijoux Records Business & Legal Affairs
Conference Room

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:
Good morning. How is everyone doing? Are you
guys ready to dive into this? Okay, who can give me
some background?

Hank Riley, Counsel: Well, I thought we could
start off with some legislative background. After the
Columbine High School massacre back in 1999,
President Clinton asked the Federal Trade
Commission to investigate whether
entertainment industries
were promoting violent
material to underage
children.1 I am sure you
all remember this case,
but to refresh your
memories: two students
stormed into their
school and fatally shot
twelve classmates and a
teacher.2 This horrific act brought attention to the
music industry when media reports revealed that at
least one of the killers posted music lyrics and movie
lines with violent content on his website.3 Eric Harris,
one of the shooters, posted lyrics to a German band,
KMFDM, on his website and was a fan of rocker
Marilyn Manson.4

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:
What did the lyrics say?

Hank Riley, Counsel: The lyrics that Eric Harris
allegedly posted were from KMFDM’s song “Waste.”
The lyrics were, “What I don’t say I don’t do. What
I don’t do I don’t like. What I don’t like I waste.”5 So,
in reaction to the publicity surrounding the incident,
the FTC conducted studies which indicated that
there is some correlation between exposure to
violent materials and aggressive attitudes and
insensitivity to violence.6 The FTC then uniformly
condemned the music industry and other industries
for intentionally marketing to children material that
was considered too violent.7

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: What did the FTC do as a result of this report?

Hank Riley, Counsel: The FTC’s report suggested
an industry-wide attempt at self-regulation, however,
the point that I wanted to get across is that the FTC
has acknowledged that it does not presently possess
the power to discipline record labels for refusing to
change marketing tactics.8 Basically, there would have
to be Congressional legislation enacted that would
specifically grant the FTC the power necessary to
regulate externally.9

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:
Any legislation in this area is bound to raise substantial
First Amendment issues.10 Though I could be wrong,
I don’t believe that laws like that are going to be
passed any time soon. Regardless, for now, I would
like to focus on what is presently impacting us. Are
there any cases out there that we should be
particularly worried about?

Brooke Hagen, Director: Well Marty, there have
been various lawsuits against record companies and
their artists for violent acts committed by individuals
after listening to rock and metal groups, like Ozzy
Osbourne and Judas Priest, and rappers, like Ice T
and Tupac Shakur. Of course, we can go over these
cases and discuss their merits individually, but before
we do, I would like to address your question, “Are
there any cases that we should be particularly
worried about?” In my view, it is alarming that cases
like these are making their way into court at all.
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mean, it seems like there is a recent trend in case law which suggests that the First Amendment may no longer protect artistic expression from litigation as well as it once did.13 This trend, coupled with the growing Congressional external regulation concerns Hank pointed out, seems to me to be a very troubling situation.

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: Hold on, hold on. Now before we go down that road I think it is important to note that musical lyrics, in particular, are afforded the utmost First Amendment protection out there.14 Now, as some of you know, I have been studying First Amendment law actively as long as I can remember. I think I can put some of Brooke’s fears to rest.

Jake Evans, Counsel: Oh great! If you are about to go on some First Amendment tirade for hours, please let me know so I can go grab a pillow off the reception area couch and give my wife a quick call and tell her I will be home in a week. (Everyone laughs.)

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: Hey—easy over there! Seriously, I think we all could use a little First Amendment refresher if Gregory is willing to give us one.

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: Of course I can, and I will try to be brief because this is review for all of us. I guess I will start with the fact that the United States Supreme Court has specifically stated that First Amendment protection extends to entertainment, so there is no question there.15 However, this protection has its limitations, and some speech is outside the scope of the First Amendment shield.16 Since we are discussing potential liability from violent acts committed by an individual after listening to lyrics by Sam Satyr, we should look to the First Amendment standard set out in the famous Brandenburg v. Ohio decision, which governs any attempt to impose legal responsibility for injuries caused by an incitement to violence.17 This standard applies whether the attempt is through criminal prosecution or through a civil suit.18

Jake Evans, Counsel: But if I remember correctly, didn’t that case have something to do with a Klu Klux Klan meeting or some sort of rally? And if so, how would this apply to our potential artist?

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: Yes, Brandenburg arose out of a Klu Klux Klan rally that was conducted on a farm outside Cincinnati.19 No one was present at the rally except the Klan members themselves, a television reporter, and his cameraman.20 However, vile incendiary racist footage from the meeting was broadcast on a Cincinnati station and a national network.21 The state of Ohio prosecuted Brandenburg, the leader of the Klan group, for violating the Criminal Syndicalism law.22 Ultimately, the Supreme Court held the law unconstitutional and stated that nothing in the record indicated that the racist messages of the Klansmen at the rally posed any immediate physical threat to anyone.23 If you bear with me for a moment, I will read an excerpt from the case and demonstrate how it could apply to Sam Satyr. Okay, basically in Brandenburg the court says, “The constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press… do not permit a State to forbid or proscribe advocacy of the use of force or of law violation except where such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action.”24 So, when you look at the standard, in order for a plaintiff to recover damages against someone like Sam Satyr, they would have to show a few things. First, the individual must show...
that the particular conduct at issue was a lawless act. Second, he or she must show that Sam Satyr directly advocated the unlawful act. Third, he or she must show that his lyrics or “media speech” went beyond mere advocacy and instead amounted to incitement which was directed to result in imminent action.

Brooke Hagen, Director: The language you read says “directed” to inciting unlawful conduct. Does that mean that there is some sort of intent requirement?

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: Brandenburg does require some showing of intent, whether explicit or implicit, in conjunction with the other requirements of the test in order to justify revocation of First Amendment protection. However, intent alone is not enough. Like I said before, there are other elements that have to be satisfied. For example, in a particular Sam Satyr song, the unlawful act sanctioned by his lyrics must be a likely and foreseeable result of the lyrics. Also, the lyrics must be directed to incite and likely to result in imminent illegal conduct. Therefore you must have some form of intent, mixed with foreseeability and imminence, to satisfy this Brandenburg formula.

Jake Evans, Counsel: With a standard that strict, where you look at the content of speech and the circumstances under which it was transmitted, I would think that a record company or artist would never be liable to someone who was listening to one of their songs and subsequently goes out and commits a violent act, especially when you look at the intent element. I think just about every artist out there would say that they are “expressing” themselves artistically and not trying to incite people to commit violent acts. For example, my friend is a rapper and he says that in his songs he is just relaying what he sees every day in his neighborhood. I truly believe that just because artists have an unfortunate upbringing and have anger in their songs they shouldn’t become targets for lawsuits, even if they are rapping that they want to take out a whole police station or whatever. I don’t see how a media outlet, an artist, or record company can ever be held liable for violent acts committed by others from what they say, especially after hearing the Brandenburg standard in detail. It seems impossible to apply the Brandenburg standard of incitement to a recording, given the fact that these recordings could occur years before ever hitting the shelves.

Brooke Hagen, Director: That is one way to look at it, but there are two sides to the live speech/taped speech debate. Some argue that taped speech is perhaps more dangerous than live speech for two reasons: (1) it can reach far more people, and (2) it is designed for repeated exposure, which, arguably, can work a listener into a frenzy and spur them into action just as successfully as a live performance. On the other hand, opponents to that argument point out that since a listener of recorded music has to take so many affirmative steps, (like buying the album and playing it repeatedly), the speaker is, in effect, taken right out of the equation. Also, let’s be realistic here. Not everyone out there thinks like we do, as lawyers, trying to fit things neatly into standardized black-letter law tests. It is important for us to take into account that some pretty powerful people out there have joined forces on the issue of violent music lyrics, if not on liability, then at the very least on accountability. For instance, in 1985, the Parent’s Music Resource Center (PMRC), alarmed by the new...
wave of violent lyrics, and prompted by a 1983 letter from a Cincinnati parent, Rick Alley, who objected to a track from Prince’s “1999” LP called “Let’s Pretend We’re Married,” began a crusade against popular music. The PMRC was a potent force, largely due to its politically connected founders and board of directors. The PMRC leadership included then-vice-president’s wife, Tipper Gore, plus the wives of ten senators, six representatives, and one sitting Cabinet member. Not only did they have the names to back their position, they also had the money. The PMRC used high-powered connections with Occidental Petroleum, Merrill Lynch, and political contributors to generate pressure on the music industry. The effort of the PMRC drew broad support from the national Parent Teachers Association, conservative religious interests, and many parents who were becoming increasingly concerned by the violence and “kinkiness” of certain rock videos and lyrics.

**Hank Riley, Counsel:** The PMRC did in fact stir up a lot of concern about the effect that explicit lyrics could have on children. However, the PMRC only threatened a mandated system and instead backed a voluntary agreement with the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) to put into effect a system that would alert parents and consumers to “graphic messages” in the music. Graphic messages of concern would include suicide, rape, and drug abuse promoted in that particular music. The main goal of the labeling system was to assist parents who wish to monitor what their children listen to.

**Jake Evans, Counsel:** But most of the record labeling legislative bills that were either dropped because of weak legislative support, low priority scheduling, or local lobbying efforts really penalized retailers and distributors, not labels or individual artists. I see what you are saying, Brooke, and I do agree that we should take action groups and legislation into account in our decision. However, I would like to stress again that, with the Brandenburg standard in place, I believe that it would be really tough for Sam Satyr or Bijoux Records to be held liable for actions that are claimed to result from or in response to Satyr’s lyrics. There are just too many loose variables involved in a musical recording to meet the strict test that Brandenburg sets out. For instance, an artist typically strives for ambiguity in their music in order to reach a greater number of people, and that is why they seldom use specific names or places in their songs.

**Gregory Goddard, Senior Director:** You make a valid point, and to illustrate, let’s get back to your example of someone rapping about “one day taking out a whole police station.” This would fail the Brandenburg intent prong as later interpreted by the Supreme Court through Hess v. Indiana because it lacks a high level of specificity in the speech. The statement is too ambiguous, pointing only to some remote or possible indirect harm.

**Hank Riley, Counsel:** Right, right. Hess was the case where a Vietnam War protestor was arrested for yelling “We’ll take the f—king street later,” while the police were attempting to clear the street.

**Gregory Goddard, Senior Director:** Exactly, and the court held that because the statement was not directed toward any specific individual or group, nor directed to any specific time or method of “taking the street,” the ambiguity of the statement sheltered...
it from any challenge to First Amendment protection.43

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** It seems that the entertainment industry would enjoy the same protections through music.

**Brooke Hagen, Director:** So far, this has been the norm. However, there have been cases where a court has held media defendants liable. When I did research to find out whether or not a court allowed a plaintiff to recover damages from those in the music or communications industries, I came across *Weirum v. RKO General*, a case in which the plaintiffs succeeded on a modified claim of incitement.45 In that case, a rock radio station with a large teenage following conducted a live contest that urged its listeners to engage in a street race in order to locate a disc jockey to receive a cash prize.46 The disc jockey was driving around town in an identifiable vehicle and giving updates to listeners as to his location.47 The radio announcer said, “OK, kids, DJ Bob is on the Pacific Coast Highway, and the first one to find him gets a hundred bucks.”48 In an effort to win the prize, a minor, while chasing the disc jockey, forced another vehicle off the road, causing the death of the driver of that vehicle.49 The radio station was held liable in that case.50

**Jake Evans, Counsel:** Wait a minute—wouldn’t that accident have more to do with the reckless driving of the teenager than the radio broadcast of a cash giveaway contest?

**Brooke Hagen, Director:** A couple of things happened on appeal. As I understand it, the primary issue the court addressed was whether the defendant owed a duty to the decedent arising out of its broadcast of the cash giveaway contest.51 The court held that the general rule that a defendant has no duty to control the actions of third parties absent a special relationship has no application if the plaintiff’s complaint is grounded upon an affirmative act of the defendant which created an undue risk of harm.52 Basically, the court held that the sense of urgency conveyed by the broadcaster created an unreasonable risk of harm to the young listeners, and the broadcasters should have known it.53 Beyond that, the court reasoned that because the broadcast was live, the unlawful conduct did occur imminently within the definition of any interpretation of the *Brandenburg* test.54

**Jake Evans, Counsel:** I am not sure how I feel about that. I admit, when you are talking about free money and prizes, people are sure to move—and fast. But holding a radio station liable because a person driving a car ran another vehicle off the road?

**Brooke Hagen, Director:** The court’s take was that since the disc jockey directly urged the young listeners to speed to the destination, the foreseeability of the risk of danger outweighed the utility of the conduct involved.55

**Hank Riley, Counsel:** I think what I am hearing is that because the audience that listened to the rock radio station was young, the court felt that they were more impressionable and that it was foreseeable that an accident would occur under the circumstances. Isn’t that a dangerous line to draw? For instance, say that Sam Satyr targets teenagers in his songs whom he knows are prone to violent behavior and also vulnerable to outside influences that might exacerbate such violent proclivity—does that mean that it is foreseeable that his speech will likely incite unlawful conduct?56 What does that mean for us in our current situation when we are dealing with song lyrics?

**Brooke Hagen, Director:** The court in *Weirum* noted that foreseeability would be measured by the

---
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facts and circumstances of each case. The court felt not only that it was foreseeable, but that it was very likely—not that someone would do some crazy, wacky thing, but that someone would do exactly what the radio announcer was telling people to do—that someone would get in their car and try to find this disc jockey. So it appears that the lawless activity cannot be an irrational act, rather it has to be a natural reaction flowing logically from what you are actually asking people to do. Luckily, it seems as far as the entertainment industry goes, the Weirum case is in the minority because of the specific facts involved. There are many cases on our side where plaintiffs have sued because they claim lyrics incited violent behavior and directly caused personal injury to themselves or to loved ones, and where the plaintiffs have ultimately been unsuccessful.

Hank Riley, Counsel: Actually, when I was at CBS, we had a huge concern when dealing with Ozzy Osbourne. At the time I was an intern in the promotions department, so I wasn’t privy to any special information. However, I did follow the cases against him in the news and have read up on it this week.

Jake Evans, Counsel: What concerns are you talking about? Are you thinking of the time when he bit the head off of a live dove in front of a group of reporters at a press conference? Or do you mean when he bit the head off of a bat at one of his concerts and had blood streaming down his face?

Hank Riley, Counsel: Ha, ha funny. Now, I am an Ozzy Osbourne fan, but I do agree that his actions have been questionable. Okay, he can be outright disgusting at times. However, at least as far as the bat goes—he thought it was fake. At his concerts, people usually threw stuffed animals, and sometimes live ones, on the stage to see what Ozzy would do with them. At this particular concert, someone threw a bat on the stage, Ozzy picked it up, held it out to the crowd, and then bit its head off. He got a real surprise—and had to be rushed off stage to get a rabies shot! As far as the dove goes: at a press conference he was supposed to pull it out from the inside of his jacket and hold it out as an offer of peace to the public because he had the “Prince of Darkness” image. However, apparently the vibe in the room caused Ozzy to bite the dove’s head off—and that really freaked out the people from the press!

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: Even though biting the heads off of animals certainly was disgusting, it was probably the turning point of his career. His following grew substantially after those acts. Although it wasn’t intentional, it was probably one of the most ingenious publicity ploys in rock history.

Hank Riley, Counsel: It sure did give him a huge following, but as you will see, it was almost to his detriment. The image that he created through these acts was dark and mysterious—and his songs contained a lot of the same messages. As far as actual legal problems, there were a couple of teenagers who committed suicide after listening to his lyrics. The families tried to recover damages from Ozzy Osbourne and the record company.

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: Were the suicides in conjunction with or related in some way to each other, or were they totally separate acts?

Hank Riley, Counsel: They were unrelated incidents, actually separated by a number of years. The two cases were McCollum v. CBS, Inc., and Waller v. Osbourne. The first case, McCollum v. CBS, Inc., occurred in 1988. A troubled 19-year-old who had alcohol and emotional problems shot and killed himself while lying on his bed and listening repeatedly to a record album by Ozzy Osbourne. On the night of the suicide, the teen listened repeatedly to one side of “Blizzard of Oz” and side two of the record “Diary of a Madman” on the family stereo in the NOW I am an Ozzy Osbourne fan, but I do agree that his actions have been questionable.
Later that evening, he went to his bedroom and put on his headphones, listened to side two of Osbourne’s album “Speak of the Devil,” placed a .22-caliber handgun to his temple, and took his own life. When he was found the next morning, he was still wearing his headphones, and the stereo was still running with the arm and needle riding in the center of the revolving record.

Brooke Hagen, Director: Oh my, what a horrible scene for the parents to wake up to!

Hank Riley, Counsel: Yes, the parents were very distraught to say the least. However, they didn’t see that this act of suicide was from John’s own will. Rather, they alleged that Osbourne’s music was a proximate cause of John’s death. The plaintiffs focused in particular on the lyrics to the song ‘Suicide Solution,’ which they claim incited John to commit suicide because it preaches that suicide is the only way out for a person who is involved in excessive drinking, as John was.

Jake Evans, Counsel: But wasn’t their argument more to do with something about subliminal messages in Ozzy Osbourne’s songs?

Hank Riley, Counsel: Yes, there is a twenty-eight second instrumental interval in the song where the following masked lyrics were sung: “Ah know people. You really know where it’s at. You got it. Why try, why try. Get the gun and try it. Shoot, shoot, shoot.”

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: How did the court address that issue?

Hank Riley, Counsel: They steered away from the subliminal messages element and basically determined that the song was not written with the intent that its listeners commit an illegal activity, (in this case, suicide), and therefore “one listener’s unreasonable reaction to the music did not justify imposing liability on the artist.” In addition, the court noted that “some active and intentional participation in the events leading to the suicide are required in order to establish a violation of the penal code.” To beat a First Amendment defense, the plaintiffs would have had to show that Osbourne and CBS intended to cause the suicide of John, or some other listener, and that they made the recorded music available for that purpose.

Jake Evans, Counsel: Okay, so what did the court have to say about Ozzy Osbourne’s music? What if Ozzy did intend for his listeners to commit suicide? Would that mean that he and the record company would have been liable?

Hank Riley, Counsel: We could explore that hypothetical, although, unless an artist comes right out and says that they intended such criminal action by the listener, I don’t see how it could ever be proven in court.

McCollum court concluded that “nothing in Osbourne’s music could be characterized as a command to an immediate suicidal act.”

Jake Evans, Counsel: That makes sense. It seems ridiculous to punish speech that advocates illegal action at some indefinite future time. Sam Satyr may sing or rap about one day “taking out your enemies”—but he could just be blowing off steam. That doesn’t mean he or Bijoux Records should be held liable just because some person takes that as a call to action.

Hank Riley, Counsel: Exactly, and the McCollum court seemed to agree with you when they concluded that “reasonable persons understand musical lyrics and poetic conventions as the figurative expression which they are” and that “no rational person would or could believe otherwise nor would they mistake musical lyrics and poetry for literal commands or directives to immediate action.”
Kathy Cole, Legal Counsel: I am sure there are a lot of parents out there who would disagree, especially when you are talking about teenagers and even younger listeners. Parents certainly don’t buy the argument that young people have the ability to think of songs on a philosophical level. Some of the letters we receive strongly suggest that they wouldn’t agree with the McCollum court’s comment that “musical lyrics and poetry cannot be construed to contain the requisite ‘call to action’ for the elementary reason that they simply are not intended to be and should not be read literally on their face.” Instead, these parents believe that teenagers are young and impressionable and are not mature enough to realize that lyrics of a song can be viewed as a poetic device, or even as a play on words, conveying meanings entirely contrary to what they believe the message is. The parents who have written to us believe that the artist and record label have some duty to the public not to convey messages that will be confusing to teens.

Gregory Goddard, Senior Counsel: Well, if those parents were here today I would tell them that I don’t agree with them, and neither should the law. See, in most cases, due to the protected status of musical lyrics, an artist and record label have no duty to ensure that members of the general public will not react violently to any given song. However, I do concede that this is not true if the work violates the Brandenburg test, which would mean that it would forfeit that initial wall of First Amendment protection.

Jake Evans, Counsel: I think the whole argument of an artist and record label having a duty to ensure listeners will not react violently to lyrics is bogus. I mean, why don’t we throw William Shakespeare up on a stake while we are at it for writing Hamlet’s soliloquy, “To be or not to be - that is the question” where he is pondering life or death?

Kathy Cole, Legal Counsel: Well, as a parent, I am going to play devil’s advocate. I think one major difference is that the works you mentioned are typically discussed in an intellectually controlled environment. Also, these are characters in a book and it isn’t like Shakespeare is whispering into one’s ear—Do it! Do it! Throw yourself into a brook and drown! However, I agree 100% that violent themes have been recurrent in artistic expression and we shouldn’t expect that rock or rap artists should all of a sudden have to watch what they say because of the possibility that one kid out of a million could have an abnormal reaction to it. Can you imagine trying to write a song if you had to factor in how you might be liable if a person interprets your lyrics the wrong way?

Hank Riley, Counsel: Actually, the McCollum court shared the same view when they reasoned that, “the deterrent effect of subjecting the music and recording industry to liability because of their programming choices would lead to self-censorship which would dampen the vigor and limit the variety of artistic expression.” If musical composers and performers, as well as record producers and distributors, were inhibited in the selection of protected, yet controversial, materials in fear of liability for civil damages, that would have the effect
of a prior restraint, which is violative of the First Amendment."96

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** Hank, at the beginning of your discussion you mentioned that there were two Ozzy Osbourne cases. What happened in the other one?

**Hank Riley, Counsel:** The other case was *Waller v. Osbourne*, and the court in that case basically used the same reasoning as the *McCollum* court. As far as the song goes, the court noted that it was not specifically directed at any person or group of persons, and that no person could rationally infer that the song incited suicide.97

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** Okay, that makes sense. Now Brooke, you said there was a case involving the group Judas Priest—what was that all about?

**Brooke Hagen, Director:** Well, *Vance v. Judas Priest* certainly had more of a subliminal message focus as compared to the cases previously mentioned. The incident occurred in 1985, when two Reno, Nevada, residents, Raymond Belknap and James Vance, both fans of the British heavy-metal band Judas Priest, shot themselves with a 12-gauge shotgun.98 Mr. Belknap died, and Mr. Vance, who shot himself in the face, was left horribly disfigured.99 Their parents filed a products liability case against the group for the album ‘Stained Class,’ which they maintained had subliminal messages in the song, “Better by You, Better than Me”.100 They claimed that repeated listening to the group’s lyrics induced the two boys to take their own lives.101 The court rejected the plaintiffs’ claim and ruled that “inadvertent” subliminal messages were not protected by the First Amendment, that, in fact, a listener has a First Amendment right to be free from such messages,102 and that intervening factors, such as alcoholism, physical abuse, and divorce caused both shootings.103

**Jake Evans, Counsel:** Wait a second, are you saying that the court did factor subliminal messages into their decision?

**Brooke Hagen, Counsel:** Well, sort of. Basically the Nevada District Judge ruled that the “do it” suggestion was accidental, a coincidence caused by a guitar part and an exhalation, and that there isn’t enough scientific evidence to conclude that subliminal messages can cause suicidal behavior.104 Plus, Judas Priest and CBS Records denied using subliminal messages and the whole products liability issue of subliminal messages was sort of left up in the air.105 Overall, the claims that subliminal messages primarily caused incitement to suicide in the Ozzy Osbourne and Judas Priest incidents severely weakened the plaintiffs’ cases.106 The courts have made it clear that music is generally protected under the First Amendment, and absent direct language encouraging the suicides or other aggravating factors, no finding of incitement is justified.107

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** Should we be exploring subliminal messages or what?

**Anna Cataldi, Vice President of A&R:** Well, as far as Sam Satyr’s lyrics go—no. I have spoken to his manager, too. He basically said, “Anything that Sam Satyr has to say, he wants it to be heard loud and clear.”

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** Okay, so let’s focus on normal audible lyrics. What other cases are out there?

**Gregory Goddard, Senior Director:** The band “Slayer” had a suit brought against them by the family of fifteen-year-old Elyse Pahler for her brutal murder.108 The family claimed that her murder was inspired by Slayer’s songs that focus on misogyny, torture, and satanic sacrifices.109 Unlike the Ozzy Osbourne and Judas Priest cases, or similar cases of alleged rock’n’roll-inspired mayhem that have been tossed out of court on First Amendment grounds, the Slayer case took a novel legal approach. The plaintiff focused on the controversial practices of entertainment marketing.110 The girl’s parents sued Slayer and its American Recordings label for violating the California Business and Professions Code, accusing them of unlawfully marketing and distributing “harmful” and “obscene” products to minors.111 Eventually, though, like the other suits we have talked about, this suit was unsuccessful on First Amendment grounds.112 The judge dismissed the case in October 2001 because the parents failed to prove that Slayer’s music incited their daughter’s murder.113 The parents have filed an appeal for the second time.114
Anna Cataldi, Vice President of A&R: I would like to point out that the Judas Priest, Slayer, and Ozzy Osbourne cases are rock-focused. Sam Satyr does have a hard rock edge as far as his choice of instrumentality and incorporation of dark and sometimes self-loathing lyrics. However, I wouldn’t put him strictly in the rock genre. Some of his songs are rap-influenced, and this combination gives him an edge. It seems to make him connect with the crowd a bit more, almost like he is talking to them when he raps.

Hank Riley, Counsel: That is what concerns me. I don’t know if it is too much of an edge when we are talking about rap music. It seems different to me than traditional rock music.

Brooke Hagen, Director: How so?

Hank Riley, Counsel: Purely from my own experience, I find that rap music has a totally different effect than other types of music—both in its delivery and in its content. Some of the rap songs that I have heard paint a picture of social struggle and anger directed at government officials. However, I know that I have had a limited exposure to rap music, and I don’t mean to generalize.

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: Well Hank, it sounds like you are describing rap like a form of “political speech.” Since political speech is not limited to literal campaign or governmental rhetoric, it encompasses any kind of speech that addresses societal values and especially includes speech that challenges the status quo—or rather, advocacy of the notion that current societal, governmental, and political practices are misguided or inaccurate. Actually, if courts agreed with your vision of rap music, it would be very favorable to artists. See, the First Amendment affords the broadest protection to such political expression in order to assure the unfettered interchange of ideas for the bringing about of political and social changes desired by the people.

Hank Riley, Counsel: But you have to admit that is a one-sided view about rap music. There are some people out there that don’t agree that rap music is just expression reflecting the everyday violence the artist has experienced but rather that rap music brings about the violence by glorifying it in songs. If that were the case, then rap wouldn’t fit the political speech classification. However, let’s pick one of Sam Satyr’s rap songs and pretend that it does amount to something like political speech. Does this mean that it has an absolute First Amendment shield from any liability for violence inspired by the speech?

Brooke Hagen, Director: Well, I personally think that calling rap music political speech is a stretch. Also, the McCollum court stated that music, in general, cannot be construed as advocacy because it contains figurative expressions and is not meant to be taken literally. But to answer your question regarding rap music and violence, you would still have to factor in the Brandenburg test.

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: We have seen examples of rap music and violence all over the news. I remember there was an incident involving a song by Ice-T and also a highly publicized case involving lyrics by Tupac Shakur.

Brooke Hagen, Director: That’s right—in 1992, the album “Body Count” by Ice-T received such a negative public outcry that the album’s song “Cop Killer” was pulled from the market by Ice-T and his record company, Time Warner. That wasn’t the last of Time Warner’s troubles—about six weeks after that, they were facing another legal battle involving Tupac Shakur. In April 1992, Ronald Howard got pulled over in a stolen vehicle by state authorities.
t trooper Bill Davidson, for a possible traffic violation unrelated to the theft of the vehicle. At the time of the shooting, Howard was listening to the cassette tape “2Pacalypse Now,” a recording by rap artist Tupac Shakur, which contained the song “Soulja’s Story.” Howard claimed that listening to this recording caused him to shoot Officer Davidson. As a result, Davidson’s survivors then brought a civil action against negligence and products liability against Shakur and his record companies. The district court ruled that the media defendants were not liable under both claims, and held that the content of the recording was not a “product.”

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: If I remember correctly, the court didn’t really address the Brandenburg test, did it?

Brooke Hagen, Director: They did address it, but only in dicta. Actually, the plaintiffs alleged that Shakur’s “2Pacalypse Now” fit recognized categories of unprotected speech, such as obscenity, defamatory invasion of privacy, fighting words, and incitement. Addressing the obscenity issue, the court found that the recording lacked the “patently offensive representations or descriptions of masturbation, excretory functions and lewd exhibition of genitals.” Plus, the civil action was based on the violent, rather than the sexual nature of the recording. The defamation argument failed because Tupac referred to police officers in general, not Officer Davidson specifically. The “fighting words” argument failed because the recording did not direct its invective and epithets at any specific person, causing them to react violently, and thus were not “fighting words.” Lastly, as far as Brandenburg goes, the court commented that the imminence prong was not satisfied.

Hank Riley, Counsel: Even though the media defendants were not held liable in this case, the problems encountered by Time Warner should raise a concern for us. It isn’t just coincidence that Time Warner pulled the album from the shelves. They received a lot of heat from Bob Dole back in 1995. Dole represented a growing public distaste for corporate giants who seemed to be lacking in self-restraint. We have to be aware that a corporate responsibility movement exists out there, and I think we should be prepared to handle those arguments if we need to.

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: Why don’t you give us a little more about the corporate responsibility argument?

Hank Riley, Counsel: In general, some people think that Hollywood, particularly the music industry, is a fairly depraved place. They believe that during the 1990s, the music industry, most notably Dole’s target du jour, Time-Warner, had made a mint by marketing the most offensive, misogynistic products directly to the most vulnerable kids. Dole was addressing the young, disenfranchised, latchkey child—often a teen-age boy left to wander before dinner—who could isolate himself under a pair of headphones with some incredibly violent rap or hard-metal releases.

Jake Evans, Counsel: That seems more like it is a problem for the individual family. If parents leave their children unsupervised, then the kids are almost bound to get into something. It seems a far stretch to be blaming the music industry for their own family’s failures.

Hank Riley, Counsel: From the point of view of Dole, and others with similar views, record executives know that these sad, unsupervised children are out there in every town and city, and will spare no expense in swooping down and grabbing them. They
believe that children are so inured as to what is normal, what's genuinely rebellious, and what's downright sick, that there likely will never be any going back unless corporate executives step up to the plate. They claim that there are no ethical standards for so many people in music and that there is no such thing as being a good corporate citizen for massive conglomerates such as Time-Warner. So, rather than letting corporate giants go unchallenged, politicians like Bob Dole have put pressure on the industry as a whole to do something about it.

Jake Evans, Counsel: It's not like legislative groups and parent organizations are the only people out there who have questioned marketing practices of the entertainment industry. Insiders such as the Billboard magazine editors encouraged the industry to self-censor the more degrading, offensive works. The editors warned, "either we resolve individually as the record-selling and record-buying public to turn away from the propagation of the hatefully self-destructive material currently threatening to overshadow the more meaningful segments of the marketplace, or we will reap the consequences of what we've sown." Luckily for us, case law is on our side in situations where there might be questions about incitement because they are measured against the Brandenburg standard.

Brooke Hagen, Director: "That may be true, but some scholars are now questioning whether or not the imminence requirement of Brandenburg is a good thing since it appears to give greater First Amendment protection to potential tortfeasors than is appropriate. It has been argued that the state has an important interest in safeguarding persons from physical harm. To deny recovery in these cases lessens the speakers' incentives to remove material from the marketplace that is dangerous and leads users to injure themselves or others. Thus, although some courts are afraid of the chilling effect that such sanctions would have on speech, many scholars are calling for state action in the form of tort liability to effect the responsible exercise of First Amendment freedoms.

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: And how would something like that work?

Brooke Hagen, Director: Well, it would involve contextually evaluating various forms of expression which are alleged to cause harm or injury and essentially weeding out protected from unprotected speech. Now I am not saying that I agree with this, but it has been argued that when a speaker intends to emote an audience, and when that audience is likely to be emoted by the speech as well as by the particular medium used—such as music—liability for actual harm resulting from the speech should be placed on the speaker in addition to the actual perpetrator of the violent act. It is sort of a totality of the circumstances approach that takes into account the potential impact on permissible and desirable First Amendment discourse.

Jake Evans, Counsel: Wow, that concept is completely foreign to me, and the cases we have discussed here don't seem to be moving in that direction at all. Let's take it into account but instead assume that Sam Satyr's lyrics are protected under the First Amendment. There are still additional steps we could take to safeguard Bijoux Records against liability. I have seen companies take out additional insurance and negotiate morality clauses into the artist's recording agreement. For instance, we could put a morality clause into Sam Satyr's contract that would read something like this:
BREACH AND MORALS: In addition to and not in limitation of any of the rights or remedies available to Bijoux Records hereunder, if Sam Satyr shall be charged with the commission of any act which is an offense involving moral turpitude under federal, state or local laws, or should Sam Satyr commit any act which would reasonably and objectively bring Bijoux Records into disrepute, contempt, scandal or ridicule, at any time, or if Sam Satyr shall fail to perform his duties and liabilities required of him hereunder, then Bijoux Records shall be entitled to terminate this agreement.¹⁶⁰

Just by incorporating this type of clause into the contract, a lot of headaches could be avoided. Aside from that, it seems from our discussion that his recorded lyrics are not likely to violate the First Amendment anyway, but it may be possible that, in the course of a performance before a live audience, Satyr could cross the line. However, as far as live performances and touring, record companies themselves are seldom involved in that segment of the artist’s career.¹⁶¹

WHERE an artist’s reputation in the entertainment industry is built on wild behavioral antics, a ‘morals clause’ may pose particular problems, especially when you are talking about terminating an agreement due to arrest or indictment for a felony!¹⁶³

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: Certainly, though, taking out additional insurance and negotiating a morality clause are options we could look into, especially if Sam Satyr ever heads down the road of a “gangsta rap” artist.

Jake Evans, Counsel: I am not really sure how much of a problem that would be anymore. Haven’t rap songs changed substantially? As far as I know, most of the songs out there are about having “hoes in different area codes”¹⁶⁴ and how life is perceived as being all about the “bling bling.”¹⁶⁵ (Everyone laughs.)

Hank Riley, Counsel: I don’t know, but I would like to hear you rap again! Just kidding. Anyway, I think that, regardless of the genre of music we are addressing, we know that musical lyrics presumptively do not constitute unlawful incitement because courts have clearly afforded music general First Amendment protection.¹⁶⁶ Therefore, as we have seen in cases involving recording artists, plaintiffs are faced with a substantial burden when attempting to prove incitement to violent behavior.¹⁶⁷

Jake Evans, Counsel: And that is exactly as it should be! In reality, I don’t think there is anything to worry about. I may be naïve, but I would like to think that people have the brains not to carry out actions that Sam Satyr is singing about.

Hank Riley, Counsel: Ha! Well, as the entertainment world has seen, sometimes we are not dealing with the most intelligent or mature people in the world. Yet, somehow we end up being the ones to blame. Remember all the negative publicity toward the entertainment industry after that teenager got severely burned when he and his friends attempted to imitate a stunt from a an MTV...
program in which a person sat on a barbecue grill while having lighter fluid sprayed on his body.\textsuperscript{168}

Jake Evans, Counsel: Yeah, but the plaintiff was barred from recovery.\textsuperscript{169}

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: True. However, putting aside how strongly I feel about First Amendment rights, I want to touch on an issue we should consider when signing Sam Satyr. In light of avoiding bad publicity such as the type MTV has undergone, rather than looking at Sam Satyr from just a legal standpoint, we should also examine his

**IDENTIFYING** explicit lyrics and giving notice to consumers preserves the core value of expression that tolerates unpopular speech and frowns upon censorship.

strong lyrical content more from the perspective of deciding, creatively, is this the kind of music we want to release?

Jake Evans, Counsel: I don’t necessarily think that should factor in as much as you are suggesting, Gregory—at least not outwardly. If we appear to be using that type of restraint, we would enter a dangerous realm of something along the line of “content based” signings in which it would be hard for us to attract an artist if they thought our label would censor their expression.\textsuperscript{170} Do you see? Anyway, I understand what you are saying, but as far as reviewing lyrics of our artists’ releases, we should do so only for purposes of determining whether a Parental Advisory Label\textsuperscript{171} is appropriate on the record packaging.

Kathy Cole, Legal Secretary: But is that all we should do? Slap a sticker on an album and never give it another thought? As we have heard, there are people out there who are saying that it is not enough, and, as a corporation, we have a moral obligation to consumers to think about what we are putting out in the market.

Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: It goes without saying that Bijoux Records takes our responsibility to help parents identify music with explicit lyrics seriously. “Not all music is right for all ages,” and that is why the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) created the idea of a Parental Advisory Label.\textsuperscript{172} As you know, we have people at Bijoux Records whose job it is to read through lyrics and listen to music, looking for anything questionable, such as the sound of a gun shot in the background, to help decide which releases should carry the Parental Advisory Label.

Jake Evans, Counsel: Right, so identifying explicit lyrics and giving notice to consumers preserves the core value of expression that tolerates unpopular speech and frowns upon censorship.\textsuperscript{173} Also, as far as record sales go, if the song has a good hook and is marketable, we can always have Sam Satyr sing a “clean” version of the song, thus re-recording it without explicit lyrics.

Brooke Hagen, Director: In addition to Jake’s point, there have been many times where we agreed with the artist that there is musical and artistic credibility in the whole of the work, even when the lyrics may be too explicit for mainstream distribution.\textsuperscript{174} In those instances we just placed the RIAA’s Parental Advisory Label on the outside of the permanent packaging.\textsuperscript{175} The artists have appreciated that it is a voluntary program, which, instead of seeking to censor their words, provides them the opportunity to help parents and families make informed decisions for their children.\textsuperscript{176}

Gregory Goddard, Senior Director: I would say that the real motivation to follow such practices flows from the fact that artists are aware that an album can lose up to ten percent of its sales if it is not carried by a major chain store.\textsuperscript{177} Aside from that, one thing that I am not too clear on is what exactly happens to compact discs when they hit the stores? Are retailers subject to liability for selling the marked packages to children under 18 years old?
Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President: Many retailers have in-store policies forbidding the sale of records containing the Parental Advisory Label to those younger than 18, implementing “Eighteen to Buy” policies. Some large retail outlets such as Wal-Mart will not even carry a stickered product at all. Distribution companies that will not carry a stickered CD but will accept a clean version require the record company to modify the song and submit the record, along with a transcript, to them. Often an album goes back and forth for several weeks before a clean copy is agreed upon. Either way—the decision is made by the retailer. For now, there is no external enforcement on these stickers. Rather, it is up to the parents to be on the lookout and use this label to identify music that may not be appropriate for their children.

Jake Evans, Counsel: Actually, retailers complained that they received mixed messages from their customers when they implemented the “Eighteen to Buy” policies in combination with the Parental Advisory stickering. They received about as much “feedback from parents who were angry that they had to accompany a teenager to buy a particular recording as they previously received from parents who were angry about a piece of music a teenager had bought unchaperoned before the policy was implemented!” It just goes to show that it is hard to please both sides on this issue.

Brooke Hagen, Director: I think that the current practice of keeping consumers informed about lyrics is the best we can really do. I mean, “for the same reason that there is no rating system for books, the works of musical artists are not rated by age” or specific content, “as it is virtually impossible to categorize words.” Also, as we have seen, if a record is just too explicitly violent and sexually explicit, distributors can refuse and have refused to release it. Remember the Geto Boys album? Geffen Records would not endorse the album and said, in part, “[w]hile it is not imperative that lyrical expressions of even our own Geffen artists reflect the personal values of Geffen Records, the extent to which ‘The Geto Boys’ album glamorizes and possibly endorses violence, racism, and misogyny, compels us to encourage Def American to select a distributor with a greater affinity for this musical expression.”

Hank Riley, Counsel: That’s right! They did! Wow, that was pretty bold considering it was on the eve of the album release.

Brooke Hagen, Director: Actually, they took a stance similar to what Gregory mentioned a few minutes ago. In that instance, the issue was whether or not Geffen wanted to be associated with those kinds of lyrics. As a private company, they had a right to decide what kind of materials they wanted to be associated with and that Geto Boys’ album happened not to be one of them.

Jake Evans, Counsel: So when people are talking about outright censorship of music, they obviously don’t understand what is happening behind the scenes. Don’t get me started on liability. You know, I don’t understand that line of thinking. If they honestly believe that some culpability should lie with music industry executives, then what about parents and retailers? We can only do so much! Stickering
guidelines, and parents don’t even know what is in their children’s CD cases!

**Hank Riley, Counsel:** Whoa! Someone is getting a little fired up!

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** That’s okay—it is nice to see some passion for the First Amendment around here! On a separate note, this has certainly been a very informative meeting. From what you all have said here today, I think we are in agreement that it seems like artists and music executives have been safe when a plaintiff has alleged that violent lyrics were the inspiration for their real-life act of violence. The case law we discussed showed that the vast majority of courts confronted with lawsuits seeking recovery from media defendants have “properly viewed the First Amendment as a shield against such suits.” However, there is no Supreme Court precedent regarding entertainment claimed to incite violence, and it seems like each state has its own take on this issue. If you try any lawsuit in a controversial area these days, with people getting maimed or killed, you are going to find a couple of courts somewhere around the country that will hear it. So, the one thing for us that I want to feel absolutely sure about is whether or not it is safe to go forward in our potential signing. I am going to mull over everything that has been said here today, and I will distribute a memo to the executives that summarizes our concerns and plans regarding Sam Satyr. Okay? So is there anything else?

**Everyone:** No.

**Martin Winchester, Senior Vice President:** All right, thanks everyone. Let’s wrap up the meeting, and, in the meantime, if there is anything else you think of, let me know. Otherwise, get out of here!

---

**ENDNOTES**

1 Disclaimer: In part, this is a work of creative writing. Bijoux Records is a fictitious record company. Any and all
characters are likewise fictitious and any similarities to real life events are purely coincidental.

2 A&R stands for “Artist and Repertoire.” The A&R staff are the people at the record company responsible for finding new talent, either by seeing the artist perform at a concert or an arranged showcase or, from hearing an earlier demo recorded at the artist’s expense. The Demo Recording Agreement, 8 ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY CONTRACTS 159 (Donald C. Farber ed., 2002).


5 Carolina Fornos, Inspiring the Audience to Kill: Should the Entertainment Industry be Held Liable for Intentional acts of Violence Committed by Viewers, Listeners, or Readers?, 46 LOY. L. REV. 441, 448 (2000).

6 Id.

7 Id. at 448 n.34; see also KMFDM, Waste, on SYMBOLS (TVT 1997).


9 Rose, supra note 8, at 236.

10 Id.


12 Id.


15 See Schad v. Borough of Mount Ephraim, 452 U.S. 61, 65 (1981) (“motion pictures, programs broadcast by radio and television, and live entertainment, such as musical and dramatic works, fall within the First Amendment guarantee”).

16 See McCollum v. CBS, Inc., 249 Cal. Rptr. 187, 192–93 (Cal. Ct. App. 1988) (“freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment is not absolute. There are certain limited classes of speech which may be prevented or punished” for example 1) obscene speech; 2) libel, slander, misrepresentation, obscenity, perjury, false advertising, solicitation of crime, complicity by encouragement, and conspiracy; 3) criminal statutory violations; and 4) speech “which is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action, and which is likely to incite or produce such action. . .”). This paper is focusing on the fourth category of speech that is not protected by the First Amendment.


18 See Smolla, supra note 17, at 220.

19 See Brandenberg v. Ohio, 395 U.S. 444 (1969); see also Smolla, supra note 17, at 220 n.6.

20 Brandenberg, 395 U.S. at 445.

21 Id.

22 Id. at 444. The Ohio Criminal Syndicalism law made it illegal to advocate “the duty, necessity, or propriety of crime, sabotage, violence, or unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform,” or to assemble “with any society, group, or assemblage of persons formed to teach or advocate the doctrines of criminal syndicalism.” Id. at 444-45. The Supreme Court held this law unconstitutional. Id.

23 Id.

24 Id. at 447.

25 See Mike Quinlan & Jim Persels, It’s Not My Fault, the Devil Made Me Do it: Attempting to Impose Tort Liability on Publishers, Producers, and Artists for Injuries Allegedly “Inspired” by Media Speech, 18 S. ILL. U. L.J. 417, 435 (1994) (stating that the third prong of this test was provided by the Court in Hess v. Indiana, 414 U.S. 105 (1973) in which the words “we’ll take the f—king street” shouted to an unruly crowd of anti-war protestors did not constitute advocacy of illegal action and could not be punished as “incitement” because such words merely had a “tendency to lead to violence.”).

31 Id. at 9.


33 Id.

34 Id. at 188.

35 Id.


38 Id.

39 Id.

40 See Brandenberg v. Ohio, 395 U.S. 444, 448 (1969) (stating that “the constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press do not permit a state to forbid or proscribe advocacy of the use of force or law violation except where such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action”).


42 Id. at 107

43 Id. at 108–09; see also Firester & Jones, supra note 14, at 8.

44 539 P.2d 36 (Cal. 1975).

45 Firester & Jones, supra note 14, at 17 (discussing Weirum).

46 Weirum, 539 P.2d at 43.

47 Id.


49 Weirum, 539 P.2d, at 37.

50 Id. at 41.

51 Id. at 39.

52 Id. at 41; see also Fornos, supra note 5, at 452.

53 Weirum, 539 P.2d at 40; Firester & Jones, supra note 14, at 9.

54 Weirum, 539 P.2d at 47. Although Weirum does not mention the Brandenburg test, the case has traditionally been discussed in other incitement cases. See, e.g., McCollum v. CBS, Inc., 249 Cal. Rptr. 187, 195 (Cal. App. 1988).

55 Weirum, 539 P.2d at 40; see also Fornos, supra note 5, at 452.

56 Fornos, supra note 5, at 452 (discussing the Weirum case to highlight the distinction between nonfeasance and misfeasance). In Weirum, the disc jockey urged his audience to speed, and it should have been foreseeable that they might drive unsafely. Weirum, 539 P.2d at 40.

57 Firester & Jones, supra note 14, at 9 (discussing Weirum, 539 P.2d at 46–47).

58 Dougherty et al., supra note 48, at 249 (discussing Weirum, 539 P.2d at 48).

59 Id.


61 20/20 (ABC News television broadcast, Nov. 6, 2002) (Barbara Walters interview with Sharon Osbourne).

62 Id.

63 Id.

64 Id.

65 Id.

66 Id.

67 Id.

68 Id.

69 Id.


71 Firester & Jones, supra note 14, at 14.

72 McCollum, 249 Cal. Rptr. at 188–89.

73 Id.

74 Id.

75 Id.

76 Id.
The lyrics to Suicide Solution suggest that “the only way out” for an alcoholic is through suicide:

Wine is fine but whiskey's quicker/Suicide is slow with liquor/Take a bottle drown your sorrows/Then it floods away tomorrows/Evil thoughts and evil doings/Cold, alone you hang in ruins/Thought that you'd escape the reaper/You can't escape the Master Keeper/Cause you feel life's unreal and you're living a lie/Such a shame who's to blame and you're wondering why/Then you ask from your cask is there life after birth/What you sow can mean Hell on this earth/Now you live inside a bottle/The reaper's traveling at full throttle/It's catching you but you don't see/The reaper is you and the reaper is me/Breaking law, knocking doors/But there's no one at home/Made your bed, rest your head/But you lie there and moan/Where to hide, Suicide is the only way out/Don't you know what it's really about?
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