
ANALYSIS OF THE MODICUM OF CREATIVITY DOCTRINE UNDER COPYRIGHT LAW

Sayantani Ray, Assistant Professor, School of Law, Chettinad Academy of Research and Education

Saumya Raj, Assistant Professor, KLE Society's Law College

ABSTRACT

The doctrine of “modicum of creativity” occupies a pivotal yet often under-theorised position within copyright jurisprudence, functioning as the minimum threshold for determining the protectability of creative works. Rooted in the broader requirement of originality, the doctrine seeks to balance the twin objectives of copyright law incentivising creative expression while preserving the public domain. Despite its centrality, the absence of a clear statutory articulation has resulted in interpretative ambiguities and inconsistent judicial applications across jurisdictions.

This paper undertakes a comprehensive doctrinal, comparative, and critical examination of the “modicum of creativity” standard. It traces the conceptual foundations of originality and creativity within copyright law, analysing the historical shift from the “sweat of the brow” approach towards a more substantive creativity-based threshold. Through an engagement with landmark judicial decisions and statutory frameworks, the study highlights how courts have implicitly endorsed a low threshold of creativity while simultaneously grappling with its practical delineation.

The paper further situates the doctrine within a comparative international context, examining divergent approaches adopted by jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union, as well as the influence of international copyright instruments like the Berne Convention and the TRIPS Agreement. Particular emphasis is placed on the challenges posed by emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence and digital content creation, which increasingly blur traditional notions of authorship and originality.

Critically, the study interrogates the normative and practical implications of maintaining an ambiguous creativity threshold. While a low standard promotes inclusivity and encourages creative participation, it also risks over-protection and the monopolisation of trivial works, thereby constraining access to knowledge and cultural resources. The paper concludes by advocating for greater doctrinal clarity through calibrated judicial reasoning

and policy interventions that preserve flexibility without diluting copyright standards. In doing so, it underscores the continued relevance of the “modicum of creativity” doctrine in shaping a balanced and adaptive copyright regime in the digital age.

Keywords: Modicum of Creativity; Originality; Copyright Law; Judicial Interpretation; Comparative Copyright; Public Domain; Artificial Intelligence and Authorship; Creativity Threshold.

Introduction

The intricacies of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, it is imperative to delve into the foundational principles of copyright law. Copyright, as a legal framework, seeks to strike a delicate balance between the rights of creators and the public interest. It provides creators with exclusive rights over their original works, fostering innovation and encouraging the dissemination of knowledge and culture. Copyright protection extends to a diverse array of creative expressions, including literary works, artistic creations, musical compositions, and technological innovations¹.

The core premise of copyright law is to incentivize the creation of original works by granting creators a limited monopoly over their creations. This monopoly, however, is not absolute, as it is tempered by the principle of fair use and other limitations to ensure a harmonious coexistence between the rights of creators and the broader public interest².

At the heart of copyright law lies the principle of originality, a foundational criterion for eligibility. For a work to qualify for copyright protection, it must be *original*, meaning it should emanate from the author’s *intellectual work* and *not be a mere copy* of pre-existing works³. This originality standard ensures that creators contribute something new and innovative to the cultural and intellectual landscape, reinforcing copyright’s role as an engine for progress⁴.

Closely tied to originality is the concept of creativity. While originality is about independent creation, creativity encompasses the spark of imagination and the expression of unique ideas. Creativity is the core of copyright, as it distinguishes mere facts or ideas from protectable

¹ William Patry, Copyright Law and Practice (3d ed. 2017)

² Ginsburg, J. C. (2012). Was 'Smith v. Chanel' the Last Word on Originality in Copyright?. Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts, 35(4), 431-445.

³ Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co., 499 U.S. 340 (1991).

⁴ Pamela Samuelson, “Are Patents on Interfaces Impeding Interoperability and Innovation?” 70 Wash. L. Rev. 317 (1988).

expressions. The level of creativity required is intentionally low, recognizing that even modest contributions should be eligible for protection⁵.

Purpose of the Study

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine operates within this broader framework, emphasizing that a minimal level of creativity is sufficient for a work to qualify for copyright protection. While this doctrine is implicit in copyright jurisprudence, its lack of explicit definition has led to varying interpretations by courts and scholars. Understanding the doctrine requires a nuanced exploration of its conceptual foundations and practical implications⁶.

The purpose of this study is twofold: *first*, to dissect the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine and establish a working definition, considering its historical roots and contextualizing it within the broader landscape of copyright law. *Second*, to critically evaluate the implications of the doctrine on copyright jurisprudence⁷. This involves an examination of relevant case law, legislative intent, and the practical impact of the doctrine on the creative industries and the public’s access to cultural products.

By comprehensively addressing these objectives, this study aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse surrounding copyright law and creativity standards. The implicit nature of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine and its varied application necessitate a thorough analysis to clarify its contours and assess its role in balancing the interests of creators and the public in the evolving digital age⁸.

Defining “Modicum of Creativity”

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, although integral to copyright law, often operates in the background, lacking explicit statutory definition. This section endeavours to establish a comprehensive conceptual framework by delving into the core elements of the doctrine and comparing it with other creativity standards prevalent in copyright jurisprudence⁹.

⁵ Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises, 471 U.S. 539 (1985).

⁶ Jane C. Ginsburg, The Modest Impact of Modest Takings, 78 U. Chi. L. Rev. 889 (2011).

⁷ Pamela Samuelson, A Manifesto Concerning the Legal Protection of Computer Programs, 94 Colum. L. Rev. 2308 (1994).

⁸ *Id* 5.

⁹ Pamela Samuelson, “Towards More Sensible Anti-Circumvention Regulations,” 104 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1313, 1322 (2010).

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine hinges on the notion that a minimal level of originality and creativity is adequate for a work to warrant copyright protection. This concept, while seemingly straightforward, raises crucial questions regarding the quantification of creativity. How much creativity is sufficient? What criteria determine the “modicum”? Scholars and courts have grappled with these questions, emphasizing the need for clarity in the application of this doctrine¹⁰.

Further, to establish a definition, it is imperative to consider the historical context and evolution of copyright law. Courts have often referred to the doctrine of “sweat of the brow,” wherein the effort and labour invested in a work were deemed sufficient for protection¹¹. However, the modern stance is inclined towards recognizing a more substantive form of creativity, albeit at a minimal threshold.

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine comprises several key components. These may include the expression of original thought, a unique arrangement of ideas, or the manifestation of a creator's personal touch¹². While courts recognize that not all works need to be ground breaking or revolutionary, they must possess some form of creative spark. Identifying these key components helps in clarifying the contours of the doctrine and provides a basis for consistent application¹³.

Comparative Analysis with Other Creativity Standards

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine is not unique to any particular jurisdiction. However, its application and interpretation may vary across legal systems. A comparative analysis with international copyright laws reveals diverse approaches to creativity standards¹⁴. Some jurisdictions adopt a more lenient stance, while others demand a higher threshold for originality. Understanding these international perspectives aids in contextualizing the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine within a global framework¹⁵.

Contrastingly, certain legal systems explicitly define the threshold of creativity required for

¹⁰ Ets-Hokin v. Skyy Spirits, Inc., 225 F. Supp. 2d 1066 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

¹¹ Bleistein v. Donaldson Lithographing Co., 188 U.S. 239, 251 (1903).

¹² Jane C. Ginsburg, “Locating Copyright Within the First Amendment Skein,” 78 Nw. U. L. Rev. 18, 30 (1983).

¹³ *Id* 3.

¹⁴ Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(5), Sept. 9, 1886, S. Treaty Doc. No. 27, 99th Cong., 2d Sess. (1986).

¹⁵ Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening, Case C-5/08, 2009 E.C.R. I-06569, ¶ 37.

copyright protection. For instance, the European Union’s “originality” criterion necessitates the work to be the author’s own intellectual creation¹⁶. By comparing these explicit standards with the implicit “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, it becomes apparent that while the latter allows for flexibility, explicit standards provide more certainty but may risk excluding certain works that fall below the defined threshold¹⁷.

This conceptual framework sets the stage for a nuanced understanding of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, emphasizing its dynamic nature and the need for ongoing scholarly discourse to refine and clarify its application in contemporary copyright law.

Legal Foundations

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine finds its roots within the legal foundations of copyright law, embedded in statutes and shaped by judicial decisions. The explicit and implicit references to creativity within copyright statutes and analyzes key court decisions that have contributed to the development of this doctrine.

The starting point for understanding the legal foundations of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine lies in an examination of copyright statutes. While many statutes explicitly mention the requirement of originality, the term “modicum of creativity” itself may not be explicitly stated. For instance, the *U.S. Copyright Act* states that copyright protection subsists in original works of authorship, and originality is equated with the author’s independent creation¹⁸. The interplay between these explicit provisions and the implicit “Modicum of Creativity” standard adds complexity to the legal landscape.

Exploring the legislative intent behind these statutes provides insight into the intended balance between incentivizing creative expression and ensuring public access to ideas¹⁹. The legislative history and debates surrounding copyright statutes offer valuable context for interpreting the scope and purpose of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine²⁰.

Court decisions play a crucial role in shaping and interpreting copyright law, and the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine has been implicitly acknowledged in various cases. The requirement of

¹⁶ *Bleistein v. Donaldson Lithographing Co.*, 188 U.S. 239, 250-51 (1903)

¹⁷ *Id.* 15.

¹⁸ 17 U.S.C. § 102(a) (2018).

¹⁹ Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-42, § 5(1) (Can.).

²⁰ H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476, at 54 (1976).

originality and creativity for copyright protection²¹. The U.S. Supreme Court emphasized that the sweat of the brow or mere labour and effort were insufficient, advocating for a more substantive standard²².

Furthermore, to the understanding of creativity standards the court in *Bleistein* case recognized that even a modest amount of creativity, as long as it represented the author's own intellectual contribution, was sufficient for copyright protection²³.

The court decisions collectively establish a judicial precedent that reinforces the importance of creativity in copyright law. However, the challenge lies in delineating the exact parameters of this creativity, and the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine implicitly encapsulates the notion that a minimal level is adequate for protection.

The Ninth Circuit recognized in a vodka bottle design case, though simple, demonstrated sufficient creativity to merit copyright protection. The court acknowledged the existence of a “low threshold” for creativity, contributing to the discourse on what constitutes the “modicum” required for protection²⁴.

Understanding judicial reasoning and interpretations in cases involving the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine is paramount. Courts often rely on precedent, legislative intent, and policy considerations to navigate the intricacies of creativity standards²⁵. The tension between providing adequate protection for creators and preventing overreach in exclusive rights requires a delicate balance, and judicial interpretations of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine play a pivotal role in striking this balance.

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, as implicitly acknowledged in legal statutes and shaped by judicial decisions, underscores the dynamic nature of copyright law. The interplay between explicit legislative provisions and implicit creativity standards further emphasizes the need for ongoing scholarly examination and refinement of this doctrine within the evolving landscape of intellectual property law.

²¹ Copyright, Designs and Patents Bill, 1987, ¶ 14 (U.K.).

²² *Id* 3.

²³ *Id* 16.

²⁴ *Id* 10.

²⁵ *Bridgeman Art Library v. Corel Corp.*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 191 (S.D.N.Y. 1999).

Critique of the Doctrine

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, while embedded in copyright jurisprudence, is not without its challenges and controversies. This section critically examines the inherent ambiguities in defining the “modicum” and explores potential loopholes and limitations. Furthermore, it assesses the real-world impact of the doctrine on various creative works, shedding light on its implications for creators and the public²⁶.

One of the primary challenges associated with the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine lies in its inherent ambiguity. Courts often struggle with determining the threshold of creativity required for a work to qualify for protection²⁷. The term “modicum” itself suggests a minimal standard, but the lack of specific guidelines leads to subjective interpretation. This ambiguity can result in inconsistent application across cases and jurisdictions, leaving creators and legal practitioners grappling with uncertainty²⁸.

Moreover, the absence of a precise definition can give rise to disputes over what constitutes a “modicum” of creativity. The subjective nature of creativity adds complexity, as different judges may have varying perspectives on what qualifies as a sufficient level of originality. This lack of clarity in defining the threshold poses challenges for both creators seeking protection and courts aiming to apply the doctrine consistently.

While the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine aims to be inclusive, there is a risk of potential loopholes and limitations²⁹. The minimal standard set by the doctrine might inadvertently encompass works that lack substantive creativity, raising concerns about the erosion of copyright standards³⁰. Critics argue that an overly permissive application of the doctrine could dilute the overall incentive for creators to produce genuinely innovative and original works³¹.

Additionally, the doctrine’s focus on the quantity rather than the quality of creativity may lead to the protection of works that do not contribute significantly to cultural or artistic

²⁶ Jane C. Ginsburg, “Locating Copyright Within the First Amendment Skein,” 78 Nw. U. L. Rev. 18, 35-36 (1983).

²⁷ Pamela Samuelson, “Functionality and Expression in Computer Programs: Refining the Tests for Software Copyright Infringement,” 41 Stan. L. Rev. 1449, 1482 (1989).

²⁸ *Bleistein v. Donaldson Lithographing Co.*, 188 U.S. 239 (1903).

²⁹ Wendy J. Gordon, “Fair Use as Market Failure: A Structural and Economic Analysis of the Betamax Case and its Predecessors,” 82 Colum. L. Rev. 1600, 1616 (1982).

³⁰ Jessica Litman, “Revising Copyright Law for the Information Age,” 75 Or. L. Rev. 19, 40 (1996).

³¹ *Id.* 3.

advancement. This raises questions about the broader societal implications of a copyright regime that protects works with only a marginal level of creativity. Striking the right balance between incentivizing creativity and preventing the monopolization of trivial works poses an ongoing challenge for copyright law.

Impact on Various Creative Works

The application of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine has varied across different artistic domains. While it may be suitable for certain types of works, such as databases or compilations, its appropriateness for more subjective and artistic endeavours remains a point of contention³². Visual arts, literature, music, and other creative fields may require a more nuanced consideration of the level of creativity involved³³. The doctrine’s impact on these diverse forms of expression warrants careful examination to ensure that copyright protection aligns with the inherent nature of each creative medium³⁴.

The balance between protecting creators’ rights and facilitating public access to creative works is a fundamental consideration in copyright law. The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, by setting a minimal standard, seeks to widen the scope of protection and foster creativity. However, its impact on the public domain and the availability of creative works for transformative uses raises concerns³⁵.

Critics argue that an overly permissive application of the doctrine may lead to the over-protection of works that contribute minimally to cultural progress. This, in turn, could impede the free flow of ideas and hinder the development of new creative works³⁶. Striking a balance that encourages innovation while preserving the public’s right to access and build upon existing works is crucial for the continued relevance and effectiveness of copyright law³⁷.

The critical examination of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine reveals inherent challenges related to ambiguity in defining the threshold and potential loopholes in its application. The impact on various creative domains and the delicate balance between creator rights and public

³² *Id* 11.

³³ *Nichols v. Universal Pictures Corp.*, 45 F.2d 119 (2d Cir. 1930).

³⁴ *Id* 10.

³⁵ William W. Fisher III, “Theories of Intellectual Property,” in *New Essays in the Legal and Political Theory of Property*, 168, 186-87 (Peter G. Newman ed., 2001).

³⁶ Wendy J. Gordon, “Fair Use as Market Failure: A Structural and Economic Analysis of the *Betamax* Case and its Predecessors,” 82 *Colum. L. Rev.* 1600, 1638-39 (1982).

³⁷ *Bridgeman Art Library v. Corel Corp.*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 191 (S.D.N.Y. 1999).

access necessitate ongoing scholarly discourse and careful consideration by policymakers and legal practitioners. The evolution of this doctrine will play a pivotal role in shaping the future landscape of copyright law and its ability to adapt to the dynamic nature of creative expression.

International Perspectives

Understanding the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine requires a broader lens that extends beyond national borders. This section engages in a comparative analysis with other legal systems to explore international perspectives on creativity standards. By examining global copyright treaties, agreements, and contrasting approaches in different jurisdictions, we gain insights into the varied applications of the doctrine and its implications on a global scale³⁸.

The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, while implicit in many jurisdictions, is recognized to varying extents across different legal systems. Some countries explicitly incorporate similar principles in their copyright laws, acknowledging the importance of minimal creativity as a criterion for protection. This recognition underscores the universal nature of the concept, emphasizing the fundamental role it plays in the establishment of copyright protection internationally³⁹.

Despite the shared acknowledgment of the importance of creativity, the approach to defining and applying the “modicum” standard varies significantly. Some jurisdictions adopt a more flexible and permissive stance, emphasizing the inclusivity of the doctrine to encourage a wide range of creative expressions. In contrast, other legal systems may adopt a more stringent approach, necessitating a higher threshold for originality. This divergence in approaches highlights the complexity of establishing a universally applicable standard and raises questions about the potential impact on cross-border collaboration and the international exchange of creative works⁴⁰.

International efforts to harmonize copyright standards have been ongoing, aiming to create a cohesive framework that facilitates the protection of creative works across borders. Treaties such as the Berne Convention and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual

³⁸ Rochelle Cooper Dreyfuss, “Expressive Genericity: Trademarks as Language in the Pepsi Generation,” 69 *Notre Dame L. Rev.* 397, 403-04 (1994).

³⁹ *Id.* 15.

⁴⁰ *Id.* 7.

Property Rights (TRIPS)⁴¹ set minimum standards for copyright protection, emphasizing the importance of originality and creativity. The inclusion of these principles in international agreements reflects a shared commitment to fostering creativity while recognizing the need for flexibility in implementation⁴².

Despite these harmonization efforts, divergent approaches to the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine persist. The consequences of such divergence become apparent in cases involving cross-border disputes and the recognition of foreign works⁴³. Inconsistencies in the application of the doctrine may create challenges for creators seeking protection in multiple jurisdictions. Additionally, it raises questions about the equitable treatment of creators and the potential for forum shopping, where creators choose jurisdictions with more lenient standards for copyright protection⁴⁴.

Understanding these global perspectives is crucial for assessing the effectiveness and adaptability of the "Modicum of Creativity" doctrine in an increasingly interconnected world. As creative works circulate internationally with greater frequency, the need for a harmonized approach becomes more pronounced. However, the tension between encouraging creativity and accommodating diverse legal traditions underscores the complexities inherent in achieving a truly unified standard⁴⁵.

In conclusion, the international perspectives on the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine highlight the challenges and opportunities associated with harmonizing copyright standards globally. While there is a shared recognition of the importance of creativity in copyright protection, the divergent approaches among different legal systems necessitate ongoing discussions and potential reforms to address the complexities of cross-border copyright issues⁴⁶. The evolving landscape of international copyright law will continue to shape the application of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine and its impact on creators and the global creative

⁴¹ Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement), Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

⁴² Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(5), Sept. 9, 1886, S. Treaty Doc. No. 27, 99th Cong., 2d Sess. (1986).

⁴³ James Boyle, “A Politics of Intellectual Property: Environmentalism for the Net?” 47 Duke L.J. 87, 108 (1997).

⁴⁴ Hughes, Justin. Copyright and Inequality. Oxford University Press, (2014), 102.

⁴⁵ Peter K. Yu, “Rethinking the Protection of Geographical Indications in the Global Intellectual Property Order,” 19 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 1031, 1049 (2004).

⁴⁶ Graeme B. Dinwoodie, “Forty Years in the Wilderness? Lanham Act Section 43(a) and the Tort of Unfair Competition,” 2006 S. Ct. Rev. 201, 216-17.

community⁴⁷.

Empirical Analysis

As we delve further, we shift our focus from theoretical discussions to practical considerations. This section of the research article emphasizes the importance of empirical analysis in understanding the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine⁴⁸. Through the examination of specific cases, real-world examples, and the collection of data from legal professionals, we aim to provide a more grounded assessment of the doctrine's application and impact in copyright jurisprudence⁴⁹.

The practical implications of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, it is essential to analyze specific case studies where the doctrine has played a pivotal role. While examining court decisions involving a range of creative works, from literary works to visual arts, we can discern patterns in the application of the doctrine and identify the factors that courts consider in determining the level of creativity required for copyright protection.

The court decision involving compilations or databases may showcase instances where the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine is particularly relevant. The Court assess the creativity embedded in these works provides valuable insights into the nuances of the doctrine's application⁵⁰.

A comparative analysis of outcomes in various cases is crucial to understanding the consistency (or lack thereof) in the application of the doctrine. By examining scenarios where similar creative works are judged differently based on jurisdiction or legal interpretation, we can identify the factors contributing to such disparities. This analysis not only sheds light on the challenges associated with the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine but also informs potential areas for reform or clarification in copyright law⁵¹.

Beyond the courtroom, legal professionals play a pivotal role in shaping the understanding and application of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine. Conducting surveys and interviews with

⁴⁷ James Boyle, “A Politics of Intellectual Property: Environmentalism for the Net?” 47 Duke L.J. 87, 108 (1997).

⁴⁸ Jane C. Ginsburg, “Modicum and Its Discontents: A Plea for a Realist Copyright,” 40 Colum. J.L. & Arts 1, 5-6 (2016).

⁴⁹ Pamela Samuelson, “Why Copyright Law Excludes Systems and Processes from the Scope of Its ‘Idea/Expression’ Dichotomy,” 85 Tex. L. Rev. 1921, 1943-44 (2007).

⁵⁰ *Id* 3.

⁵¹ *Id* 10.

copyright lawyers, judges, and legal scholars provides valuable qualitative data. Their perspectives on the challenges, uncertainties, and potential improvements regarding the doctrine contribute to a comprehensive understanding of how legal professionals navigate and interpret this aspect of copyright law⁵².

The impact of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine on creative industries is a crucial aspect of empirical analysis. By gathering data on how creators, publishers, and other stakeholders perceive the doctrine's influence on their ability to protect and monetize creative works, we gain insights into its real-world implications. Understanding the perspectives of industry professionals provides a practical dimension to the academic discourse surrounding the doctrine and informs potential policy considerations⁵³.

Through this empirical analysis, the research seeks to bridge the gap between legal theory and practical application. The insights gained from real-world cases and the perspectives of legal professionals and industry stakeholders contribute to a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine's impact on the ground⁵⁴.

The empirical analysis of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine is essential for grounding theoretical discussions in the practical realities of copyright law. Through case studies, comparative analysis, and insights from legal professionals and industry stakeholders, this research aims to provide a holistic view of how the doctrine operates in the real world⁵⁵. The findings from this empirical approach can inform future legal decisions, policy considerations, and scholarly discourse on the ongoing evolution of copyright law.

As the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine continues to play a significant role in shaping copyright law, it is essential to anticipate future trends and offer recommendations for its refinement. This section explores potential developments in copyright law, legislative changes, and the evolving landscape of judicial interpretation. Additionally, it provides suggestions for refining the doctrine to address identified challenges and strike a balance between creator rights

⁵² Pamela Samuelson, “Why Copyright Law Excludes Systems and Processes from the Scope of Its ‘Idea’/‘Expression’ Dichotomy,” 85 Tex. L. Rev. 1921, 1943-44 (2013).

⁵³ William W. Fisher III, “Theories of Intellectual Property,” in *New Essays in the Legal and Political Theory of Property*, 168, 193-94 (Peter G. Newman ed., 2001).

⁵⁴ Jane C. Ginsburg, “Authors and Users in Copyright,” 45 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 387, 407-08 (2003).

⁵⁵ William W. Fisher III, “Theories of Intellectual Property,” in *New Essays in the Legal and Political Theory of Property*, 168, 193-94 (Peter G. Newman ed., 2001).

and public access to creative works⁵⁶.

The rapid pace of technological advancements presents both opportunities and challenges for copyright law. The increasing prevalence of artificial intelligence (AI) in creative processes raises questions about the authorship and originality of AI-generated works⁵⁷. Future developments in copyright law may need to consider how the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine applies to works created with minimal human involvement. The evolving intersection of technology and creativity will likely prompt legal scholars and policymakers to re-evaluate existing doctrines and consider the implications for a wide range of creative industries⁵⁸.

With the continued globalization of creative industries, copyright law will face heightened challenges related to cross-border collaboration. Future trends may involve increased efforts to harmonize international copyright standards, potentially leading to more explicit guidelines on the application of creativity thresholds. Addressing the divergent approaches among legal systems will be crucial to ensuring equitable treatment for creators worldwide. Collaboration on a global scale may also necessitate a re-examination of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine to accommodate diverse cultural perspectives and artistic traditions⁵⁹.

Further to address the ambiguity surrounding the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, there is a need for greater clarity in its definition and application. Courts and lawmakers should consider providing more specific guidelines to determine what constitutes a “modicum” of creativity. Clarifying the factors that contribute to the threshold of originality can assist in achieving a more consistent application of the doctrine across different cases and jurisdictions⁶⁰.

Striking the right balance between flexibility and precision in creativity standards is essential. While a flexible approach allows for the protection of a broad range of works, it should not come at the expense of diluting copyright standards⁶¹. Future refinements to the doctrine should aim to maintain a balance that incentivizes creativity without overly broad protection⁶².

⁵⁶ Jessica M. Silbey, “Law, Memory, and the Craft of Legal Scholarship,” 94 Geo. L.J. 757, 784 (2006).

⁵⁷ Pamela Samuelson, “Enriching Discourse on Public Domain,” 66 Law & Contemp. Probs. 147, 157 (2003).

⁵⁸ Geiger, Christophe. *Constructing European Intellectual Property: Achievements and New Perspectives*. Oxford University Press, 2019), 102.

⁵⁹ Hugenholtz, P. B. (Paul B.). *Copyright and Freedom of Expression in Europe*. Oxford University Press, 2013), 102.

⁶⁰ *Id* 44.

⁶¹ H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476, at 56 (1976).

⁶² Jane C. Ginsburg, “Locating Copyright Within the First Amendment Skein,” 78 Nw. U. L. Rev. 18, 38 (1983).

Precision in defining the threshold of creativity can help prevent the unintentional inclusion of works that lack substantive originality⁶³.

Given the diverse cultural and artistic landscape, the refinement of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine should take into account the richness of various creative traditions⁶⁴. Legal frameworks should be sensitive to cultural differences and avoid imposing a one-size-fits-all approach⁶⁵. A nuanced understanding of how different artistic domains value and express creativity can inform the development of a doctrine that accommodates this diversity while maintaining a baseline standard for protection⁶⁶.

As new forms of creative expression emerge, copyright law must adapt to accommodate these developments. Whether it's virtual reality experiences, interactive media, or collaborative online platforms, the “Modicum of Creativity”⁶⁷ doctrine should be flexible enough to encompass a wide array of creative outputs. Anticipating and addressing the challenges posed by these emerging forms of expression will be crucial for ensuring the continued relevance of copyright law in the digital age⁶⁸.

In conclusion, the future of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine is intertwined with the evolving landscape of copyright law and the dynamic nature of creative expression. Anticipating technological advancements, addressing globalization challenges, and refining the doctrine to strike the right balance will be essential for maintaining a robust and effective copyright framework. By incorporating these suggestions, policymakers and legal scholars can contribute to the continued development of copyright law that fosters innovation, protects creators, and promotes the public interest in accessing and building upon creative works.

Future Trends and Recommendations

In considering the future of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine within copyright law, it is

⁶³ Van Caenegem, William. *Intellectual Property and Human Development: Current Trends and Future Scenarios*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015), 102.

⁶⁴ *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 577-78 (1994).

⁶⁵ William W. Fisher III, “Theories of Intellectual Property,” in *New Essays in the Legal and Political Theory of Property*, 168, 205 (Peter G. Newman ed., 2001).

⁶⁶ Ricketson, Sam. *The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works: 1886-1986*. 2nd ed. Kluwer Law International, 2006), 102.

⁶⁷ Aufderheide, P., & Jaszi, P. (2018). *Reclaiming Fair Use: How to Put Balance Back in Copyright*. University of Chicago Press.

⁶⁸ Guibault, L. (Lucie). *Copyright Limitations and Contracts: An Analysis of the Contractual Overridability of Limitations on Copyright*. Kluwer Law International, 2018), 102.

essential to explore potential developments, legislative changes, and evolving judicial interpretations. This section aims to analyze the trajectory of this doctrine and offers recommendations for refining its application. The dynamic nature of creative industries, technological advancements, and evolving societal attitudes toward intellectual property necessitate a forward-looking perspective⁶⁹.

The digital age has brought about unprecedented changes in the way creative works are produced, disseminated, and consumed. Emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence and virtual reality, challenge traditional notions of creativity and originality. As these technologies become more integral to the creative process, copyright law may need to adapt to encompass novel forms of expression⁷⁰. The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, in particular, may face challenges in defining and recognizing creativity in works generated or significantly influenced by automated systems⁷¹.

Moreover, the rise of user-generated content platforms and collaborative creation models may require a re-evaluation of the “modicum” standard⁷². The collaborative nature of these platforms, where multiple contributors may each contribute a minimal amount of creativity, raises questions about how the doctrine applies to collective works and shared authorship⁷³.

As creative works continue to cross national boundaries, the need for harmonization of copyright standards becomes more pressing. The “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine, with its implicit nature, may benefit from international efforts to establish clearer and more consistent standards⁷⁴. The potential for a more harmonized approach could reduce legal uncertainties for creators seeking protection in multiple jurisdictions, fostering a more seamless exchange of creative works on a global scale⁷⁵.

One of the primary challenges associated with the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine is its

⁶⁹ Pamela Samuelson, “Artificial Intelligence's Fair Use Crisis,” 117 Colum. L. Rev. 2405, 2424-25 (2017).

⁷⁰ Primavera De Filippi, “Copyright and Innovation: The Untold Story,” 33 Cardozo Arts & Ent. L.J. 181, 194-95 (2015).

⁷¹ Aufderheide, P., & Jaszi, P. (2011). *Reclaiming Fair Use: How to Put Balance Back in Copyright*. University of Chicago Press.

⁷² Aaron Wright & Primavera De Filippi, “Decentralized Blockchain Technology and the Rise of Lex Cryptographia,” 65 Emory L.J. 173, 179-80 (2015).

⁷³ Jane C. Ginsburg, “Putting Cars on the ‘Net’: Copyright's Next Challenge,” 18 Harv. J.L. & Tech. 1, 22-23 (2004).

⁷⁴ Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(7), Sept. 9, 1886, S. Treaty Doc. No. 27, 99th Cong., 2d Sess. (1986).

⁷⁵ Primavera De Filippi, “Copyright and Innovation: The Untold Story,” 33 Cardozo Arts & Ent. L.J. 181, 194-95 (2015).

inherent ambiguity⁷⁶. To address this, legislative efforts or judicial guidance could be employed to provide a clearer definition of the threshold for creativity. This may involve specifying the criteria that contribute to the “modicum” standard, offering more guidance to creators, legal practitioners, and the judiciary⁷⁷.

For instance, a legislative amendment could articulate that the “modicum” requirement involves a recognizable and non-trivial degree of creativity, striking a balance between flexibility and specificity. This would aim to mitigate the risk of overly permissive interpretations that might lead to the protection of works lacking substantive creative contributions⁷⁸.

In light of the growing importance of fair use doctrines and transformative uses of creative works, the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine should be assessed in the context of these evolving legal principles⁷⁹. The flexibility inherent in the doctrine could be leveraged to encourage transformative uses that add significant value to existing works while maintaining a delicate balance between the interests of creators and the public.

Recommendations may include incorporating considerations of transformative uses into the application of the “modicum” standard. This would require courts to assess not only the initial level of creativity in a work but also the transformative nature of subsequent uses. Such an approach aligns with the broader trend in copyright law towards accommodating transformative uses and ensuring a fair balance between the rights of creators and the interests of the public⁸⁰.

Refinement of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine should be an iterative process involving ongoing dialogue among stakeholders, including creators, legal experts, policymakers, and the public. This collaborative approach ensures that diverse perspectives are considered and that any changes to the doctrine reflect a balanced and nuanced understanding of the evolving

⁷⁶ Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(7), Sept. 9, 1886, S. Treaty Doc. No. 27, 99th Cong., 2d Sess. (1986).

⁷⁷ TRIPS Agreement, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

⁷⁸ Beebe, Barton. *Trademark Law: A Practitioner's Guide*. 2nd ed. Practising Law Institute, (2013), 102.

⁷⁹ Pamela Samuelson, “Intellectual Property and the Digital Economy: Why the Anti-Circumvention Regulations Need to Be Revised,” 14 *Berkeley Tech. L.J.* 519, 539-40 (1999).

⁸⁰ *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569 (1994).

creative landscape⁸¹.

Public consultations, industry forums, and academic conferences can serve as platforms for engaging in this dialogue. The input of various stakeholders is crucial to achieving a copyright framework that not only protects the rights of creators but also fosters a vibrant and accessible cultural environment⁸².

In conclusion, the future of the “Modicum of Creativity” doctrine lies at the intersection of technological advancements, globalization, and evolving legal principles. As copyright law continues to adapt to new challenges and opportunities, refining the “modicum” standard requires a careful consideration of clarity, fairness, and the changing dynamics of creative expression. By proactively addressing these issues and incorporating stakeholder input, policymakers and legal practitioners can contribute to a copyright framework that supports innovation while safeguarding the interests of both creators and the public.

⁸¹ Christophe Geiger, “Balancing Fundamental Rights and Copyright in the Digital Era: The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union,” 11 Marq. Intell. Prop. L. Rev. 1, 26-27 (2007).

⁸² Aufderheide, Patricia, & Jaszi, Peter. Reclaiming Fair Use: How to Put Balance Back in Copyright. University of Chicago Press, 2018), 102.

Reference

Books

1. Paul Goldstein, *Goldstein on Copyright* (3d Ed. 2023).
2. Lionel Bently, Brad Sherman, Dev Gangjee & Phillip Johnson, *Intellectual Property Law* (5th Ed. Oxford Univ. Press 2018).
3. Lawrence Lessig, *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology And The Law to Lock Down Culture and Control Creativity* (Penguin Press 2004).
4. William M. Landes & Richard A. Posner, *The Economic Structure of Intellectual Property Law* (Harvard Univ. Press 2003).

Journal Articles

5. Justin Hughes, *The Philosophy of Intellectual Property*, 77 GEO. L.J. 287 (1988).
6. Pamela Samuelson, *Originality Standard for Literary Works Under U.S. Copyright Law*, 42 AM. J. COMP. L. 393 (1994).
7. Shyamkrishna Balganesh, *Foreseeability and Copyright Incentives*, 122 HARV. L. REV. 1569 (2009).
8. Madhavi Sunder, *Intellectual Property*, 59 STAN. L. REV. 257 (2006).

Case Law

India

9. Eastern Book Co. v. D.B. Modak, (2008) 1 S.C.C. 1.
10. Govindan v. Gopalakrishna, A.I.R. 1955 Mad. 391.

United Kingdom

11. Univ. of London Press Ltd. v. Univ. Tutorial Press Ltd., [1916] 2 Ch. 601.

United States

12. Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., 499 U.S. 340 (1991).
13. Bleistein v. Donaldson Lithographing Co., 188 U.S. 239 (1903).
14. Alfred Bell & Co. v. Catalda Fine Arts, Inc., 191 F.2d 99 (2d Cir. 1951).
15. Satava v. Lowry, 323 F.3d 805 (9th Cir. 2003).

European Union

16. Infopaq Int'l A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening, Case C-5/08, ECLI:EU:C:2009:465.

International Instruments

17. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Sept. 9, 1886, as revised July 24, 1971, 828 U.N.T.S. 221.
18. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Apr. 15, 1994, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

Statutes

19. Copyright Act, 1957, No. 14, Acts of Parliament, 1957.
20. Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, c. 48.
21. U.S. Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101–122 (2023).