

PAPARAZZI

by

Nicole Zsuzsanna Loomis

A Thesis Project Presented to the
FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
MASTERS OF THE ARTS
SPECIALIZED JOURNALISM

MAY 2009

Copyright 2009

Nicole Zsuzsanna Loomis

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Introduction	1
You are What You Read	4
Changing of the Guard	6
Old Hollywood	7
Survival Skills	9
X17: The Niche Player	12
Exclusives Your Honor	14
The Pol-Parazzi	16
Bibliography	20

Abstract

As the demand for celebrity gossip and photos continues to grow, the Internet has become a platform for a new business model: celebrity photo agencies.

Instead of paparazzi selling their images to magazines such as “People” and “US Weekly” themselves, new companies such as X17, TMZ and Buzzfoto have become the middle men in the relationship, deciding rates to pay to paparazzi as well as rates demanded from gossip magazines.

The paper will focus on the photo agencies within the broader framework of production and consumption of images by the various actors in the sector. These actors include large photo distribution companies, such as Getty Images and AP versus, photographers, including paparazzi and professionals, magazines/newspapers, such as People and US Weekly, and blogs.

It's a balmy late afternoon in West Covina and Alan Zanger, a notorious paparazzo who spent his days hiding in celebrities' bushes has finally made it home. Yes, he has a home.

Miles away from the security cameras and wrought iron fences of the Hollywood Hills, away from the tour buses careening through the streets Beverly Hills, Alan Zanger sits curled into himself, unable to make eye contact as he speaks.

Zanger, once known as the top "stakeout specialist" in L.A., with an ability to hide in his car for weeks on end, looks more like a worn relic than a tough paparazzo who once was punched in the face by Alec Baldwin.

He agreed to meet with me in his home after much hesitation. It tickles irony's nose to know that most paparazzi are beyond private. Some use fake names, most won't tell you where they live, and with Zanger, it took weeks just to get him on the phone.

I had been scared to meet him somewhere private. After all, this was the same guy who had been caught in celebrities' bushes and underneath cars with a protruding camera in hand. His brand of aggression landed him in court after court – and some time in jail, too.

As we sit in the living room, his two baby daughters giggle to the hum of cartoons in the TV room. The low sun shines through a terrace sliding glass door, showing his face, hidden beneath a baseball cap, for the first time.

"I never really cared about why or what. My goal was just to get the pictures." The 'why' or 'what' once had much higher stakes. As a Vietnam War veteran, Zanger said many tactics learned as a soldier helped him as a pap –being able to hide for days on end, being able to "hunt" his prey. These are things that made him top in his field.

“I was making a bloody fortune doing it. I was the first one to use an SUV to hide in,” Zanger said of his then Toyota camper. “We knew where they lived. They never used to see me. There was no interaction.”

In the book “Convergence Culture,” Henry Jenkins, a communications scholar at MIT, argues that the circulation of media content—across different media systems, competing media economies, and national borders—depends heavily on consumers’ active participation. Jenkins postulates that convergence doesn’t represent “a technological process bringing together multiples media functions within the same devices,” but rather “a cultural shift as consumers are encouraged to seek out new information and make connections among dispersed media content.”(Jenkins, 2006)

This cultural shift, then, helps us begin to understand why the business of celebrity photography is booming. Since there is a new home for images on the Internet alongside traditional venues, consumers of celebrity gossip are not forced to wait each week until the new issue of “People” magazine hits newsstands. Instead, they can access thousands of images and information about celebrities in multi-dimensional platforms – be it on television, online, or in a magazine – 24 hours a day.

This shift has caused the different players in this industry to grow more and more dependent on each other, and in turn the cost of celebrity images has dramatically undergone “versioning,” in which the same image can be sold at different prices, over and over.

These changes depend heavily on the use of digital cameras and Internet technology, which enable paparazzi to upload images to photo agency networks at a moment’s notice.

The “convergence” that Jenkins describes is also applicable to the players in the business of selling images – be it the paparazzi, the celebrity agency, or the media.

This efficiency, though, is leaving some paparazzi, who had made a career by working in secret and alone, stranded in the new era.

The lack of interaction, of lone hunter and prey, is something Zanger reminisces about with sadness. It was a time, Zanger said, when paps dealt directly with gossip rags themselves.

“I only went to magazines I felt were fair. I own the copyrights to all my pictures. It’s gotten worse.”

Zanger, who once collected large sums of money from his solo shots and worked directly with “People,” magazine, refused to join a photo agency as they became the middle men between paps and the media.

Nowadays, most magazines don’t talk to paparazzi directly at all. What put Zanger out of business, he says, was new technology combined with the rise of these agencies.

“All of a sudden computers were graphic-friendly,” Zanger said. Instead of going to a one-hour photo lab, it was e-mail. Instead of film, it was digital cameras.

“Magazines demanded quicker and quicker uploading,” Zanger said. “Now it’s even worse – they want the pictures almost immediately.”

“The advent of the picture agencies changed everything. There have never been that many paps,” Zanger said, who in his career only worked alone.

And since the streets are packed with so many paparazzi shooting the same picture, Zanger can’t get the exclusives for which he was once famous – leaving him in

the dust of the hordes of young paps with bright, shiny Canons and technological gear to boot.

You Are What You Read

It was late April of 2007, and the celebrity meltdown du jour was Alec Baldwin and Kim Basinger. Baldwin had left a voicemail for his 11-year-old daughter threatening her to behave and calling her a “thoughtless little pig.” The divorced couple was expected to appear at Stanley Mosk civil courthouse in downtown Los Angeles a fight over the daughter.

After TMZ, the celebrity gossip and news website owned by AOL Time Warner, posted the audio of Baldwin’s voice mail message to his 11-year-old daughter, he responded, “...you find out that everybody who works in tabloid media are people who are filled with self-hatred and shame, and the way they manage those feelings is they destroy the lives of other people.”

But what constitutes the tabloid media today? Celebrities have been generating breaking news in mainstream media for years. News organizations such as CNN now credit TMZ as a news source. Britney Spears was Google’s third-most-popular search of the year in 2007, and Paris Hilton was eighth.

We all seem to be tuning in or reading about celebrities. Yet the paparazzi, who collect the information and images so eagerly consumed, are vilified. Celebrities cry out against about the paparazzi photographers, but their publicists often tip them about the stars’ movements. There is manipulation, and in the modern entertainment world, celebrity can be fleeting. Stars seem to abide Oscar Wilde’s maxim, “the only thing

worse than being talked about is not being talked about.” To stay on top, to remain visible, many celebrities need to be talked about. Princess Diana worked in collusion with her “tormenters,” and sometimes was the one who tipped the paparazzi about her movements. Paris Hilton is paid by high-end night-clubs to show up; the clubs then tip the paparazzi and get publicity. Of course not all celebrities do this. And it can get out of control. Paris Hilton wasn’t happy with the 24-hour news cycle coverage of her arrest. In the case of Princess Di, she ended up dead.

In 1922, media critic Walter Lippmann said the following of photos in the famed opus, “Public Opinion:”

“Photographs have the kind of authority over imagination today which the printed word had yesterday, and the spoken word before that. They seem utterly real. They come, we imagine, directly to us without human meddling, and they are the most effortless food for the mind conceivable.”

“Effortless food for the mind” indeed: be it Britney Spears strapped to a gurney or Paris Hilton shackled and in tears, we have been forced – or have chosen – to eat the junk food of society, whether we like it or not.

Though the year was 1922, Lippmann’s words still ring true – if not truer – as the celebrity photography industry continues to flourish, almost 90 years later.

What Lippmann may not have foreseen was how powerful the *business* of selling photographs – particularly images of celebrities – would become. The industrial organization of the sectors involved in distributing celebrity images has changed significantly. So too has the center of power – leaving lone soldiers like Alan Zanger left for naught.

Changing of the Guard

Paparazzi – humbly known by some as scum with cameras – once worked entirely as their own bosses, selling images directly to gossip magazines. The new generation of paps works either as “staff” or as independent contractors for celebrity photography agencies, which have become the center of power.

Thus, a divide has begun to form between the older generation of paparazzi and the new. The veteran paparazzi, like Alan Zanger, were the guys who hid in their cars with long-lens cameras and did “stakeouts” for hours.

But the new generation, the younger, more aggressive brand we have come to see in the media, has congealed together like a moving nuclear unit, forming little gangs – with a spotter, a driver, a photographer and even an “harasser” to bully competition away.

In New York City, paps used to be masters of disappearing into the landscape. There has been a shift in the last two years and the amount of guys working has tripled, quadrupled, and is still growing. They are recognized and they don’t like it.

There used to be maybe 10 guys working New York. Ron Galella, famous for stalking Jackie-O in the 1960’s, is probably the most famous New York City paparazzo. Steve Sands, Lawrence Schwartzald, Arnolando Magnani, Paul Smallback, Santiago Bayez – these are the guys that now have earned a “spot” on the red carpet during movie premiers – a simple marking of tape where they are called to stand. These are the guys with the press passes. These are the guys that don’t have to stand in the cold late at night with the rest of the group. These are the guys who, unlike Zanger, popped their veteran collars up and became noted photographers.

But for Edward Opinaldo, a next generation paparazzo who works in NYC for “Splash Foto,” late nights in the cold are all he’s earned. Pushed to the side of red carpet events, Opinaldo is forced to stick to the streets because his name means nothing yet.

“The first two rows, those are the big guns,” he said. “It’s a hierarchy. It’s an elite club. Even if you’re the first to arrive, it doesn’t mean anything.”

Guys like Opinaldo have to stand on ladders are often cast to the background with the fans.

Many new paps try landing jobs at agencies on salary instead of working independently. For a new paparazzo, it’s considered lucky to get a salaried job with a monthly stipend. Though salaried paparazzi get access to information and get commissioned to do certain shots, they don’t get a personal credit on the photo, and the percentage the paparazzi make as the image continues to be sold and re-sold declines, Opinaldo said.

A photo credit, for Opinaldo, is something he wants. “It’s a vanity thing.”

The money isn’t very good anymore, either, according to Opinaldo. After his photo agency takes a cut, he usually only makes around \$60 a photo, unless it’s an exclusive, which can earn in the four or five-figure range, he said.

Most of the vets would say Edward joined the game too late. That there’s too much supply and not enough demand anymore.

And in a way, he knows it’s probably true.

Old Hollywood

Though L.A. has bred the pack mentality and art of the high-speed chase, it also once a place that helped protect actors and actresses’ privacy, with bigger moats set up by

studios and publicists who knew how to keep mum and couldn't be bought. There may have been valets, but there weren't valets with Flip cams and Blackberry messenger, uploading tips to paps every next A-list sighting.

In the old days of Hollywood, the paparazzi epidemic simply couldn't have happened. There wasn't the same kind of access. The studio system of early Hollywood was incredibly controlling – stars were under contract and it was the studios that decided who and what was photographed.

The old Hollywood photographers took “stills” or photos shot while actors were being filmed in movies. The photographers were sometimes friends with the actors and actresses. Access was gained the old-fashioned way – through trust.

Bob Willoughby, a 1940's photographer, became the first “outside” photographer, meaning he was the first photographer not part of the studio system to get his photos in magazines. Willoughby was able to take a series of photos of Judy Garland while she was filming “A Star is Born” in 1954 and built a collaboration with the major studios.

Willoughby built a relationship with Garland, who at the time was very temperamental with photographers because of her struggles with addiction. She later died of an accidental drug overdose at age 47.

“They had to make special arrangements with the unions and they paid a 'stand by' photographer to let me on the set. I think they may have hired me initially to keep Judy happy...they knew Judy liked me and felt at ease with me. She had been a publicity problem for them initially, but it then worked out so well that they hired me again for some of their other projects and I never looked back.”

It was considered a treat to capture intimate moments behind the scenes,

“showing the moods of the people and the stress and fun of film making,” Willoughby said. This is what he lived for.

“Some of the actors had clearance of their images and my work was to make them and the films look as interesting as possible, and I would never, nor ever have to this day, exploited any of the people I worked with,” Willoughby said. “The actors and studios knew they could always trust me, it was an important factor in my success.”

Willoughby, 80, sees a huge distinction between the first generation of Hollywood photographers and the modern day paparazzi. He classifies the paparazzi as news gatherers, not artists.

“There are still some wonderful photographers working on the film sets all over. They are the most professional people like every other technician on the set. They must be the best or they basically wouldn't be there.

The news photographers are another thing, they have a different assignment – to get the actors off guard, to exploit personalities – and thankfully I never had to work exploiting others.”

Survival Skills

Brad Elterman probably wouldn't agree with Willoughby. “Exploit” is not part of his vernacular – at least not when he's talking about what *he* does. Elterman is a veteran pap who has fought against the changing landscape, forming a successful photo agency, Buzz Foto, based in L.A. Elterman lives in the Hollywood Hills, drives a Mercedes Benz, and dates actresses. He has wild, curly blonde hair and talks with an affect of a well-seasoned Hollywood player.

When I first met Brad in L.A., he was on the phone with one of his photogs, Justin Campbell, who I had befriended at the Waverly Inn in New York. We were at the Coffee Bean on Robertson, the boulevard that had become a corral for paparazzi. We shook hands, in a fury of excitement.

Justin had gotten an exclusive of Kate Hudson and she was not pleased, from what I could make of Elterman's phone conversation.

"She attacked Justin," Elterman said to me afterward. He was calling the *Daily News* and the *Post* now to try and sell the shot. *Daily News* agreed to take a look at the picture, but passed on running it, saying that the picture made it look like Hudson was "attacking the Daily News," and that people wouldn't understand why that would be.

When Elterman, now 51, was 16, he became known as the "teenage paparazzo" in Los Angeles, and remembers there being only a few competitors.

"I got access very early. I had information. There was no publicist to call. You wanted a picture of Frank Sinatra, you go to Chasens' on a Sunday night."

In 1980, Elterman formed California Features International, a small paparazzi photo agency and in 1992, co-founded Online USA which he eventually sold to Getty Images in 2000.

Elterman said he first felt the shift in the industry in the early 1990's when his company sold a photo of actor Leonardo DiCaprio buying toys at "Toys R' Us" to "People" magazine.

"Normally they would pay \$200 or \$250," Elterman said. "They paid \$5,000."

"People," until this point, didn't publish stakeout-style photos. "They were always afraid they were going to offend someone," Elterman said.

Elterman has been able to keep up with the changing landscape and technology, while most of his photographer friends have not.

“There’s a whole school of guys who just packed up. They got out of the business.”

The new generation has come to include ex-convicts, gang members, and illegal immigrants – or so Elterman said – with bitterness in his voice, or perhaps exaggeration as he did.

“There are definite gangs,” said Elterman. “There’s been an onslaught of illegal aliens hired by nefarious agencies and the old-school guys couldn’t compete. The old guys would get out of the way for each other.”

Elterman prides himself on running a “clean” photo agency, with his credo, “Paparazzi as an Art Form,” running across the top of his website.

When we met, he was preparing images for his upcoming art show in L.A., “Paparazzi as an Art Form.” TMZ had posted a link to the invitation and the response was critical, he said. I found the following posts on TMZ in response to his invitation:

Everybody looks at these types of photos - fans and critics, snobs and normal people, etc.. In this respect, images of celebrities have an integrative effect and serve to provide unity to the culture. celebrities become the nexus of hopes, dreams and nightmares - the ultimate ink blot test. Yes, this is art, at its most primordial level.(see how you can write after you get an art degree - we all learn to take bullshit, and through some weird alchemy, we make them into words of gold - or almost) -- Posted at 12:06PM on February 2nd 2008 by The-Rex

16. Paps are just glorified stalkers that have found a way around the legal system to stalk, harass and humiliate their prey. They pride themselves on getting that "very embarrassing or humiliating shot" and bask in their glow in watching their prey fail at ever what they are doing, not realizing or caring that they too might have caused such failure. It is very pitiful to know in our society that there are those that find joy in watching others self destruct or fail. -- Posted at 8:18AM on Feb 2nd 2008 by Dharma

In January, Elterman sold the shot that ran on the cover of the *Daily News* of Britney Spears strapped to a gurney after a bidding war between the *Post* and the *Daily News*.

“The *News* paid a fortune for it,” he said, hinting it was somewhere in the six-figures. “It’s going to sell for a long time.”

But still, Elterman talked, too, of the oversupply that has shadowed sales the last couple years. He blames this change on the formation of the new breed of photo agencies, who over-hire and flood the streets as a business tactic.

“It’s a sexy business. When something is in now, it’s usually peaked.”

X17: The Niche Player

X17 is a paparazzi-photography agency owned and run by a 45-year-old Frenchman named Francois Navarre, who goes by the name “Regis,” and his wife Brandy Navarre, an American.

Considered to be the masters of pack mentality, X17 has become one of Elterman’s biggest enemies.

According to writer David Samuels, who profiled X17 in his story, “Shooting Britney,” in *Atlantic Magazine* last April, the success of the company comes from its ability to derive images from its own labor pool.

According to Samuels, the roughly 70 paps make \$800 to \$3,000 a week, “plus the occasional four-or low-five-figure bonus in exchange for global rights to their images, which Regis owns lock, stock, and barrel.”

In “Shooting Britney,” Samuels described the growing power of X17, which he considers to be the new monopoly in the business. According to Samuels, as major American tabloids stopped being able to purchase exclusive “front-of-the book” photos

costing \$50,000 to \$75,000 per issue, photo budgets were cut and the photo agencies stepped in.

“The larger photo agencies like X17 and Bauer-Griffin then found that they could make even more money by selling a single set of pictures 15 or 20 times over, to eight or 10 magazines, five or six television programs, and Web sites. And so the industrial phase of paparazzi production was born.”(Samuels, 2008)

This “industrial phase” brought X17 \$3 million in Britney Spears-related images in 2007, or “25 percent of the company’s gross revenues from the sale of celebrity photos and videos.” (Samuels, 2008)

Current trends in the 24/7 celebrity media industry were discussed at an NYU Journalism School panel “The Britney Show,” in March of 2008 which featured X17’s co-owners, Francois and Brandy Navarre. “When I started doing business, I started to meet paparazzi and they were the guys hiding in trucks,” said Francois Navarre. “They were selling photos for \$20,000. The big change came when the U.S. started publishing paparazzi pictures. “People” magazine extended their business and spent a fortune.”

Nowadays, the relationship between celebrities and paparazzi has become symbiotic since celebrities depend so much on the images for their own careers, according to former *US Weekly* editor Bonnie Fuller who also spoke at the NYU event:

“Exposure for a lot of celebrities – particularly young celebrities – has been a big part of their career building,” Fuller said.

USC professor Elizabeth Currid contends in her book, “The Warhol Economy,” that the images displayed in gossip magazines have the power to influence a celebrity’s career.

Says Currid: "...despite the fact that many people view gossip columns as trashy and inaccurate, they are intricately important to the careers of those in the news—so much so that those writing the columns can theoretically extort thousands upon thousands of dollars and perks in order to preserve a person's reputation."(Currid, 2007, p. 133)

Some agencies are rumored to split profits with celebrities themselves – coordinating meeting places at the Ivy or Kitson on Robertson Boulevard.

During the panel discussion at NYU, Brandy Navarre spoke of this phenomenon, noting that celebrities would alert X17 where they are going shopping frequently. "It's a tourist attraction," said Brandy Navarre. "They are very sophisticated – they go to certain places to get pictures they wanted there. Certainly, more and more celebrities are in on it."

The danger for X17, according to Brandy Navarre, is the blogs who then steal images and lessen the value of shots as they proliferate across the web. She described some of the blogs as "parasites" who are living off the "working media."

"I think sometimes we are a catalyst to something already happening. We are there, so we are triggering something but we are not the cause," Brandy Navarre said. "In the U.S., you don't own your image."

Exclusives, Your Honor

Welcome to the Wild, Wild West of Internet versioning – and all the legal perils that come with it.

To explain: bidding wars occur daily as agencies shop "exclusive" photos to different forms of media. The same image, for example, of Britney Spears shaving her

head, can be sold over and over as smaller media (mostly blogs) purchase the image to upload to their site. This is what economists call “versioning.”

For Kim Timlick, who purchases and oversees images for the celebrity blog “Pop Sugar,” versioning occurs on the daily, with different photo agencies shopping similar images around at different prices.

“It’s not too difficult to get an exclusive, if you’re willing to pay,” Timlick said.

Celebrity magazines pay top dollar for exclusive images, which give them rights to the image for a week or two. Since information has different values for different customers, Timlick believes it all comes down to a willingness to pay.

Most photo agencies demand that celebrity blog sites like “Pop Sugar” and “Pink is the New Blog” purchase photos and credit the photo back to the agency.

Perez Hilton, whose real name is Mario Lavandeira, is a blogger whose website, www.perezhilton.com displays photos of celebrities that he comments on – yet he doesn’t take any pictures himself.

In April of 2006, X17 sued Perez Hilton for \$7.6-million in a federal copyright infringement law suit, alleging he used 51 X17 photos without permission.

“Lavandeira’s actions have caused substantial damage to X17’s business in the form of diversion of trade, loss of profits, injury to goodwill and reputation, and the dilution of the value of its rights,” according to the complaint.

“X17 can make as much as tens of thousands of dollars from one magazine on an exclusive story. In the case of the Spears smooch shot, X17 sold a two-page spread to *Us Weekly*, but the magazine decided to shrink the photo play (which lowered the price by

\$10,000, to \$15,000)...because the images had already been on Hilton's site and others,” according to the complaint.

Perez claims “fair use” to copyright laws which allows someone to take information that is copyrighted if it is “reviewed’ because he writes on the photos and manipulates them as “satire.” Such is fair use, he claims.

Though the parties settled in court in April, 2008, and Lavandeira is now banned from using X17 images, the problem of how to stop copyright infringement remains.

Though copyright infringement measures continue to be explored in this ever-evolving industry, one thing is for certain – the business of celebrity photography has significantly changed.

Whether photo agencies succeed as the monopoly in the business of celebrity photography is yet to be seen, but for the time being, it will be up to the veteran paparazzi to re-define themselves in this enterprising industry in order to survive.

The Political-Parazzi

Down the hill and a few zip codes away from most of the big celebs lives E.L. Woody, the self-described “King of Paparazzi.” Woody is another L.A. veteran who works from his home in West Hollywood, sometimes in his pajamas.

He is unlike most of the veterans in the sense that he sees the changing paparazzi landscape as a symptom of a bigger disease. He looks not at his colleagues in disgust, but instead, at our society in the present moment. He thinks the celebrity inundation is just a plot to keep Americans distracted. A so-called “opiate of the masses.”

He is very much an anomaly. On the one hand, he's a successful street paparazzo who has broken many salacious Hollywood scandals on video, like Eddie Murphy getting caught with a transvestite, for example. On the other hand, he speaks as though he's a moral crusader and it's his "duty" as an American to expose anything and everything.

He quotes James Madison and the First Amendment, served in the U.S. Army Special forces in 1967 and was a Vietnam Vet.

When I showed up at his house, a young kid showed up at the door, asking me through a metal screen, if Woody was expecting me.

"Yes," I said. "We have a meeting."

It was early afternoon and sunny. The curtains in the living room were drawn shut. They looked like tie-dyed sheets slung over curtain rods. A big Buddha statue sat by the entrance and there were large canvasses around the room with portraits of people painted in bright colors.

He reminded me of Walter from the movie Big Lebowski. He was a big guy with glasses and a bathtub of a belly. He wore Adidas track pants and slippers.

Huge green safes lined the walls of his office. They were probably five-feet by six-feet and there were three of them. I later found out they were filled with videotapes. There were thousands of hours worth of celebrity footage.

Woody is the kind of guy that just started talking without any introduction or questions asked. At one point in our conversation, he lifted up his shirt to show me scars from 300 stitches he said he had gotten from being attacked by the mafia. He had a lot to say and his words flew from his mouth that day for almost five hours, nonstop.

He started by berating Barbara Streisand, saying she was to blame for the anti-paparazzi legislation. He hates Barbara Streisand more than he hates anyone. He said she to blame for the paparazzi getting such a bad rap.

He said it was the media's fault for turning paparazzi into such horrible creatures.

“They've turned the word into a lynching offense. They vilify the word to suppress the collection of news. In fact, everybody is legitimate press. You're just sold out and oppressed,” he said, talking about how people at big news organizations like Fox and CNN that tarnish the paparazzi but still cover the same stories the paparazzi do themselves.

“Anybody can gather the news. That's the freedom of the press. They want to control the press. They want to approve you before you go out and gather the news. It's a chilling effect on newsgathering. It's censorship.”

Of all the paparazzi I met, old and new, Woody's words stuck with me the most. What he said that day made me begin to turn my gaze away from the churning celebrity industrial complex and onto the media itself. Newsgathering has always included people from all nooks and crannies of society. But as news organizations continue to become empires relying on brand, the stratifying effect leaves convergence out of the conversation – something no news organization in the present moment can afford to do.

We might trust Woody's words more if we knew he worked for the *New York Times*, for example. But his point about the paps being cheapened or lessened because of their lack of connection to a bigger news organization is well taken. The paps can't get into the news organizations but at the same time, their content is being bought, sold and resold sometimes without their even knowing.

At a time when citizen journalism has become a legitimate addition to the mix, who's to say, then, paparazzi don't deserve to be a part of the canon.

Newspapers across the country are dropping like flies trying to figure out a money-making model that will save their content. In keeping their eyes peeled for enterprising models, it's worth looking to the bottom of the journalistic barrel as the significant changes occurring in the world of celebrity coverage have become a microcosm to the changing media landscape as a whole.

Woody speaks to the bigger conversation of this changing media landscape – though his voice may remain unheard. Yes, the content may be as silly as Lindsay Lohan pumping gas or Gwen Stefani pushing a stroller – but the way in which that content is being produced, absorbed, versioned, commented on and recycled sheds light on the effects technology has had on *all* media.

Bibliography

Anderson, Robin and Gray, Jonathan. (2007) "Battleground: The Media"
Published by Greenwood Publishing Group
ISBN 0313341672, 9780313341670

Black, J., Dyk, Tim. [Privacy, Technology, and the California "Anti-Paparazzi" Statute](#)
Harvard Law Review, Vol. 112, No. 6 (Apr., 1999), pp. 1367-1384. Published by: The
Harvard Law Review Association Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1342388>

(Second sourced footnotes in "Privacy, Technology, and the California "Anti-Paparazzi"
Statute")

48 – Mark Sableman, More Speech, Not Less: Communications Law in the Informaton Age 128 (1997)
49-See Lyrrisa Barnett Lidsky, "Prying, Spying, and Lying: Intrusive Newsgathering and What the Law
Should Do About It, 73 Tul. L. Rev. 173, 203 (1998)
50—Warren and Brandeis, supra note 19, at 195.
51—See McClurg, supra note 34, at 1018-21 & nn. 150-176.
94-see Lessig, supra note 89, at 663
95 Carlson, supra note 9, at 46.

Currid, Elizabeth. (2007) "The Warhol Economy: How Fashion, Art, and Music Drive
New York City." Published by Princeton University Press, 2007
ISBN 0691128375, 9780691128375

The Economist. (2003, Aug. 30) "Britain: Snap pop fizz; Celebrity economics. (London)
Vol. 368, Iss. 8338, pg. 23

The Economist. (2005, April 30) "Business: Papped; Celebrity Magazines" Vol. 375, Iss.
8424; pp. 64

The Economist. (2005, Sept. 1) "The Fame Machine," print edition.

"The Most Expensive Celebrity Baby Photos," *Forbes Magazine*. Retrieved from
Firefox, (11/10/08) http://www.forbes.com/2008/04/10/hollywood-celebrity-magazines-biz-media-cx_lr_0410babypix.html

Frosh, Paul. (2003) "The Image Factory: Consumer Culture, Photography and the Visual
Content Industry." Published by Berg Publishers
ISBN 1859736424, 9781859736425

Gilstrap, Peter. (2007, July 9) "Vision Changing for H'Wood's lens Craft." *Variety
Magazine*. Section: Smoke and Mirrors, p. 4

Gross, Larry, Katz, John Stuart and Ruby, Jay. (2003) "Image Ethics in the Digital Age."
Published by University of Minnesota Press ISBN 0816638241, 9780816638246

Gupta, Dipayan. (2008, 3/27) Huffington Post article on “The Britney Show” panel:
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dipayan-gupta/youre-asking-for-it-cha_b_93741.html

Hilden, Julie. (2007, May 16) “Perez Hilton, Michelle Malkin, and the “fair use” exception to copyright law: what are the rules when bloggers use video excerpts and photographs without permission?”

FindLaw's Writ, retrieved Dec 3, 2008 03:45:52 GMT,

<http://74.125.45.132/search?q=cache:0RWndy6VkK8J:writ.findlaw.com/hilden/20070516.html+perez+hilton,+fair+use&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us&client=firefox-a>

Howe, Peter. (2005) “Paparazzi.” Published by Artisan, New York.

Jenkins, Henry.(2006) “Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide”

Published by NYU Press

ISBN 0814742815, 9780814742815

Lippman, Walter.(1922) “Public Opinion.” Published by The Free Press, New York.

Lister, Martin.(1995) “The Photographic Image in Digital Culture.”

Published by Routledge.

ISBN 0415121574, 9780415121576

Mahler, Jonathan. (2008, Sept. 29) “The Ur-Text of a Tabloid Age,” Newsweek, U.S. Edition.

Perez-Pena, Richard. (2008, May 5) “How Much for those baby pictures,” New York Times. Retrieved Dec. 3, 2008,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/05/business/media/05tabloid.html>

Samuels, David (2008, April) “Shooting Britney,” Atlantic Magazine. Stable URL:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200804/britney-spears>

Shapiro, Carl and Varian, Hal. (1999) “Information Rules,” Harvard Business School Press.

Vara, Vauhni. (2005, Oct. 14) “Photo Agencies Scour the Web for Copyright Violations,” Wall Street Journal.