2000

A historical look at the paparazzi phenomenon of the twentieth century

Dawn Marie Dalton
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Dalton, Dawn Marie, "A historical look at the paparazzi phenomenon of the twentieth century" (2000).
Master's Theses. 1986.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.9kmx-35gt>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1986

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**A HISTORICAL LOOK AT THE PAPARAZZI PHENOMENON
OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY**

A Thesis

Presented to

**The Faculty of the Department of Theatre Arts
San Jose State University**

In Partial Fulfillment

**of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts**

by

Dawn Marie Dalton

May 2000

UMI Number: 1399790

Copyright 2000 by
Dalton, Dawn Marie

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1399790

Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2000

Dawn Marie Dalton

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE ARTS

Dr. Kimberly Massey

Dr. Robert Jenkins

Dr. Ethel Walker

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

William Fish

ABSTRACT

A HISTORICAL LOOK AT THE PAPARAZZI PHENOMENON OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

by Dawn Marie Dalton

This thesis takes an historical look at the evolution of the paparazzi phenomenon during the twentieth century. After Princess Diana's death in 1997, the paparazzi were blamed for the world's obsession with celebrities. They were portrayed as "socially deviant," "sleazy," and as individuals who made the lives of celebrities miserable. This thesis exposes a complex "web of obsession" for celebrity images, and argues that culpability for this obsession cannot be solely placed on the paparazzi. This thesis historically examines each player in the "web of obsession"--the mass media market, consumers, paparazzi, and celebrities--to reveal their culpability. This thesis also reveals that U.S. lawmakers' reaction to the public's outrage by calling for more legislation to govern the paparazzi was unnecessary.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my editor, Renee Sins, whose dedication to this project has sustained me. Without her, I would not have had the confidence to undertake this thesis. Her encouragement, friendship, and patience have been what I have held on to. She has a true gift for editing, and for that I will always admire her. Thank you, Renee. I am totally indebted to you.

The idea for this thesis came from my old high school friend and favorite paparazzo, Giles Harrison. I thank him for introducing me to his world and planting the seed to do research on the phenomenon that surrounds his profession. This research opened my eyes to a larger picture than I previously thought existed.

The credit for turning this idea into a thesis goes to Dr. Kimb Massey, who encouraged me to try graduate school. I will always be grateful for her inspiration. I am also indebted to Kimb for taking on the role of my first reader, even though she is on a professional leave from the university. Her insights on conceptual unity pushed me to take this thesis to another level, and I truly appreciate the personal sacrifices she has made for me.

I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Bob Jenkins and Dr. Ethel Walker, who have also

sacrificed personal time to read and comment on my thesis. I am grateful and indebted to them for this.

I also appreciate the other Theatre Art Department faculty with whom I have had classes. They have continuously listened to and supported me on my subject of the paparazzi. Thank you for my advanced education.

I also gratefully acknowledge my mother, Joan, whose inspiration to follow my dreams and stick to my plans got me through graduate school. My mother-in-law, Marsha, has also listened to me endlessly talk about what I have learned and accomplished. Marsha and my mother have been my biggest cheerleaders. I love you both.

Lastly, and most importantly, I want to thank my husband, Jeff, to whom I dedicate this thesis. He has been patient, supportive, and understanding throughout my graduate schooling. Without Jeff, I would not have even attempted this feat and because of Jeff I have finished. We have enjoyed numerous "library dates" together, and he has spent a tremendous amount of time copying, watching television with no sound, and listening to me explain what I have learned about the paparazzi. It is done now, honey, and we can start on the next chapter of our lives. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: THE MASS MEDIA MARKET	6
Print Media	6
Electronic Media	23
Market Changes	30
CHAPTER THREE: THE CONSUMERS	40
Who Are The Consumers	40
The "Catch 22"	44
CHAPTER FOUR: THE PAPARAZZI	47
Who Are The Paparazzi	47
Styles of Paparazzi Photographs	59
Seven Best-Selling Images	64
Paparazzi Techniques	79
CHAPTER FIVE: THE CELEBRITIES	104
Who Are The Celebrities	104
The Effects of Being a Celebrity:	
The First Fifty Years	118
The Second Fifty Years	123
The Host-Leech Relationship	128
Who Are The Publicists	130
Trying to Control the Paparazzi and the Results	133
CHAPTER SIX: THE LAWS	142
U.S. Laws	142
Lawsuits Against the Paparazzi	152
Lawsuits Against the Celebrities	154
Legislation After Princess Diana's Death	162
The "Catch 22"	167
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION	168
WORKS CITED	174
WORKS CONSULTED	192

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

On August 30, 1997, the paparazzi's world, as they knew it, changed dramatically when Princess Diana of Wales died in a tragic car accident. Following the accident, the paparazzi were blamed for causing Princess Diana's death due to their high speed pursuit of her car to obtain photographs of her and companion, Dodi Al Fayed. Celebrities immediately began speaking out against the paparazzi and their "out-of-control" pursuits of celebrities for photographs and videotapes. Actor Tom Cruise called CNN a few hours after the accident and detailed his own high-speed experience with the paparazzi through the same Parisian tunnel (Bishop 106). Actors Whoopi Goldberg, Elizabeth Taylor, Steven Seagal, and Alec Baldwin also called CNN and described their own run-ins with paparazzi and detailed how the paparazzi hounded them mercilessly (M. Stein, "Calif" 40). Actor George Clooney held a press conference a few days after the accident and called for "legitimate news organizations and network news" to "draw a line in the sand" and refuse to use tabloid-generated information (Bishop 106-07).

The public's response to the paparazzi controversy was very dramatic. Some heckled, harassed, and even attacked press photographers, confusing them for the paparazzi. The day after Princess Diana's death, a newspaper photographer

in New Zealand was attacked by construction workers. As they knocked him down to the ground and shoved his camera in his face, one of the workers yelled: "Didn't you do enough, killing someone yesterday?" ("Photographers" 18). While covering the reaction to Mother Teresa's death, an Associated Press freelance photographer was pelted with rocks outside the Missionaries of Charity in the Bronx (Kaminer 18). An Orange County Register photographer who hiked five miles in ninety degree heat to cover a brush fire was met with the response: "Oh, look, here come the paparazzi" ("Photographers" 18). And, Tun Berger, a photography editor for the San Gabriel Valley Newspapers, said that one of his photographers taking environmental photographs at a school was heckled by a student who said, "Why don't you go out and kill somebody else?" ("Photographers" 18).

The mainstream press responded by trying to differentiate themselves from the paparazzi. "There is a distinction between sober-minded 'us' and sleazy 'them,'" wrote Richard Folkers in an U.S. News & World Report article (40). Susan Ellerbach, managing editor of Tulsa World said, "We need to provide a better distinction between so-called 'tabloid' journalists and those of us who provide our communities with information, knowledge, and entertainment they use in their daily lives" ("Diana" 40). In an article

for the Journal of Communication Inquiry, Ronald Bishop noted that mainstream journalists framed the paparazzi as "socially deviant" and "villains," and painted themselves as "heros" (108). "What kind of photos do you get when you chase a car going 60-100 miles per hour?" added CBS reporter Vicki Mabrey (Bishop 100).

One of the biggest reactions to Princess Diana's death, however, was the immediate introduction of "panic legislation" in the U.S. This legislation proposed to control the way the paparazzi obtained their photographs and videotapes. It attempted to balance a person's "right-to-privacy" with the public's "right-to-know." However, its opponents claimed that the legislation was a direct threat to the First Amendment which protects speech and the press from censorship by the government. Many legal experts worried that since the proposed legislation restricted the news gathering techniques of the paparazzi, it would also restrict the mainstream press.

With such strong reactions from celebrities, the public, the mainstream press, and lawmakers, it was obvious that the paparazzi were not well liked at the end of the twentieth century. But, historically, the world has not always felt this way toward the paparazzi. Well into the 1970s, the paparazzi were considered glamorous in the U.S. They were "somewhat cutting-edge figures, cool to have at

parties," wrote Nancy Jo Sales in a 1996 New York article (36). However, the ensuing media coverage of the paparazzi's involvement with Princess Diana's death in 1997 resulted in a drastically changed perception of the paparazzi. In the Spring 1999 issue of The Review of Litigation, Jamie E. Nordhaus stated that the public perceived the paparazzi as "annoying, persistent photographers who in essence stalk their celebrity victims and go to any length necessary to get the shot they desire" (286).

The photographs and videotapes that the paparazzi most desire feature celebrities. The best-selling celebrity image shows "frailty, weakness or just simply reveals that the star, beneath the layer of bodyguards, publicity agents and entertainment lawyers, is [. . .] human," according to Miles Corwin in The Los Angeles Times (A1). To show this human side of celebrities, the paparazzi must penetrate the "walls" that celebrities build around themselves to control their desired images. To do this, the paparazzi have developed techniques that often invade the celebrities' personal privacy.

The paparazzi profession is very lucrative if performed and marketed correctly. A paparazzo, on the documentary Blast 'Em, explained the market:

A picture of a celebrity is like hard currency. [. . .] a piece of international currency. [. . .] You can

sell it in America, England, France, Germany, Japan, Australia, South America, anywhere in the world. It suffers no language barrier. [. . .] A stock agent can sell that [photograph of Michael Jackson] across the world, over and over and over and over again. And that's the core of what to some degree how this industry functions.

What began in the first half of the twentieth century as a "society of spectacle," turned into an international obsession for exclusive photographs and videotapes of celebrities by the end of the century. In today's society "the life of a model or a TV star is more important than news from Rwanda or conflicts which lead good photo-reporters to risk their lives," explains Charles Masters in a 1997 IPI Report (7).

But, this obsession is actually a very complex web, reaching beyond just the paparazzi. The role the paparazzi play in this "web of obsession" depends on several other factors, including the publications buying the footage; the celebrities building "images," the publicists controlling the images and regulating the coverage of the paparazzi and publications; and the public buying the publications and watching the television programs.

This thesis provides a historical exploration of the paparazzi phenomenon during the twentieth century by examining the culpability of all the players in the "web of obsession:" the market, consumers, paparazzi, celebrities and their publicists, as well as the laws that govern them.

CHAPTER TWO: THE MASS MEDIA MARKET

The first player in the "web of obsession" is the mass media market. The paparazzi profession exists through the mass media market because this market pays for the paparazzi's product--photographs and videotapes.

PRINT MEDIA

U.S. Mainstream Newspapers

The demand for and supply of celebrity news first started in the U.S. print media with the invention of the high-speed rotary press in the late 1800s (Rogers 69). The rotary press allowed printing on both sides of a newspaper, creating more news space. Celebrity gossip was used to fill the additional space, with the hope of attracting readers. Then came the development of photography, allowing readers to see the celebrities that they were reading about. In 1914, the New York Times became the first newspaper in the U.S. to add a rotogravure section to its Sunday paper. The rotogravure process printed sixteen pages at a time and did not restrict the number of photographs allowed (Kobré 329). This new development resulted in a greater need for photographs, especially of celebrities, and the first market for paparazzi photographs was created in the U.S.

For the first two decades of the twentieth century,

mainstream newspapers published a low volume of photographs. But, by 1930, tabloid newspapers filled 40% of their news space with photographs. To compete, mainstream newspapers responded by increasing the number of photographs they used by two thirds, equaling 38% of their space by 1938 (Mott 683).

The Great Depression in the 1930s soon greatly affected mainstream newspapers. Many folded because of declining advertising and circulation sales. The proliferation of picture magazines during this era also had a great effect on mainstream newspapers. To compete, newspapers began running more feature stories, using larger photographs, and adopting a magazine-style photo essay layout (Kobré 339). In the 1950s, television had the most dramatic effect on mainstream newspapers. Viewers preferred the moving images of television over photographs in newspapers. By the 1970s, as television started airing evening news programs, many afternoon newspapers folded. Mainstream newspapers never overcame the initial impact of television and are no longer a very large market for paparazzi photographs.

At the turn of the century, most U.S. mainstream newspapers had "people" columns and relied on wire news services like the United Press International (UPI) or Associated Press (AP) for the few celebrity photographs they used. Paparazzi-supplied photograph agencies like Gamma-

Liaison Agency, Sygma, Globe Photos, or Sipa Press sold photographs to UPI and AP for publication in U.S. and foreign mainstream presses (Elterman 158).

Tabloid Newspapers - Great Britain

The first true print publication for the paparazzi was started in January 1904 in Great Britain. England's tabloid newspaper, the Daily Mirror, became the first publication in the world to fill its pages exclusively with photographs. This tabloid actively pursued and even created "new" photographs, instead of waiting for "news" to happen. For example, the Daily Mirror sent photographers to climb Mont Blanc, cross the Alps in a balloon, lower themselves into an active volcano, and even gain permission from Queen Alexandra to photograph King Edward VII's dead body for its front page (Baynes et al. 8).

The Daily Mirror made itself known as "a genre making public the grief of private individuals" (Becker 133). Modeling itself after the Daily Mirror, New York's Daily News became the Daily Mirror's main foreign competition in the 1920s. In fact, they were such an influence on each other that England's Daily Mirror and Daily Express tabloids were both modeling themselves after the Daily News's extensive use of photographs (Becker 133; Baynes et al. 51; R. Williams 208).

The tabloid newspaper market in Great Britain in 2000 remains very strong. There are three daily tabloids: the Daily Mirror, The Sun, and the Daily Express. These three tabloids are mainly interested in photographs of British royalty. But, they are also interested in photographs of sports celebrities and American television and film celebrities. According to paparazzo Brad Elterman, London's Sunday tabloid newspapers, the Sunday Mirror, The News of the World, and the Sunday People, are the best places to sell exclusive photographs, because the Sunday tabloids have a larger photograph budget than the dailies. Other Sunday tabloids and publications include the Daily Record/Sunday Mail and D.C. Thomson and Company in Scotland, and the You/The Mail on Sunday and Weekend in England (Elterman 156-57). Regarding British tabloids in general, though, paparazzo Elterman said, "if you have the type of photo they want, the sky is the limit" (Elterman 156).

According to a 1997 Business Week article, only 20% of the revenue from these British tabloids came from advertising, essentially freeing them from outside censorship. Instead, these tabloid papers made their money from single-copy sales in supermarkets and at newsstands (Lesly and Flynn 42). In 1997, it was reported that circulation and revenue was down for the tabloids in England. That same year, however, News of the World sold

five million copies each Sunday in a country of sixty million. Signifying that England's tabloid market was still a major outlet for paparazzi photographs (Feinstein 7).

Tabloid Newspapers - U.S.

The third print outlet for paparazzi photographs--the U.S.'s tabloid newspaper industry--did not exist until 1919 when publisher Joseph Patterson launched the Illustrated Daily News (later called the Daily News). Patterson based the Illustrated Daily News on the success of England's Daily Mirror (Mott 667-68). This New York tabloid paper was half the size of standard newspapers, usually 11" by 14", making it easy to read on subway trains. It was targeted toward less-educated people and immigrants, and it regularly featured crime and sex scandals (Kobré 329). One of its most famous photographs was of Ruth Snyder as she was being electrocuted in 1928. To get the photograph, a miniature glass-plate camera was strapped to a photographer's ankle underneath his pants and a long cable ran up his leg into his pocket so he could trip the camera. The photograph ran on the front page of the Daily News with the caption: "This is perhaps the most remarkable exclusive picture in the history of criminology" (Biagi 58). The photograph, unethically acquired by most public standards, boosted the Daily News' circulation on that day to over a million copies

(Geraci 175).

In 1924, the Daily News had the largest circulation of any U.S. newspaper, at nearly 750,000 (Agee, Ault, and Emery 122). Because of its success, two other tabloid newspapers started in New York in 1924, the Daily Mirror and the New York Evening Graphic. A war of "gutter journalism" in New York soon began (Mott 669). Sensational stories of murders, scandals, gangsters, illicit love nests, bootleggers, and flappers dominated the three tabloids.

Between 1919 and 1924, eleven other tabloid newspapers started in nine other cities. Most of these tabloids, however, did not last long. The Great Depression of the 1930s, changed the moods of the readers. By 1932, the Evening Graphic folded. The Daily Mirror continued with celebrity gossip and reached a circulation of 600,000 in 1937, but it was never very profitable, and with the newspaper strike of 1962-63 it closed (Hertzberg 123). To survive the Great Depression, the Daily News began reporting actual news. In fact, Patterson reportedly told his editors that "the Depression and its impact on the lives of ordinary people had become the big story, not mayhem and the frolics of the stars" (Morton 52). By 1938, the Daily News had a circulation of 1,750,000 on weekdays and 3,250,000 on Sundays (Bessie 16).

Despite the trends in the big cities, Frank Luther Mott

wrote in his book American Journalism that between 1930 and 1950 local tabloids continued to steadily increase. In the 1930s there were a dozen tabloids and by the 1940s almost fifty (672). By the 1950s, however, most of the local tabloids had folded due to local television news programs featuring more blood, gore, and celebrities than the newspapers could provide (Morton 52). The local tabloids still in circulation in 2000 are New York's Daily News, with a 1999 circulation of approximately 723,000 on weekdays and 810,000 on Sundays, and the New York Post (tabloid as of 1942), with a circulation of approximately 437,000 on weekdays and 382,000 on Sundays (Fine 11-12).

One other early local tabloid newspaper to survive was New York's National Enquirer. Founded in 1926 as a full-size Sunday paper, the National Enquirer published mostly crime stories and racing tips. In 1952, with a circulation of less than seven thousand readers, the failing tabloid was bought by Generoso Pope for a mere \$75,000. Pope changed the content of the tabloid to mainly feature stories on gore, emphasizing horrific murders and accidents. By 1968, its circulation was up to one million (Bird 24). When the circulation numbers began to level out at a million, Pope again tried a new approach. He made the tabloid into a national paper and sold it in the relatively untapped market of supermarkets and drugstores chains. He began publishing

only weekly, and to accommodate the new market, he changed the paper to a "family-style" format featuring stories on household repairs, pop psychology, unusual human-interest, celebrity gossip, and the occult and mystery. By 1974, circulation was up to four million earning Pope a gross annual revenue of \$41 million (Peer and Schmidt 62; Klaidman G2).

Based on the success of the National Enquirer, Rupert Murdoch started the color-printed tabloid, Star, in 1974. Star focused on celebrity news, and by 1979 had a circulation of three million readers and an annual net earning of \$5 million (Welles 56-57). That same year, Pope counterattacked Murdoch's new tabloid by changing the National Enquirer to a color-printed format and starting a national television advertising campaign featuring the slogan: "Enquiring Minds Want to Know." By 1982, the National Enquirer's circulation was over five million with gross revenues of \$140 million (Byrne 78-79). The National Enquirer's top-selling issue of all time featured Elvis Presley lying in his open copper coffin at Graceland. The photograph was taken by an undisclosed relative or close family friend who was paid \$75,000. The 1977 issue was a complete sell out at 6.5 million copies (Sachs 34; Elterman 134).

In 1980, Pope started the Weekly World News featuring

bizarre stories, leaving the National Enquirer to concentrate on celebrity stories. After Pope died in 1988, MacFadden Holdings bought the National Enquirer and Weekly World News for \$412.5 million ("Enquirer" 1B). In 1990, Star's circulation was 3.5 million and the National Enquirer's was 4.5 million. It was in this year that G.P. Group, a MacFadden subsidiary, acquired Star for \$400 million (Oram 10). In February 1999, the three tabloids were acquired for \$300 million by America Media Inc. At the time, National Enquirer had a circulation of 2.24 million and Star had 1.82 million readers (Quinones). As of March 2000, the National Enquirer and Weekly World News had editorial offices in Lantana, Florida, and Star was headquartered in Tarrytown, New York.

In 1954, the local tabloid Midnight was started by Joe Azaria in Montreal, Canada. At the same time, Azaria also bought the Cleveland Examiner and turned it into the National Examiner. In its early years, Midnight had a circulation of seventy-five thousand, and it was not much more than a scandal sheet. In 1960, Mike Rosenbloom bought Midnight and changed its name to the Midnight Globe and later just the Globe. By the late 1960s, Globe changed its format to become a sex-and-gore version of the National Enquirer. By 1977, Globe claimed a circulation of 1.4 million readers by following the National Enquirer's lead of

dropping the gore content and beginning a national supermarket distribution (Sandhage and Brohaugh 27). In 1982, the Globe and National Examiner moved to West Palm Beach, Florida, and in 1983 a new tabloid, the Sun, was started by Rosenbloom to compete with the Weekly World News. In 1999, under Globe Communications, these three tabloid publications were located in Boca Raton, Florida.

U.S. tabloid newspapers remained very successful and quite a viable market for paparazzi photographs throughout the rest of the twentieth century. However, circulation among the six steadily declined. For example, the National Enquirer's circulation dropped from 5.0 million in 1982 to 2.24 million in 1999. The Globe's circulation was 1.6 million in 1990, decreasing to 1.0 million in 1997. Star went from 3.5 million in 1990 to 1.82 million in 1999. To increase circulation and profits, the tabloids divided their markets strategically to increase circulation and profits. Cleo Paskal wrote in the Columbia Journalism Review that the National Enquirer and the Globe concentrate mostly on A-list celebrities (like Liz Taylor, Bill Cosby, or Michael J. Fox), the Star and the National Examiner on B-list celebrities (soap opera and country western celebrities), and the Sun and the Weekly World News stick to the bizarre and weird (18). But, the decrease in circulation may be due more to the fragmentation of the overall market than

occurred in the 1990s (to be explained later in this chapter.)

In November 1999, all six tabloids came under one ownership--American Media Inc. American Media Inc., parent company of the National Enquirer, Star, and Weekly World News, bought Globe Communications Inc., owner of the Globe, National Examiner, and Sun for \$105 million ("With the Tab's"). The future of these tabloid outlets for paparazzi photographs is now uncertain.

Magazines

The fourth print market is magazines. Originally, magazines about celebrities were published by film studios. Fans disliked these publications because they sounded like press releases and revealed very little personal information about the celebrities. As a result, Motion Picture was developed in 1911 as the first "fan magazine." It was quickly followed by Photoplay, Movie Life, Screen Stories, Movie Star Parade, Picture Play, Screenland, Screen Stars, Silver Screen, Screen Book, Motion Picture Classics, Modern Screen, and Motion Picture (Fahey and Rich 14; M. Levin 7; Kobal, Hollywood 29). These magazines told the "real" personal stories of the celebrities. Accompanying the articles were many photographs depicting the celebrities' off-screen lives including their weddings, husbands,

families, and homes. According to Barbara Gelman in Photoplay Treasury, the fan magazine Photoplay became "the most important fan book, the bible of Hollywood, the magazine the stars trusted and wanted to appear in" (ix). Photoplay was started in 1914 and averaged 170 pages per issue, covering news of film celebrities. By 1925, it had a circulation of over half a million (Kobal, Art 46).

Up until the 1950s, these fan magazines would get their stories straight from the studio's publicity departments. Gossip columnists like Louella Parsons and Hedda Hopper were given full rein, as long as they followed guidelines set up by the studios (Weeks 1F). Reporters and photographers were invited to christenings, weddings, and celebrities' homes; privy to their personal problems; and given exclusives. These early fan magazines were so strongly tied to Hollywood that they would only disclose details of scandals that were approved by the studios.

When the studio system was dissolved in 1948, inevitably scandals involving celebrities began to erupt. In 1949, a new magazine called Confidential was started to cover these scandals. Confidential made "scandal a high-paying business and a commonplace thing among the stars" (Gelman x). To compete, the fan magazines resorted to reporting hearsay, breaking the long-standing trust among the celebrities, reporters, and photographers.

In the early history of magazines, there were also "picture magazines" featuring paparazzi photographs. In 1914, the New York Times newspaper started the picture magazine Mid-Week Pictorial to publish its abundance of World War I photographs. In the 1920s, photographs of film and theater celebrities, fashions, sports, and high school beauty queens replaced the war photographs (Kobré 329). Daniel J. Boorstin noted in his book, The Image, that between 1901 and 1914, 74% of the subjects found in magazines came from politics, business, and the professions. By 1922, well over half of the subjects in magazines came from the world of light entertainment, sports, and the nightclub circuit (59).

On November 23, 1936, a year before Mid-Week Pictorial folded, a new mass-circulation picture magazine called Life debuted. In its first few years, Life was known as a sensational magazine, running articles and photographs such as "how to undress in front of your husband" (Kobré 338). Within six months of its debut, Life had its first Hollywood cover featuring the film celebrity Jean Harlow.

A few months after Life began publication, the picture magazine Look was started by the Cowles brothers, John and Gardner. Look, too, began as a sensational magazine. One of the Cowles brothers defended the magazine's subject matter by explaining that: "Look has been criticized as

[being] sensationally thrilling. My only reply is that life itself is thrilling" (Kobré 339). Look also toned down its image and began to concentrate on feature stories within a few years of its debut.

After the successes of Life and Look, thirteen new picture magazines emerged with a combined circulation of sixteen million per issue. Magazines such as See, Click, Peek, Pix, Picture, and Scoop featured stories from the social ills of drinking to "how you should tell your child about sex" (Kobré 339). Foreign picture magazines also debuted, including England's Picture Post and France's Match, both in 1938. France's Paris-Match (formerly Match) and South America's Manchette often duplicated Life almost exactly by running the same photographs and stories that were of international interest. Life and Look soon turned their content to the "photo essay," a sequence of photographs around one subject with only brief captions. Life and Look dominated the market until television was fully developed in the 1950s and their audience decreased (Baynes et al. 10; Rothstein 113). The era known as the "golden age of photojournalism" had ended as the "golden age of television" began.

To continue to compete, magazines had to specialize their formats. In his 1979 book, Photojournalism, Arthur Rothstein stated that "studies show that the American reader

seems more inclined to purchase several magazines giving intense coverage to his particular areas of interest than a general news pictorial magazine" (113). Mott, author of American Journalism, was in agreement with Rothstein's research. In 1962, Mott said that the more specialized a magazine; the more prosperous. Mott also noted that fictitious stories in magazines declined and that magazines specializing in home services, entertainment and sports personalities, and news and public affairs all increased in circulation (832).

Specialized magazines "for those aspiring to fame or to regain faded recognition, for star-for-a-day ordinary people, and for celebrities from untapped fields," fueled the demand for paparazzi photographs wrote Joshua Gamson in his 1994 book Claims to Fame (43). People magazine was the first of these specialized magazines. People began in 1974, displaying large photographs of celebrities and very little type. Its managing editor's motto was "young is better than old, pretty is better than ugly, TV is better than music, music is better than movies, movies are better than sports, anything is better than politics" (Tebbel and Zuckerman 294). Within two years, People's circulation was 2.5 million and by 1999 its circulation was 3.7 million. (Tebbel and Zuckerman 295; Kuczynski C1). The success of People encouraged the development of other U.S. magazines that

focus on "personality," "people", and "infotainment." Magazines such as US, In Style, Entertainment Weekly, Spy Magazine, and Picture Week all emerged. Picture Week, however, only lasted for little over a year before it stopped production in 1986, and Spy Magazine closed its doors in 1998 after twelve years and a circulation that had gone from 225,000 to 125,000 ("Tested" AA1; Nix 88). US and Entertainment Weekly had circulations of 1.0 million and 1.5 million, respectively, in 1999. In 1998, In Style had a circulation of approximately 1.1 million (Kuczynski C1; "Time Inc.'s" C1).

In 1988, Premiere joined the group, and by 1989 it claimed to be America's number one film magazine. In 1997, Premiere had a circulation of 600,000, and it competed against Movieline magazine with a circulation of 246,000 (Gremillion 20). Fame also emerged in 1988, and it spared no expenses in fulfilling its claim to be "today's most entertaining and enlightening magazine." Fame covered the behind-the-scenes creators of business, fashion, entertainment, media, and politics (Tebbel and Zuckerman 296-97). Fame only lasted for a little more than two years when it closed its doors in December 1990 ("Fame Ceases" D4).

For the younger market, Teen Beat, Teen People, Entertainment Teen, Teen Style, and many other "teen"

oriented magazines exist. The pages of these teen magazines are filled with photographs of young celebrities. Rolling Stone is another magazine that welcomes paparazzi photographs of music or film celebrities. But, according to the paparazzi, the most prestigious magazines to have photographs published in are Newsweek's "Newsmakers" column or Time's "People" column (Elterman 157-58).

The foreign magazine market for paparazzi photographs includes: France's Voici and the top-selling magazine Paris-Match (according to paparazzo Elterman, Paris-Match pays very well for world exclusives) (Masters 7; Elterman 157); Italy's Gente; Germany's Bunte, Stern, and Burda Publications (interested in film and television celebrities known in Germany); South Africa's Fair Lady/National Magazines (interested in television celebrities on U.S. shows shown in South Africa); England's Sound, Melody Maker, and New Musical Express (interested in only rock, pop, and heavy metal celebrities); Japan's Shinko Music Publishing Company, Ltd. (Music Life/Rock Show) (interested in all three musical types plus youth celebrities); and Sweden's OK/Poster (interested in photographs of young celebrities from the film, music, and television industry) (Elterman 157-58; Riding All; Galella, Jacqueline 58).

According to Elterman, in his 1985 book, Shoot the Stars, the best foreign magazine markets for photographs, in

order of profitability, were: Germany, Sweden, The Netherlands, Italy, Spain, Australia, Japan, United Kingdom, South Africa, West Malaysia, and South America. (Elterman considered the U.S. a secondary market because most of his sales were to foreign countries.) In his book, Elterman explained that an exclusive could be sold to each country because "very few readers in Italy read German magazines, and very few readers in Sweden read Japanese magazines. So an exclusive can actually be exclusive to twenty or more magazines around the world" (146).

ELECTRONIC MEDIA

The electronic marketplace for the paparazzi emerged in the 1950s with the introduction of television. However, before television became a truly viable market for paparazzi videotapes, three key technological advances had to take place. These technologies--geostationary satellites, cable television, and camcorders--took over thirty years to develop; therefore, television was not a real outlet for the paparazzi until the late 1980s.

Geostationary Satellites

The first technological advancement came on July 26, 1963, with the launching of the geostationary satellite Syncom II. Satellites rapidly became relay stations for

paparazzi photographs, and, later, videotapes. Satellites allowed images to be transmitted to a fixed-orbit stationary satellite, bounced off the satellite's transponder pods, and retrieved by receiving stations on earth. Warren K. Agee wrote in his co-authored book, Introduction to Mass Communications, that these transmissions were "cheaper, faster, and more reliable than by ground lines" (9). Agee also stated that a computer could talk to another computer via satellite about 160 times faster than it could through land lines. The introduction of geostationary satellites helped create a new paparazzi market in two ways. First, satellites instantly changed the world into a global market. The exposure of paparazzi images created a market for universally recognizable faces and stories, and globalized the media ("Fame: The Faustian" 22). Second, satellites played a vital part in the rise of the cable industry.

Cable Television

Cable television was initially started in 1949 as a system to carry broadcast signals via cables to homes in Pennsylvania and Oregon. Consumers in parts of these states had difficulties receiving over-the-air television transmissions due to the rugged terrain. Sending the signals through coaxial cables solved this problem. For the rest of the U.S., however, the cable industry did not take

off until 1975, when Time, Inc. leased a communication satellite to distribute Home Box Office (HBO) to cable system operators. Cable providers then fed HBO transmissions through cable lines to consumers who paid for a special connection to unscramble the signal. The success of HBO soon led other new companies to distribute their programs via satellites. Thus, with the help of satellites, the cable industry was started.

The number of cable subscribers soon grew from 10 million in 1975; to almost 20 million in 1980; to 53.2 million in 1990 (Agee, Ault, and Emery 313). By the mid-1990s, there were over one hundred cable channels nationwide with the average household only able to receive forty of them. These cable channels needed to fill their time, thus new types of programming emerged. Jeff Greenfield argued in a 1997 Time article that the 1970s cable television revolution significantly changed the market for paparazzi videotapes. He demonstrated that by the mid-1980s, syndicated tabloid television shows like Entertainment Tonight (ET) and afternoon talk shows started to fill the channels that cable provided (18). Satellites also made it easy for local stations to pick up these tabloid entertainment shows that were sold by production companies.

A FCC ruling, in 1970, also helped the proliferation of tabloid television shows. The Primetime Access Rule stated

that the time between 7:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. was owned by local stations and not the networks. The FCC hoped to give viewers a greater diversity of programming. Instead, local stations bought shows from syndicators to fill the time slot, and tabloid shows like ET took off. In August 1996, the FCC rule was eliminated, but the popularity of the syndicated shows in that time slot did not change, and most programming stayed the same ("FCC" 9627-28; Bliss 296).

Camcorders

Before the paparazzi videotape market was fully established, one more technology needed to be in place. In the early 1980s, camcorders were on the market, but they were very expensive. In fact, in 1992 only 15% of American households and 20% of Japanese households owned camcorders (Agee, Ault, and Emery 349). A year earlier, the Washington Post predicted that paparazzi videotapes would soon take hold in the tabloid and mainstream marketplace. It was also noted that a few veteran paparazzi were carrying small, lightweight, super-8 or hi-8 videotape cameras in the hopes of selling their footage to news stations, infotainment shows, and tabloid television shows ("Paparazzi's Progress" C9). It was not until camcorder companies lowered their prices, however, that paparazzi videotapes started flooding the market. In 1997, with camcorder equipment priced under

\$500, an estimated fifteen million Americans owned one (Agee, Ault, and Emery 349).

In the mid-1990s, the affordability of camcorders greatly increased the amount of paparazzi videotapes available to tabloid television shows. With videotape cameras in the hands of so many people, privacy became difficult for many celebrities to maintain. Easy access to and affordable camcorders also hurt the paparazzi because they were suddenly competing against anyone with a camcorder. In a 1996 TV Guide article, Mary Murphy wrote that making videotapes of celebrities could be a very lucrative career choice for those who wanted to pursue it. "The right video can earn anywhere from \$1,500 to \$50,000 worldwide, and top videorazzi can make more than \$250,000 a year," she said (27). "The word is out that anyone with a video camera can submit footage," said Pat Kingsley, head of a publicity firm in Hollywood (Murphy 28).

Videotape Market

Tabloid television shows emerged in the early 1980s, and later became the largest market for paparazzi videotapes. The first tabloid television show to debut was the syndicated ET on September 14, 1981. Critics considered it a "\$22 million gamble," but it proved to be a gigantic success for Paramount. In 1996, ET was on 179 stations

reaching 95% of the nation and 17 foreign countries. Some have criticized ET as a "'news' show on Prozac: Everything [is] repackaged as something relentlessly upbeat," wrote Steven D. Stark in his book Glued to the Set (335). Richard Zoglin wrote in a 1994 Time article that "the show has dropped almost all pretense of being anything but an arm of the Hollywood publicity machine" (85). "Entertainment Tonight [is] the equivalent of a big, wet kiss to Hollywood," exclaimed CNN's Entertainment Weekly co-anchor Judd Rose (Waxman, "Behind" B1).

After five years, a challenger entered the ring to combat ET. A Current Affair first aired in July 1986 and began syndication by 20th Century Fox Film Studios in October 1987. Dennis Kneale wrote in The Wall Street Journal that A Current Affair was one of the main shows that helped Fox become television's "fourth network" (B1). A Current Affair became the first tabloid program to show the "seamier side of fame--particularly if it involved sex--and sensational crime stories reminiscent of the New York tabloids and the National Enquirer," wrote Stark in Glued to the Set (337).

A Current Affair did not battle ET alone for long. On January 9, 1989, King World Productions' Inside Edition premiered and eight months later, on September 18, 1989, Paramount's Hard Copy aired. The battle for stories and

scoops among these gossip shows (A Current Affair, Inside Edition, and Hard Copy) began. Before Inside Edition even went on the air, it lured six producers and staff members from A Current Affair. The shows regularly accused each other of copying stories. In 1989, Meg Cox wrote in The Wall Street Journal that Inside Edition accused A Current Affair of taking early promotions of upcoming shows off a satellite feed, studying them, and copying quick-and-dirty versions of the stories for their own show (B1, B6).

The mid-1990s saw the rise of four more tabloid shows: King World Production's American Journal in 1993, Warner Brothers' Extra in 1994, NBC's Access Hollywood in 1996, and MGM Studios' National Enquirer TV in 1999. Access Hollywood set itself up in direct competition with ET's celebrity-dominated format. Access Hollywood was first co-owned and distributed by Twentieth Television, but currently it is partly owned by NBC and distributed by Warner Brothers. Access Hollywood gives ET a run for its money in large markets like Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, and Los Angeles, where it often beats or meets ET's ratings (Graham 3D).

American Journal and Extra competed against the sensational formats of A Current Affair, Inside Edition and Hard Copy, but that did not last very long. In 1996, A Current Affair was cancelled, and two years later American

Journal was cancelled; both due to low ratings (G. Levin 26; "Major" 22). Hard Copy was cancelled in 1999. "The show had run its course," said Hard Copy co-president Frank Kelly (Brennan 5). Extra, Inside Edition, and the National Enquirer TV remain. They compete against each other for racy, sensationalistic, lurid, and shocking news. Robert H. Lloyd wrote in his thesis Historical Development and Commercial Venture of Tabloid Television that to attract larger audiences, the producers of these shows go further and further down the path of bad taste (12).

MARKET CHANGES

For approximately the first ninety years of the twentieth century, the paparazzi sold their footage to the four main markets previously detailed: British and the U.S. tabloids, worldwide magazines, and the syndicated tabloid television shows in the U.S. In the 1990s, six additional markets emerged that challenged the existing markets. These six markets were not exclusively devoted to tabloid-type news, but together they fragmented the market and spurred competition for paparazzi photographs and videotapes by the end of the twentieth century.

The first new market to suddenly covet paparazzi photographs was England's mainstream newspapers. The change began in 1993, when Rupert Murdoch's mainstream newspaper,

The Times, with a circulation of 430,000, started a campaign to increase its circulation against The Daily Telegraph, with a circulation of 1.2 million. The Times cut its sales price and turned to populist news and features. With its circulation dropping, The Daily Telegraph responded with a sales promotion of its own to attract new readers. For both newspapers, sports, health, travel, media, arts, and fashion became the main battle zones. Other British newspapers quickly followed suit. This had a dramatic impact, since in 1998, there were eleven national daily newspapers and nine national Sundays in Great Britain, making it the most competitive market in the world (Almond 64). These newspapers began to feature fewer articles on foreign news, local government, religion, and defense, and they began to specialize in entertainment type news. In response to the format changes at the mainstream newspapers, Great Britain's tabloids had to become even more tabloid to compete (Almond 64-65).

The second new paparazzi market emerged on U.S. cable networks when mainstream tabloid shows proliferated. In 1997, cable shows like CNBC's daily Business Center, Bravo's monthly Expose, TNT's weekly Rough Cut, and CNN's ShowBiz Today and Entertainment Weekly all explore the inner workings of Hollywood's film industry. They claim to cater to audiences with an interest in the nuts and bolts of the

entertainment industry; beyond the current celebrity-driven headlines. Bravo Programming Vice President, Frances Berwick, said "they want not just the performance, they want to know how it's put together" (Waxman, "Behind" B1).

The third market appeared in 1990 when a new U.S. cable network called E! Entertainment Television debuted. E!, devoted to "in-depth, original programming on the world of entertainment," did not catch on with audiences until 1995 (Flint 25; "E!"). By 1998, however, E! claimed to be the only 24-hour network to cover the world of entertainment, reaching 51 million cable and direct broadcast satellite subscribers and 120 countries worldwide ("E!"). E!'s 1998-1999 production schedule included: Celebrity Profile, The Gossip Show, E! News Daily/E! News Weekend, The E! True Hollywood Story, Mysteries & Scandals, Fashion Emergency, Talk Soup, Howard Stern, coverage of twenty award ceremonies, and more than one hundred one-hour specials.

The emergence of newsmagazine shows on U.S. television networks is the fourth market to develop. Prior to a surge of network newsmagazine shows in the 1990s, only two existed. They were 60 Minutes in 1968 and ABC's 20/20 in 1978. By 1997, there had been fourteen weekly, hour-long network newsmagazines in prime time. Along with 60 Minutes and 20/20, these shows were: CBS's West 57th in 1986, 48 Hours in 1988, Eye to Eye with Connie Chung in 1993, Street

Stories in 1993, and Public Eye with Bryant Gumbel in 1997; ABC's Our World in 1986, Prime Time Live in 1989, Day One in 1993, and Turning Point in 1994; NBC's Dateline NBC in 1992 and Now in 1993; and Fox's Front Page in 1993.

By the 1999-2000 television season, only four of these shows remained: CBS's 60 Minutes and 48 Hours, NBC's Dateline, and ABC's 20/20. But, an interesting new trend emerged. Instead of airing a different newsmagazine show each night, the same show with different stories airs several nights a week. CBS's 60 Minutes is on Sunday and Tuesday nights, and the network covers Thursday nights with 48 Hours; Dateline NBC is on five nights a week; and ABC's 20/20 is on four nights a week ("New" 12G).

One reason the remaining four newsmagazines succeeded is that they cost less to produce than a typical thirty minute sitcom. A sitcom usually costs nearly \$1 million an episode, while a newsmagazine costs approximately \$500,000 (Gamson, "Incredible" 32). These programs are also used in "counter-programming," meaning that they are put into time periods where the network is not likely to win (Hall, "News Shows" F1). For example, in 1999, NBC's ER had extremely high ratings, therefore, ABC's 20/20 and CBS's 48 Hours were programmed against it ("New" 12G).

According to Gamson's 1994 article in The American Prospect, these newsmagazines helped fragment the current

paparazzi market because they covered America's "guilty pleasures"--stories on sex, crime, disaster, and celebrities (34). These tabloid-type stories bring viewers to the shows, and advertising money into the networks' pockets. For example, CBS newsman Bernard Goldberg said in the Calgary Herald that "when we put the West Bank (in Israel) and South Africa on 48 Hours, nobody watched. When we did spring break, we got the highest ratings in the history of 48 Hours" (Hall, "News Magazines" F3).

The fifth recently emerged market, the Internet, has had a tremendous effect on the paparazzi. Agee wrote in his co-authored book, Introduction to Mass Communications, that the Internet was originally created in the late 1960s by the U.S. government, defense contractors, and universities as a way to exchange information and ideas between scientists, engineers, and academic specialists. In the early 1990s, the general population gained access to the Internet, and by the mid-1990s individuals and companies were rushing to get connected. Via a modem and an Internet provider, anyone on a computer could be connected to the linked computers of the World Wide Web (10-11).

Globally speaking, the Internet has had the same (maybe even a greater) impact on the paparazzi market in regards to globalizing celebrity images as geostationary satellites had in the 1970s. Information on celebrities is easily

accessible. There are Web sites devoted to certain celebrities and many entertainment news sites like Mr. ShowBiz, Hollywood Online, and E! Online (Cuneo 27). These Web sites often feature scandalous information on celebrities that was captured by paparazzi or "stalkerazzi." Los Angeles Daily News reporter, Janet Weeks, wrote that she believes that people are infatuated by celebrities to an even greater extent since the emergence of the Internet. For example, she stated that in 1996, Winona Ryder had seventy unapproved pages on the World Wide Web. "Thousands of people are plugging in because they want to find out about her life. People gobble it up," Weeks said (1F).

The sixth and final market is the U.S.'s mainstream press, both print and electronic. In the 1990s, the mainstream press began covering borderline tabloid stories such as: the Paula Jones and Monica Lewinsky lawsuits against President Clinton; the O.J. Simpson murder trial; the Tonya Harding and Nancy Kerrigan ice skating scandal; the John and Lorena Bobbitt incident; the Menendez brothers trial; and the Jon Benet Ramsey and Ennis Cosby murders. A 1998 study by the Project for Excellence in Journalism reported that the three nightly network news programs, weekly news magazines, and major newspapers were featuring more cover stories on celebrities, scandals, and human interest. The study indicated that cover stories increased

from 15% of the total coverage in 1977 to 43% in 1997 (Roberts A13). Jack W. Germond and Jules Witcover wrote in the National Journal that the old standards of "don't print it if you can't prove it" and "don't print it if it doesn't affect the job" have all gone to the wayside (1154).

The emergence of celebrity- and scandal-filled news in the mainstream presses can be traced to two causes: 1) the content and validity of some tabloid newspaper stories; and 2) the lack of hard news to cover in the 1990s. In 1987, this last paparazzi market was initiated when presidential candidate Gary Hart challenged mainstream reporters to follow him if they suspected he was cheating on his wife. Hart was followed, but it was the tabloid newspaper the Star that broke the scandal. Star photographed Hart having an affair with Donna Rice on the boat Monkey Business while on a trip to Bimini. The end result: a Washington Post reporter in response to that scandal asked Hart if he had ever been unfaithful, and the first appearance of tabloid-type journalism appeared in the mainstream press (Shepard 28).

In 1992, Star broke another story that the mainstream press could not ignore. Star revealed a lawsuit by an Arkansas state employee accusing presidential candidate Governor Bill Clinton of using state funds to romance five women. The New York tabloids quickly picked up the story,

but mainstream newspapers did not. Things took a dramatic turn when National Public Radio reporter, Cokie Roberts, asked Clinton about "womanizing" in a televised debate. The next day, Star published an extensive interview with one of the five women he was said to have romanced, Gennifer Flowers. Clinton temporarily stopped campaigning after the confrontation, but he later appeared on 60 Minutes to discuss the situation--forcing the mainstream media to cover the scandal (Germond and Witcover 1154).

Because of these two events, the mainstream press deliberated about what to do when the next tabloid newspaper takes the lead in breaking a scandalous story. In a 1994 National Journal article, it was stated that mainstream newspapers were trying to figure out "how to avoid having the sensationalist tail wave the responsible dog" (Germond and Witcover 1154). The mainstream press feared that the paparazzi images and stories captured from planes, boats, or blacked-out vans for British and American tabloid newspapers were being recycled by mainstream newspapers, magazines, wire services, and television shows (Kurtz A1).

That fear hit a new low when ABC Worlds News Tonight's reporter, Diane Sawyer, asked Marla Maples if Donald Trump really provided the best sex she had ever had (Gamson, "Incredible" 31). Another low came in 1995 during the O.J. Simpson murder trial coverage. Since the National Enquirer

had followed the Simpsons' marital problems since 1989, mainstream reporters turned to it for leads (Sachs 33, 34). Media critic Jon Katz said that the National Enquirer's coverage of the case was better than many of its mainstream competitors. In fact, Katz noted that David Margolick, a reporter for The New York Times, twice cited the National Enquirer's story that Simpson had been overheard yelling "I did it!" during a confessional jailhouse meeting with his minister and friend, Roosevelt Grier (Sachs 34).

Covering sensational tabloid stories like the Simpson trial dramatically changed the network news forever. As one network producer explained to Gamson in a Fall 1994 The American Prospect article:

Ten years ago, they would have said, 'Well, goddammit, this is important, the public needs to know about X and we're going to do it.' Now, if you put on something you know is going to put people to sleep at 10 o'clock, and it does horribly, you know you're going to be hearing about it (32).

Lloyd wrote in his thesis Historical Development and Commercial Venture of Tabloid Television that he noticed the change, too, and added that "in order to attract viewers, traditional news programs began to flatter the American culture rather than examine it" (ii).

The second cause of the emergence of celebrity- and scandal-filled news in the mainstream press--the lack of hard news to report on in the 1990s--resulted in "nothing" to report. For the most part, the 1990s were free of major

wars or world crises, and the U.S.'s economy was very strong. "'There is no news,' meaning nothing to fear, at least not today," wrote Joan Konner in a 1997 Columbia Journalism Review article (6). This lack of news meant there was a need to fill time and space with the easily attainable news. Celebrity news and scandals proved to be a reliable and profitable alternative to hard news.

Where for the first ninety years of the twentieth century, the paparazzi market consisted of only four outlets, by 2000 it included competition from cable tabloid television shows, a twenty-four hour entertainment channel, network newsmagazine shows, Web sites, and even British and U.S. mainstream print and electronic media organizations. As Los Angeles Media Critic, David Shaw, described it: "It's a vast maw, craving information--infotainment--around the clock" ("Diana" 41).

CHAPTER THREE: THE CONSUMERS

The second player in the "web of obsession" is the consumer. Consumers are the audience for the candid, "real" images of celebrities that the paparazzi provide to the mass media markets.

WHO ARE THE CONSUMERS

Historically, the public's fascination with knowing about the "real" celebrity dates back to the 1800s. Back then, heros with social power, such as religious figures, state leaders, or military commanders, were considered celebrities. Men like Andrew Jackson, Cromwell, Napoleon, Mohammed, Martin Luther, Dante, Shakespeare, and Samuel Jackson were all worshipped (Fowles 10-11). They were portrayed as "exemplars of virtue."

Fueled by the industrial and graphic revolutions, many Americans in the last half of the nineteenth century began to believe that success happened to only the most ruthless and cunning individuals. Democracy taught people to govern themselves and to believe in human equality, but it also led to distrust and suspicion of those with "heroic greatness" (Boorstin 49). The field of psychology also emerged around this time, and, by 1890, the common understanding was that "humans were subject to unconscious impulses and desires,

that lurking within the hearts of men were 'animal passions' that could never be completely suppressed" (Ponce de Leon 352). To satisfy the public's skepticism, heros released information about themselves to the public to make themselves seem more real. Information on their hobbies, tastes, and personal lives was released along with information on their talents and achievements. "[Heros] were portrayed as human beings--in some cases, flawed human beings--who just happened to be famous," wrote author Charles L. Ponce de Leon in an article for Prospects (352).

As historian Daniel J. Boorstin explained in The Image, our society went from worshipping heros to worshipping celebrities in the 1900s. "The hero was distinguished by his achievement; the celebrity by his image or trademark. The hero created himself; the celebrity is created by the media. The hero was a big man; the celebrity is a big name," Boorstin wrote (61). This transition from heros to celebrities was examined in a quantitative study conducted by sociologist Leo Lowenthal in the early 1940s. Lowenthal researched the types of biographies in popular magazines over a forty-year period. In this study, Lowenthal argued that editors printed biographies that people wanted to read, so changes in the types of people Americans admired could be examined by looking at magazine biographies. He found that political biographies went from 46% in 1901-14 to 25% in

1940-41, business and professional biographies went from 28% to 20%, and entertainment biographies rose from 26% to 55% (109-36). The focus of the public's attention had shifted from politics and production (industry, business, and natural sciences) to consumption (entertainment and sport) (Boorstin 59).

This shift can be partly explained by the fact that Americans had more time to pursue leisurely activities in the early 1900s. Americans went from working seventy hours per week to under sixty. To fill their free time, the public attended the theater, vaudeville, and movies, creating a market for information on the celebrities involved in the entertainment industry (Brinkley 501-04). These entertainers were biographed in fan magazines and other publications, and as the heroes of the past had taught them, these new celebrities released information about their personal lives to satisfy consumer skepticism.

Consumers were soon easily divided into eight groups based on their consumption level of celebrity-filled publications and television shows. The first group consists of "invisible" consumers, those who claim to live behind a celebrity-proof shield. Most "invisible" consumers only appear to be non-consumers because they do not pay attention to mainstream celebrities. But, for example, they may admire a PBS gardening or cooking show host; the world-

champion fly caster; or a locally celebrated minister. There are very few people who have no interests at all (Rein, Kotler, and Stoller 109).

The second group of consumers consists of the "watchers," people who observe but do not aggressively seek out publications and television shows on celebrities. Their behavior is passive, they are people who occasionally read People magazine or go to see a blockbuster film or a play.

"Seekers" are the third and the largest group of consumers. These consumers actively seek out and attend a favorite singer's concert, go to a favorite artist's gallery opening, subscribe to celebrity-filled magazines, and attend theater and films regularly. The celebrity industry tracks this consumer group, looking at their self-images, demographics, and psychological needs. They then mold celebrity images around these common characteristics so the "seekers" identify with the celebrities.

The fourth group is the "collectors," consumers who attend all the events surrounding their favorite celebrity, and collect souvenirs and memorabilia, too. They achieve a sense of closeness to the celebrity that "seekers" do not.

"Fans" are the fifth group of consumers. Fans seek interaction with a celebrity or some type of recognition that they are a fan. Consumers in this group join fan clubs and chat with celebrities when they make themselves

available to the public.

The sixth group consists of "insiders," better known as groupies in the 1970s. "Insiders" want to be part of the celebrity's world. They will sleep with them, give them drugs, or hound and harass them until they are on the inside.

The seventh group of consumers is the "entourage," people who have penetrated a celebrity's innermost circle. They are fans who, for example, are also a celebrity's barber, hairdresser, clothier, landlord, sibling, agent, or business manager.

The last group of consumers is composed of the "ensnared." The "ensnared" are fans who often cause harm to a celebrity. They include the obsessed fan; the "muckraker" journalist out to destroy a celebrity's image or career; or a "destroyer" who is out to psychologically destroy a celebrity by stalking them, impersonating them, etc. (Rein, Kotler, and Stoller 109-17).

THE "CATCH 22"

The mass media market often blames consumers for the world's obsession with celebrities. They argue that they are simply fulfilling the public's insatiable appetite for celebrity-filled tabloid information. Jean-Francois Leroy, director of an annual photojournalism festival in France,

agrees. In a 1997 IPI Report, Leroy stated that "the public demands the images and the publications are willing intermediaries" (Masters 7). This argument, however, ignores the well-grounded theory of agenda-setting which turns responsibility back on the mass media market (content providers). According to Stanley J. Baran, in his book Introduction to Mass Communication, agenda-setting is defined as "a theory that argues that media may not tell us what to think, but media certainly tell us what to think about" (327). Baran further explains that the amount of space or time devoted to a story (like the paparazzi), and consistency and repetition between all the mass media sources, tells people if the issue or event is important (327).

According to data previously detailed in this chapter, there exists a need for information on celebrities, because consumers have been taught to be skeptical of those they admire. This skepticism, however, does not explain the increased amount of celebrity-filled tabloid information that existed in every mass media market at the end of the twentieth century. Consumers did not demand more celebrity-filled tabloid information. Instead, the size of the mass media markets increased so much in the last decade of the twentieth century that the very attainable celebrity news and scandals became easy fill material. Paparazzi soon

sold the same photographs to both tabloid and mainstream publications. For example, a 1996 paparazzi photograph of Brad Pitt and Harrison Ford on the film set of the Devil's Own appeared in Time, Newsweek, People, the Washington Post, the Daily News, Star, and the National Enquirer (Sales 39).

Yet, consumers have not complained that the line between the mainstream print and electronic press and the tabloids has been blurred. Consumers continue to be interested in and fascinated with learning more about celebrities, but they no longer need to look to the tabloids for this information. All avenues of the mass media market provide this information to them.

As it stands at the end of the twentieth century, consumers may not be demanding more celebrity images, instead, the mass media markets are providing them greater access; and since consumers are not complaining, the mass media markets will continue to provide this access unless instructed otherwise by consumers.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE PAPARAZZI

The paparazzi fill the demand for photographs and videotapes that the print and electronic media request. This makes the paparazzi the third player in the "web of obsession."

WHO ARE THE PAPARAZZI

The word *paparazzi* is the Italian plural of the word *paparazzo* and is defined as "a free-lance photographer who pursues celebrities to take their pictures" ("*Paparazzo*," Oxford). The word "*paparazzo*" is thought to be rooted in three French words: *paperassier* meaning "scribbler," *paperasse* meaning "scrap paper," and *papier* meaning "paper" ("*Paparazzo*," Grolier). But, it was Federico Fellini's film La Dolce Vita about an Italian *paparazzo* that coined celebrity photographers as "*paparazzi*." Fellini explained how he came up with the name for his film's main character:

When I was a schoolboy in Rimini, I shared a desk with a very restless boy who was always squirming, who was always talking so fast that his words came out stuck together in an endless buzzing. A teacher baptized him "*Paparazzo*," which in my part of the country is an insect, a sort of mosquito that's always emitting a buzz. While I was writing the script for La Dolce Vita that nickname came to mind, and so I named one of the photo-reporters *Paparazzo* (*Galella*, Jacqueline 9).

Fellini's inspiration for a film about a *paparazzo* came from watching Tazio Secchiaroli, the "Godfather of the

Paparazzi," and other celebrity photographers at work on Rome's famous celebrity-filled boulevard, via Veneto. Fellini began researching the film by talking to Secchiaroli and other photographers about their profession. Fellini asked them "how they spotted their prey, how they teased them, how they tailored their features for the various newspapers. They had hilarious stories of lying in wait for eternities, of imaginative escapes, and of dramatic chases" (Mormorio 29). In 1960, La Dolce Vita was released to international acclaim; nominated for Best Director, Best Screenplay, Best Art Direction; and won an Academy Award for Best Costume Design ("La Dolce").

The paparazzi's role in taking celebrity images has changed three times during the twentieth century. From the early 1900s to 1920, celebrities hired freelance photographers to take their photographs for distribution to newspapers, magazines, and fans. From the 1920s to the end of the 1940s, celebrities, under contract with the film studios, were photographed only by the studio's private photographers. From the early 1950s to the present, freelance celebrity photographers, now known as "paparazzi," have captured candid, unposed photographs and videotapes of celebrities for distribution to the mass media market.

"The paparazzi's job is to capture real life, show the human side of stardom, celebrities when they are themselves,

in genuine situations, showing real emotions, glamorous or not," says the "Godfather of American Paparazzi," Ron Galella, in an article by Hilary Alexander for The Straits Times (2). According to Pamela Kruger in her article "King of the Night Crawlers," paparazzi are initially attracted to the field because they are big fans of celebrities. Many are former autograph collectors who, after spending so much time chasing celebrities for autographs, decide to earn a living by photographing and videotaping them instead (42). Some paparazzi are former photojournalists who reluctantly turned to taking celebrity photographs just to make a living (Zoglin, "Hey" 56). Most paparazzi start part time in the evenings, holding down full-time jobs during the day. But, they soon earn enough money to quit their day jobs and pursue being a paparazzo full time (Elterman 76). With the right photographs, a paparazzo can earn in one day what a photojournalist earns in one year (Riding A11).

Paparazzo Rochelle Law freely admits why she chose the profession: "I do it for the money. I steal their souls. They can have 'em back when they buy the newspaper" (Lawlor 4). Freelance photographer Mike Lawn agrees: "They do it for money, money, money. It's the great incentive to lose all their principles" (Woodward and Amarick 38). In 1971, paparazzo Galella earned a respectable \$41,000 a year (Galella, Jacqueline 176). In 2000, the average paparazzo

earned anywhere from \$50,000 to \$65,000 a year (Elterman 76; Kruger 42). A paparazzo who captures an exclusive photograph or videotape can earn from \$300,000 to \$500,000 year, or even more (Cash 13). Phil Ramey, considered the "most dreaded paparazzo in Hollywood," earns \$1 million a year (Cash 14). Not all paparazzi are in it for the money, though. Los Angeles paparazzo Peter Brandt claims other reasons for going into this profession. He admits that he likes his job for the excitement and relative safety it provides. He adds, "I went into the business for the challenge" (Lawlor 4).

For the first seventy years of the twentieth century, approximately three hundred people claimed membership in the paparazzi profession. They worked in Hollywood under studio contracts, as part of a magazine or newspaper staff, or freelance (Fahey and Rich 7). The number of paparazzi photographers increased dramatically in the 1990s. For example, in 1970 a dozen or so paparazzi could be found outside premieres; by 1980 the number had grown to almost twenty; and at the end of the century 100 to 120 paparazzi could be seen trampling outside a premier for a spot (Weeks 1F; "Paparazzi's Progress" C9). A 1997 article by Dan Ehrlich, in Editor & Publisher, concurs with those numbers. Ehrlich states that in 1975 only ten paparazzi covered British royal events; by Princess Diana's tour in 1983,

there were thirty; and by 1990 the number had increased to one hundred (11).

Many paparazzi are based in New York, Paris, London, St. Tropez, Rome, Acapulco, and Capri (Galella, Jacqueline 9). But, the true "paparazzi capital of the world" is Los Angeles since it is center of the U.S.'s film and recording industries (Corwin A1). In Los Angeles, the paparazzi are sometimes referred to by stereotypes. "The Krauts are very aggressive. The French are sneaky, obnoxious. The Spanish don't get up on time. The British are more story led. For most Europeans, any picture of a star will do," said Kevin Smith, co-owner of the photograph agency Splash (Kershaw T2).

Reporter Miles Corwin wrote in The Los Angeles Times that a few elite paparazzi live as well as the celebrities they pursue (A1). Paparazzo Steve Wood owns a "three- or four-storey Georgian terraced house in Kensington. It was probably worth at least half a million and was decorated like the pictures from a Colefax & Fowler catalogue," wrote the astonished British reporter William Cash who had picked up Wood at his home for an article they were working on for the Daily Express (13). An established paparazzo can set a flexible schedule, working as much or as little as they want (Elterman 76). Paparazzo Secchiaroli worked "until he tired of the job, just a third or a quarter of the year" (Mormorio

27). Paparazzo Galella, who is famous for photographing Jacqueline Kennedy-Onassis, only worked twenty days in 1971; his best year photographing her, he claims (Galella, Jacqueline 173). If a stakeout requires travel, a paparazzo can also take time to vacation while on assignment (Elterman 76). Paparazzi Pascal Rostain and Bruno Mouron have been to such places as Monaco, Switzerland, Hawaii, and Antilles pursuing celebrities. They both claim that they would much rather be a paparazzo than a celebrity. "We have a better life than them. The only problem they have is having the paparazzi against them, and we don't have that problem," said Rostain (Redmond 76).

Most paparazzi have little sympathy for celebrities. They feel that once they become celebrities, it is a given that they forfeit their right to privacy. "If you want fame and fortune, you pay the price. Stars should worry when people don't take their picture," said New York paparazzo Vinnie Zuffante (Kruger 45). Paparazzo Angie Coqueran feels that once a celebrity signs a million dollar contract, they should expect pests like her (Hedegaard 74). In the documentary Blast 'Em, paparazzo Victor Malafronte best sums up how the paparazzi feel: "I have no sympathy for someone who makes twenty or thirty million dollars a year."

A paparazzo may sell his or her photographs straight to a publication, taking home all the profits, but most work

through an agency. The agency handles all sales (a single photograph may sell to as many as fifty different publications), and splits any profits with the paparazzo. Money is made off every sale since the paparazzo owns the copyright to every photograph he or she takes (Kruger 44). Agencies are in direct communication with publications; they know the publications' needs; and the agencies inform the paparazzi of them. On occasion, a publication may call an agency looking for certain footage; the agency then relays this information on to the paparazzi. Therefore, working with an agency is usually the most profitable arrangement for a paparazzo. Agencies in New York, include: Star File, DMI Agency, Retna, Outline Agency, and Galella Ltd.; in Los Angeles: Splash News Agency, Online USA, Sipa Press, Celebrity Photo Agency, and American Photo Syndicated; in Paris: Angeli Agency; in England: London Features, Big Pictures, Alpha, and Rex Features; based in New York and Los Angeles: Sygma and Globe Photos; and based in New York, Los Angeles, and Paris: Gamma Liaison Agency (Burshtein A11; Davis 21; Elterman 158; Fenichell 80; Hosenball 60; Kershaw T2; Kruger 44; "Secrets" 82-85, 92; Jeannine Stein, "Night" sec. 5,1; Webb 17).

Paparazzi are no strangers to battle scars received in the line of duty. For example, British paparazzo, Dave Hogan, once got his foot caught in Madonna's car. Her

driver drove away, dragging Hogan, causing injuries that took months to heal, but Hogan refused to sue Madonna because she was one of his favorite subjects, and he did not want to burn a bridge with her ("Secrets" 83; Alexander 2). Paparazzo Russell Turiak was once assaulted by celebrity Burt Reynolds after taking a photograph of Reynolds and then girlfriend, Loni Anderson. Turiak said, "I was walking away and he punched me in the back of the head. That actually brought me quite a bit of notoriety" (Kurtz A26).

In fact, the paparazzi like to brag about their battle scars. Esquire writer, John H. Richardson, wrote in "I, Stalkerazzi" that the paparazzi like to compare celebrity battle stories. "One guy got roughed up staking out Madonna; Schwartzwald got pounded by Pamela Anderson Lee's bodyguards; and Friday, it was a guy named Henry, jumped by a friend or bodyguard or acquaintance of Leonardo DiCaprio's," wrote Richardson in 1998 (70).

Paparazzo Richard Young has been attacked many times by celebrities. His encounters include a "gongfu bout with model-turned-actress Lauren Hutton, a mild choking by director Roman Polanski, a handbag lashing by singer-actress Barbra Streisand and having actor Sean Penn spit in his face" (Alexander 2). Paparazzo Zuffante got a black eye from Sean Penn after Penn hit him in 1987. Zuffante said, "I lost a lot of respect for Madonna after that" (Kruger

45). Paparazzo Alan Zanger was also beat up once by actress Jackee's boyfriend. (Jackee was a 1992 television celebrity from the show "Royal Family.") The boyfriend caught Zanger trying to photograph Jackee, grabbed a baseball bat, broke all the windows of Zanger's truck, and swung at Zanger a few times. According to Zanger, the worst part was that the boyfriend broke his camera and destroyed all of his film (Corwin A1).

Paparazzo Galella has been assaulted by celebrities numerous times. Once, in 1973, Galella was photographing Marlon Brando as he walked down a street in New York's Chinatown. Galella made the mistake of asking Brando to take off his sunglasses, and Brando responded by punching him in the jaw. The result was nine stitches and a broken jaw for Galella. The next day, New York's Daily News headlined: "It's Brando by a KO in a Photo Finish" (Fenichell 94; Galella, Off-guard 95). Later, a very famous photograph was taken of Galella wearing a football helmet and carrying a camera trying to photograph Brando again (Schonauer 54). Galella has also had run-ins with Richard Burton's security men. In 1971, Galella followed Burton to Mexico where Burton was filming a movie. To get behind-the-scenes photographs, Galella hid inside a grotto housing the hotel's pool pump. An electrician went to turn off the pump because it was making a loud hum, and Galella was

discovered. Galella now has five capped teeth from this confrontation with Burton's security guards (Fenichell 81, 94; Galella, Jacqueline 11).

Since the 1950s, three different types of paparazzi have existed, distinguished by where and how they get their footage. The first type of paparazzi consists of an elite group of photographers who can gain inside, authorized access into any celebrity-filled event like a film premiere, charity dinner, gala, tribute, book signing, award ceremony, or private event. These elite paparazzi have built relationships with the publicists who control these events.

The number of these elite paparazzi is growing. For example, in 1988 at the Arthritis Foundation Awards dinner there were only three paparazzi allowed inside for the photo session (Jeannine Stein, "Night" sec. 5, 1). But, just eight years later, sixty paparazzi had inside access to the MTV Video Music Awards, and they were all maneuvering for a good position (Sales 35).

The second type of paparazzi is those who are not invited into celebrity events, but can be found outside waiting to take photographs or shoot videotapes of celebrities as they enter or exit. According to paparazzo Richard Chambury, it is not glamorous capturing photographs and videotapes this way. "People don't see the reality-- standing around for eight hours, freezing to death, getting

up at five o'clock just to put out a ladder for a film premiere," said Chambury (Webb 19). This group of paparazzi also includes paparazzi who wait outside restaurants, nightclubs, theaters, hotels, airports, and recording studios looking for celebrities. Known celebrity hangouts include: Spago, Le Dome, Nicky Blair's, or Rodeo Drive shops in Los Angeles; the Plaza, Four Seasons, Nobu, Spy, Wax, or Madison Avenue shops in New York; and the San Lorenzo or Langan in Hampstead, England (Jeannine Stein, "Night" sec. 5, 1; Sales 37).

Shoot the Star author Brad Elterman says that this type of paparazzi can be further divided into two groups:

1) those who wait at hangouts hoping to photograph or videotape a celebrity; or 2) those who will not wait around unless they know that a celebrity is definitely inside. The latter paparazzi have developed a contact list consisting of valet parking attendants, waiters, maitre d's, doormen, limousine drivers, security people, and bellhops who, for a tip, will call the paparazzi and let them know when a celebrity is within their premises (76; Kruger 45). These contacts also include restaurant and theater owners who will call in the hopes that their establishment will receive free publicity. When the paparazzi arrive, the owner acts surprised and throws a fit to keep the celebrity coming back to their establishment and avoid suspicion (Kruger 45;

Salgado 12).

The National Enquirer uses a network of contacts to gain knowledge of an exclusive. This network includes: celebrities' relatives, agents, lawyers, neighbors, bodyguards, hairdressers, limousine drivers, gardeners, bartenders, nurses, and publicists. National Enquirer editor, Iain Calder, boasts that the tabloid spent tens of millions of dollars in the 1980s to set up these contacts so that when a story breaks, they have people in place to call. Known as "checkbook journalism," the National Enquirer paid \$50 in 1988 for a small gossip story and up to \$1,600 for information that led to a front-page story. "For really explosive stories, payoffs can soar into the high five figures," wrote Jeffrey Ressler in Rolling Stone (64).

There are also celebrities who give information to the tabloids, some openly, others secretly. In 1988, National Enquirer's celebrity list of "friends" included: Bill Cosby, Billy Graham, Linda Blair, and Kenny Rogers. Reportedly celebrity Michael Jackson said "if he doesn't see his picture or an item or anything about him in the paper, he tells his people to 'get me a story,'" claims National Enquirer reporter Cindy Solomon (Ressler 64).

The final group of paparazzi feel that "getting the picture that's exclusive and saleable that's the key," according to paparazzo Ramey (Langan 12). They are known as

the "stalkerazzi," a breed of paparazzi who stakeout celebrities for days or weeks in search of an exclusive photograph or videotape (Riding A11). Julia Lawlor wrote in a USA Weekend article that these paparazzi are "part detective, part psychiatrist, part actor, and part daredevil" (4).

STYLES OF PAPARAZZI PHOTOGRAPHS

"Pictures can make or break a story. It's one thing to describe a happy bride or groom, another to see the picture. And pictures validate the story. They prove you were there," said Globe's bureau chief Mary Ann Norbom (Langan 12). The styles of photographs taken by the paparazzi over the twentieth century have changed quite a bit. For the first two decades, private photographers took photographs that were either "sweet, Victorian portraits" or posed "family album" photographs. The Victorian photographs were soft focused, partly because of slow film speed and partly because the apertures were wide open creating blurred backgrounds. Victorian style celebrity photographs were very stiff and formal (Kobal, Art 90, 93). They featured formally dressed celebrities, occasionally in costume for a role, with neutral backgrounds and nineteenth-century props (Fahey and Rich 14). The "family album" photographs were of celebrities doing everyday things. In these photographs,

they "play with their puppies, pick flowers in their gardens, collect their mail, and even hang out their washing. It is charming make-believe," described John Kobal in his book Hollywood: The Years of Innocence (29).

Photographer Nelson Evans was one of the first photographers to photograph celebrities at home--on their grass, in their gardens, or by their cars (Fahey and Rich 14).

During this time, there were very few photographs of celebrities engaging in day time recreation or a glamorous nightlife. They worked very long hours, and they simply just did not have the time. It was the very beginning of Hollywood, and hotels and restaurants were just starting to be built. "What social life we had revolved around the people in the studio, for we knew no others. Our lives were circumspect and to an outsider probably quite dull," said film celebrity Lillian Gish (Kobal, Hollywood 108).

The next style of photographs to emerge featured the "assembly-line look," a phrase coined by film celebrity Carmel Myers. Myers claims that photographs from the 1900s to the late 1920s were more real than the next three decades, because they did not have makeup men back then. "[You photographed with] whatever you had, you did your own [makeup], good or bad. Your own lips, eyes, nothing changed in your face. [. . .] We didn't have that [makeup artists] then: whatever was ours, we kept it and carried it," said

Myers (Kobal, Hollywood 133). Agreeing with Myers, film celebrity Gloria Swanson said: "Nobody looked alike. We were all originals" (Kobal, Hollywood 133).

The gallery and set photographs taken by celebrity photographers from the 1920s through the 1940s were meant to encourage the public to spend money to see a particular film. The types of photographs taken during this period can be divided into seven categories. According to Kobal, in his book The Art of the Great Hollywood Portrait Photographers, these categories are: straight portraits (in street clothes, alone, or in pairs or groups of leading players); character portraits (costumed straight portraits); advertising (character portraits in action, used in posters or other advertising); fashion (styles in vogue for women, usually a style used in the film); exploitation (posed, with advertised merchandise); production (scenes from the film during production); and publicity (informal or off-stage, strips, layouts, gag ideas, stunts, montages, etc.) (58-59). Celebrity photographer, Bud Graybill, describes why these types of photographs were taken during this time period: "The idea [. . .] was to keep them in the public's eye--to sell them in an attractive manner. The idea wasn't to get them with their guards down, scratching their butts, or looking dirty or unkempt" (Kobal, Art 56).

Since celebrity photographers were under exclusive

contract by the studios, the photographs had to fit a predetermined, identifiable style determined by the studio. According to Kobal in Hollywood: The Years of Innocence, eventually, it got to the point where everyone could identify which celebrity worked for what studio just by looking at his or her photograph. "There was the Paramount look, the Universal look, and so on," said Kobal (21). Kobal further described the photographs as the "slick, manufactured look of many stars of the 20s and 30s" (133).

The break up of the studios in 1948 and technological advances in photography that allowed photographers more freedom, lead to three new styles of photographs in the second half of the century. During this time, the public also became fascinated with the "reality" of their celebrities. "Movie stars were still gods and goddesses, but the marble had weathered, and photographers, no longer constrained, were eager to give the people what they wanted-warts and all," wrote Liz Smith in an American Photo article (46).

The first style is the posed, "I know you are there" photograph or videotape. This type of image is taken at film premieres, charity dinners, galas, tributes, book signings, award ceremonies, or private events. It can be taken inside or outside of the event.

The second style to emerge is the candid photograph or

videotape. The Oxford English Dictionary defines candid as "unposed, informal." According to paparazzo Zanger, the public is looking for this type of image most of all. "Who gives a damn about shots of these people when they're made up--everybody already knows what they're like then. People want to see what they look like when they're uncovered, when they're most vulnerable," said Zanger (Corwin A1). When a paparazzo captures this type of image, the celebrity knows they are there. However, the paparazzo does not ask the celebrity if it is alright to take his or her photograph for two reasons: "One, it will destroy the spontaneous, off-guard mood by getting a posed shot if they do consent. Second, it's too easy for the star to say 'no' because of many excuses," said paparazzo Galella in his book Jacqueline (71). Most often, candid photographs are taken outside restaurants, nightclubs, theaters, and hotels; in airports; or on public streets.

According to paparazzo Elterman, a candid paparazzi photograph or videotape can be easily identified, because the celebrity will often look unamused or try to cover his or her face (Elterman 76). These photographs catch celebrities in mid-action, with their mouths open, bodies or hands in awkward positions, eyes closed or looking off, hair sticking up, or picking their noses or teeth. Paparazzo Elterman says if this type of photograph tells an

interesting story it will sell. Otherwise, it becomes a stock photograph, defined by Elterman as, "a photo of something or someone in which nothing special is happening at the time" (Elterman 60). Stock photographs can be used indefinitely. Publications often request certain photographs for articles about particular celebrities. Elterman says that he has seen photographs used up to eight years after he has taken them (Elterman 60).

The final photograph style is of celebrities who are not even aware that they are being photographed or videotaped. Some paparazzi believe that this image is the best. This is especially true of photographs that the celebrity does not even know were taken, until he or she sees them published ("Secrets" 82). These photographs and videotapes are completely unauthorized and are usually captured after long stakeouts by "stalkerazzi."

SEVEN BEST-SELLING IMAGES

This section examines the seven best-selling categories of celebrity images that emerged in the second half of the twentieth century. These categories are: 1) couples; 2) children of celebrities; 3) death; 4) nudity; 5) behind-the-scenes of television and film sets; 6) scandalous situations; and 7) appearances.

Couples

The indisputable number one category, that can result in unprecedented amounts of money being paid, is photographs or videotapes of couples. The 1997 photographs of Princess Diana of Wales and Dodi Al Fayed together were the highest paid paparazzi photographs to date. The blurry images of them kissing on Al Fayed's yacht in the Mediterranean earned Italian paparazzo, Mario Brenna, \$450,000 from the Daily Mirror, \$210,000 from the Globe, and \$7 million worldwide (Woodward and Amarick 38; Zoglin, "Hey" 56). This couple category can be further divided into three groups: new couples, weddings and newlyweds, and unfaithful partners.

According to paparazzo Ann Clifford, new romances always sell. Clifford especially likes these images because they can be sold again when the couple breaks up ("Secrets" 85). Photographs of Princesses Stephanie and Caroline of Monaco are well sought after in this category because, as one paparazzo said, "[Stephanie] likes men very much. And that makes us happy" (Redmond 76). In Sudie Redmond's 1992 article in American Photo, the first photographs of the newly-divorced Caroline with tennis celebrity Guillermo Vilas earned paparazzi Rostain and Mouron \$300,000 and fifty-four magazine covers in 1982. Rostain and Mouron followed the couple to Maui, Hawaii, to capture the photographs. After shadowing the couple for a few days,

they got the exclusive photographs by sneaking up on them in a rented boat (Redmond 76; Schonauer 58). Redmond also notes that ten years later and a year after Caroline's second husband died, one European paparazzo earned approximately \$400,000 for an exclusive photograph of Caroline with her first new romantic interest, a French actor. He caught them on a ski vacation in Zuers, Austria. It became a big story, because people were curious about Caroline's love life since her husband's death (72).

According to paparazzo Coqueran, in 1989, couple photographs of Diane Keaton and Al Pacino, John F. Kennedy Jr. and Daryl Hannah, and Madonna and Warren Beatty were the top money makers (Hedegaard 74, 75). In 1991 it was disclosed in "The Fame Trade," an article in The Economist, that a photograph of Julia Roberts with a new boyfriend was worth \$20,000 (23). In the article, "Snappers See Stars," Alexander wrote that if a celebrity is dating another celebrity with equal amounts of sex appeal, status, or money, it makes the photograph even more valuable (2). In 1999, couples that fit this category included: Brad Pitt and Jennifer Aniston, Pamela Anderson Lee and Tommy Lee, or Gwyneth Paltrow and Ben Affleck (Ely, Ridder, and Fitz 24-25; Nincevic 4; Campbell 22-23).

The second sub-group is celebrity weddings and newlyweds. Paparazzo Coqueran is always in the pursuit of

these images because they are a hot sell. And, like couple images, Coqueran likes these photographs and videotapes, because, if the couple divorces, she can resell the photographs and videotapes (Hedegaard 92). Wedding photographs and videotapes are very hard to obtain, though, because of tight security designed to keep out unwanted paparazzi. Tight security, however, did not prevent paparazzo Brandt from exclusively photographing Susan Dey's wedding in 1988. Brandt eluded security at the Bel Air Hotel by booking a \$600 room at the hotel and then climbing to the top of a bell tower at the hotel at 2 a.m. the day of the wedding (Lawlor 4). In 1991, paparazzo, Raul De Molina, resorted to taking photographs of Jane Fonda and Ted Turner's wedding from a helicopter (Schonauer 58). One paparazzo tried to videotape Elizabeth Taylor's wedding by parachuting into her wedding with a videotape camera attached to his helmet. He landed ten feet from her seated guests and was immediately arrested (Corwin A1).

Yet, the paparazzi continue to go to great lengths to get these images for the big payoffs. In 1997, the street price for coverage of Barbra Streisand's wedding was approximately \$50,000 (Kershaw T2). It was revealed in a 1998 article in The Spectator that paparazzo Ramey earned \$100,000 for a roll of film containing the wedding of Anjelica Huston and sculptor Robert Graham (Cash 14).

Photographing two sets of celebrity couples, with one set being newlyweds, can also earn a paparazzo considerable money. As was disclosed in the 1990 article "Get the Picture," paparazzo Coqueran earned \$3,500 for Goldie Hawn and Kurt Russell with newlyweds Tom Cruise and first wife, Mimi Rogers (Hedegaard 75).

The sub-third group of profitable couple photographs and videotapes is unfaithful partners. "Your average starlet-caught-with-wrong-escort might top out at \$40,000. The sky's the limit for big names in trouble," said Lawlor in her 1990 article "Hollywood Stakeout" (4). Although exact figures were not disclosed, the most profitable infidelity photograph to date came in 1987 when the married presidential candidate Gary Hart was caught with another woman, Donna Rice, on his lap aboard his boat Monkey Business (Lawlor 4). When paparazzo, Bill Davila, captured the three-way couple of Donald Trump, Marla Maples, and Ivana Trump in Aspen, it earned him a "hefty five-figure amount," as was revealed in a 1992 American Photo article (Schonauer 58). Because the tabloids and the paparazzi pay cash for tips, paparazzo Elterman said he pities "the poor celebrity who goes out for an evening with a girlfriend or boyfriend if he or she is married to someone else" (Elterman 76).

Children of Celebrities

Children of celebrities are the second category of profitable paparazzi photographs and videotapes. This type of image is a gray area for many paparazzi; however, others feel that if a celebrity does not want his or her children to be photographed or videotaped, then they should not bring them to screenings or other events where they know the paparazzi will be ("Secrets" 83). Sometimes a paparazzo may even feel bad about pursuing a celebrity for photographs and videotapes of their children. In 1989, paparazzo Coqueran pursued Kurt Russell and Goldie Hawn to get a photograph of them with their newborn. Originally, Coqueran tried to keep a distance from the couple and the baby, but she was unable to get all three in the same frame using a telephoto lens, so she resorted to a 35-millimeter, wide-angle lens up close (Hedegaard 74-75).

Photographs and videotapes of children are very lucrative. In 1997, the first shots of Madonna's baby earned Larry Schwartzwald a hefty \$50,000 (Richardson 68). The National Enquirer paid more than \$250,000 for exclusive photographs of Michael Jackson's baby in 1997 (Lesly and Flynn 42). Lawlor's article in 1990 divulged that photographs of Lisa Marie Presley and her new baby were worth \$50,000 and even more if the paparazzo got a full shot of the baby's face (Lawlor 4). In 1991, photographs of

Michael J. Fox and Tracy Pollen's baby, along with exclusive photographs of John F. Kennedy Jr., earned paparazzo Malafronte \$6,000 in domestic and international sales in a three month time period (Blast 'Em). In 1992, paparazzo Zanger also staked out Fox and Pollan to capture photographs of them with their baby. He knew where they shopped, worked out, and ate. After twenty-three days of following them, he finally photographed Pollan with her baby by crawling on his stomach and using a telephoto lens to shoot through a hole in a wooden fence (Corwin A1). And a shot of the seldom seen Woody Allen with Mia Farrow and their children earned paparazzo Coqueran \$2,000 in 1989 (Schonauer 58).

New York paparazzo, Kelly Jordan, recommends getting photographs and videotapes of celebrities and their children no matter what. Although she says it is awful, terrible things seem to happen to children of celebrities. She once took a photograph of Sally Jessy Raphaël and her daughter at a party. When her daughter died, Jordan made at least \$20,000 from that one photograph, as was revealed in a 1992 American Photo article ("Secrets" 84).

Death

Images of celebrities right before they die is the third category of valuable paparazzi photographs and videotapes. For instance, Kennedy-Onassis taking her last

walk in Central Park earned paparazzo Davila tens of thousands of dollars (Sales 37). Once New York paparazzo Albert Ferreira did some investigating and discovered that Greta Garbo was sick. For a few days he staked out her house and finally from a distance he saw two ladies get into a car in front of her house. He followed them to a hospital, and as Garbo opened the door to get out he got two photographs of her. Two days later she died (Blast 'Em; "Secrets" 85). French paparazzo Bernard Wis captured Jean-Paul Sartre on his deathbed by doing a lot of research. He found out exactly where Sartre was in the hospital, and then went to the building across the street and photographed Sartre with a 500-millimeter lens through his hospital window ("Secrets" 82).

Dead celebrities in their caskets are also very profitable. The photographs of John Lennon and Steve McQueen in their caskets were worth several thousands of dollars each (Kruger 44). To get these photographs and videotapes, the paparazzi will do just about anything. To get photographs of Bing Crosby in his casket, a paparazzo for the National Enquirer disguised himself as a priest to get into the chapel (Corkery 21). In 1985, Paparazzo Ramey pounced on a moving coroner's van to capture Rock Hudson in his body bag (Ressner 53).

The final photographs of Princess Diana in 1997 (in the

car after the accident) were sold for \$320,000 (Hosenball 60). National Enquirer editor, Stephen Coz, said he was offered exclusive U.S. rights for \$250,000 (Riding A11). Germany's top-selling daily Bild Zeitung was the only publication to publish a fuzzy color photograph of Princess Diana in the car which resulted in a huge public protest. The public could not understand why the photographs were even taken. But, as one British photograph editor explained, how could people expect the paparazzi "to put down their cameras when they had one of the biggest news pictures of the century in their viewfinders" (Feinstein 4).

Nudity

The fourth type of profitable paparazzi photographs and videotapes is of nude celebrities. One of the earliest nude photographs was of French actress Brigitte Bardot while on vacation at her villa outside of Rome. Bardot did not even know that the nude photographs had been taken until she saw them on the pages of the Italian magazine Playmen. She had been photographed 600 feet away with a 640-millimeter telephoto lens (Time-Life 18). Another set of famous nude photographs was taken in Rome in November 1958. Inspiring actress Aiché Nanà performed a striptease at a private party at the Rugantino Restaurant in front of "respectable" society people of the time and a few paparazzi. The

photographs were published in the weekly paper L'Espresso, Life, and other foreign magazines, earning the paparazzi large sums of money due to their scandalous nature (Mormorio 30-33).

Topless photographs of Princess Caroline of Monaco were taken in 1978 by a paparazzo who climbed a coconut tree to capture her diving topless from a boat in Antilles, France. This paparazzo used a 500-millimeter mirror telephoto lens and 2X extender to capture the photograph (Redmond 76). Caroline's sister, Princess Stephanie, however, has earned the title "Princess of the Golden Breasts" from the French press because of the number of times she has been photographed topless. The first topless photograph of Stephanie appeared in 1984, when paparazzi Rostain and Mouron spied a topless Stephanie with Los Angeles disco owner Mario Jutard, while on a stakeout in Mauritius. In 1988, Stephanie was photographed having a wild pool party. One photograph showed her taking a ride on her boyfriend's shoulders while in the pool. In 1989, a French paparazzo caught Stephanie sunbathing nude on a lounge chair at her Los Angeles home. To get the photograph he dressed in a camouflage outfit and shot through some leaves (Redmond 76).

One of the most famous sets of nude photographs was taken in 1972 by paparazzo Settimio Garritano. He captured Kennedy-Onassis as she sunbathed fully nude on her husband's

Greek island of Skorprios. After months of trying to find someone to publish the photographs, a nineteen-page, full frontal portfolio titled "The Billion Dollar Bush" appeared in Italian Playmen, and later the photographs were published in the U.S.'s Screw and Hustler, as well as several tabloids (Heymann D5). Kennedy-Onassis asked her husband to sue all the publications that published the photographs, but he refused. In 1989, it was revealed that he had actually arranged for Garritano to take the photographs. "Onassis figured if she appeared in the nude, nothing else they did could ever offend her again," said Roy Cohn in C. David Heymann's article "A Woman Named Jackie" (D5).

Behind the Scenes of Television and Film Sets

Paparazzi images taken behind the scenes of popular television and film sets are the fifth type of best selling photographs and videotapes. The tabloids love to reveal feuds, bickering, and scandals on sets. In 1999, stories like "Brandy Freaks Out on Set of Show," "Oprah Duped by \$1.5m Con Woman," and "Scandalous Past of New ER Beauty" could all be found in Star (Gould 21; Dunn 5; Heller 26). Star File agency owner, Virginia Lohle, said that what makes images from film sets so profitable is their longevity. "You can use it in advance; you can use it at [the] time of release; you can use it at [the] time of video release; you

can use it fifteen years later for the nostalgic revival," said Lohle (Richardson 68). Images from closed film sets can be very profitable. In 1996, three paparazzi acting as extras on the Warner Brother's Batman and Robin set were caught as they were about to take behind-the-scenes footage. One of them allegedly had a camera in his sock and a note in his pocket reading "Batman only--\$35,000" (Littleton 28, 30). To get videotape footage from the set of Interview with the Vampire, paparazzo Turiak convinced a Manhattan high-rise resident to let him shoot from his place. Turiak was able to observe a closed rooftop set, capturing a provocative scene between actors Tom Cruise and Brad Pitt (Roberts A12).

Scandalous Situations

The sixth group of profitable photographs and videotapes is of celebrities in scandalous situations. An early photograph, that seemed scandalous at the time, took place in 1958 when actress Anita Ekberg let a paparazzo photograph her wading in the Trevi Fountain in Rome. She had been out dancing barefoot that evening and had hurt her foot. The photographs of Ekberg going wild in the fountain were first sold to the magazine Tempo illustrato and then to other publications all over the world (Mormorio 30). In the 1990s, the Los Angeles paparazzi agency Splash was the first

to put together the scandalous newspaper account of Michael Jackson's alleged child abuse. They were also the first to obtain Hugh Grant's police mug shot in 1995 after his arrest for soliciting prostitute Divine Brown (Kershaw T2).

According to many paparazzi, Brad Pitt has bad skin; as a result he makes himself very difficult to photograph and videotape. However, two paparazzi were able to get a photograph of Pitt when he was working on the Devil's Own film set in 1996. Because the film crew blocked the paparazzi from taking photographs at the scene, two paparazzi went to a near-by building and got permission to shoot from a law firm on the second floor. Pitt saw them, and, using a prop gun he was about to use in an upcoming scene, pretended to shoot at them. The photograph depicting this action ended up in the New York Post and many publications around the world (Sales 38-39). Another profitable photograph involving a celebrity with a gun took place in the early 1980s. This incident happened right after John Lennon had been killed by a fan which put a lot of celebrities on edge. A paparazzo waiting outside the Beverly Hills restaurant Chasen's photographed Dean Martin leaving the restaurant with his suit coat open revealing a pistol in a holster hanging from his belt. The photograph was sold to publications in twenty-five countries (Elterman 86-91).

Princess Diana was a celebrity with a lot of controversy and scandal surrounding her. Therefore, she was a very desirable target for the paparazzi. She was bulimic, had an unhappy marriage, an adulterous love affair, a love triangle with her husband and Camilla Parker-Bowles, a bitter divorce, and battles with the Palace. But, the biggest scandalous story about Princess Diana was the fact that she was dating a man whose father was the most controversial businessman in Great Britain ("Fame: The Faustian" 22). That was why the 1997 photograph of them together sold for \$7 million (Woodward and Amarick 38).

Appearances

The seventh and final category of images deals with a celebrity's appearance. If a celebrity changes hair color or styles often, the paparazzi must seek them out to get current photographs and videotapes. In "Snappers See Stars," Alexander wrote that supermodel Linda Evangelista has changed her hair color from blonde to strawberry to brunette causing her three times the coverage she normally would get (2). Madonna is another celebrity whose looks change frequently (Blast 'Em). In 1988, author Kruger said that second-string starlets will dress in outrageous outfits to make a tabloid's special section like Star's "Would you be caught dead in this outfit?" She states that television

actors in particular will do this just for the publicity (45).

Placing Blame By The Mass Media Market

One way the mass media market made the paparazzi look like villains in the 1990s was to point out the amount of money that the paparazzi made for photographs and videotapes. An historical review of the most saleable photographs and videotapes, previously outlined in this chapter, revealed that the first mention of the amount of money a paparazzo made from their footage was disclosed in the May 1988 issue of American Photographer. In this issue, Pamela Kruger wrote that paparazzo Vinnie Zuffante liked photographing Madonna because he could make up to \$15,000 on one photograph of her. Kruger also revealed that Zuffante made \$65,000 a year. Two years later in the January 1990 issue of Savvy Woman, author Erik Hedegaard wrote that paparazzo Coqueran made \$13,000 from a couple photograph of Madonna and boyfriend Warren Beatty; \$3,500 off a photograph of newlyweds Tom Cruise and Mimi Rogers with celebrity couple Goldie Hawn and Kurt Russell; and \$2,000 from a photograph of Woody Allen with his wife and children (75). Later that year, in an article in the USA Weekend by Julia Lawlor, it was revealed that an infidelity photograph was worth \$40,000; photographs of Lisa Marie Presley's baby

could sell for \$50,000; and that the photograph of Gary Hart with Donna Rice was the most profitable infidelity photograph to date, although the exact amount was not disclosed (4).

Since 1988, the mainstream press has talked openly about the amount of money a paparazzo makes for photographs and videotapes. In 1992, part of an issue of American Photo was devoted to the paparazzi profession. Three articles revealing dollar amounts were published in that issue, including: "Secrets of the Paparazzi," "The Great Chase, Then and Now," and "Caroline & Stephanie." Divulging this information was clearly a part of agenda-setting by the mass media market to turn the paparazzi into money hungry villains in the eyes of the public.

PAPARAZZI TECHNIQUES

This section examines the techniques that the paparazzi have used over the last hundred years to capture photographs and videotapes of celebrities.

The First Fifty Years

During the first half of the twentieth century, the techniques used by the paparazzi to photograph celebrities were very limited, and not many candid, off-guard photographs were taken. This was due, in part, to the fact

that the technology to capture candid photographs was not available until 1949. It is also due to the fact that taking photographs of celebrities was limited by the film studio system until 1948.

In the very early 1900s, before celebrities were controlled by the film studios, celebrities were required to provide photographs of themselves to newspapers, magazines, and their fans. In Los Angeles, for example, celebrities would go to private, "main street," portrait photographers with commercial storefront studios and spend great amounts of money for photographs. Before the 1920s, celebrities such as Lillian and Dorothy Gish each spent \$10,000 a year on photographs, and Mary Pickford spent as much as \$50,000 a year. In fact, Pickford's mother told up-and-coming celebrities that photographs were the key to getting into the motion pictures. "Get the very finest photographs of yourself. Spend plenty of money on them. See that there are photographs in profile, full face, bust and full figure," she once told future film celebrity Rudolph Valentino (Kobal, Hollywood 132).

Eventually, the film studios started requesting large quantities of photographs from the private photographers. But, the studios quickly realized that since they had to pay for each photograph, it would be cheaper to set up their own portrait studios and take the photographs themselves (Kobal,

Art 49). The first film studio with its own portrait studio was Famous Players-Lasky (later called Paramount Pictures) around 1920. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM), Radio-Keith-Orpheum Corporation (RKO), Warner Brothers, and a few other film studios set up their own portrait studios by 1930, virtually eliminating the need for private photographers. And, since celebrities were under contract by the film studios, they were forced to give up their own private, portrait photographers unless they wanted to pick up the expenses themselves. But, this would have been astronomically costly for them, because in 1931, Paramount Pictures alone supplied close to a million photographs to newspapers and magazines all over the world (Kobal, Art 67).

In addition to studio portraits, the film studio's celebrity photographers also took photographs on indoor and outdoor film sets and at premiers and conventions. Photo services like Globe and Black Star had photography staffs to cover the nightclub circuit, but bulky equipment hampered them from getting candid photographs outside of these locations. This was due to the fact that from 1917 to 1936, photographers lugged around either bulky Eastman or Agfa Ansco view cameras or the smaller Graphic Graflex (Kobal, Art 66). Photographers also had to carry sources of artificial light; they burned magnesium wires and ribbons until gas-filled bulbs were introduced in 1926 (Stroebel and

Zakia 438). These big cameras and flashes made taking candid photographs difficult for most of the first four decades of the twentieth century.

In 1936, the invention of the electronic flash in the U.S. made taking candid photographs a bit easier. The electronic flash is described as "the first dependable, intense, reusable, short-duration light source available to photographers" in Leslie Stroebe and Richard Zakia's Encyclopedia of Photography (438). The new Speed Graphic and Crown Graphic cameras could use these synchronized electronic flashes, and they soon became the cameras of choice for celebrity photographers in the U.S. through the end of the 1940s. Because these new cameras were hand-held at eye-level and came with easily interchangeable lenses, they were faster and easier to operate enabling photographers to take more candid photographs (Geraci 23; Stroebe and Zakia 72).

European photographers preferred the Rolleiflex twin-lens reflex camera with a bulky Braun flash that required a heavy lead battery that was carried around the shoulder (Mormorio 26). This camera used rolled film, had a built-in folding viewing hood, a coupled film advance counter system, and a shutter mechanism that had to be cocked and fired separately. These new features enabled Europeans to take more candid photographs of celebrities (Stroebe and

Zakia 72-73).

Although not popular with many celebrity photographers, the first 35-millimeter camera was developed in Germany in 1924. The Leica camera had a collapsible anastigmatic lens, forty exposure film, coupled film advance, and a shutter cocking mechanism. The Leica was admired by photographers for its quiet shutter, small size, and quality line of lenses (Stroebe and Zakia 72). But, it was the Contax S. camera, manufactured in East Germany in 1949, that truly allowed candid photography to become what it is today. This single-lens reflex camera had a built-in pentaprism for eye-level viewing and a focal-plane shutter. It was fairly light in weight and small in comparison to the twin-lens reflex cameras. The Contax S. had screw-mounted lenses allowing the macro, wide-angle, zoom, or telephoto lenses to be easily interchanged (Stroebe and Zakia 73, 83-84).

Germany perfected the telephoto lens during World War II (to spy on England), and this lens was the last piece of equipment needed by celebrity photographers to truly penetrate the privacy of celebrities (Di Forti 20). But, this invasion of privacy was not aggressively pursued until the studio system broke up. This took place in 1948 when the U.S. Supreme Court, in *U.S. vs. Paramount Pictures, Inc.*, declared that the film studios had to sell their theaters, effectively splitting production and distribution

from exhibition. This meant that the studios were no longer guaranteed an outlet for their films (Mast and Kavin 296). "The studios released their contract players and technical personnel [including still photographers] and reduced their production schedules," said Mitch Tuchman in a Film Comment article (70). Once again, freelance celebrity photographers were needed. This created a dramatic change in the profession during the last half of the century, and resulted in a new set of techniques for capturing photographs that were saleable to publications.

The Second Fifty Years

By 1950, the equipment necessary for candid photography had been developed, and film studios no longer controlled celebrity images. This meant that celebrity photographers were on their own and eager to succeed. And, since studios were no longer suppressing information on celebrities, scandals quickly started to erupt. Ingrid Bergman, Elizabeth Taylor, Ava Gardner, Anita Ekberg, and Lana Turner were all in the news. Since the studios also no longer provided photographs of celebrities, the publications covering the scandals turned to the freelance celebrity photographers. The techniques the paparazzi used to capture these photographs, and later videotapes, can be defined by the approaches of three different types of paparazzi: those

who wait outside celebrity filled events and hangouts, those with inside access, and those who capture exclusive images.

Outside Celebrity Events and Hangouts

The first approach used by the paparazzi to capture the newly in demand photographs was to wait outside celebrity events and hangouts for a celebrity to emerge or come by, all the time keeping a respectable distance (Corwin A1). In Italy, they used Lambretta and Vespa motorscooters to race from airports to restaurants to nightclubs to capture photographs of celebrities as they learned of their locations (Time-Life 18). The paparazzi began to break the respectable distance rule when they learned that by working in a group, they could trap a celebrity and photograph them without them getting away (Di Forti 20). The Italian paparazzi became ruthless. They "stopped at nothing for a picture of a celebrity, tracking their prey in cars, on Vespa motorscooters, or simply on foot, their onslaught heralded by pushing and shouting and blasts of strobe," said David Schonauer in his article "The Great Chase, Then and Now" (48).

A new paparazzi photography technique, resulting in more saleable images, emerged on the evening of August 15, 1958, when a group of paparazzi in Rome came across the former King Farouk of Egypt sitting at a cafe with two young

women. All of the paparazzi kept a respectable distance as they photographed Farouk, except for paparazzo Secchiaroli who leaped out at Farouk and took a flash photograph right in his face. This action startled Farouk who thought he was being attacked. He jumped up and started shouting at the paparazzo and grabbed him by the neck. As the paparazzi fled the scene, they soon came across actress Ava Gardner and her boyfriend Anthony Franciosa entering a nightclub. Secchiaroli tried his new technique again by setting off a flash in Franciosa's face. He got the same forceful response from Franciosa as he did from Farouk. These incidents made the weekly L'Espresso creating a myth about what the Roman paparazzi had become (Mormorio 23-25). But, it was an incident between Secchiaroli and actor Walter Chiari that solidified this technique. As Gardner and Chiari were entering an apartment building to go home after nightclubbing around Rome, Secchiaroli set off a flashbulb right in Gardner's face causing her to scream. Chiari rushed Secchiaroli, but this time Secchiaroli had arranged for another paparazzo to catch the whole incident on film. The photographs were published in Settimo Giorno and many other newspapers. As Secchiaroli explained it:

In situations like this one, we discovered that by creating little incidents we could produce great features that earned us a lot of money. That way we could break the humiliating barrier of earning only the three thousand lire from the newspapers for a

photograph, and instead earn as much as two hundred thousand lire (Mormorio 26).

Since the paparazzi could now earn almost sixty-eight times their average earnings for photographs by provoking celebrities, a new breed of paparazzi emerged throughout the world. "It was the realization that the picture of the drama, the confrontation, was worth more even though it is dark and blurry and it would mean nothing as an image if you did not know the story," explained Olivier Renaud-Clement in the article "Gallery Puts Paparazzi History on Display" (Laurence A9). The provocation technique was frequently used by the paparazzi throughout the rest of the century. "I soon found out that the more suggestive a photograph is, the angrier and more stressed or offguard the subject is, the more value that photograph has," said actor Michael J. Fox during testimony for the House Judiciary Committee for stricter paparazzi laws in 1998 (United States 6).

A similar technique was used in the 1990s when shooting videotapes of celebrities became profitable for the paparazzi. Paparazzi who shoot these controversial videotapes are called "videorazzi." Videorazzi learned that a profitable videotape needs a celebrity in action or reaction. Videotape footage of a celebrity walking down the street is not very valuable, but if a videorazzo can provoke them into action, the footage becomes more marketable. Robin Leach of Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous said the

videorazzi often resort to yelling "vulgar things" to try to get a hostile reaction out a celebrity (Weeks 1F). "If he yells, it sells," wrote Robert Dominguez in a 1995 New York Daily News article (13).

Calling this confrontational technique the "rat attack," the videorazzi sometimes work in teams with one provoking the celebrity and the other videotaping the incident (Murphy 29). Actress Ellen Degeneres told about her experiences with this type of provocation in a Newsweek article. She explained that when she and partner Anne Heche travel together, the videorazzi at airports are aggressive. "They'll say anything to get you mad--they'd bring up stuff about my sexuality. I never thought about getting violent, but we did think about putting shaving cream on their lenses," said Degeneres (Chang and Beals 16). Will Smith also had this technique used on him at the Los Angeles International Airport, but he did get violent. According to Smith, a paparazzo prevented him from driving his car away from the airport. "So then I proceeded to smack his head off. [. . .] When it got to the point of him physically preventing me from going someplace, it was a step too far," said Smith (Murphy 29). The whole incident, unknowing to Smith, was captured on videotape and sold to Hard Copy for \$2000-\$3000 (Horn 4C). A tabloid producer explained that "we're not told to encourage it, but [video paparazzi]

understand that if they get someone to go ballistic it's money in the bank" (Dominguez 13).

In 1996, the right hostile reaction could earn a videorazzo anywhere from \$1,500 to \$50,000 worldwide. These types of images can be sold in the print market as well, making them more valuable. In 1995, David Handschuh, a staff reporter for the New York Daily News, noted that a still frame of a videotape looks just as good as a still photograph (Reina 10). Although not provoked, videotape footage taken by videorazzo Coqueran of John F. Kennedy Jr. and then-future wife Carolyn Bessette arguing in public earned Coqueran \$250,000 in 1995. Coqueran continues to receive royalties from still frames of the videotape used by the print media (Sales 37; "Time Line" 28).

Inside Celebrity Events

A few elite paparazzi are allowed inside celebrity-filled events. In the late 1970s, the paparazzi were welcome guests in the celebrity-filled nightclub Studio 54 in New York. Vanity Fair called it "the greatest club of all time" (Haden-Guest and Kummer 51). It was the place "to see and be seen, it was the place where paparazzi mingled with celebrity, where high-brow danced with low-brow, where pop art and fine art talked into the wee hours of the morning," according to authors Anthony Haden-Guest and Niels

Kummer in the inside cover of their book Studio 54. Such celebrities as Liza Minnelli, Bianca Jagger, Andy Warhol, Halston, Calvin Klein, Michael Jackson, Diana Ross, Farrah Fawcett-Majors, Cheryl Tiegs, Rod Stewart, John Travolta, Sylvester Stallone, and many others could be found at Studio 54 (Haden-Guest and Kummer 51, 55-57). According to Anthony Haden-Guest in his book, The Last Party, over a dozen paparazzi were let in to photograph the celebrities as they partied into the night (xvi, 386-392). They captured images of "Bianca Jagger boogying with her breasts escaping from her halter dress" and "Maggie Trudeau without underwear" (Sales 36). "What pictures! Never been anything like it. Never will be, either," said paparazzo John Barrett (Sales 36).

When the market for celebrity photographs exploded in the 1990s, each paparazzo had to come up with a style or technique to set themselves apart from all the other paparazzi and photographers. In the documentary Blast 'Em, a photography editor said that she did not care who shot the best photograph. "It's a very, very competitive universe. May the best shot get in," she said. To compete, a paparazzo has to make his or her photographs more saleable than the other ones. "One learns how to locate the best vantage point from which to shoot, how to find a better angle, and even when and how to use available light--all to

keep the photograph exciting, yet make it different," said photographer Leigh Wiener in his book How Do You Photograph People? (20). French paparazzo Wis agreed:

Think a lot before you go out to shoot. [. . .] Think of a way to get something different--where to stand, what personality to go after. You have to push yourself and take chances. [. . .] I think it's better to get a great shot--even if you succeed only one out of three times ("Secrets" 82).

But, it is "not all sunshine and roses" among this elite group of paparazzi. Competition is fierce and sometimes even ruthless. At the Emmy Award ceremonies in 1987, someone pulled the flash sync cords out of several battery packs belonging to the paparazzi. At other events, camera settings have been changed (Kruger 44).

Exclusives

In the early 1960s, a new paparazzi technique emerged--it was known as a "scoop" in Italy, "coup" in France, or an "exclusive" in America. Schonauer in the article "The Great Chase, Then and Now" described an exclusive as "a picture of shattering importance (relative to the celebrity world) or a shot of someone famous in a supremely private moment" (53). To be a true exclusive, no one else can have a similar photograph or videotape. The first exclusive ever captured by a paparazzo was the "Liz 'n' Dick" scandal in 1962. This exclusive was captured in Rome by paparazzo Marcello Geppetti. Geppetti photographed Elizabeth Taylor having an

affair with Richard Burton, her Cleopatra co-star. At the time, Taylor was married to Eddie Fisher (Schonauer 53).

Throughout the rest of the century, the search for the exclusive dominated the paparazzi industry. There are basically three ways to capture an exclusive: the first is luck--being in the right place at the right time; the second is doing a lot of legwork; and the third and most successful technique is staking out a celebrity.

Because a paparazzo never knows when he or she is going to get lucky (the first way to capture exclusive footage), the paparazzi have one golden rule: never leave home without your camera. New York paparazzo Barry Talesnick says he never knows who or what he will run into while out. He was once walking down a street behind Carnegie Hall when he saw Diane Sawyer and her new husband Mike Nichols in a passionate embrace. "They were smooching away like teens on a date. They were locked in such a deep embrace they didn't know anything until they saw the flash of our point-and-shoot cameras," said Talesnick ("Secrets" 83). Acting on impulse can also get a paparazzo lucky. Once paparazzo John Paschal was waiting outside a restaurant for Brooke Shields and Michael Jackson to emerge. As Shields and Jackson entered a waiting limousine, Paschal noticed that the limousine driver had left the driver's side door open, so he slid into the front seat and took a photograph of them.

"Brooke looked a little startled, but Michael laughed that someone would do what I did," said Paschal ("Say" 129). Paparazzo Audrey Lavin has also acted on the same impulse to capture an exclusive. She once slid into Prince Rainier's limousine in New York to ask him about his personal relationships (Ressner 54).

The second way to capture an exclusive is by doing a lot of legwork. For example, paparazzo John Roca got a lead that Diane Sawyer was planning to interview Marla Maples about her possible split from Donald Trump. Roca knew the interview was going to take place in Atlantic City, so he called all the car rental agencies in the area pretending to be from Prime Time Live, until he figured out which agency they were using and when they were arriving. Through a lot of legwork, he also found out where the crew was staying. He then followed the crew to the Trump-owned Taj Mahal, but, unfortunately, was not able to get the photographs because of tight security ("Secrets" 92).

Staking out a celebrity is the third and most successful way of capturing exclusive photographs and videotapes. Paparazzi who capture images via a stakeout are known as "stalkerazzi." A stalkerazzo begins by learning what particular footage is in demand by either contacting his or her agent or conducting research. The stalkerazzo will then stake out the celebrity in the hopes of capturing

the in-demand exclusive. First, the stalkerazzo must find out where the celebrity lives or is staying. This is easily accomplished with a little detective work or through informants. The stalkerazzo will then sit outside the celebrity's home with the hope of catching him or her coming or going. If they get lucky, they get the photograph or videotape that is demand and, sometimes, an even more saleable photograph or videotape. For example, if the celebrity notices the stalkerazzo and then makes the mistake of confronting him or her, the result could be very profitable for the stalkerazzo. Stalkerazzo Spencer Dove once staked out Mick Jagger's house for a week in the hopes of capturing a photograph of him. When Jagger spotted Dove sitting in his car, he chased after him. This resulted in Dove capturing a photograph of Jagger marching down the street and, as Dove put it, looking very old. Jagger did catch up with Dove and hit the roof of his car with an umbrella as he sped off ("Say" 125).

However, celebrities know that the stalkerazzi stake out their homes, so they often make themselves hard to photograph or videotape as they enter or leave. Therefore, the stalkerazzi often follow celebrities. The stalkerazzi may also follow a celebrity because the footage they need is of the celebrity with a certain person, like a new lover for example. A celebrity may lead a stalkerazzo to many places

where he or she is able to obtain the in-demand photograph or videotape, or the pursuit may result in another type of exclusive for the stalkerazzo. For example, the celebrity may be getting a haircut, and the stalkerazzo might get lucky and capture the first footage of the celebrity with a dramatic new hairstyle. Or the celebrity may lead them to a restaurant where any number of exclusive photographs or videotapes may result. Once stalkerazzo Galella followed Kennedy-Onassis and Aristotle Onassis to a restaurant in Manhattan's Chinatown. After talking the owner into letting him inside the restaurant, Galella shot through a coat rack capturing the first photographs of Kennedy-Onassis eating with chopsticks. Galella also photographed Onassis smoking a cigar, making Galella very popular with the Cigar Institute of America (Galella, Jacqueline 60-63).

Celebrities often try to lose stalkerazzi who follow them through high speed chases. Celebrity David Duchovny described his high speed chase experience as very scary. "I've had a dangerous car chase--breaking laws, running red lights. You get this rage. You have no control. It feels like an assault," Duchovny said (Chang and Beals 16). Celebrity Arnold Schwarzenegger also experienced a high speed chase when the first footage of Schwarzenegger after his heart surgery in 1997 was in high demand. Stalkerazzi Giles Harrison and Andrew O'Brien chased Schwarzenegger as

he and his wife were driving one of their children to school. The chase resulted in the two stalkerazzi blocking Schwarzenegger's car at the school. Harrison and O'Brien were later arrested, and both served time in jail ("Snap" 181).

Stakeouts can take place anywhere. When a celebrity gets married, a stalkerazzo may stake out the church (Chang and Beals 16). Staking out celebrities while they are on vacation is also quite common. The Mediterranean has been the celebrity vacation hot spot for a long time. The first photographs of Princess Diana and Al Fayed kissing were taken there. In addition, the practice of using boats to capture footage of celebrities on the shores has been perfected there during the last half of the twentieth century (Gumbel 6).

However, stakeouts are not as glamorous as they sound. Stalkerazzo Galella recalled the worst stakeout that he performed. Galella had followed Elizabeth Taylor and Richard Burton on a cruise to London. Taylor and Burton were not allowed to bring their dogs to shore, so they left them on their yacht on the Thames River and visited them on weekends. Galella hid in a rat-infested warehouse across from the yacht for a weekend. Surrounded by rats and without bathroom facilities, he was able to capture some exclusive photographs of Taylor, but he felt that overall

the experience was not very successful (Galella, Off-guard 80).

Stakeouts require a stalkerazzo to develop personal strategies to make them successful. Los Angeles stalkerazzo Zanger always brings a thermos full of coffee, granola bars, and an empty bottle in case he has to go to the bathroom. He says that he cannot leave a stakeout even for a second, because the celebrity might leave and he would not even know it. When he follows celebrities, he sometimes changes cars so he is not easily recognizable. He recommends rental cars because they are easy to exchange. He also recommends cars with tinted windows ("Secrets" 83-84). New York stalkerazzo Coqueran even recommends getting commercial plates so that it is easier to double-park on streets during stakeouts (Hedegaard 75).

Some stalkerazzi make themselves inconspicuous on stakeouts by driving expensive cars that they own. Stalkerazzo Kip Rano drives a green Rolls Royce while on stakeouts in Los Angeles (Lawlor 4). Stalkerazzo Galella drove a red Pontiac Firebird in the 1970s. He said Secret Servicemen for Kennedy-Onassis did not believe it was his car. "It helps me look as though I belong. You fit right into the best parking lots with a car like that," he said (Galella, Jacqueline 76). Galella even went as far as to date Kennedy-Onassis' maid to get inside information on

Kennedy-Onassis' comings and goings. The situation worked out until Galella and the maid were seen together, and the maid was fired (Galella, Jacqueline 39-40). Reporters for the National Enquirer have also dated people for information on celebrities. Reporter Anna O'Toole dated John Wayne's physician for three months until he found out what she did for a living. O'Toole also had herself committed to a psychiatric unit in a Los Angeles hospital to gain access to a famous television celebrity (Corkery 21).

Stalkerazzi also use disguises while in pursuit of exclusives. Stalkerazzo Law uses a black wig to help change her appearance. Law has posed as a wedding guest, flower delivery person, and a hospital nurse. She has even snuck onto film sets to get exclusive photographs (Lawlor 4). In 1992, stalkerazzi Cash and Wood posed as members of the royal skiing party to capture exclusive photographs of Princes William and Harry's royal cousin after she broke her leg in a skiing accident (Cash 13). One stalkerazzo even went as far as to throw a fake birthday celebration at a restaurant while sitting at a table next to George Clooney and a friend. The stalkerazzo was then able to capture exclusive videotape footage of Clooney inconspicuously (Roberts A12). In 1975, stalkerazzo Young snuck into Richard Burton's 50th birthday party. Young happened to bump into the disc jockey who had to leave unexpectedly, so

Young quickly took over the disc jockey's job. Three hours later, the disc jockey returned, enabling Young to get exclusive photographs of Burton and Elizabeth Taylor with a giant birthday cake (Alexander 2; "Secrets" 92).

Stalkerazzo Galella considers himself the "master of disguises." He uses sunglasses, pipes, mustaches, hats, and a variety of wigs--including hippie, salt and pepper, and Afro styles (Galella, Jacqueline 71, 76). While on a stakeout trying to capture photographs of Kennedy-Onassis and her husband on their private island of Skorpios, Galella disguised himself as a Mexican gardner. He dressed in a sombrero, huaraches, a false mustache, and pushed a wheelbarrow filled with grass clippings where he hid his camera and film (Fenichell 81, 94). Galella, a consummate stalkerazzo, always carries a press card in case someone asks for his credentials, and he keeps a current passport and \$500 in traveler's checks ready in case he needs to fly at a moment's notice. To make his camera equipment inconspicuous, Galella likes to carry it in a duffle bag, airline bag, or mailbag (he can disguise himself as a mailman, if needed) instead of an ordinary camera bag which would give him away (Galella, Jacqueline 76).

To keep an exclusive truly exclusive, the stalkerazzi usually do not share information among themselves. "Rule number one is never tell anyone where you're going,"

explained stalkerazzo Zuffante in Kruger's article "King of the Night Crawlers" (43). Stalkerazzo Chambury agreed with Zuffante. "Careless talk costs money," Chambury said in an interview for Edward Webb's article "What's the Story?" (17).

The latest approach to emerge in capturing exclusive photographs and videotapes is the use of helicopters and planes. Photographs of Michael Jackson were so rare in 1984 that aerial shots of his family's estate were very profitable for paparazzo Elterman (Elterman 32). And, because celebrities have tight security at their weddings, parties, or other private events, the paparazzi have resorted to the "eyes in the skies" to capture their exclusive photographs and videotapes. Paparazzo Ramey is notorious for his ruthless use of helicopters. He has videotaped Jackson's backyard amusement park, ranches and beach houses of numerous celebrities, and many weddings ("Paparazzi's Progress" C9; Langan 12). In 1994, Ramey charged \$350 plus expenses (including a helicopter, if needed) for exclusives. He received five figure bonuses if the footage was especially good (Langan 12). The use of helicopters and planes has forced celebrities to hire hot air balloons or helicopters to keep away unwanted paparazzi (Kershaw T2). Paparazzo Turiak shot footage of Don Johnson and Melody Griffith's wedding in Aspen, Colorado by a

helicopter. While hanging out of the helicopter, Turiak endured injuries when he was hit by a buckshot by a member of Johnson's entourage (Lawlor 4). Helicopters also allow the paparazzi to get to celebrity-breaking stories fast. In the mid-1990s, journalist Cash caught up with paparazzo Ramey at the Santa Monica airport just as he was leaving to capture footage of Elizabeth Taylor being taken to a hospital by ambulance (Cash 14). Sometimes air surveillance is coordinated with a ground crew (Corwin A1). This was the case when paparazzo Ramey captured footage of Alan Thicke's wedding in 1994. Ramey's helicopter hovered 300 feet over the wedding ceremony for half an hour as Ramey took photographs with a telephoto lens (Langan 12).

Digital cameras are the very latest equipment being used by the three types of paparazzi. A digital camera hooked up to a cell phone allows a paparazzo to send a photograph instantaneously (Riding A11). This new technology has made it easier for the paparazzi to meet deadlines and ensure exclusives (Webb 17).

An Illusion

To place the culpability for the world's obsession with celebrities on the paparazzi, the mass media market often reported in the last decade of the twentieth century that the paparazzi were using more aggressive techniques to

capture their photographs and videotapes. Smith noted in her article "Public Fantasies, Private Pictures" that the paparazzi had grown more aggressive over the years (47). Richard Zoglin wrote in a 1997 Time article that he had noticed that the paparazzi were resorting to "more aggressive tactics--sometimes even provoking confrontations with stars in order to catch their temper tantrums on film" (56). Valerie Virga, photography editor for the National Enquirer said in Zoglin's article that she noticed a real increase in invasive photographs in 1996 (56).

But, as illustrated in the historical review of paparazzi techniques previously outlined in this chapter, the techniques used by the paparazzi have not changed since the 1960s. The technique of provoking celebrities for a more saleable image was firmly established in 1958. In the 1990s, it was simply applied to the new technology of videotape recording. Additionally, the practice of stakeouts, and the use of disguises, telephoto lenses, planes, helicopters, boats, and many other techniques was clearly documented in past encounters.

What did change in the 1990s was the number of paparazzi. As previously explained in this chapter, the number of paparazzi increased from a dozen outside a premiere in 1970 to over one hundred in the 1990s. This increased number of paparazzi directly correlated to the

increased demand coming from the six new mass media markets created in the 1990s. Since there were more paparazzi answering the demands of this very large market, it seemed that the paparazzi were more aggressive. But, in reality, the paparazzi were using the very same techniques established more than forty years ago.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE CELEBRITIES

Celebrities are the people the paparazzi photograph and videotape, and they constitute the fourth and final player in the "web of obsession."

WHO ARE THE CELEBRITIES

Historian Daniel J. Boorstin, in his book The Image, defined a celebrity as "a person who is known for his well-knownness" (57). The first type of celebrities were film stars. Initially, the film studios did not release the identities of their actors. They were simply known as the "Biograph Girl," "Vitagraph Girl," or by some striking physical feature such as "the girl with the curls," "the sad-eyed man", or "the fat guy" (Walker 27, 29). At the time, the celebrities did not mind that no one knew their names because being in films was considered a step down from being in the theater. "We were always conscious of the fact that we were in this messy business because everything else had failed--because nobody had seemed to want us, and we just hadn't been able to hang on any longer," said film celebrity Linda Arvidson in her book When the Movies Were Young (54). The film studios also suppressed the film celebrities' names because they knew once the celebrity became known, it would "open the doors to temperament and

outrageous salary demands" (Fahey and Rich 13).

By 1910, however, pressure from the public finally forced the film studios to release the names of their celebrities. The first known celebrity was Florence Lawrence, formerly the "Biograph Girl." Her name was released in a publicity stunt that shocked the public. The stunt went like this: initially, Lawrence's name and photograph were placed in newspapers and it was reported that she had been killed in a street accident. Then, two weeks later, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch devoted its front page to an interview with and eight photographs of the very much alive Lawrence. A week later, the stunt concluded with Lawrence making a personal appearance in St. Louis, giving the public its first chance to see a celebrity in person (Walker 31-33).

Soon, everyone knew the names of their favorite film celebrities, and fan magazines were created to fulfill the public's intense interest. The celebrities, however, did not fully realize the potential power that came with fame and popularity, and they went about their daily routines like those around them (Kobal, Hollywood 28). It was not until 1916 that things drastically changed. This change took place as Charlie Chaplin was on a train ride from Los Angeles to New York. As word spread that Chaplin was on the train, the public packed railroad stations along the line to

get a glimpse of him. By the time the train got to New York, the crowds could not be contained. Chaplin knew he was popular, but he never realized what power he possessed. "The power of stardom strikes home to an artist as a disproportion between who he thinks he is and how other people think of him. It is bewildering, exhilarating, depressing or terrifying," wrote Alexander Walker in his book Stardom (46). Chaplin's realization of his true power fetched him a contract with Mutual for \$670,000 a year while he was in New York. Other celebrities soon realized their power, as well. Mary Pickford went from earning \$500 a week in 1912 to \$350,000 a film in 1917. Anita Stewart signed a contract with Vitagraph in 1917 for \$1000 a week plus 10% of the profits with a guaranteed salary of \$127,000 a year (Walker 48-50).

To sell their films, the studios began creating images for their celebrities. America's sweetheart was Pickford, America's hero was Douglas Fairbanks, the vamp was Theda Bara, the cowboy was William S. Hart, the fat man was John Bunny or Fatty Arbuckle, and the little man was Chaplin, Harold Lloyd, or Buster Keaton (Mast and Kavin 106-09). Now the celebrities had to combine their personal images with their studio personas.

Three national scandals soon erupted that tarnished the celebrity personas created by the studios. The scandals

started in 1920 when Pickford divorced her husband and married Fairbanks. Soon after their wedding it was revealed that Pickford's divorce was not legal. This challenged Pickford and Fairbank's screen images of purity. In 1921, a scandal surrounded Arbuckle when one of his party guests died. Arbuckle was tried for involuntary manslaughter and eventually found not guilty. His image, however, had been ruined and he worked in very few films thereafter. The final scandal broke in 1922 when Wallace Reid died of a drug overdose. As a result of these scandals, the film studios decided to force celebrities to sign contracts containing "moral" clauses dictating their actions. In addition, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, known as the Hays Office, was established in 1922 to control celebrity images (Mast and Kavin 115-16). The studio and Hays Office continued to control until the studio system was dissolved in 1948, and the celebrities were released from their contracts. Now, most studios maintain contracts on a picture-by-picture basis with celebrities (Gamson, Claims 41).

At about the same time that the studio system dissolved, a new type of celebrity was emerging: the television star. By the late 1950s, 80% of American households owned television sets. As a result, film attendance began to steadily decline, dropping from ninety

million tickets per week in 1948 to fifteen million in 1970, and averaging out to approximately twenty million tickets per week in the 1990s. In addition to television celebrities, three other types of celebrities emerged with the introduction of television into viewers' homes; they were: musicians, athletes, and comedians. Before 1950, musicians were known through their live concerts and recordings. Broadcasts of their performances on television, and music videos in the 1980s, greatly widened their audience bases. Although baseball was initially hurt by the introduction of television because fewer people attended live games, it and other televised sports soon prospered. As a result, numerous baseball, football, basketball, and other sport-related celebrities have emerged. Lastly, stand-up comedians prospered on television due to cable's need for inexpensive programming (Fowles 34-37).

In a study to determine the true celebrities of the last half of the twentieth century, Jib Fowles conducted a survey of 433 popular performers found in Current Biography (from 1966-1985) for his book Starstruck. Fowles found that actors and actresses topped the list of celebrities at 51%. They were followed by musicians (18%), comedians (15%), athletes (14%), and others (2%). Fowles also concluded that if celebrities are defined as those who are recognized by 80% or more of the public, then only one hundred celebrities

exist at any given time (265-66, 68).

Internationally known celebrities are called megastars, and this is the highest level of fame a celebrity can reach. According to Jonathan Alter's 1997 Newsweek article, the list of twentieth century megastars included: Charles Lindbergh, Babe Ruth, Winston Churchill, Muhammad Ali, John F. Kennedy, Elvis Presley, and Michael Jordan (60-61). Megastars who constantly stay on the top one hundred list can be separated into one of three categories: royalty, American royalty (the Kennedys), and long-time celebrities. Each type of megastar is closely examined in the remainder of this section to determine how they have been able to maintain their high level of fame.

The first type of megastar is royalty, and the members of Great Britain's royal family fit into this category. Paparazzo Jim Bennett wrote in American Photo that "they are supposed to be the ideal family, everything Great Britain and the Commonwealth stand for" (Dolgoft 62). Consequently, photographs and videotapes of the royal family doing anything sell. Until the mid-1980s, profitable paparazzi photographs featured the royal family fulfilling official obligations or doing everyday activities. One successful photograph taken in 1974, by paparazzi Daniel Angeli and Jean-Paul Dousset, showed the Duchess of Windsor spraying for flies in her Paris apartment (Schonauer 57). Another

profitable photograph for Angeli and Dousset showed the Queen of England scraping her boots at Badminton Mansions (Dolgoff 62).

According to paparazzo Jason Fraser, in the early 1960s, the British royal family's status was fading so the queen made an effort to court the press. "They court publicity. Make no mistake--that is what keeps them in business," said paparazzo Bennett (Dolgoff 62). In the 1960s, Great Britain relied on the squeaky clean image of its royalty for tourism. A few scandalous photographs, however, hurt this image. One such photograph, taken in 1978 by paparazzi Angeli and Dousset, featured Princess Margaret in her first appearance after her unprecedented divorce from Lord Snowdon. In the 1970s this was quite scandalous (Dolgoff 62).

By the late-1980s, the photographs of the British royalty started to change. Paparazzo Bennett said that in 1987, he started taking more off-beat photographs of the royal family during more private times. For example, he captured them on vacation or at their estates. "They [newspapers] don't want another picture of Diana all dressed up in evening wear. They want to see her in blue jeans," he said (Dolgoff 62, 64). Taking photographs and videotapes of the royal family on vacation is quite a challenge. When British royalty travel, they have three layers of

protection: local police guard the perimeter, a special Scotland Yard branch covers the middle ground, and a personal bodyguard protects each member of the royal family (Secrets 93). This coverage makes it difficult to get unguarded photographs and videotapes of the royal family, and, consequently, drives up the price of these types of images.

More scandalous photographs of the royal family started to emerge in the 1990s. A photograph, in early 1990, of Princess Diana of Wales driving a German Mercedes resulted in a scandal over the photograph and \$28,000 for the paparazzo who took it ("Secrets" 93). Another example of a successful photograph was taken in 1990 by paparazzo Allen Grisbrook; it showed Sarah Ferguson, the Duchess of York, falling in a dress and revealing her underwear (Dolgoff 60, 64). In 1992, French paparazzo Angeli caught Ferguson on vacation in France caressing and embracing Texan millionaire, John Bryan. This photograph was taken while Ferguson was still married to Duke Andrew. The eighteen color and five black-and-white photographs showed the topless Ferguson and Bryan "engaging in a variety of compromising poolside activities" such as embracing each other on a lounge chair, Bryan nibbling on Ferguson's foot, Ferguson riding on Bryan's shoulders in the pool, and the two of them kissing while one of Ferguson's daughters

watched. When these photographs were published in Britain's Daily Mirror, four million papers were sold. The next day, the Daily Mirror published another eighteen color photographs, due to the high demand (Burshtein A11; Jenish and Melville 36).

Of all the photographs and videotapes taken of the British royal family, the ones of Princess Diana were the most profitable for the paparazzi. Before Princess Diana's death in 1997, there were approximately fifty paparazzi who virtually lived off Princess Diana's image alone (Riding A11). According to Lewis Grossberger in the article "Diana Still Dead," Princess Diana was on the cover of forty-three issues of People magazine (46). The pressure of the paparazzi's pursuit was so intense for Princess Diana that in 1996 she got a restraining order against a paparazzo who allegedly bumped her car with his motorcycle as he chased her. In the affidavit for this case, Princess Diana stated that she cancelled social engagements because she felt "too distraught to leave [her] home" ("Too" 70). Two weeks before her death, Princess Diana was quoted in the French newspaper Le Monde as saying that she wanted to leave Great Britain and its paparazzi. "Any sane person would have left long ago. But I cannot. I have my sons," said Princess Diana (Carlson 46). In fact, some people felt Princess Diana was dating Dodi Al Fayed because his father's money

could shield her from some of the paparazzi; as the Onassis family fortune did somewhat for Jacqueline Kennedy-Onassis (Almond 65).

Prior to her death, Princess Diana set up informal agreements with editors and publishers to leave her sons alone until they were out of school. One year after her death, Peter Almond wrote in Nieman Reports that astonishingly the media have lived up to their word. In fact, in January 1998, two French agency photographers took photographs of the princes while they were on a ski trip in Switzerland. Under a "name and shame" policy set up by Buckingham Palace, the photographers were publicly identified and the photographs were never published (66). But, in 1997, the former chairman of Britain's Press Council, Louis Blom-Cooper, said to "give it another two or three years" before the press starts pursuing them (Hosenball 60). And, as Blom-Cooper predicted, in August 1999 there was an intense eight-day search by helicopters and speedboats to capture footage of Princes, William and Harry, on vacation in Greece. Ideally, the paparazzi were looking to capture footage of the two princes with their father and his long-time love, Camilla Parker-Bowles. The only footage captured, however, was of the two princes joining friends at a restaurant ("Paparazzi Pinpoint" A2).

The British believe that America's fascination with

celebrities comes from not having royalty of its own ("Fame Trade" 23). Many paparazzi feel that the Kennedy family has been America's substitution for royalty. The Kennedy family is the second type of megastar. This family has been pursued by the paparazzi throughout most of the second half of the century.

According to paparazzo Ron Galella, Robert and Ethel Kennedy are loved by fan and news magazines alike. Galella said that Ethel is very warm and friendly; she even greeted and shook hands with Galella at a tennis match as he photographed her. Galella feels Joan Kennedy is the prettiest of all the family, and, although she is shy, he loves taking photographs of her and Ted Kennedy (Galella, Jacqueline 130, 140, 151). In 1989, paparazzi Angeli and Dousset captured controversial photographs of Senator Edward Kennedy while he was vacationing in St. Tropez. Shooting from a boat, using a 600-millimeter lens doubled with a converter to 1200-millimeter, they were able to photograph Kennedy and his girlfriend having an offshore romance. The photographs were widely used with articles depicting his lifestyle (Schonauer 57).

As Princess Diana was the most photographed member in her royal family, Jacqueline Kennedy-Onassis was the most sought after member of the Kennedy family for several decades. Her image transformed over the years from being

"the young, stylish, upper-crust first lady," to becoming the "tragic widow," then shocking the nation by marrying the "short, old, and suspiciously rich" Aristotle Onassis (Squiers 67). When she married the Greek shipping magnate in 1968, photographs of this former "saint" were worth thousands of dollars. Like the speculation surrounding Princess Diana and boyfriend Al Fayed, many felt Kennedy-Onassis married Onassis because his immense wealth could finally offer her some privacy (Carlson 46).

In an article for American Photo, Liz Smith said that Kennedy-Onassis had no job and accomplished nothing of great consequence, but was highly sought after by the paparazzi (47). Photographs of her in ordinary situations easily sold, including photographs of her walking her dog, watching a parade on Fifth Avenue, riding bicycles with her son, or buying ice cream. "The image of Jackie paying for ice cream like any humble woman was a winner," said paparazzo Galella (Squiers 70).

As a result of the assassinations of her husband John F. Kennedy and brother-in-law Robert Kennedy, Kennedy-Onassis was very wary of large crowds and objects being pointed at her. Occasionally she ran from the paparazzi, but usually she met them head-on and dealt with them (Smith 47). Her most persistent pursuer was paparazzo Galella, who in his book Off-guard, admitted he was obsessed with her,

considering her "the perfect model of wife, mother, woman-- someone whose ways of being should exist as instruction to all wives, all mothers, all women" (125). Galella pursued Kennedy-Onassis for four years until a court order in 1973 ordered him to keep twenty-five feet away from Kennedy-Onassis and thirty feet from her children for the rest of his life (Sales 37). Galella claims he was not out to make Kennedy-Onassis look bad, and, in fact, destroyed unflattering photographs of her (Squiers 67).

Celebrities who have sustained their careers and popularity for many decades are the last type of megastar. Several celebrities fit this category. The first megastar of this stature is Elizabeth Taylor. Sixty-eight-year-old Taylor has been famous since the age of twelve. Throughout her film career, as well as many marriages, weight problems, addictions, life-threatening illnesses, perfumes, lavish birthday parties, and fund-raising efforts, Taylor has been the paparazzi's "dream girl" (Smith 47). Globe's bureau chief Mary Ann Norbom commented in 1994 that "Elizabeth Taylor hasn't made a movie in years but our readers identify with her because of her personal problems" (Langan 12). According to Smith, in an American Photo article entitled "Public Fantasies, Private Pictures," "fat" photographs of Taylor have been very profitable for the paparazzi since 1957 (46).

The paparazzi will go to great lengths to photograph Taylor. One paparazzo even lowered himself by a rope onto Taylor's hotel terrace to get photographs of her and her fourth husband, Eddie Fisher, having dinner (Time-Life 18). Paparazzo Phil Ramey hid in bushes outside the Betty Ford Center for a week in 110-degree desert heat to capture a few photographs of Taylor after her detoxification treatment (Ressner 53). Los Angeles paparazzo, Alan Zanger, reported that he made a five-figure income in 1990 for the exclusive photographs he took of Taylor on a gurney as she was being put into an ambulance. Taylor was being rushed from one hospital to another with a case of pneumonia (Corwin A1). As photograph agent, Virginia Lohle, said, "I learned a long time ago [that] the Rolling Stones pay your phone bill, but Elizabeth Taylor pays your rent" (Richardson 68).

Madonna is another megastar surrounded by controversy. Madonna's singing career took off in 1984 and, by 1986, her then-husband, actor Sean Penn, had had two run-ins with the paparazzi resulting in thirty-two days in jail for Penn (McGraw sec. 2, 1). In American Photo, Smith said that Madonna's appeal is due to her "sexed-up public image--so much more open and defiantly provocative than anyone before her" (47). This image and the money a paparazzo can make by capturing it on film or videotape has resulted in paparazzi who specialize in just Madonna. One such paparazzo is New

York-based Angie Coqueran. Coqueran knows Madonna's exercise routines, her favorite hotels and the names she checks in under, and the fans she should be afraid of. Coqueran even sorts through Madonna's garbage. In 1990, one of the hottest photographs of the year was of Madonna with her then-new boyfriend Warren Beatty. After staking them out, Coqueran finally got a photograph of them entering a gym together, earning her \$13,000 (Hedegaard 74-75, 92-93; Schonauer 58). Although Vinnie Zuffante did not specialize in Madonna photographs, he liked photographing her in 1988 because he could earn up to \$15,000 for one photograph when it sold in the U.S. and abroad (Kruger 42). Another thing that makes Madonna's images so popular is that she often changes her look. This dates photographs and videotapes of her, resulting in the need for current images (Blast 'Em).

THE EFFECTS OF BEING A CELEBRITY: THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS

In the 1920s, celebrities began to feel the effects of stardom. At this time, studios were forcing celebrities to sign exclusive contracts so that the studios could control their images. Many of these contracts contained moral clauses stating that "should a star receive any adverse publicity, the studio would have the right to cancel the contract immediately" (Kobal, Art 48). Joshua Gamson wrote in Claims to Fame that in a typical contract, an actor

agreed to:

"act, pose, sing, speak, or otherwise perform solely and exclusively" for the contracting studio, to promote films through personal appearance tours, and to give the studio control of his or her name and likeness in advertising and publicity (25).

An example of the total control that studios had on the lives of celebrities, can be further examined by looking at film celebrity Mary Miles Minter's 1919, three-year, \$1.3 million contract with Realart, a subsidiary of Paramount Pictures. Her contract stated that:

The young star is not to become a "public figure" except in the ways that the studio evangelists direct. She can be interviewed seldom, if ever--except as part of said evangelism. She must be seen very little in public--if at all. And she must not marry! (Kobal, Hollywood 188).

Studio publicity departments controlled what news was released about celebrities, and the celebrities were forced to live flawless lives. Celebrities had little control over the direction of their careers, and sometimes, as disciplinary punishment, a studio would "loan out" a celebrity to appear in a film that would damage their careers (Gamson, Claims 25). To further protect their "investments," studios would even go as far as to arrange marriages. If a studio found out that a celebrity was homosexual, they would force the celebrity to marry to avoid suspicion. If a celebrity was dating someone from a different race, creed, or color, and it was thought to jeopardize the celebrity's image, the studio would force the

celebrity to date someone else (Kobal, Art 54-55).

Celebrity photographers also had to follow numerous rules established by the studios. One rule was that female celebrities were never to be photographed with a drink or cigarette in their hand. "As far as the public was concerned, the female stars drank cocoa and ate candy," wrote John Kobal (Art 59-60).

In response to several celebrity scandals in the early 1920s, the U.S. government established the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association (known as the Hays Office) in 1922 to control the content of celebrity photographs released to the public. All celebrity photographs had to receive final approval from the Hays Office before being published. The Hays Office established many rules, for example: no flesh above a woman's stocking top was to be shown; no cleavage; the inside of a thigh could not be shown; when a couple embraced the man had to be higher than the woman; men had to wear ties and jackets; if a man wore a bathing trunk or gymnasium outfit, there could be no unseemly bumps or body hair; and no shots of navels (Kobal, Art 63-64).

Retouchers were hired to fix any photographs that did not meet the requirements. "[Mae West's] celebrated curves have been flattened to the point where her jewelry seems suspended near her neck and wrists," wrote Kobal (Art 98,

100). Retouchers also fixed naturally occurring visual flaws of celebrities to help sustain the studio "images." Spots and wrinkles were smoothed out; dirty teeth were cleaned, missing ones replaced, and crooked ones straightened; dull or bloodshot eyes were cleared up; necks and eyelashes were lengthened; and waists and ungainly pounds were shaved away (Kobal, Art 98-100). Often, celebrities would request special retouches or favors. Joan Crawford requested that a photographer's film be slightly overexposed to eliminate her freckles, and Fred Astaire asked that no photographs be taken of him without his toupee on (Smith 46).

Although most celebrities of this time were creations of the film studios, a few people were celebrities in their own right. One such celebrity was Charles A. Lindbergh, who on May 21, 1927, made the first nonstop solo flight from New York to Paris in a monoplane. Lindbergh became the world's first global celebrity, and, as author Leo Braudy described it, "[he] symbolically connected the United States and Europe at a time when political tensions were threatening to drive them apart" (21). When Lindbergh arrived in Paris, his flight was so well publicized that he was mobbed by 100,000 people ("Fame: The Faustian" 21). In New York, all previous newspaper sales were broken covering the event (Mott 699).

Fame, however, had a dramatic effect on Lindbergh's life. Women would fight over a corn cob he had chewed. He could not cash a check or send his shirts to the laundry, because they would never be returned. He had to court his future wife in the sky, as this was the only place he could find privacy. On their honeymoon, they were buzzed by a photographer hanging out of a seaplane window as they sailed on a yacht. According to author Boorstin, it was so bad for Lindbergh that when he tried to stay out of the press, he would make the news because of his efforts to stay out of it (69).

The effect that fame and the press had on Lindbergh got increasingly worse. In 1932, Lindbergh's infant son was kidnapped and murdered. Photographers, in search of an exclusive, broke into the morgue, opened the coffin, and photographed the mangled corpse of the child. No newspapers or magazines would buy the photographs, so they were sold on the streets of New Jersey for \$5 each ("Fame: The Faustian" 21). Three hundred reporters covered the twenty-eight day murder trial that followed, and over eleven million words describing the details of the trial were wired around the world (Mott 703). The last straw for Lindbergh came in 1935, when the car taking his second son to nursery school was run off the road by photographers. After this incident, the Lindbergh family fled the U.S. They were finally left

alone after Lindbergh led a campaign against the U.S.'s involvement in World War II; the world lost interest in him, and he gained his privacy back ("Fame: The Faustian" 21).

THE EFFECTS OF BEING A CELEBRITY: THE SECOND FIFTY YEARS

After the break up of the film studios in 1948, celebrities were released from their confining contracts, as well as the shelter of the studios. Soon, celebrities began to experience the intense pressure of the press and paparazzi, similar to what Lindbergh experienced in the 1920s and 1930s. Celebrities, such as Barbra Streisand, Richard Dreyfuss, Sharon Stone, John Lennon, and Woody Allen, have all stated that their fame makes them prisoners of their own homes, since this is the only place they can have any privacy (Mauro 26; Hiscock 26; Fowles 138). Celebrity Dom DeLuise once explained to Joan Rivers that "the moment you leave the house, it's P.R." (Murphy 30). Fowles described, in Starstruck, that "success as a performer is not liberating, it is confining. Stardom does not grant license, it takes it away" (152). Celebrity Pierce Brosnan said the following of his fame: "I feel like I stepped into the lions' den. I feel like there is no breathing space. I am like a mouse running around on a little wheel" (Fowles 101). A newcomer to the celebrity scene in the late 1990s, Jewel Kilcher, confided to Barry

Koltnow, a reporter for the Orange County Register, that if she knew what it meant to be a celebrity, she would have chosen a different path. "I live in a world of constant confinement. [. . .] The solitude and confinement that come with fame is an odd thing. Learning to deal with that has been difficult," Kilcher said (3AA).

The effects that the paparazzi have on the lives of celebrities are tremendous. A simple photograph or videotape taken by a paparazzo can be detrimental to a celebrity, especially if it is published with a fictional story. Michael J. Fox had such an experience in 1987 when a photograph of Fox and future-wife Tracy Pollen asking a New York Police Department Officer for directions to their car was published with a fictitious story saying that they were asking the police for help dealing with death threats. Fox said that he had never received a death threat before the article. But, Fox testified before the House Judiciary Committee for stricter paparazzi laws in 1998, that soon after the photograph and story ran a woman began:

to write a series, approximately 6,200 in all, of graphic and terrifying hate letters that threatened death to Tracy, to myself, and eventually our unborn child. [. . .] I firmly believe she would not have acted had the tabloid not provided that irresponsible, fictional precedent (United States 7).

Fox furthered testified that the paparazzi made his wedding to Pollen a nightmare by chasing the cars in the wedding, flying helicopters over the ceremony, and even bribing

locals to take photographs. The paparazzi also tracked down Fox and Pollen on their island honeymoon, and took photographs of the couple in their suite from a boat using a telephoto lens. In 1989 and 1995, the paparazzi tried posing as medical personnel to get photographs of the couple's children after they were born. In 1990, the paparazzi infiltrated his father's funeral, and even pretended to be mourners to try to get into the wake at his mother's home (United States 7-8).

Celebrity Paul Reiser has had many of the same experiences. When his wife went into labor prematurely, someone at the hospital leaked the information to the paparazzi. Within hours, the hospital received calls from impostors posing as relatives and concerned friends trying to get information about Reiser's son. The paparazzi were soon spotted in the halls around the intensive care unit trying to photograph the child (United States 15).

Celebrity Priscilla Presley said that even when she is on private property, she is still under the constant eye of the paparazzi. In the book, Starstruck, Presley recalled that once she was "kissing her husband while they were sunning themselves [in] their backyard pool in Los Angeles, and hearing the click and whirl of a camera mechanism from a photographer concealed in the landscape" (Fowles 118).

This extreme intrusion of privacy is felt in other

countries, too. In December 1999, it was leaked that Crown Princess Masako of Japan was pregnant. When she went to get a pregnancy test, cars and helicopters followed her limousine, and the media coverage of the hospital visit was tremendous (Zielenziger 16A). After a couple weeks of speculation, it was reported that she had miscarried (French 5A).

The paparazzi's effects even influence where celebrities can buy homes. Neighbors simply do not like the attention that celebrities draw to a neighborhood. They do not want the fans, tourist vans, or paparazzi hanging around outside their homes taking photographs and videotapes. Celebrities may have the security necessary to keep the public away, but the neighbors often do not. "One celebrity I know of was shut out of his desired co-op after the board members got together and bought the apartment out from under him. They didn't want to deal with the paparazzi staking out their front door," explained Manhattan realtor Roger Erickson (Knadler 128). Erickson says that celebrities like Madonna, Barbra Streisand, Calvin Klein, Sheryl Crow, Mariah Carey, and music mogul Tommy Mottola have all been turned down by co-ops (Knadler 128, 130).

One of the scariest consequences of the paparazzi in the lives of celebrities is the "stalkerazzi." The problem is that when the stalkerazzi are staking out celebrities for

photographs and videotapes, the celebrities do not know if the stalkerazzi are real stalkers who could cause them actual physical harm or not. Celebrity Shane Barbi said:

Living in the limelight sometimes opens us up to a world of daily threats, extortion and stalkers. It also brings danger to your family and people you love. It's hard enough without creeps like him [paparazzo Chris Williams] snooping around (Benza 25).

The fear of the stalkerazzi has grown even greater since the murders of celebrities John Lennon and Rebecca Schaeffer by stalkers in the 1980s. As recent as 1996, Madonna had stalker Robert Dewey Hoskins sentenced to ten years in prison for stalking and threatening to kill her (DeWitt, Ortnier, and Yocca 1). In 1996, celebrity Sharon Lawrence described what it felt like to be stalked by the paparazzi: "When I got in my car, they started following me down the street. It was creepy. It warps you, you lose your head" (Murphy 29). In the People article, "Too Close For Comfort," public relations specialist, Stan Rosenfield, points out another problem. "[Celebrities] are conditioned to be on guard against real stalkers or kidnappers, who could be posing as paparazzi," said Rosenfield (70). As stated in The Economist's article "Fame: The Faustian Bargain," it is "no wonder so many of the famous ultimately come to see their celebrity as a curse, and wish that they had remained undiscovered and unsung, at least during their lifetimes" (23).

THE HOST-LEECH RELATIONSHIP

A celebrity's livelihood is his or her public image. Although it may seem that the paparazzi only make being a celebrity miserable, the paparazzi actually play a very important role in creating celebrity images. As celebrity Elizabeth Taylor explained it, "a star's image is his or her stock in trade, and it has to be carefully protected" (Fowles 118). Historian Boorstin agreed, stating that celebrities are "nothing greater than a more-publicized version of us" (74). He goes on to say that celebrities are a creation of gossip, public opinion, and images portrayed in magazines, newspapers, films, and on television (63).

Lawyer Douglas Mirell refers to the role that the paparazzi play in the celebrities' lives (creating gossip, public opinion, and images) as a "host-leech relationship." "The question is, Who's the leech? It changes from time to time," said Mirell (Krasnowski A3). In the article "Italy: Playing an Elaborate Game," author Andrew Gumbel described this host-leech relationship as a cat-and-mouse game. He explained that when celebrities go on vacation in Italy, the paparazzi follow them. The celebrities take part or all of their clothes off, the paparazzi photograph and videotape them. The footage is published, and the celebrities are talked about. In the end, everyone "comes out of the whole exercise happy," wrote Gumbel (6). "And the more they try

to dodge us [in this game], the more exciting the chase becomes," added paparazzo Dave Hogan (Alexander 2).

"The celebrities use [the] photographers to get free publicity, just as the agencies and the photographers live off celebrity pictures," Robert J. Salgado said in a 1997 Editor and Publisher article (12). Paparazzo Zuffante further explained that since there is a new celebrity every day, "these people will do anything for us. They'll stand on their heads" for the publicity (Blast 'Em).

Celebrities have used this relationship to their advantage since the 1960s. They figured out that confrontational photographs could help their careers by forcing their faces and names into publications, resulting in free publicity. Some celebrities even resorted to informing the paparazzi of their whereabouts so they could act "surprised" when found (Mormorio 26). Peter Plagens wrote in his article "Cutting to the Chase" that he felt that actress Anita Ekberg acted aggressively in photographs taken of her in 1960 to gain free publicity for her new feature film (86). For instance when Ekberg was followed by the paparazzi to her Roman villa, she came outside of the villa in her stocking feet and shot at the paparazzi with a bow and arrow, wounding one paparazzo. A story and photographs documenting the whole incident were featured in Life's October 31, 1960 issue and other publications

("Swings" 28-30). Soon afterward, another incident occurred with Ekberg. Again, frustrated with the many paparazzi who followed her, Ekberg kneed one of them in the groin. Paparazzo Marcello Geppetti caught the whole incident on film, again giving Ekberg free publicity when the photographs were sold to newspapers and magazines (Plagens 86).

In retrospect, the picture of misery painted by the celebrities about the effects that the paparazzi have on their lives is often a convenient way for them to turn culpability for the world's obsession with celebrity images away from themselves. It has been shown that celebrities need the paparazzi to sustain and maintain their careers as much as the paparazzi need them.

WHO ARE THE PUBLICISTS

Publicists help celebrities maintain or suppress their images in the mass media market. They were known as "press agents" for the first half of the twentieth century. These press agents mostly handled publicity for circuses, theaters, and newspapers, until they were lured to Los Angeles to become part of the film studios' publicity departments. At the film studios, their main job was to make sure no "detrimental publicity" occurred from the production through the release of a film (Kobal, Art 46,

48). "Studio press agents are your shield, your moat, your fortress against the world," said celebrity Bette Davis (Fowles 128).

A publicist's job in the second half of the twentieth century was to enable, design, manage, and protect a celebrity's image (Rein, Kotler, and Stoller 280). According to paparazzo and author Brad Elterman, publicists went about this in two ways. First, they kept a celebrity's name and face in newspapers and magazines, and on television shows during the developmental period of a celebrity's career, or when they had something to promote like a new film, television show, concert date, record album, or book. Second, publicists kept a client out of newspapers and other publications so they do not receive too much media attention, risking overexposure (66). Historian Boorstin said that to extend a celebrity's longevity, publicists control his or her image by sparingly exposing him or her once a month or even every two months, rather than every week (64). These suppressed celebrities were ideal candidates for the paparazzi in the last half of the twentieth century, because their lack of planned exposure makes footage of them more valuable. Elterman called this concept: reclusive equals exclusive (Elterman 66).

Wayne Warga wrote in a 1982 TV Guide article that, in regards to television celebrities, there is a pattern to the

degree of publicity that celebrities need depending upon their stage of stardom. Stage one consists of a celebrity promoting a new show. He or she can be found on every talk show, and in every newspaper and magazine. "You see, hear and read about him or her everywhere," Warga noted (4). If the show is a success, the celebrity enters stage two. A celebrity in stage two will often hire a publicist, a "heavy hitter" agent, and a very good attorney. This celebrity then chooses what publications he or she will appear in. "It depends now on the publication, the subjects not to be discussed, who else will be in the story, whether or not the cover is included," said Warga (5). A protective publicity wall is built around a stage two celebrity. A celebrity enters stage three when he or she becomes disenchanted with some element of his or her show, and holds up production until it is solved. A certain degree of publicity is needed to get the public behind the celebrity, and a number of resolutions may result, including: the celebrity is given a raise (or whatever else he or she wanted) and returns to stage two; nothing happens and the celebrity returns to stage two; the show is cancelled and the celebrity returns to stage one when they have something new to promote; or the show goes on without the celebrity (sometimes with the understanding that the celebrity is making "the big move into movies.") If the celebrity does not make it in films

and returns to the same television show or a new one, they start over again in stage one (Warga 5-6).

TRYING TO CONTROL THE PAPARAZZI AND THE RESULTS

Problems arise in the "host-leech" relationship when the celebrities or their publicists try to control the paparazzi. "They cannot have it both ways, cannot plead for publicity in the morning and expect not to be photographed in some embarrassing circumstance later in the day," wrote the editors of Time-Life's Photojournalism (19). Princess Diana was a classic example of a celebrity who tried to control the paparazzi. She used her fame and the paparazzi to promote good causes, like AIDS research and the elimination of land mines, and she often divulged details of her personal life when she thought it was useful (Carlson 46; Chidley 34-36; "Too" 70). In fact, she was so friendly with some editors and reporters that, in December 1996, she went to the staff Christmas party for England's The Sunday Times (Hosenball 60). "Diana used them enormously to her advantage and knew exactly how to do it," said Daily Mirror royal reporter James Whitaker (Ehrlich 11). But, Princess Diana did not want the constant eye of the press. Most paparazzi believe that that is just not how it works. "You can't say one day, 'Come and photograph me,' and the next day say, 'I don't want the attention,'" said paparazzo

Frédéric Garcia (Riding A11).

Throughout the twentieth century, celebrities and publicists tried to control the paparazzi so that celebrity images would not become overexposed. Nine techniques emerged that gave celebrities some control against the unwanted photographs and videotapes taken by the paparazzi. The result of most of these techniques was that the celebrity became hunted because their image was still in demand from the mass media market.

The first technique used by celebrities was to not stop and pose for a paparazzo when he or she was trying to photograph or videotape them. "I don't see why [celebrities] try to run away from paparazzi. At a certain point, they should just let themselves be photographed and move on," said paparazzo Secchiaroli (Woodward and Amarick 38). "The easiest way for a celebrity to be let alone is to be gracious and pose," added paparazzo Kip Rano (Lawlor 4). One paparazzo explained in the documentary Blast 'Em what occurs when celebrities do not cooperate:

If I'm in a pinned off press area, and he [Robert De Niro] chooses not to come and let us make a picture, then we've got to go get the picture some place else. That's my job. [. . .] I'm covering a Robert De Niro movie. I've got to get a picture of Robert De Niro. [. . .] If I have to go out on the street to get him walking up the street, then I'm going to go out on the street getting him walking up the street.

John F. Kennedy Jr. was an example of a celebrity who often made himself very hard to photograph or videotape and

refused to pose for the paparazzi. Kennedy constantly ran past the paparazzi, even at public events. New York paparazzo Steve Sands recalled that at one charity function Kennedy only allowed three photographers to take his photograph even though there were many more pre-approved. This kind of action really made the paparazzi angry because their livelihood depended on coming back with a photograph (Richardson 69). Kennedy hated stopping for the paparazzi so much that he even had a permanent blockade installed outside his apartment so the paparazzi would stay a humane distance from him and his wife as they came and went (Carlson 46).

The paparazzi also cite the case of Princess Diana in this category. Many paparazzi suggested that on the night Princess Diana and Al Fayed died, if they had just stopped in front of the Ritz Hotel in Paris and allowed themselves to be photographed, the paparazzi would not have chased their car.

The second technique celebrities used was disguises while in public. Celebrities often wore sunglasses, hats, or even wigs. On the documentary Blast 'Em, one paparazzo said that he almost did not recognize celebrity Jack Nicholson skiing because he was wearing dark goggles. The paparazzo got the exclusive photograph, though, which was sold to People magazine. Author Fowles wrote in Starstruck

that Greta Garbo used to wear dark glasses and a big hat to disguise herself; Marilyn Monroe wore a scarf and no makeup; and Hedy Lamarr wore a blonde wig (138). During Michael Jackson's peak of fame, Fowles noted in his book that one writer said,

while the people were working to make their hair and clothes and movements look more like Michael Jackson's, Michael Jackson sat in a hotel room applying a false moustache and a worn hat to try to look more like them. Like them, he found it easier to go out in the world in disguise (138).

The third technique celebrities developed was to make photographs and videotapes of themselves less saleable. Paparazzo Elterman said celebrity David Bowie was very good at this. For example, Elterman recalled trying to photograph Bowie as he entered a recording studio; Bowie kept his head down so that the only photographs Elterman captured were of the top of Bowie's head (Elterman 68). Princess Diana was good at hiding her face behind tennis rackets or other objects. "She learned a trick: no face, no photo," said CBS reporter Martha Teichner in an interview on Sunday Morning in 1997 (Bishop 100). According to paparazzo Galella, Kennedy-Onassis was extremely good at making it hard to photograph her. "If she sees you, she'll put on sunglasses, or hold the flowers in front of her face, or turn her head, or she'll even get so close to you that you can't focus. She will even hide behind other people," said Galella (Galella, Jacqueline 31). Galella further noted

that Kennedy-Onassis learned that if she took cabs, it was more difficult to follow her because the cabs all looked alike. Kennedy-Onassis also knew to wear black at night so that photographs taken of her did not come out as well (Galella, Jacqueline 39, 57).

The fourth technique celebrities developed was to hire bodyguards to block and protect against the paparazzi. Paparazzo Lawrence Schwartzwald said the following about this technique: "Bodyguards to me are muscular fans, because they seem to adore the people they work for or think that by having an association with them, that makes them important" (Sales 38). A combination of bodyguards and other measures kept the paparazzi away from Larry Hagman when he had a liver transplant. Hagman had the windows of his hospital room covered, and he placed security guards outside his room. Because of his extreme measures, no photographs or videotapes were taken of Hagman during his hospital stay (Murphy 30).

The fifth technique was one that John F. Kennedy Jr. developed. In 1997, Kennedy began videotaping the paparazzi that followed him. Kennedy stunned the paparazzi outside his apartment one day when he came out with a camcorder and started videotaping the paparazzi's license plates. Kennedy yelled at them: "Hey, guy with the green jacket! You're here every weekend. You're looking for a harassment

lawsuit" (Rush and Molloy, "JFK" 6). The videotape could have been used to document the constant presence of certain paparazzi outside of his home (Rush and Molloy, "JFK" 6).

Selling their own exclusives was the sixth technique celebrities came up with to gain some control of their image. For example, in 1995 after a jury acquitted O.J. Simpson of murder, Simpson sold his homecoming photographs to Star for close to \$500,000 (J. Williams 2D). In 1991, Elizabeth Taylor had a well known photographer photograph her wedding, and then she sold the photographs herself and donated the money to AIDS research (Corwin A1). In 1989, the family of Lisa Marie Presley earned \$450,000 for selling the first photograph of Presley and her baby (Lawlor 4).

The seventh technique that celebrities used was calling for a boycott of publications and media that used paparazzi photographs and videotapes. Celebrity George Clooney successfully organized a boycott of Paramount Pictures television in 1996. Clooney encouraged celebrities not to cooperate with such Paramount shows as Entertainment Tonight. He was joined in this boycott by his colleagues from ER, as well as celebrities Whoopi Goldberg, Rosie O'Donnell, Steven Spielberg, Madonna, Dean Cain, and others (Kurtz A26; "Public's" 30; Waxman, "Hard Copy" D1). Clooney and the other celebrities wrote letters to Paramount complaining that they were tired of the "rat attack"

technique that paparazzi and videorazzi were using on them to get more saleable footage (the technique where a paparazzo provokes a celebrity and a videorazzo videotapes the incident.) The boycott was declared a success when Hard Copy executives announced that they "would no longer use footage in which insults and harassment were used 'solely to provoke a reaction,' 'unauthorized footage' of celebrities in their homes or 'footage that is known to have been obtained illegally,'" wrote Sharon Waxman in The Washington Post ("Hard Copy" D1).

The eighth technique celebrities used to control their images was waivers. This relatively new development was first used in July 1999 by Tom Cruise's publicists. The waiver required interviewers for Cruise's film, Eyes Wide Shut, to consent to "provisions to block the showing of 'bloopers' and 'errors or misstatements' as well as to bar future use of the footage," wrote Brian Lowry in the Los Angeles Times (F6). Lowry said that through waivers publicists were looking to prevent portions of interviews from showing up on programs other than what were initially intended. According to publicist Pat Kingsley, since most programs only use a few sentences of interviews, old interviews were frequently recycled. This was "an attractive idea to programmers, since archival and library footage offers an inexpensive way to fill out their

schedules," Kingsley said (Lowry F6). This technique backfired on celebrities because the need to fill space still existed, so the media turned to the paparazzi to fill this need.

Through their publicists, the celebrities' ninth and final technique to try to control their images was to pick which publications they would work with. Celebrities did this by naming what publications they would pose for, writers they would talk to, photographers they would use, photographs that could be taken, questions that could be asked, and even when a story could appear (Kershaw T2). What this control did was make many celebrities impossible to access by the media. The result being that many magazines like People bought more paparazzi photographs because they simply could not gain access to the celebrities. Landon Y. Jones Jr., managing editor for People, gave the example of Whitney Houston posing in 1996 for a Vibe magazine cover, but refusing to do the same for People (Weeks 1F). Unfortunately, even if a celebrity wanted to appear in every publication that requested footage of them, the explosion of the mass media market in the 1990s made this virtually impossible.

These nine techniques succeeded in making footage of celebrities harder for the paparazzi to obtain, but also resulted in the paparazzi resorting to staking out, chasing,

and even breaking laws to get celebrity footage. Since photographs and videotapes of the celebrities were harder to obtain, the price of this footage was driven up, making these celebrities even more sought after. The solution seems to simply let the paparazzi take their photographs and videotapes, but this could result in overexposure and hurts the celebrity's career. A "catch 22" exists.

CHAPTER SIX: **THE LAWS**

The general belief after Princess Diana's death in 1997 was that stricter laws were needed in the U.S. to control the paparazzi. Five laws currently govern the paparazzi. Two lawsuits have been successfully brought against the paparazzi, and over a dozen lawsuits have been brought against celebrities by the paparazzi.

U.S. LAWS

To protect against lawsuits or criminal prosecution in the U.S., the paparazzi understand the laws that govern their profession. These laws can be divided into four categories: 1) invasion of privacy; 2) libel; 3) stalking; and 4) harassment. The paparazzi are also aware of the copyright laws that govern the rights to their photographs and videotapes.

Invasion of Privacy

In 1890, the article "The Right to Privacy" was written by Samuel D. Warren and Louis D. Brandeis in the Harvard Law Review. This article was the first to argue for a law to "protect the privacy of the individual from invasion either by the too enterprising press, the photographer, or the possessor of any modern device for recording or reproducing

scenes or sounds" (Gonzalez 935, 937). By 1960, the right to privacy finally became law in a majority of the states in the U.S. ("Privacy" 1369). Although this law varies from state to state, there are four basic types of privacy suits that can be brought against the paparazzi. They are:

1) physical invasion or intrusion; 2) publication of private matters; 3) false light; and 4) right to publicity.

The paparazzi avoid physical invasion of privacy suits by knowing the difference between public and private places. Photographs or videotapes of celebrities may be taken at any time, if the celebrity is found on public property. "When people occupy a public space, they can freely engage in any kind of conduct that does not involve direct personal injury to others," wrote Tibor R. Machan in The Freeman (723).

Public places include streets, highways, waterways, sidewalks, beaches, parks, zoos, trains stations, bus stations, public areas of schools and universities, and city-owned airports (Kobré 284-85; Machan 722). Although police headquarters and government buildings are publicly owned, the paparazzi know that there are restrictions inside these locations. Prisons, legislative chambers, military bases, state courtrooms, and inside public classrooms (while in session) are also public places where the paparazzi can only shoot footage if permission is granted. Photography inside Federal courts is strictly prohibited (Kobré 285-88).

Local laws and restrictions apply to the paparazzi. These laws and restrictions include interference of traffic, the rights of others, or police business; becoming a public nuisance; and other applicable ordinances (Geraci 164). The paparazzi are also aware that no one (including law enforcement officers, bystanders, relatives, or bodyguards) can stop them from capturing footage in public. In addition, film and equipment cannot be confiscated. The Constitution clearly states that "no person shall be deprived of his personal property without due process of law" (Rothstein 214). In fact, the paparazzi may sue for pain and suffering or other damages if they are attacked while pursuing their profession. According to paparazzo Brad Elterman, if there is a witness to the incident, the paparazzo will most likely win the lawsuit (Elterman 141).

A paparazzo standing on public property can take footage of a celebrity on private property if the photograph or videotape passes the "naked eye" test: the photograph or videotape is equivalent to what the naked eye can see. For example, if a paparazzo is standing on a public sidewalk and can see a celebrity in their yard, on their porch, or inside their house, they do not need anyone's permission to take the celebrity's photograph or videotape (Kobré 281). Photographs taken by a telephoto lens would not meet the "naked eye" qualification. The use of telephoto lenses are

prohibited in the Second Restatement of Torts (the law that covers the four categories of right to privacy) when it states that invasion of privacy occurs when "mechanical aids, to oversee or overhear the plaintiff's private affairs" are used (Nordhaus 301). Likewise, if the paparazzo has to go to any extra trouble to get the footage, like climbing a tree, the footage would not pass the "naked eye" test. The paparazzi are limited to what an average passerby can see (Geraci 166; Kobre 281).

D. Scott Gurney, in an Indiana Law Journal article, states that celebrities are expected to take reasonable steps, such as "closing curtains on windows or building privacy fences around swimming pools," to keep the paparazzi from photographing them in their homes, apartments, or other living quarters from public locations (710-711). Gurney states that in semi-secluded places, such as a beach on a privately-owned island, a celebrity has some reasonable expectation of privacy. This area of the law is murky, though, because celebrities attract greater attention than private individuals and expectation of privacy is objectively and subjectively reasonable in fewer instances. A lawsuit filed under these circumstances would be "guided by the facts of the particular case" (Gurney 711).

Places like movie theater lobbies, restaurants, cafes, hotel lobbies, casinos, grocery stores, business offices,

and tax-supported theaters and museums are private properties that are open to the public. Celebrities found in these locations can only be photographed or videotaped if permission is granted by the management or owner of the establishment. According to Kenneth Kobre in Photo Journalism, the law is murky in regards to publicly open private property, too. It is understood that unless there are signs posted that prohibit photography, a paparazzo is allowed to shoot footage on the property unless asked to leave by the management. The management cannot ask for the paparazzo's film when they ask them to leave. The film is the paparazzo's personal property, and they have full rights to publish the footage they captured before they were asked to leave (284-85).

However, the law is very clear on capturing images in medical facilities. Even if hospitals, rehabilitation centers, emergency vans, mental health centers, clinics, and doctor's offices are publicly owned, publicly supported, or publicly operated, they are off limits to the paparazzi unless they have permission from the facility and consent from those who are being photographed and videotaped. A Missouri court ruled in the 1940s that a person has "the right to obtain medical treatment at home or in a hospital without personal publicity" (Kobre 280, 285). Admission lists to hospitals are public information (Kobre 285).

A celebrity's home is his or her "castle" and considered private property, this includes their porches, lawns, apartments, hotel or motel rooms, and automobiles. Permission must be granted by the celebrity before the paparazzi may enter their private property to capture a photograph or videotape. If permission is not granted, the paparazzo may be prosecuted with a civil charge of invasion of privacy, as well as a criminal charge of trespassing and possible jail time (Geraci 165).

The second type of privacy suit is the publication of private matters. These suits deal with the rights of private and public figures. Private individuals are usually hostages, crime victims, or air crash survivors who become public figures involuntarily. The law grants more protection to these people. Embarrassing photographs or videotapes of private individuals can result in a civil charge of invasion of privacy, unless the information revealed is of general public concern. On the other hand, public officials, public figures, and those who seek publicity, chose to live their lives in the public eye, and therefore, have fewer privacy rights. "The image of the celebrity thrives on publicity, and thus such a person also garners a 'newsworthiness' along with the fame," said paparazzo Elterman (Elterman 139). "Newsworthiness" must be of "public interest," and, as Kobre explained in his book

Photo Journalism, this means "anything interesting to the public--and there are few things that won't interest some people" (279). A paparazzo, therefore, can pursue photographs and videotapes of celebrities in embarrassing situations and sell them to the media without being sued (Elterman 139; Chernoff and Sarbin 36-45).

False light is the third type of privacy suit. The paparazzi can get in trouble if they deliberately miscaption a photograph or give information that is ran with a photograph or videotape that is grossly negligent or malicious, and they know it. Even though celebrities have fewer privacy rights, they can sue if the photograph or videotape and the accompanying text places them in false light. For a celebrity to win this type of lawsuit, "actual malice" must be proven. For example, if "a story or photograph is published with the knowledge that it is false, or with reckless disregard as to whether it is false or not," it is malice (Geraci 168). Paparazzo Elterman gave the following example: if a celebrity is captured in a see-through evening gown and the photograph is published, there is nothing the celebrity can do about it, if it was photographed legally. However, if the photograph is published with the caption, "The 10 Great Whores of the 20th Century," the celebrity may sue (Elterman 139-40).

The final type of privacy suit is the right to

publicity. Private and public individuals own their name, image, and likeness, which cannot be used by the paparazzi for commercial purposes. A photograph or videotape taken by a paparazzo can be used in all news publications, including print and electronic medias, but the photograph or videotape cannot be used as an advertisement or endorsement for a product without special permission or license (Byrd 102-04.)

Libel

Libel resembles false light, and the two are often used in combination in lawsuits. Libel is defined as "defamation of character, which occurs when a person's reputation is damaged by showing him in a way that holds him up to hatred, ridicule, or contempt" (Rothstein 208). What makes libel different from false light is that in libel lawsuits, the defendant believes that the footage and accompanying text provided is true and that they have represented the facts accurately. For a lawsuit to be won, it must be proved that the paparazzo acted with willful disregard for the truth or was unprofessional when checking the facts that were published with the photograph (Geraci 168-70).

Stalking

In 1989, when celebrity Rebecca Schaeffer was killed by a stalker, anti-stalking laws were immediately proposed and

passed in the U.S., and now all states have criminal stalking laws in effect (DeWitt, Ortner, and Yocca 4; Joyce 37). But, according to Jamie E. Nordhaus in an article in the Spring 1999 issue of The Review of Litigation, a loophole exists in the law that benefits the stalkerazzi. The law states that a stalkers intent must be to place the person in reasonable fear. Nordhaus says that the stalking of a celebrity by a stalkerazzo does put the celebrity in reasonable fear, but the intent of the stalkerazzo is not to scare, but to obtain photographs and videotapes. Therefore, no stalkerazzi have ever been prosecuted under anti-stalking laws (Nordhaus 302; DeWitt, Ortner, and Yocca 4).

Harassment

In both California and New York, harassment statutes exist for celebrities to prosecute the paparazzi. In New York, an injunction can be obtained against a paparazzo if they behave in an alarming, annoying, or harassing manner, and they cause intentional infliction of emotional distress. Again, the intent loophole exists. In California, harassment is defined as "a knowing and willful course of conduct directed at a specific person which seriously alarms, annoys or harasses the person, and which serves no legitimate purpose" (DeWitt, Ortner, and Yocca 4). Again, Nordhaus exposes a loophole--that if a paparazzo claims that

his or her legitimate purpose is news gathering, they cannot be prosecuted (302-03).

Copyright Law

Under the January 1978 copyright law, a paparazzo has copyright rights on a photograph from the moment it is taken. The only exception to this rule is if a publication directly hires the paparazzo to capture certain footage. The footage would then be copyrighted to the publication (Cavallo and Kahan 63-64). If a paparazzo is hired directly, he or she can restrict the publication's copyrights by requiring the publications to sign a contract stating that the photograph is for one time use only; limiting the use of the footage to a certain time period; or allowing the footage to be used only for a special purpose, etc. (Rothstein 207).

To claim copyright, the paparazzo puts the word *copyright*, the abbreviation *Copr.*, or the letter *c* in a circle ©; their full name; and the date of first publication on the photograph. A March 1, 1989 amendment to the copyright law no longer requires that a copyright notice be placed on a photograph, but the paparazzi still do so to avoid confusion of copyrights (DuBoff 19-20). For international copyright protection, a paparazzo includes other copyright statements. In Central and South America,

the statement "All Rights Reserved" must be put on all photographs. The Universal Copyright Convention (UCC) requires the international copyright symbol ©, with the name of the copyright owner, and the year of first publication for photographs to be copyright protected after September 16, 1955. UCC requirements cover a paparazzo in all European countries (DuBoff 20-21). A photograph that is not copyrighted and appears in a publication that is not copyrighted, could become public domain (Geraci 171). A paparazzo usually does not register a photograph with the Copyright Office until a publication uses the photograph without permission, and the paparazzo wants to sue. Registration helps the paparazzo defend against infringement (Kobré 291).

LAWSUITS AGAINST THE PAPARAZZI

In the U.S., only two lawsuits have been successfully prosecuted against the paparazzi. The first lawsuit is the only case that exists where physical invasion of privacy included a public area. The lawsuit was brought against paparazzo Ron Galella by Jacqueline Kennedy-Onassis, the woman Galella had pursued photographs of since 1967. Galella started the lawsuit in September 1970 by suing Kennedy-Onassis and her three secret service agents for \$1.3 million, malicious prosecution, false imprisonment,

harassment, and interfering with the pursuit of a lawful occupation. The three agents were released from the lawsuit on the grounds that they were government employees doing their jobs by protecting Kennedy-Onassis and her children. Kennedy-Onassis countersued Galella for harassment, assault, battery, invasion of privacy, and commercial exploitation. She got a preliminary restraining order against Galella in December 1971, restricting him from coming within one hundred yards of her apartment and fifty yards from her and her children. The final trial ruling in 1972, declared that Galella had to stay fifty yards from Kennedy-Onassis, seventy-five yards from her children, and one hundred yards from her apartment and children's schools. The U.S. Court of Appeals, in September 1973, reduced Galella's charges to twenty-five feet away from Kennedy-Onassis, thirty feet from her children, and totally dismissed the one hundred yards and surveillance restrictions. Galella was allowed to photograph the family if he stayed outside the buffer zone (Galella, Jacqueline 164-81). In 1982, Galella was convicted of twelve violations of the twenty-five feet restriction and fined \$120,000. The conviction was later dropped when Galella agreed to pay Kennedy-Onassis \$10,000 for legal fees and promised to never photograph her again (Smolla 325).

In 1997, the second lawsuit against the paparazzi took

place in California and ended with two paparazzi being jailed for their misconduct. Stalkerazzi Giles Harrison and Andrew O'Brien were staking out Arnold Schwarzenegger hoping to capture the first footage of Schwarzenegger after his elective open-heart surgery. Harrison and O'Brien followed Schwarzenegger and his wife, Maria Shriver, as they took their son to preschool. The Chevrolet Blazer driven by Harrison bumped into Schwarzenegger's car at an intersection; a pursuit through the streets of Santa Monica followed; and the scene ended with the two paparazzi blocking Schwarzenegger's Mercedes Benz at the school. O'Brien then got into a shoving match with the school's principal and a Federal Express delivery man who tried to intervene. Harrison was charged with two counts of misdemeanor false imprisonment and one count of reckless driving. O'Brien was charged with four counts of misdemeanor false imprisonment, two counts of misdemeanor battery, and one count of reckless driving. In 1998, Superior Court Judge Robert Altman charged Harrison to sixty days in jail and O'Brien to ninety days ("Snap" 181).

LAWSUITS AGAINST THE CELEBRITIES

The paparazzi have successfully sued celebrities when they violated the paparazzi's right to take photographs and videotapes. Using the five laws explained earlier in this

chapter, the paparazzi have brought fifteen lawsuits against celebrities or their bodyguards.

The first lawsuit filed against a celebrity and won by a paparazzo involved celebrity Bob Dylan and paparazzo Gary Aloian in 1983. The incident took place at the Los Angeles International Airport, where Dylan said that Aloian annoyed him by taking flash photographs at a close range. To stop Aloian from taking photographs, Dylan reportedly placed him in a headlock. Aloian sued Dylan for assault and \$100,000. In 1985, an out-of-court settlement was reached; the terms of the agreement were not disclosed ("Personalities" B3).

In the mid-1980s, celebrity Sean Penn frequently made the news with his numerous run-ins with the paparazzi. One such run-in took place in 1985 while paparazzi Ian Markham-Smith and Laurence Cottrell were waiting outside a Nashville hotel for Penn and his fiancée Madonna. The paparazzi planned to ask the couple for a short interview about their upcoming marriage. Instead, according to Markham-Smith, Penn punched and knocked him down, and then hit him on the head with a rock or brick. Cottrell claimed Penn took his camera and assaulted him with it. Assault and battery charges were filed against Penn, he was fined \$100, and given a ninety-day suspended jail sentence (Gelb G3; "Actor" sec.1, 7). In 1987, Penn was sentenced to sixty days in jail for assaulting an extra who took a photograph of him

during the filming of the police drama Colors. Penn paid \$80-a-day for private jail lodging at a secret location due to security problems. He only had to serve thirty-two days of his sentence (McGraw sec. 2, 1; Bright 1).

In 1985, paparazzo Vince Zuffante sued Prince's bodyguards after they beat him up outside the Los Angeles restaurant and nightclub, Carlos'n Charlie's. Zuffante claimed that he was hurt so badly that he could not work for three months (Kruger 45). The bodyguards were arrested; one was charged with strong-arm robbery for taking another paparazzo's film, the other was charged with assault on Zuffante (Elterman 100-01). Both bodyguards were sentenced to one hundred hours of community service after pleading no contest to the misdemeanor battery charges (Jeannine Stein, "Trapped" sec. 5, 1).

Three years later, Rob Camilletti, Cher's boyfriend at the time, tried to avoid the paparazzi outside her home when the brakes on the car he was driving locked up, causing him to crash into a paparazzo's car. "I thought about driving past them, but then I thought to hell with them, I'll just drive up fast, make a wide turn and cut it quickly up the highway so they wouldn't be able to get a picture," said Camilletti (Peterson E2). Instead, he slid into Peter Brandt's Honda Accord. Camilletti was so furious that he wrecked Cher's Ferrari that he smashed Brandt's camera and

telephone. At first, he was charged with a misdemeanor charge of reckless driving, but, after an investigation, the charges were dropped. Camilletti was later sentenced to two years of unsupervised probation, three hundred hours of community service, and \$1,175 in fines and court costs for destroying Brandt's equipment ("Lens" C12; "Cher's" sec. 2, 2).

Paparazzo Aloian filed a second lawsuit against a celebrity in 1990. This incident also took place at the Los Angeles International Airport. This time, Tom Arnold broke Aloian's camera equipment after Aloian took a photograph of Arnold and his wife Roseanne. According to The Plain Dealer, Arnold got Aloian in a bear hug, then proceeded to punch him repeatedly in the back as Roseanne encouraged him. Arnold denied ever hitting Aloian, but did admit that he broke his equipment. A judge ordered the couple to pay Aloian \$20,000 ("Roseanne" A2).

Two years later, paparazzo Richard Corkery was covering an event where Bill Cosby's wife was accepting an award. Corkery took a photograph of Cosby applauding an act and then moved to the back of the room. Cosby followed Corkery and asked a security guard to have him removed. Corkery asked on what grounds he was being asked to leave, and Cosby responded by physically pushing Corkery through a pair of doors. Corkery sued Cosby for \$3 million because he felt

Cosby's act was socially unacceptable and terrorizing. Although no injuries occurred, a jury found that assault and battery did occur, but under provocation. Cosby was ordered to pay Corkery twenty cents (Reina 10; "Bill" 52).

In 1994, paparazzo Alex Oliveira sued Michael Jackson for \$1 million for failing to act while Jackson's bodyguards beat him up. Oliveira was trying to photograph Jackson in Manhattan's Central Park when Jackson's bodyguards assaulted him and took his film. Oliveira claimed he suffered severe and permanent injuries including "back, shoulder and neck pain, sleeplessness, anguish, and psychological and emotional distress" (Harper B3). In 1996, Oliveira was awarded \$25,000 through arbitration with Jackson (Sales 38).

In 1995, the peak year for lawsuits against celebrities, four lawsuits were filed by the paparazzi. The first lawsuit involved paparazzo Joseph Ligier videotaping Robert De Niro as he left the Bowery Bar in New York. De Niro responded to the videotaping by punching Ligier in the nose and pulling his hair. De Niro denied ever hitting Ligier. However, Ligier filed criminal charges and a civil suit against De Niro. Later, Ligier told De Niro that he would drop the charges, if De Niro paid him \$300,000. De Niro participated in a sting operation with the Manhattan District Attorney's office that resulted in Ligier being arrested when he accepted the money (Reina 9; Rush and

Molloy, "For a Price" 19; Murphy 28). The charges against De Niro were dropped; Ligier was not charged (Davis 21).

Another lawsuit in 1995 involved Woody Harrelson assaulting two paparazzi who were taking photographs of Harrelson, his wife, and their daughter. Harrelson removed the film from paparazzo Steven Connolly's camera at the Martha's Vineyard Airport after asking the paparazzo not to take photographs of his daughter. Connolly and paparazzo Paul Adao sued Harrelson for violating their constitutional right to work and for causing them pain and emotional distress. Adao had videotaped the confrontation, and he sold the footage to Hard Copy. In June 1998, a jury ordered Harrelson to pay Connolly \$4,826.30 for medical costs and loss of camera and film; and Adao \$2.00 ("Paparazzi Bills" 32; Murphy 28; Fee and Raposa 8).

A third lawsuit in 1995 involved another confrontation between a celebrity and a paparazzo who was trying to take photographs of the celebrity's child. Alec Baldwin was bringing home his wife and newborn baby from the hospital when he noticed paparazzo Alan Zanger parked outside his house. Baldwin went up to Zanger's truck and sprayed shaving cream on the windows so Zanger would not be able to videotape him. Baldwin testified that Zanger got out of the truck and continued to videotape despite Baldwin's request to stop. At one point, Zanger raised his camera abruptly

and Baldwin slapped it away in self-defense, accidentally hitting Zanger in the nose and knocking his glasses off. Baldwin said that Zanger then assaulted him. In the criminal case in 1996, Baldwin was acquitted of a misdemeanor battery charge. In July 1998, a civil court jury found both parties negligent and awarded Zanger \$4,500 in damages ("Paparazzi Bills" 33).

The fourth lawsuit filed in 1995 involved celebrity Tony Danza chasing two paparazzi after they photographed Danza and his daughters on a private Malibu beach. Paparazzi Chris Williams and Alan Zasi said Danza pursued them in his Cadillac and forced them to pull over after bumping them with his car. Danza then kicked in their passenger car window, took their video camera, and allegedly threatened to kill them (Murphy 28; "Danza" 2D). Williams and Zasi sued Danza for assault and battery and emotional distress; Danza countersued (Caruso 3). The final verdict of the lawsuit and counterclaim was not published. However, in March 1996, Danza told a Sun Herald reporter that it was going to cost him \$200,000 to get rid of the lawsuit. Danza added: "I think there should be a modicum of privacy and no-one should be able to come to your house and shoot your kids with a video camera" (Thomas 11). Therefore, it is reasonably concluded that the case was settled out of court.

In 1996, Tommy Lee, of the rock group Motley Crue, assaulted paparazzo Henry Trappler outside the Viper Room nightclub in Los Angeles. Trappler suffered a displaced hip and other injuries which resulted in a four-day hospital stay, and required months of recuperation and rehabilitation. Trappler filed a suit, and, in 1998, Lee settled out of court with Trappler for an undisclosed amount ("Lee" J2; "Shooting War" T2).

Brian Harvey, former lead singer of East 17, assaulted paparazzo Reinaldo Vargas outside of a London nightclub in 1997. Harvey felt that he was being provoked by Vargas to get a more valuable photograph and responded by punching Vargas repeatedly until "a flap of skin peeled above his eye." Reportedly, Harvey then said to Vargas, "Look at your face, is that worth a picture?" (Carroll 6). England's Daily Mirror published Vargas' photographs the next day, paying 10,000 pounds (Carroll 6). In February 1998, Harvey was convicted of an affray and fined 1000 pounds for the attack, and 2852 pounds for production costs ("Singer" 7).

The last lawsuit recorded in the twentieth century took place in 1998 and involved paparazzo Corkery, again. This time, celebrity James Brolin allegedly assaulted Corkery as he tried to photograph Brolin and then-fiancee Barbra Streisand leaving a movie theater in Manhattan (Neuwirth 3). Brolin claimed that the contact with Corkery was accidental.

He felt very strongly that he had been set up, especially since another paparazzo was there to capture the whole incident on videotape (Joel Stein 87). Police downgraded the charge against Brolin to harassment (Neuwirth 3). As of March 2000, no further information had been published on this lawsuit. It is reasonably concluded that the lawsuit is still pending.

LEGISLATION AFTER PRINCESS DIANA'S DEATH

After Princess Diana's death in 1997, three federal and two state "anti-paparazzi" laws were drafted to regulate the paparazzi's behavior. Much of this legislation duplicated the existing laws described earlier in this chapter.

The first bill was drafted immediately after Princess Diana's death. Republican Sonny Bono of California introduced H.R. 2448, "Protection from Personal Intrusion Act," on September 10, 1997. Bono proposed stricter enforcement of harassment charges as well as greater penalties. Bono believed that for-profit photographers and camera operators who harassed celebrities should be subject to imprisonment for a minimum of twenty years if a death resulted, imprisonment for a minimum of five years if bodily injury resulted, or imprisonment for no more than a year if neither death or bodily injury resulted (Joyce 36).

A second "anti-paparazzi" bill was introduced to

Congress by Republican Elton Gallegly of California in February 1998 (Childs, "105th" 37). H.R. 3224, "The Privacy Protection Act of 1998," proposed prosecution of paparazzi who attempt "to obtain an image, recording or other impression for commercial purposes," when their conduct causes a "reasonable fear that death or bodily injury will result" ("Paparazzi Bills" 31).

On May 21, 1998, the U.S. House of Representative's Judiciary Committee held a hearing to discuss these two bills. Testimonials were given by two sets of panels. Proponents of the bills included actors Michael J. Fox and Paul Reiser, and victims' rights advocate Ellen Levin. Opponents of the bills included the following representatives from the news media: Barbara Cochran, president of the Radio-Television New Directors Association; David Lutman, president of the National Press Photographers Association; Paul McMasters, First Amendment ombudsman of the Freedom Forum; and Paul C. Tash, executive editor of the St. Petersburg Times and chairman of the American Society of Newspaper Editors' freedom of information committee (Childs, "Actors" 14). McMasters portrayed the bills as:

[. . .] unnecessary, unwise, and unconstitutional. It is possible for good writers to tell credible stories from a distance, but photographers must be there, must have access to the people and the events that make the news. Their ability to tell a graphic story is compromised, however, if they are forced to second-guess themselves in the fleeting moment when news comes into focus in their lenses. It is an instant too

easily lost if reflexes are dulled by the threat of civil suits and prosecution under ambiguous laws ("Paparazzi Bills" 31).

On May 30, 1998, Senators Dianne Feinstein of California and Orrin Hatch of Utah introduced the Senate's version of an "anti-paparazzi" bill, S. 2103, the "Personal Privacy Protection Act" (Childs, "Actors" 14). This bill was broader in scope than the House bills. It proposed not only criminal penalties for harassment, but expanded the definition of trespassing to "include zoom lenses and other enhancement devices used to capture activity on private property without the photographer physically trespassing" ("Paparazzi Bills" 31). The proposed punishment was the same as the House bills with twenty years imprisonment if death resulted, five years if serious bodily injury resulted, and not more than one year if there were no injuries ("Paparazzi Bills" 32).

None of the Federal bills passed. Anne Hawke and Kevin Donnelly wrote in Quill that they felt the bills failed because they were overly vague in regards to drawing a clear line between criminal behavior and reasonable news gathering, full of ambiguities, and singled out the press for special regulation (20-22).

At the state level, two bills were introduced in California. Senator Tom Hayden proposed S.B. 1379 which defined harassment as "repeatedly coming within 10 feet of a

newsmaker to take a picture without his or her permission" (M. Stein, "Media" 13). The bill also prohibited intrusion "on a person's solitude or seclusion in a way that a reasonable person would consider to be highly offensive" ("Paparazzi Bills" 32). Opponents of the bill felt that it would hurt legitimate news gathering efforts and have "a 'chilling effect' on their ability to cover suspected criminals, child abusers, embezzlers, and others whose behavior has made them newsworthy" ("Paparazzi Bills" 32). In May 1998, the bill died without a vote from the California Senate Judiciary Committee.

The second bill, introduced by Senator John Burton of California, S.B. 262 proposed that the paparazzi in California be prohibited from filming or recording anyone "engaging in personal or family activity in circumstances where they had a reasonable expectation of privacy" (Hiscock 26). Theoretically, this meant that paparazzi who stood on public property and used certain advanced technologies (like telephoto lenses) to invade a celebrity's private property, could be heavily fined. A paparazzo could be forced to pay "'up to three times the amount of any general and special damages that are proximately caused by [a] violation' of the statute, and it allows for punitive damages as well" ("Privacy" 1380). The bill also allowed a celebrity to charge a paparazzi with trespassing if the celebrity felt in

physical jeopardy (Hiscock 26).

The Screen Actors Guild sponsored the bill, along with celebrities Schwarzenegger, Tom Cruise, Sharon Stone, Alec Baldwin, and George Cloony (M. Stein, "Media" 13; Hiscock 26). In March 1998, S.B. 262 passed the Senate with a 28-0 vote, and in July 1998, it cleared the Assembly's Judiciary Committee with an 11-3 vote ("Paparazzi Bills" 32). On September 29, 1998, Governor Pete Wilson signed the bill into law ("Privacy" 1368).

But, according to an April 1999 Harvard Law Review article, the new California law was no more effective than the common privacy law already in place in all fifty states. The reason for this was that two weaknesses from the common privacy law were incorporated into the new California law. The first weakness was including "reasonable expectation of privacy" into the law, consequently, if the technology used was commonplace, then privacy could not be reasonably expected. The second weakness of the new law was including "a manner highly offensive to a reasonable person." This statement would allow the paparazzi to defend themselves by saying that they were in pursuit of a newsworthy story ("Privacy" 1370-71). Therefore, nothing changed regarding the way the paparazzi were regulated.

THE "CATCH 22"

It has been clearly outlined in this chapter that laws exist for celebrities to sue the paparazzi. Matt Krasnowski wrote in The San Diego Union-Tribune that there are "stalking, trespassing, assault and false imprisonment laws that could help remedy the complaints of stars" (A3). However, only two celebrities have used these laws to sue the paparazzi. As Nordhaus stated in his 1999 article in The Review of Litigation, there is "a lack of effort on the part of celebrities to test the boundaries of the law by bringing suit against intrusive actions" (315).

Celebrities do not sue the paparazzi for two reasons: 1) It would take a lot of time, effort, and money to sue every paparazzo for every photograph and videotape the celebrity felt was intrusive. (It is an uphill battle when only one paparazzo is stopped, and there are hundreds more.); and 2) The lawsuit draws more attention to the celebrity, resulting in additional paparazzi attention--the "catch 22."

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

What this thesis set out to prove was that the phenomenon of the paparazzi would not exist without the celebrities, mass media market, and consumers who have vilified them strongly at the end of the twentieth century. Because, together, these four entities form a complex "web of obsession." This thesis has shown that the paparazzi are simply filling a demand which originates from the mass media market, celebrities, and consumers, and if this demand did not exist, the paparazzi profession would not thrive. Moreover, this thesis has demonstrated a clearly orchestrated plan by the mass media market, and to some extent, celebrities and consumers to place the culpability for the world's obsession with celebrities on the paparazzi.

For nearly the entire twentieth century, the paparazzi profession was liked, often even admired, by the general population, tolerated by celebrities, and compensated by a willing mass media market. During the last decade of the century, attitudes toward the paparazzi changed drastically due to several factors. By far, the most significant factor was the tragic death of Princess Diana of Wales in a 1997 car crash resulting from a high speed chase with the paparazzi. After Princess Diana's death, celebrities detailed numerous ways that the paparazzi made their lives

miserable and the mainstream press quickly disconnected and differentiated themselves from the paparazzi, labeling them as "sleazy" and "socially deviant." U.S. lawmakers joined the paparazzi bashing by calling for more regulation of the profession. The public's response to what was said in the media about the paparazzi was to condemn and/or even harass any reporter with a camera. Overall, the paparazzi profession was disgraced. Yet, amid all this opposition, the paparazzi product, celebrity images, remained greatly in demand.

The mass media market's plan to place culpability for the world's obsession with celebrities on the paparazzi was orchestrated in two strategic phases. First, the mass media market successfully portrayed that the paparazzi were "villains" by claiming that the paparazzi used more intrusive techniques to get saleable images in the last decade of the century. This thesis has clearly demonstrated that this is not true, and in fact, shows that the techniques of the paparazzi began in the 1950s and were perfected in the 1960s. What did change, however, is the size of the mass media market. This market grew from four principal outlets to include every mass media arena in a very short period of time (less than ten years). As a result of this rapid growth, additional paparazzi were required to fill the huge content demand from the market.

This influx of new paparazzi resulted in the facade that more intrusive techniques were being used. But, in reality there were simply more paparazzi using already established techniques.

The second phase of the mass media market's plan to turn culpability away from themselves was to characterize the paparazzi as money-hungry deviants. This thesis demonstrated that although large sums of money were made by paparazzi in the twentieth century, an "agenda-setting practice" was applied by the mass media market to make the public aware of the paparazzi's activities and income. This turned the world's attention to and formed the anger towards the paparazzi, as well as suppressed the mass media market's role in this "web of obsession."

Not only did the mass media market shift blame from themselves and target the paparazzi, they also focused culpability on consumers by claiming that the media simply fills a need created by consumers. The media market claimed that if the consumers did not buy the publications and watch the television programs, then their content would not be filled with celebrity information. This thesis has shown that consumers want information on celebrities. Although, it is unclear how much of that demand may be a result of agenda-setting by the media. For example, the increase in the amount of celebrity information in every media market at

the end of the twentieth century does not correlate to consumer demand. Consumers did not call or write for more information on celebrities, instead, the mass media market used an easily attainable product (paparazzi photographs and videotapes) to fill expanded air time and space. However, consumers are not completely blameless in the "web of obsession." In fact, consumers devour the celebrity news and enjoy the fact that they can access celebrity information from any part of the mass media market.

In the 1990s, celebrities openly disclosed that the paparazzi made their lives miserable, also turning culpability for the "web of obsession" away from themselves and to the paparazzi. This thesis has clearly illustrated that the celebrities actually need and pursue the paparazzi to build and sustain their careers. Celebrities use the paparazzi to promote their careers, but they only want the attention under their terms, and complain when they cannot control it. Celebrities have tried various techniques to control paparazzi coverage, but these techniques actually resulted in them being hunted even more by the paparazzi because images of them become rare and very profitable.

Lawmakers responded to the reaction from the mass media, celebrities, and consumers after Princess Diana's death by pushing for more legislation to regulate the paparazzi. This thesis revealed that laws already in

existence could be used to prosecute the paparazzi. In addition, the one new piece of legislation that passed, has not provided celebrities any further protection. In reality, celebrities simply do not sue the paparazzi. The time, effort, and money to sue every paparazzo who took intrusive photographs and videotapes of them would be tremendous, and the media attention surrounding the lawsuit would lead to a greater need for paparazzi photographs and videotapes. This situation is a "catch 22" for the celebrities.

Overall, it is the belief of this thesis that complete culpability for the world's obsession with celebrity images should not be placed solely on the paparazzi. They are filling a demand. If celebrities, consumers, and the mass media market really want to clear the world's "web of obsession" with celebrity images, they should start by taking responsibility for their roles and actions. Celebrities should sue the paparazzi who break laws to capture their images. Consumers should tell the mass media market that they do not want celebrity images and information at any expense, by refusing to watch programs filled with celebrity information or buy such types of publications. And, the biggest participant in the "web of obsession," the mass media market, should take responsibility for its irresponsible decision to fill "time

and space" with easily attainable celebrity images. In addition, the mass media market should devise a plan to send positive messages to the public through responsible programming.

WORKS CITED

- "Actor Fined in Attack on Two." New York Times 19 Oct. 1985, late ed., sec. 1: 7. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 14 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Agee, Warren K., Phillip H. Ault, and Edwin Emery. Introduction to Mass Communications. New York: Longman, 1997.
- Alexander, Hilary. "Snappers See Stars." Straits Times 19 July 1992: 1-2. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Almond, Peter. "Legacy of Diana and the British Press." Nieman Reports Summer 1998: 63-67.
- Alter, Jonathan. "Diana's Real Legacy." Newsweek 15 Sept. 1997: 59-61.
- Arvidson, Linda. When the Movies Were Young. New York: Dover Publications, 1969.
- Baran, Stanley J. Introduction to Mass Communication: Media Literacy and Culture. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1999.
- Baynes, Ken, Tom Hopkinson, Allen Hutt, and Derrick Knight. Scoop Scandal and Strife: A Study of Photography in Newspapers. Ed. Ken Baynes. London: Lund Humphries, 1971.
- Becker, Karin E. "Photojournalism and the Tabloid Press." Journalism and Popular Culture. Ed. Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks. London: Sage, 1992. 130-53.
- Benza, A. J. "Chorus of Papa-razzing." Daily News [New York] 27 Aug. 1995: 25. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 15 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Bessie, Simon Michael. Jazz Journalism: The Story of the Tabloid Newspapers. New York: E.P. Dutton: 1938.
- Biagi, Shirley. Media/Impact: An Introduction to Mass Media. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1994.

"Bill Cosby Ordered to Pay Photographer 20 Cents in Battery Suit." Jet 22 Aug. 1994: 52. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Bird, S. Elizabeth. For Enquiring Minds. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1992.

Bishop, Ronald. "From Behind the Walls: Boundary Work by News Organizations in Their Coverage of Princess Diana's Death." Journal of Communication Inquiry 23.1 (1999): 90-112.

Blast 'Em!. Writ. and Dir. Joseph Blasioli. Victor Malafronte, Sally Kirkland, and Queerdonna. Documentary. Fox Lorber, 1993.

Bliss, Edward, Jr. Now the News: The Story of Broadcast Journalism. New York: Columbia UP, 1991.

Boorstin, Daniel J. The Image or What Happened to the American Dream. Kingsport, TN: Kingsport, 1961.

Braudy, Leo. The Frenzy of Renown: Fame and Its History. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

Brennan, Steve. "'Hard Copy', 'Mandel' Fade Out." Hollywood Reporter 23 Apr. 1999: 5. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Bright, Spencer. "The Greatest Screen Actor of His Generation Keeps Threatening to Turn His Back on Hollywood. Why? The Volatile Sean Penn Reveals all to Spencer Bright." Daily Telegraph [London] 20 Feb. 1999: 1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 14 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Brinkley, Alan. The Unfinished Nation: A Concise History of the American People. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.

Burshtein, Karen. "Paparazzi Will Go To Any Length For The Shot." Gazette [Montreal] 2 Sept. 1997: A11. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 9 Feb. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

- Byrd, L. Lee. "Privacy Rights of Entertainers and Other Celebrities: A Need for Change." Entertainment & Sports Law Journal 5.1-2 (1998): 95-116.
- Byrne, John A. "Slugging It Out in the Supermarkets." Forbes 14 Mar. 1983: 78-79.
- Campbell, Laurie. "Ben and Gwyneth-Together Again?" National Examiner 30 Nov. 1999: 22-23.
- "Candid." Def. 5c. The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989.
- Carlson, Margaret. "Blood on their Hands?" Time 8 Sept. 1997: 46. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.
- Carroll, Rory. "Media Pressure 'Drove East 17 Singer to Attack Photographer.'" Guardian [London] 28 Jan. 1998: 6. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 9 Feb. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Caruso, Michelle. "Actor Danza Hits Us, Sez Suit." Daily News [New York] 24 Oct. 1995: 3. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Cash, William. "Photo Finish." Spectator 10 Jan. 1998: 13-14.
- Cavallo, Robert M. and Stuart Kahan. Photography: What's the Law?. New York: Crown, 1979.
- Chang, Yahlin and Gregory Beals. "'Too High a Price for Fame:' After Diana's Death, Celebrities are Speaking Out Against the Sacrifices They Make for Being in the Public Eye." Newsweek 15 Sept. 1997: 16.
- Chernoff, George and Hershel Sarbin. Photography and the Law. New York: Amphoto, 1971.
- "Cher's Boyfriend is Fined for Photo Row." Los Angeles Times 25 Apr. 1989, sec. 2: 2. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Chidley, Joe. "The Tabloid Princess." Maclean's 8 Sept. 1997: 34-37.

- Childs, Kelvin. "Actors Testify for Bills to Punish Paparazzi." Editor & Publisher 6 June 1998: 14. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.
- - -. "105th Congress Gets Into Gear on Newspaper Issues." Editor & Publisher 12 Sept. 1998: 36-37.
- Corkery, P.J. "Enquirer: An Eyewitness Account." Rolling Stone 11 June 1981: 19+.
- Corwin, Miles. "The Life of a Celebrity Stalker." Los Angeles Times 4 Aug. 1992: A1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Cox, Meg. "Rival Tabloid-TV Shows Stoop Low to Get Scoops." Wall Street Journal 21 Feb. 1989: B1+.
- Cuneo, Alice Z. "Interactive Hollywood Hits Cyber High." Advertising Age 29 Jan. 1996: 27. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- "Danza Accused of Scuffling." USA Today 22 Aug. 1995: 2D. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Davis, Ivor. "Those Pesky Paparazzi: Photographers Hot on the Trail of Big Bucks." State Journal-Register [Springfield, IL] 4 Apr. 1996: 21. Publications Lib. Dow Jones Interactive. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 16 Feb. 2000 <<http://nrstg2s.djnr.com/cgi.bin/>>.
- DeWitt, Nicholas, Charles B. Ortner, and Mark Yocca. "Representing Celebrity Stalking Victims." Entertainment Law & Finance July 1996: 1+.
- "The Diana Effect: Will Anything Change?" Editorial. Columbia Journalism Review Nov./Dec. 1997: 40-41.
- Di Forti, Massimo. "Flash Warning: The Paparazzi Are Coming." Trans. Marguerite Shore. Aperture Summer 1993: 20-25.
- Dolgoft, Stephanie. "The Royals: God Save the Queen! For Fergie and the Rest of the Firm, All's Fair." American Photo July-Aug. 1992: 60-65.

- Dominguez, Robert. "They Angle for Tabloid Hit Parade." Daily News [New York] 15 Oct. 1995: 13. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- DuBoff, Leonard D. The Law (In Plain English) for Photographers. New York: Allworth, 1995.
- Dunn, Clif H. "Oprah Duped by \$1.5m Con Woman." Star 30 Nov. 1999: 5.
- "E! Entertainment Television Announces New Fall Programming Lineup." Business Wire 18 Aug. 1998. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Ehrlich, Dan. "Quick, Deadly End to Paparazzi Symbiosis." Editor & Publisher 13 Sept. 1997: 11.
- Elterman, Brad. Shoot the Stars: How to Become a Celebrity Photographer. Beverly Hills: California Features International, 1985.
- Ely, Suzanne, Mandy Ridder and Reginald Fitz. "Jennifer Aniston Deadly Diet and Drug Secret." National Enquirer 30 Nov. 1999: 24-25.
- "'Enquirer' Sold: Elvis Didn't Bid." USA Today 14 Apr. 1989: 1B. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Fahey, David and Linda Rich. Masters of Starlight: Photographers in Hollywood. New York: Ballantine Books, 1987.
- "Fame: The Faustian Bargain." Economist 6 Sept. 1997: 21-23.
- "Fame Ceases Publication." New York Times 28 Dec. 1990: D4. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- "The Fame Trade." Economist 27 July 1991: 23.
- "FCC Clears Way for Network Programming Between 7 and 8 p.m." Entertainment Litigation Reporter Aug. 1995: 9627-28.

- Fee, Gayle and Laura Raposa. "Woody Tries to Chop \$80G Legal Bill." Boston Herald 11 Mar. 1999: 8. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe>>.
- Feinstein, Adam. "Paparazzi Debate Stirs the Globe." IPI Report Oct.-Nov. 1997: 4+.
- Fenichell, Stephen. "A Quiet Afternoon at Home with Ron Galella." American Photo July-Aug. 1992: 78+.
- Fine, Jon. "Sunday, Bloody Sunday." Columbia Journalism Review Mar./Apr. 1999: 11-12.
- Flint, Joe. "After Five-Year Fight, E! Strikes Black Ink." Variety 6 Feb. 1995: 25. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe>>.
- Folkers, Richard. "When Our Worlds Collide." U.S. News & World Report 15 Sept. 1997: 40. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.
- Fowles, Jib. Starstruck: Celebrity Performers and the American Public. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.
- French, Howard W. "Japan's Hopes Dashed with Princess's Miscarriage." San Jose Mercury News 31 Dec. 1999: 5A.
- Galella, Ron. Jacqueline. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1974.
- - -. Off-guard: Beautiful People Unveiled Before the Camera Lens. New York: Greenwich House, 1983.
- Gamson, Joshua. Claims to Fame: Celebrity in Contemporary America. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.
- - -. "Incredible News." American Prospect Fall 1994: 28-35.
- Gelb, Lisa Serene. "Penn, Madonna Sued for \$5 Million." Washington Post 28 Sept. 1985, final ed: G3. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 14 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Gelman, Barbara, ed. Photoplay Treasury. New York: Crown, 1972.

- Geraci, Philip C. Photojournalism: New Images in Visual Communication. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1984.
- Germond, Jack W. and Jules Witcover. "When the Press's Tail Wags the Dog." National Journal 26 (1994): 1154.
- Gonzalez, Eduardo W. "'Get that Camera Out of My Face!' An Examination of the Viability of Suing 'Tabloid Television' for Invasion of Privacy." University of Miami Law Review 51 (1997): 935-53.
- Gould, Martin. "Brandy Freaks Out on Set of Show." Star 30 Nov. 1999: 21.
- Graham, Jefferson. "'Access' Pushes to Open More Affiliate Doors. Show on Rebound After Bad Year." USA Today 26 Jan. 1999, final ed.: 3D. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 15 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Greenfield, Jeff. "Why Relevance is Obsolete." Time 24 Feb. 1997: 18. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.
- Gremillion, Jeff. "Quiet on the Set." Media Week 24 Nov. 1997: 20. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Grossberger, Lewis. "Diana Still Dead!" Media Week 8 Sept. 1997: 46. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.
- Gumbel, Andrew. "Italy: Playing an Elaborate Game." IPI Report Oct.-Nov. 1997: 6.
- Gurney, D. Scott. "Celebrities and the First Amendment: Broader Protection Against the Unauthorized Publication of Photographs." Indiana Law Journal 61 (1985-86): 697-719.
- Haden-Guest, Anthony. The Last Party: Studio 54, Disco, and the Culture of the Night. New York: Morrow, 1997.
- Haden-Guest, Anthony, and Niels Kummer. Studio 54: The Legend. New York: Neues, 1997.

- Hall, Jane. "News Magazines Spread Across TV's Timetable." Calgary Herald 5 Oct. 1997, final ed.: F3. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 15 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- - -. "News Shows are Infantry as TV Rating Battles Rage." Los Angeles Times 28 May 1996: F1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 15 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Harper, Marla, comp. "Michael Jackson Sued." Washington Post 16 May 1994: B3. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 14 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Hawke, Anne and Kevin Donnelly. "Paparazzi." Quill Sept. 1998: 19-22.
- Hedegaard, Erik. "Get the Picture." Savvy Woman Jan. 1990: 73+.
- Heller, William. "Scandalous Past of New ER Beauty." Star 30 Nov. 1999: 26.
- Hertzberg, Hendrik. "Topless Tabloids of Gotham." New Yorker 22 Feb. 1999: 120-29.
- Heymann, C. David. "A Woman Named Jackie." San Diego Union-Tribune 23 June 1989: D5. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Hiscock, John. "California Restrains Paparazzi." Chicago Sun-Times 5 Jan. 1999, final ed.: 26. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Horn, John. "Snapping That Shot Carries Bigger Cost for Paparazzi: Hollywood Says Some Stars Are Fighting Back." Detroit News 4 Nov. 1995: 4C.
- Hosenball, Mark. "Taking the Tabs to Task." Newsweek 15 Sept. 1997: 60.

- Jenish, Darcy and Joy Melville. "The 'Fergie Photos': Royal Family Values Suffer Another Blow." Maclean's 31 Aug. 1992: 36. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 Jan. 2000 <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe>>.
- Joyce, Jenifer. "Lost Photo Opportunities: First Amendment Experts Question Constitutionality of Proposals to Prevent Harassment by Paparazzi." ABA Journal 83 (1997): 36-37.
- Kaminer, Ariel. "Fear and Clothing." New York 22 Sept. 1997: 17-19.
- Kershaw, Alex. "A Shooting War." Guardian [London] 23 June 1997: T2. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Klaidman, Stephen. "Upbeat Enquirer Thrives on Sales in Supermarket." Washington Post 17 Aug. 1975: G1-G2.
- Knadler, Jessie. "Celebdom's Gazillion-Dollar Digs." Cosmopolitan July 1998: 128+.
- Kneale, Dennis. "Can Fox Cool Down and Stay Hot?" Wall Street Journal 25 May 1989: B1.
- Kobal, John. The Art of the Great Hollywood Portrait Photographers: 1925-1940. New York: Knopf, 1980.
- - -. Hollywood: The Years of Innocence. New York: Abbeville, 1985.
- Kobré, Kenneth. Photo Journalism: The Professionals' Approach. Boston: Focal, 1996.
- Koltnow, Barry. "With Film, Jewel Has It All But Isn't Sure She Wants It." San Jose Mercury News. 2 Dec. 1999: 3AA.
- Konner, Joan. "Rewriting the Script of History." Columbia Journalism Review Nov./Dec. 1997: 6.
- Krasnowski, Matt. "Paparazzi are Rarely Prosecuted." San Diego Union-Tribune. 9 Sept. 1997: A3. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Kruger, Pamela. "King of the Night Crawlers." American Photographer May 1988: 41-45.

Kuczynski, Alex. "Striking Back at the Empire." New York Times 27 Sept. 1999: C1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Kurtz, Howard. "Pictures at a High Price: Paparazzi Take More Than Celebrities' Photos." Washington Post 1 Sept. 1997: A1+.

"La Dolce Vita." Microsoft Cinemania 97. CD-ROM. 1997 ed.

Langan, Fred. "Paparazzo Lurks in Stars' Shadows." Christian Science Monitor 4 Oct. 1994: 12. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Laurence, Charles. "Gallery Puts Paparazzi History on Display." Ottawa Citizen 13 Sept. 1997: A9. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Lawlor, Julia. "Hollywood Stakeout: Camera Bugs." USA Weekend 12 Aug. 1990: 4. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

"Lee Settles Lawsuit." Calgary Herald 11 Apr. 1998: J2. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 9 Feb. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

"Lens Bashing by Cher's Pal Not a Felony." San Diego Union-Tribune 5 Oct. 1988: C12. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Lesly, Elizabeth and Julia Flynn. "How Awful. How Could They? I'll Take One." Business Week 15 Sept. 1997: 42.

Levin, Gary. "'Videos' Taking Slot from 'Affair' on WNYW." Daily Variety 18 Jan. 1996: 26. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Levin, Martin, ed. Hollywood and the Great Fan Magazines. New York: Arbor House, 1970.

- Littleton, Cynthia. "Magazines Move to Limit Paparazzi." Broadcasting & Cable 11 Nov. 1996: 28+.
- Lloyd, Robert H. "Historical Development and Commercial Venture of Tabloid Television." Thesis. South Illinois U, 1992.
- Lowenthal, Leo. Literature, Popular Culture, and Society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- Lowry, Brian. "Tension Increasing Over Restrictions on Star Footage." Los Angeles Times 17 July 1999: F6.
- Machan, Tibor R. "Paparazzi and Public Property." Freeman 47 (1997): 722-24.
- "Major News Organizations Begin Pooling." Electronic Media 23 Mar. 1998: 22. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe>>.
- Mast, Gerald and Bruce F. Kavin. A Short History of the Movies. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1996.
- Masters, Charles. "France: 'We Live in a Society of Spectacle'." IPI Report Oct.-Nov. 1997: 7-8.
- Mauro, Tony. "Paparazzi and the Press." Quill July/Aug. 1998: 26-28.
- McGraw, Carol. "Arrest Warrant Issued for Actor Sean Penn." Los Angeles Times 21 July 1987, sec. 2: 1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 14 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Mormorio, Diego. Tazio Secchiaroli: Greatest of the Paparazzi. Trans. Alexandra Bonfante-Warren. New York: Abrams, 1999.
- Morton, John. "Don't Worry, It Will Go Away." American Journalism Review Nov. 1997: 52. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web5.searchbank.com/itw/>>.
- Mott, Frank Luther. American Journalism. A History: 1690-1960. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Murphy, Mary. "Hollywood Celebrities Battle the Video Stalkers." TV Guide 13 Jan. 1996: 26-31.

Neuwirth, Robert. "The Terminator Beats the Press." Editor & Publisher 28 Feb. 1998: 3.

"New TV Season." San Jose Mercury News 5 Sept. 1999: 12G.

Nincevic, Polly. "Hollywood's Best Mom is: Pam Anderson!" National Examiner 30 Nov. 1999: 4.

Nix, Jennifer. "Spy Magazine Assassinated Again." Variety 9 Feb. 1998: 88. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 21 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Nordhaus, Jamie E. "Celebrities' Rights to Privacy: How Far Should the Paparazzi Be Allowed to Go?" Review of Litigation 18.2 (1999): 286-315.

Oram, Roderick. "Murdoch Sells Weekly US Tabloid Paper for Dollars 400m." Financial Times [London] 31 Mar. 1990: 10. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

"Paparazzi Bills Advance in Legislatures, But Celebrity Suits Favor Photographers." News Media & the Law Summer 1998: 30-33.

"Paparazzi Pinpoint Princes." San Jose Mercury News 13 Aug. 1999: A2.

"Paparazzi's Progress." Washington Post 24 June 1991: C9. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

"Paparazzo." The Grolier International Dictionary. 2 vols. Danbury, CT: Grolier, 1987.

"Paparazzo." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989.

Paskal, Cleo. "Space Aliens Made Me Cynical: The View From Tabloid Valley." Columbia Journalism Review May/June 1992: 18-19.

Peer, Elizabeth and William Schmidt. "The Enquirer: Up from Smut." Newsweek 21 Apr. 1975: 62.

"Personalities." Washington Post 13 Nov. 1985: B3. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 15 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Peterson, Karla. "Public Eye." San Diego Union-Tribune 29 July 1988: E2. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

"Photographers Feel Backlash." Editor & Publisher 27 Sept. 1997: 18. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Plagens, Peter. "Cutting to the Chase: A Show of Paparazzi Photos, Planned Long Before Diana's Death, is Fascinating - in a Creepy Way." Newsweek 22 Sept. 1997: 86. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Ponce de Leon, Charles L. "The Man Nobody Knows: Charles A. Lindbergh and the Culture of Celebrity." Prospects: An Annual of American Cultural Studies. Ed. Jack Saltzman. New York: Cambridge UP, 1996. 347-72.

"Privacy, Technology, and the California 'Anti-Paparazzi' Statue." Harvard Law Review 112 (1999): 1367-84.

"Public's Rights Must Be Protected." Quill July/Aug. 1998: 30-37.

Quinones, Eric R. "Publisher of National Enquirer, Star Being Sold for \$300 Million." Associated Press 17 Feb. 1999. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Redmond, Sudie. "Caroline & Stephanie: Paparazzi Prizes of the Highest Order, Monaco's Princesses Are Hard to Catch." American Photo July-Aug. 1992: 72-77.

Rein, Irving, Philip Kotler, and Martin Stoller. High Visibility: The Making and Marketing of Professionals into Celebrities. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Business, 1997.

Reina, Laura. "Photographing Celebrities." Editor & Publisher 30 Dec. 1995: 9-10.

Ressner, Jeffrey. "Enquiring Minds: A Walk on the Sleazy Side with the New Breed of Tabloid Reporters." Rolling Stone 30 June 1988, 53+.

Richardson, John H. "I, Stalkerazzi." Esquire Jan. 1998: 64+.

Riding, Alan. "Public Likes Celebrity Photos But Hates the Photographers." New York Times 2 Sept. 1997: A1+.

Roberts, Jerry. "Celeb Shows Play Fame Game." Daily Variety 22 May 1998: A12-A13.

Rogers, Madeline. "The Picture Snatchers." American Heritage Oct. 1994: 66-72.

"Roseanne, Tom Pay Off Paparazzi." Plain Dealer 28 Aug. 1993: A2. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Rothstein, Arthur. Photojournalism. New York: American Photographic Book, 1979.

Rush, George and Joanna Molloy. "For a Price, Tale of the Tape and De Niro Could Both Unwind." Daily News [New York] 10 Oct. 1995: 19. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

- - -. "JFK Jr. Shooting Back." Daily News [New York] 18 Nov. 1997: 6. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Sachs, Andrea. "Mud and the Mainstream: When the Respectable Press Chases the National Enquirer, What's Going On?" Columbia Journalism Review May/June 1995: 33-39.

Sales, Nancy Jo. "Shoot Out." New York 16 Sept. 1996: 34-39.

Salgado, Robert J. "We're Different: U.S. Photographers." Editor & Publisher 13 Sept. 1997: 12. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Sandhage, Doug and William Brohaugh. "More Tabs to Check at the Checkout Counter." Writer's Digest. July 1977: 27-28.

"Say Cheeeeeeezzzzzzzz." People Weekly. 20 Dec. 1991: 122+.

Schonauer, David. "The Great Chase, Then and Now." American Photo July-Aug. 1992: 48-59.

"Secrets of the Paparazzi." American Photo July-Aug. 1992: 82+.

Shepard, Alicia C. "A No-Win Situation." American Journalism Review July-Aug. 1994: 26-33.

"A Shooting War: Stars Who Snapped Back." Guardian [London] 23 June 1997: T2. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 9 Feb. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

"Singer Fined for Affray Blames Paparazzi." Herald [Glasgow] 5 Feb. 1998: 7. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 9 Feb. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Smith, Liz. "Public Fantasies, Private Pictures." American Photo July-Aug. 1992: 46-47.

Smolla, Rodney A. "From Paparazzi to Hidden Cameras: The Aggressive Side of a Free and Responsible Press." Communication Law and Policy 3 (1998): 315-29.

"Snap Decision: Two Photographers Face Jail Terms for Playing Cat-and-Mouse with the Schwarzeneggers." People Weekly 16 Feb. 1998: 181. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Squiers, Carol. "Jackie O." American Photo July/Aug. 1992: 66-71.

Stark, Steven D. Glued to the Set: The 60 Television Shows and Events That Made Us Who We Are Today. New York: Dell, 1997.

Stein, Jeannine. "A Night On The Town With Paparazzi." Los Angeles Times 15 Sept. 1986: sec. 5: 1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

- - -. "Trapped in Fame: Besieged by Media Hordes, Modern Celebrities Insist They Must Retain Some Right to Have a Private Life." Los Angeles Times 8 Aug. 1988, sec. 5: 1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 13 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Stein, Joel. "Poor Paparazzo: Did Pest Become Victim?" Time 2 Mar. 1998: 87. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Stein, M. L. "Calif. Pols Want Press Limits." Editor & Publisher 13 Sept. 1997: 13+.

- - -. "'Media Harassment' Laws Proposed." Editor & Publisher 16 May 1998: 13.

Stroebel, Leslie and Richard Zakia, eds. Encyclopedia of Photography. Boston: Focal Press, 1993.

"Swings and Arrows of Outraged Ekberg." Life 31 Oct. 1960: 28-30.

Tebbel, John and Mary Ellen Zuckerman. The Magazine in America: 1741-1990. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.

"Tested Here: Time Folds Picture Week Magazine." San Diego Union-Tribune. 7 Nov. 1986: A1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Thomas, Brett. "Tap Danza." Sun Herald 24 Mar. 1996: 11. Publications Lib. Dow Jones Interactive. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 16 Feb. 2000 <<http://nrstg2s.djnr.com/cgi.bin/>>.

"Time Inc.'s Softest Sell." New York Times 30 Nov. 1998, natl. ed.: C1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Time-Life Books, eds. Photojournalism. Alexandria, VA: Time-Life, 1971.

"Time Line to Tragedy." Globe 30 Nov. 1999: 28+.

"Too Close for Comfort; Aggressive Lensmen Shadowed Di Virtually Everywhere She Went." People Weekly 15 Sept. 1997: 70. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Tuchman, Mitch. "Post-Tax-Shelter Hollywood Has a New Mogul: Uncle Sam." Film Comment Nov./Dec. 1978: 70-74.

United States. Cong. Committee on the Judiciary. Protection From Personal Intrusion Act and Privacy Protection Act of 1998. 105th Cong., 2nd sess. H.R. 2448, H.R. 3224. Washington: GPO, 1999.

Walker, Alexander. Stardom: The Hollywood Phenomenon. New York: Stein and Day, 1970.

Warga, Wayne. "The Three Stages of Hollywood Stardom." TV Guide 9 Oct. 1982: 4+.

Waxman, Sharon. "Behind the Bright Lights." Washington Post 28 Apr. 1998: B1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 15 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

- - -. "'Hard Copy' Softens but Celeb Boycott Continues; Effect of Tabloid's New Rules is Uncertain." Washington Post 8 Nov. 1996: D1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000 <http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>.

Webb, Edward. "What's the Story." British Journal of Photography 143 (1996): 17-19.

Weeks, Janet. "Shutter Bugs: Celebrities Now Swatting Back at Paparazzi." Star Tribune [Minneapolis] 16 June 1996, metro ed.: 1F. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Welles, Chris. "The Americanization of Rupert Murdoch." Esquire 22 May 1979: 51-59.

Wiener, Leigh. How Do You Photograph People?. New York: Viking, 1982.

Williams, Jeannie. "Family Time for Simpson." USA Today 10 Oct. 1995: 2D. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 15 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Williams, Raymond. The Long Revolution. New York: Columbia U.P., 1961.

"With the Tab's \$105 Million Acquisition by 'National Enquirer'/'Star' Parent: Will 'Globe' Publisher Jim Fraguella be with Evercore Evermore?" Media Industry Newsletter 8 Nov. 1999. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 19 Jan. 2000
<<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Woodward, Berton and Paula Amarick. "The Paparazzi Plague: Aggressive Celebrity Photographers Face Mounting Public Anger." Maclean's 8 Sept. 1997: 38.

Zielenziger, Michael. "Still an Heir of Mystery in Japan." San Jose Mercury News 14 Dec. 1999: 16A.

Zoglin, Richard. "Hey, Wanna Buy Some Pix?" Time 15 Sept. 1997: 56-57.

- - -. "That's Entertainment?" Time 3 Oct. 1994: 85.

WORKS CONSULTED

- "Access to Places." News Media & the Law Fall 1997: 1-16.
- Affleck, Ben. "Adventures in the Celebrity Trade." Premiere Feb. 2000: 61+.
- Beyette, Beverly. "How the Stars Zap the Tabs." Los Angeles Times 13 Sept. 1989, sec. 5: 1. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 27 Nov. 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.
- Christy, Marian. Invasions of Privacy: Notes from a Celebrity Journalist. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1984.
- Clausen, Christopher. "Reading the Supermarket Tabloids." New Leader 7 Sept. 1992: 10-13. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.
- Denniston, Lyle. "From George Carlin to Matt Drudge: The Constitutional Implications of Bringing the Paparazzi to America." American University Law Review 47 (1998): 1255-71.
- Diamond, Edwin. "Celebrating Celebrity." New York 13 May 1985: 22-24.
- "Don't Mean Diddly." Editorial. New Yorker 11 July 1994: 4-5.
- Eastman Kodak Company. Encyclopedia of Practical Photography. New York: American Photographic, 1978.
- Efron, Sonni. "Japanese Gleefully Ponder Royal Pregnancy." San Jose Mercury News 11 Dec. 1999: 11A.
- Ehrlich, Dan. "The Press Under Fire." Editor & Publisher 13 Sept. 1997: 9-10.
- Fallows, James. "Are Journalists People?" U.S. News & World Report 15 Sept. 1997: 31-33. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

"A Farewell to Breasts: Newspapers." Economist 31 Jan. 1998: 58. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 March 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

"Free the Paparazzi." Editorial. Editor and Publisher 13 Sept. 1997: 6.

George, Hunter. "Hometown Photographers Aren't the Paparazzi." American Editor Sept. 1997: 18.

Glynn, Kevin Thomas. "Tabloid Television: Popular Culture and the New 'Reality Programming.'" Diss. U of Wisconsin-Madison, 1995.

Goldberg, Vicki. The Power of Photography: How Photographs Changed Our Lives. New York: Abbeville, 1991.

Goode, Erica and Katia Hetter. "The Selling of Reality." U.S. News & World Report 25 July 1994: 49-56.

Graustark, Barbara. "Newsmakers." Newsweek 17 July 1978: 57. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Gumbel, Andrew. "Hollywood Stars Gain Legal Right to Privacy." Independent [London] 2 Jan. 1999: 11. Academic Universe. Lexis-Nexis. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 8 May 1999 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/>>.

Hedgecoe, John. The Book of Photography: How To See and Take Better Pictures. New York: Knoph, 1980.

Kamm, Thomas and Paul M. Barrett. "How Would Paparazzi Who Stalked Diana Fare in French Court?" Wall Street Journal 2 Sept. 1997: A1+.

Lacayo, Richard. "Who Shares the Blame?" Time 15 Sept. 1997: 52-55. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web7.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

"Legislators Ride Anti-Paparazzi Wave After Di's Death." News Media & The Law Fall 1997: 3-5.

Malanowski, Jamie. "The State of Celebrity 1990." Spy Jan. 1990: 59-65.

Malkan, Jeffrey. "Stolen Photographs: Personality, Publicity, and Privacy." Texas Law Review 75 (1997): 779-835.

Morris, John G. Get the Picture: A Personal History of Photojournalism. New York: Random House, 1998.

Morrow, Lance. "Journalism After Diana." Columbia Journalism Review Nov./Dec. 1997: 38-39.

"Paparazzi: Shooting Stars." Narr. Robert Krulwich. ABC Turning Point. ABC. 27 Mar. 1997. Transcript.

Powers, William. "All This and Leonardo, Too." National Journal 30 (1998): 2042-43.

Reibstein, Larry. "The Battle of the TV News Magazine Shows." Newsweek 11 Apr. 1994: 60-65.

Rowland, Jack. "Please Don't Call Me Paparazzo." News Photographer Nov. 1997: 10. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web5.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Saltzman, Joe. "Celebrity Journalism, the Public and Princess Diana." USA Today Jan. 1998: 65. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

- - -. "Tabloid Hysteria." USA Today May 1994: 21. Infotrac. Expanded Academic ASAP. San Jose State Univ. Lib., San Jose. 10 Mar. 1999 <<http://web2.searchbank.com/itw/>>.

Schickel, Richard. Hollywood at Home: A Family Album 1950-1965. New York: Crown, 1990.

Simons, Marlise. "Paparazzi Cleared in Crash That Killed Diana." San Jose Mercury News 4 Sept. 1999: 5A.

Tharp, Mike and Betsy Streisand. "Tabloid's TV Blood Lust." U.S. News & World Report 25 July 1994: 46-48.

Traynor, Ian. "Germany: Question of Regulation." IPI Report Oct.-Nov. 1997: 6.

Wallace, Bruce, Julian Nundy, and Paula Adamick. "Diana. Princess of Wales: 1961-1997." Maclean's 8 Sept. 1997: 29-32.

Ware, Hilary E. "Celebrity Privacy Rights and Free Speech: Recalibrating Tort Remedies for 'Outed' Celebrities." Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review. 32 (1997): 449-89.

Weiss, Philip. "Bad Rap For TV Tabs." Columbia Journalism Review May/June 1989: 38-42.

Zimmerman, Tom. "The Object of their Desire: The Commingling of Stars, Fans, and Photographers." Journal of the West 28 (1989): 76-82.