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Fiscal year 1964 was possibly the most active and productive period thus far in the current program for general revision of the copyright law. As the year began, the preparation of a preliminary draft bill was in full swing: 18 draft sections, based upon an exhaustive analysis of the many comments received on the Report of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law and of various foreign laws and earlier revision bills, had already been circulated and discussed at four all-day sessions of the Panel of Consultants on General Revision. During the year, 34 additional draft sections were prepared and circulated. These were discussed at four more Panel meetings: on August 15 and 16, 1963, in Chicago and on October 8, 1963, November 13, 1963, and January 15, 1964, in Washington. Throughout the year officials of the Copyright Office took part in innumerable meetings, discussions, and exchanges of correspondence with the subcommittees formed under American Bar Association Committee 304 on the Program for General Revision of the Copyright Law, with various special committees, and with many interested organizations and individuals.

The purpose of distributing preliminary draft sections for discussion and criticism was to pinpoint and seek comments on all the questions of content and drafting likely to be raised by a general revision bill. The draft included alternative provisions on several controverted issues, and the language was intentionally made detailed and precise to insure that important issues would not be overlooked but would be fully discussed. This plan proved successful in eliciting a large number of meaningful and constructive observations and suggestions which resulted in improvements in language and which paved the way for some necessary compromises.

The second half of the fiscal year was devoted to the large and difficult task of compiling, analyzing, and synthesizing all the comments on the preliminary draft, of making substantive decisions and changes on the basis of these comments, and of completely redrafting the bill, section by section. The preparation of a revised bill for introduction in Congress was undertaken by the Copyright Office General Revision Steering Committee, which has been meeting for over 5 years but never more frequently than during the spring and early summer of 1964. During the period the
committee, which included George D. Cary, the Deputy Register, Abe A. Goldman, General Counsel, Barbara A. Ringer, Assistant Register for Examining, and Waldo H. Moore, Chief of the Reference Division, met regularly with the Register. Miss Ringer and Mr. Goldman were the principal drafters of the revision bill.

Just after the close of the fiscal year, on July 20, 1964, the Copyright Office's bill for the general revision of the copyright law was introduced in the Senate by Senator John L. McClellan (S. 3008) and in the House by Representative Emanuel Celler (H.R. 11947). The bill was also later introduced by Representative William L. St. Onge on August 12, 1964 (H.R. 12354). This event marked a turning point in the revision program. The study and drafting phase is now over; the active legislative phase is opening.

The final draft of the bill as introduced was prepared by the Copyright Office without the direct collaboration or consultation of any private groups or individuals. In addition to simplifying, clarifying, and substantially condensing the language of the preliminary draft, the Office made choices between the various alternatives offered in the earlier draft and also adopted some important substantive changes. In arriving at a final draft the Office was helped immeasurably by the comments it had received, and particularly by the suggestions of the subcommittees of American Bar Association Committee 304 under the able chairmanship of John Schulman. The Office also sought to meet with individuals and groups in an effort to work out viable compromises on as many issues as possible.

Although introduction of the bill is a clear step forward in the progress of revision, it should not be regarded as a final statement of the fixed views of the Copyright Office. It is obvious that important issues and conflicts remain to be settled.

For example, further adjustments may need to be sought with respect to questions of Government publications; educational uses of copyrighted material, including educational broadcasting; the status of community antenna systems; the status of jukebox performances; the scope of "works made for hire"; the provision allowing termination of transfers of copyright ownership; and manufacturing requirements. In the coming fiscal year the Copyright Office hopes to work toward reconciling these and other issues, with the immediate goal of presenting a newly revised bill and report to the 89th Congress.

The Year's Copyright Business

Registrations in 1964 rose to an alltime peak of almost 279,000. The total of completed registrations increased more than 14,000, or well over 5 percent. October 1963 was the largest month in the history of the Copyright Office in terms of earned fees, and April 1964 was the second largest month in terms of registrations. The tables appearing at the end of this report give detailed figures.

By far the largest increase was in registrations for periodicals, which gained by nearly 5,000 or more than 7 percent. While coming close, periodical registrations did not quite surpass the total number of registrations for music, which increased by nearly 4 percent and remained the largest single class of material registered. Book registrations also rose by the substantial margin of nearly 5 percent, but among the major classes the largest relative gain (12 percent) was shown by renewals. The number of assignments and related documents recorded increased 9 percent and that of notices of use, 16 percent. In the smaller classes there were surprisingly large increases in works prepared for oral delivery, photographs, and prints and
pictorial illustrations. Motion pictures leveled off, works of art and "designs" decreased by some 5 percent, and commercial prints and labels resumed their decline. Fiscal 1964 was the 12th straight year in which total registrations increased; it marked a gain of 15 percent over the past 5 years and 32 percent over the total of 10 years ago.

Of the applications for registration and other materials received during the year, 86.5 percent were acted upon without correspondence, 2.5 percent were rejected, and 11 percent required correspondence before final action could be taken. Fees earned for registrations and related services again broke all records; the total of $1,133,547 represents an increase of more than 5 percent. The Cataloging Division prepared over 5,500 pages of copy for the semiannual issues of the eight parts of the Catalog of Copyright Entries and produced and distributed nearly 1.7 million catalog cards. Of these, some 620,000 cards were added to the Copyright Card Catalog, 214,000 were sent to subscribers to the cooperative card service, 73,000 were furnished to the Library of Congress, and 781,000 served as copy for the printed Catalog.

The Reference Search Section also had a banner year. Almost 10,600 searches were made, a gain of 5 percent. To answer the questions involved in these searches some 68,000 titles were reported, a gain of 21 percent.

Official Publications

Publication of the issues of the Catalog of Copyright Entries continued at a nearly normal schedule, although the time lag in publication created in 1962 and 1963 by losses of experienced personnel has not yet been overcome. The typographical format of the Catalog was improved during the year.

The 18th volume of Decisions of United States Courts Involving Copyright (Bulletin 33), covering the period 1961-1964, was issued November 1963. The Office also published a revised edition of Copyright enactments: Laws Passed in the U.S. Since 1783 relating to Copyright, a 150-page loose-leaf compilation of U.S. laws enacted through 1962.

Throughout the year transcripts of meetings of the Panel of Consultants General Revision, at which the preliminary draft of the revision bill was discussed, were edited and issued in multilith form. The bill will be collected in printed editions during the following year, together with written comments received on the draft.

Copyright Contributions to the Library of Congress

In 1964 over 449,000 articles were deposited for copyright registration, representing an increase of somewhat less than 5 percent over the previous year. Of this total, some 241,000 articles were transferred to the Library of Congress for its collections or for disposal through its Exchange and Gift Division. These transfers which were in addition to bulk transfers in various classes from deposits in previous years, constitute an increase of well over 6 percent, and include most of the current book, periodical, music, and map production of the American publishing industry.

The efforts of the Compliance Section of the Reference Division to obtain compliance with the registration and deposit requirements of the copyright law resulted in more than 12,000 registrations, an increase of some 9 percent over fiscal 1963. The copies deposited as the result of this activity were valued at more than $228,000, and fees were received totaling more than $52,-
Correspondence and meetings concerned with efforts to obtain deposit of copyright record sleeves and album jackets continued throughout the year.

Administrative Developments

Throughout fiscal 1964 one of the most pressing problems facing the Copyright Office was the registrability of computer programs. Officials engaged in considerable research into the background of the problem and participated actively in meetings, discussions, and correspondence aimed at resolving the two basic questions involved: (1) whether a computer program as such is the "writing of an author" and thus copyrightable, and (2) whether a reproduction of the program in a form actually used to operate or to be "read" by a machine is a "copy" that can be accepted for copyright registration.

In April 1964 these doubtful questions were decided in favor of registration. The Office announced, however, that before a computer program will be registered it must meet the following requisites:

1. The elements of assembling, selecting, arranging, editing, and literary expression that went into the compilation of the program must be sufficient to constitute original authorship.

2. The program must have been published with the required copyright notice—that is, "copies" (i.e. reproductions of the program in the form in which the content is perceptible, or capable of being made perceptible, to the human eye) bearing a notice of copyright must have been distributed or made available to the public.

3. The copies deposited for registration must consist of or include reproductions in a language intelligible to human beings. Thus, if the material was published only in a form that cannot be perceived visually or read, it was agreed that a readable form such as a print-out of the entire program would have to be deposited also.

In the past, the Copyright Office has undoubtedly made registration for a number of computer programs as parts of larger works such as books and periodicals. The three registrations made near the end of the year, however, were probably the first for computer programs as such, and for this reason they attracted a great deal of attention and publicity. There are indications that the Office's decision is being given careful consideration by those concerned with the development of this vitally important technology.

Difficult problems continued to arise in connection with the deposit of copies of electronic musical compositions since no adequate system exists for notating pre-recorded electronic, vocal, or other sounds; in at least one case an oscillogram was accepted as a "copy" of the musical composition. Works written by U.S. Government employees also continued to cause a great deal of correspondence to determine whether they are "publications of the United States Government" and therefore wholly or partly uncopyrightable. Problems presented by the manufacturing clause were intensified by rapid advances in the techniques of book production. Two recurring questions were when to require statements of new matter in certain classes of material (notably maps and music) as well as how to word acceptable statements and what constitutes the "best edition" of a motion picture that has been distributed in more than one size or by more than one process.

A major organizational change took place in the Examining Division in August 1963, when the examination of books and periodicals was merged in fact as well as in theory. Although both operations had come within the jurisdiction of a single
section for many years, in practice the handling of books and periodicals had been kept entirely separate, with resulting difficulties. The merger of the operations was not without its own problems, but there is reason to hope that the benefits from the change will outweigh the disadvantages. Although the Examining Division made a number of procedural changes in an effort to expedite the processing of assignments and other documents, it became increasingly apparent during the year that the indexing of the documents is a function that can be handled more quickly and efficiently in the Cataloging Division. A detailed plan for shifting the operation was formulated, developed, and approved and was ready to be put into effect as the year ended.

In the Reference Division changes worth noting included the establishment of a procedure whereby letters enclosing a search fee can be sent to the Reference Search Section on the day of their receipt in the Copyright Office; the sending (on an experimental basis) of reports to attorneys without receiving the search fee in advance, in cases requiring no more than 2 hours of search time; the undertaking of a large part of the operational liaison between the Copyright Office and the Bureau of Customs; and continued work on the compilation of pre-1909 copyright cases.

In January 1964 the Cataloging Division supplied expanded imprint statements for all materials issued in book format and more specific terms of physical description for many classes. It prepared and distributed extensive revisions of the copyright cataloging rules in order to implement and systematize these practices, and it gave continuing attention to other sections of the rules. From entries originally recorded on 4 x 6 forms, photographically reduced cards were produced for periodical registrations for the 1946–54 segment of the Copyright Card Catalog and claimant cross-references to them were supplied. As the result of the increased workload and the need for better control of incoming material, the Service Division inaugurated a new system of forwarding material to the Examining Division. This innovation proved helpful in assuring that cases are handled in accordance with their date of receipt. The Examining Division undertook a major change in its methods of keeping weekly, monthly, and annual statistics.

In February 1964 the Service Division completed a project of sorting and boxing all of the copyright applications dating from 1898 through June 30, 1909, and transferred 1,767 boxes of applications to the Federal Records Center in Alexandria, Va. In order to free badly needed shelf space, the Office also agreed to destroy certificate mailing records after 5 years, and to transfer letter books of correspondence (carbon copies) to the Records Center after the same period.

In September 1963 the Service Division began making photocopies of certain copyright deposits, applications, and correspondence requested through the Library's Photoduplication Service. This gives quicker and more efficient service by reducing the amount of handling and by providing safeguards not heretofore possible.

More than half of the application forms in use in the Copyright Office were revised during the year. The most difficult revisions involved the wording, on Form A, of the affidavit of domestic manufacture. Representatives of the Book Manufacturers Institute argued that the wording of the affidavit form in use for the past several years encouraged some publishers to have books produced from imported reproduction proofs and that it should conform more closely to the language of section 17 of the statute. This question was also discussed with representatives of the book publishing industry, and efforts to arrive at language which conforms with the statute and yet
leaves the "repro proof" question open went on for more than a year.

Revisions worth noting were also made in one of the Office's most important information circulars: Circular 35 entitled General Information on Copyright. Not only was the wording revised and the text rearranged, but the format was also completely changed in an effort to make a more attractive and readable circular.

All four divisions continued to emphasize staff training during 1964. Staff members took advantage of programs offered within the Copyright Office and elsewhere in the Library of Congress and also in courses and seminars presented by the General Services Administration, the Government Printing Office, and the University of Illinois Allerton Park Conference on Research Methods in Librarianship. On October 3, 1963, an all-day seminar on copyright problems was conducted for 34 representatives of the Protestant Church-Owned Publishers' Association, and a similar meeting with representatives of music publishing firms was held on May 15, 1964.

Among the many distinguished foreign visitors to the Copyright Office in fiscal 1964, one stands out as deserving special notice. As part of a 4-month UNESCO fellowship in copyright law, Abdur Rahman Khan, Section Officer of the Ministry of Education of Pakistan, spent several weeks in the Copyright Office. As an official who will be charged with duties connected with the new Pakistan copyright law, Mr. Khan was particularly interested in studying government administrative problems in the copyright field.

**Legislative Developments**

Because of the great amount of attention given to the program for general revision of the copyright law, other legislative activity in the copyright field during fiscal 1964 was relatively meager. As recounted in last year's report, several bills were introduced in the 88th Congress to repeal or amend the jukebox exemption now contained in section 1(e) of the copyright law. One of these, H.R. 7194, which was introduced by Representative Celler on June 24, 1963, would repeal the exemption but would provide that no proprietor of a jukebox location would be held liable for infringement unless he either owned or controlled the jukebox or refused to identify the owner. This bill (which was also introduced by Representative Seymour Halpern as H.R. 8457 on September 17, 1963) was reported out of the full House Judiciary Committee as of September 10, 1963, with a majority report by Representative Edwin E. Willis strongly supporting the bill and two statements of minority views, by Representatives Byron G. Rogers and Roland V. Libonati, strongly opposing it. The bill was put on the House Calendar and the Rules Committee held hearings on it on June 10, 1964, but it was awaiting further Rules Committee action as the fiscal year ended.

Efforts to secure enactment of legislation for the protection of original ornamental designs of useful articles continued throughout fiscal 1964. As the year began there were four identical bills pending in Congress: H.R. 323 (Flynt), H.R. 769 (Ford), H.R. 5523 (Libonati), and S. 776 (Hart-Talmadge). The Senate had passed an earlier version of the bill during the 87th Congress, and on December 6, 1963, it again passed the bill, following a favorable report submitted by Senator Philip A. Hart on December 4, 1963. On December 12, 1963, the House Judiciary Committee held a 1-day hearing at which the preponderance of the testimony favored the legislation. In the weeks that followed the hearing, however, there were reports
of strong opposition by certain retail merchandising and garment manufacturing interests, related largely to the feared impact of design protection on the wearing apparel industries. Serious attempts were made to compromise the conflicting views and to work out statutory solutions satisfactory to both sides, but no further action had been taken by the House Judiciary Committee as the year ended.

In October 1963 Congress enacted, as Public Law 88-155, a joint resolution dealing with a revised manual of Senate procedure prepared by the Senate Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian. This measure provides that the work shall be subject to copyright by the author, "notwithstanding any provisions of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain." Senate Report No. 785 on the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill of 1963 includes a section on unauthorized reproduction of American books and recordings in Nationalist China; the Committee states its view "that the Nationalist Government of China should cooperate in the assistance this country extended and continues to extend in its behalf," and requests the State Department to continue its unrelenting efforts to protect the rights of American companies.

Although none of the pending bills aimed at granting tax relief to authors was acted upon during the year, the Revenue Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-272) contained provisions which would help to relieve some of the author's tax burden. The act contains a provision enabling any taxpayer with a widely fluctuating income to average 1 year's unusually large income over a period of 5 years, and eliminates the necessity for recomputing the taxes of earlier years.

Judicial Developments

Actions Pending Against the Register of Copyrights

During the year there were two rulings on motions in the famous case of Public Affairs Associates, Inc. v. Rickover, which has been pending in the courts for over 5 years, and in which the Register of Copyrights and the Librarian of Congress are both defendants. In July 1963 the District Court sustained all of the objections made on behalf of the Register, the Librarian, and the other Government defendants to the voluminous interrogatories which the plaintiff had asked them to answer; Adm. H. C. Rickover was required to answer four of the interrogatories addressed to him. Later in the year arguments were heard on a motion to produce certain documents from the Copyright Office files; the court ordered the Department of Justice to make the documents available to the plaintiff since there was no claim of privilege with respect to them.

A new action in the nature of mandamus, Armstrong Cork Co. v. Kaminstein, was filed in the District Court for the District of Columbia on January 16, 1964 (Docket No. 119-64). This action seeks to compel the Register to make registration for the design of Armstrong's "Montina" flooring. The application in this case had originally been questioned because the copies of the flooring deposited were not identical, but it developed in the course of correspondence and a series of interviews that no two segments of the flooring can be identical since there is no fixed design that is repeated throughout the goods. The patterns are produced haphazardly as the result of vinyl chips falling at random through a hopper, and neither the shape of the chips nor the linear patterns are subject to control. Thus, as set forth in the answer to the complaint filed on behalf of the Register, regis-
tration has been refused on the ground that the "design" does not constitute the "writing of an author."

Subject Matter of Copyright Protection

Defendants in copyright infringement actions involving commercial designs continued to raise issues of originality and copyrightability, usually with little success. For example, a textile fabric design employing characters "of the Cleopatra era both in appearance and dress" was held original in *John Wolf Textiles, Inc. v. Andris Fabrics, Inc.*, 139 U.S.P.Q. 365 (S.D.N.Y. 1962), and in *Loomskill, Inc. v. Slifka*, 223 F. Supp. 845 (S.D.N.Y. 1963), *aff'd per curiam*, 330 F. 2d 952 (2d Cir. 1964), the court upheld copyrights in fabric designs adapted from an "Audubon book of birds" on the ground that "presenting old material in a new plan or arrangement is sufficient to lend copyrightability to the resulting work." On the other hand, Judge Bryan in *Manes Fabric Co. v. The Acadia Co.*, 139 U.S.P.Q. 339 (S.D.N.Y. 1960), noted that "the 'style' of plaintiff's fabric is apparently derived from illuminated medieval manuscripts and other works of art in the public domain, and it is therefore entitled to less broad protection than if the style were wholly original with it," and added that "the colors in the spectrum have not been successfully removed from the public domain." The copyrightability of color schemes was also rejected in *Clarion Textile Corp. v. Slifka*, 223 F. Supp. 950 (S.D.N.Y. 1961).

In *Remco Industries, Inc. v. Goldberger Doll Mfg. Co.*, 141 U.S.P.Q. 898 (E.D.N.Y. 1964), the court granted a preliminary injunction against infringement of copyright in "a doll approximately five inches tall, representing a male figure wearing a dark suit and exhibiting a 'mop' haircut associated with the musical group known as the Beatles." In contrast, although the court in *Ideal Toy Corp. v. Adanta Novel-

ities Corp.*, 223 F. Supp. 866 (S.D.N.Y. 1963), granted a preliminary injunction against the sale of dolls dressed in clothing similar to that used by the plaintiff on its "Tammy" dolls on grounds of unfair competition, it refused recovery for copyright infringement on the ground that plaintiff's copyright extended only to the unclothed doll, "judging from the description 'doll' in the claim as registered."

The familiar problem of the copyrightability of commercial labels, this time for furniture wax, came before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Drop Dead Co. v. S. C. Johnson, Inc.*, 326 F. 2d 87 (1963), *cert. denied*, 377 U.S. 907 (1964). In answer to defendant's argument that the label was uncopyrightable because it was largely textual and "used solely to laud the product and instruct in its use," plaintiff argued that it was not claiming "a separate copyright in the instructions and phrases" or "the exclusive right to the use of ovals or gold foil as such," but that its copyright covers only "the total embodiment of the numerous elements of its entire original label." In holding for the plaintiff on grounds that "the 'liberal' rather than the 'strict' rule of what constitutes copyrightable matter has been followed in the Ninth Circuit," the court upheld copyright in the label as "particularly and peculiarly embodying the numerous commonplace elements contained in it," and ruled that "labels which go beyond a mere trademark are copyrightable; if a label has 'some value as a composition, it no longer is 'a mere label.'"

Another recurrent problem, that of the copyrightability of trade catalogs, was carefully analyzed in *PIC Design Corp. v. Sterling Precision Corp.*, 231 F. Supp. 106 (S.D.N.Y. 1964). While upholding plaintiff's copyrights on grounds that "the degree of originality necessary to sustain a copyright is very low," Judge Ryan held that the figures and formulas in tables of
specifications are facts in the public domain; he also cast doubt on the copyrightability of the tabular arrangement of the figures and ruled against the copyrightability of the "format" or "visual impact" of the catalog. In *Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. v. Brown*, 223 F. Supp. 219 (E.D.N.Y. 1963), the court upheld copyright in the problems appearing in physics textbooks, including some taken from earlier books, on the basis of "the conception, organization and presentation of material whether new or old"; and the copyrights in a rock and roll song and in a piano arrangement of it, even though "trite" and "commonplace," were upheld in *Nom Music, Inc. v. Kaslin*, 227 F. Supp. 922 (S.D.N.Y. 1964).

Several cases during the year involved actions under State law for common law or statutory copyright infringement. Three cases—*Coloig v. KSFO*, 140 U.S.P.Q. 580 (Cal. Dist. Ct. App. 1964); *Borden v. Andrews*, 139 U.S.P.Q. 537 (Cal. Super. Ct. 1963); and *Land v. Jerry Lewis Productions, Inc.*, 140 U.S.P.Q. 351 (Cal. Super. Ct. 1964)—recognized that protection under California law is available for "a particular combination of ideas (which presupposes the expression thereof), or the form in which the ideas are embodied," and that ideas as such may be the subject of contract. A television game format was also held "tangible enough physical property of value in such concrete form" to allow recovery in New York on a theory of implied contract in *Robbins v. Frank Cooper Associates*, 19 App. Div. 2d 242, 241 N.Y.S. 2d 259 (1st Dep't 1963). In another case arising under New York law—*CBS v. Documentaries Unlimited*, 42 Misc. 2d 723, 248 N.Y.S. 2d 809 (Sup. Ct. 1964)—a news announcer was granted common law copyright protection not only in literary material of his own composition but also in his "voice and style of talking," which the court regarded as "to all intents and purposes, his personality, a form of art expression, and his distinctive and valuable property."

**Notice of Copyright**

The perennial problem of the statutory notice requirements continued to produce litigation during fiscal 1964, with decisions exemplifying both the "substantial compliance" and the "strict construction" schools of thought on the subject. Selvage notices on textile fabrics were upheld in *John Wolf Textiles, Inc. v. Andris Fabrics, Inc.*, 139 U.S.P.Q. 365 (S.D.N.Y. 1962), *Cortley Fabrics Co. v. Stifka*, 138 U.S.P.Q. 110 (S.D.N.Y.), aff'd per curiam, 317 F. 2d 924 (2d Cir. 1963), and *Loomskill, Inc. v. Stifka*, 223 F. Supp. 845 (S.D.N.Y. 1963), aff'd per curiam, 330 F. 2d 952 (2d Cir. 1964). In the *Cortley* case, where the selvage notice was "engraved on the rollers and mechanically imprinted on each and every repeat," Judge Levet ruled that the defendant had failed to sustain its "burden of proving that the notice of copyright could have been incorporated in the body of the design." In *Loomskill* the question was closer since the notice was added to selvage of the finished goods after it had been printed, the design itself contained some printed matter, and the plaintiff offered no evidence on the question. Judge Wyatt, with some misgivings, however, upheld the notice because, he said: "Looking at the fabric design itself, it is difficult to see how the copyright notice could be put in the relatively small boxes without destroying the effect."

A surprisingly strict attitude toward the notice requirements was taken by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in *OA Business Publications, Inc. v. Davidson Publishing Co.*, 334 F. 2d 432 (1964). It invalidated a notice appearing under the masthead on page 3 of a newspaper on the ground that it was not "on the title page" or "under the title heading," since
"the purported masthead . . . carries only part of the registered title and no volume or number of issue." The work involved in Neal v. Thomas Organ Co., 325 F. 2d 978 (9th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 379 U.S. 828 (1964), was an instruction manual for playing the organ; the title appeared on the front cover, the reverse of the cover was blank, and the notice appeared on the next (or third) page. The court, which had a great deal of difficulty with this question, said it recognized that "there is little room here for 'liberal interpretation' or for a consideration of 'Congressional intent,'" and that strict compliance would have required "placing the notice of copyright on the cover or on the fourth page, if the work is a musical composition, or on the second page, if the work is a book." The court held that the third page cannot be considered the "title page" since it does not bear the title, but it upheld the notice, limiting its opinion "to the peculiar circumstances of this case in which the title appears only on the cover and in which the cover is of a harder and less malleable material than the leaves within."

An important and previously unresolved question was dealt with in Nom Music, Inc. v. Kaslin, 227 F. Supp. 922 (S.D.N.Y. 1964): Can the assignee of copyright in an unpublished work use his name in the copyright notice when the work is published, without first recording his assignment? The court ruled that the use of the assignee's name in this situation is permissible, and that section 32 of the statute applies only where the work had previously been copyrighted in published form.

Ross Products, Inc. v. New York Merchandise Co., 141 U.S.P.Q. 652 (S.D.N.Y. 1964), held that the notice requirements of neither the statute nor the Universal Copyright Convention were satisfied by the word "Copyright" accompanied by a number referring to a Japanese patent, appearing on a hang-tag, although the court refused to rule upon the efficacy of a foreign-language notice. It also declined to decide upon the ultimate validity of the Copyright Office regulation requiring a notice of copyright on copies of a work as first published abroad, deciding only that the regulation is valid and controlling where the author-proprietor is an American citizen.

**Publication**

There were several decisions during the year involving the troubled question of what constitutes a "publication" that will destroy common law rights in a work. Possibly the most significant was King v. Mister Maestro, Inc., 224 F. Supp. 101 (S.D.N.Y. 1963), which involved the right of Martin Luther King to enjoin the unauthorized distribution of phonograph records of his famous speech "I Have a Dream" as delivered during the Freedom March in Washington. The court decided that neither the delivery of the address before a vast public audience and over radio and television nor the distribution to the press of copies of the advance text of the address without copyright notice constituted a "general publication" that destroyed the common law copyright. Similarly, the court in CBS v. Documentaries, Unlimited, 248 N.Y.S. 2d 809 (Sup. Ct. 1964), referred to the "well-settled rule" that "public performance of a work, such as delivery of a speech, singing of a song, or reading of a script, whether given in public or over the radio or television, is not such a general publication as constitutes a dedication to the public or places it in the public domain, with consequent loss of copyright."

The court in Nom Music, Inc. v. Kaslin, 227 F. Supp. 922 (S.D.N.Y. 1964), without referring to the line of cases leading to the opposite conclusion, stated: "It is clear . . . that a phonograph record is not a copy of a musical composition and need not contain.
a copyright notice, nor is a sale of the record a 'publication' of the underlying composition." A thorough analysis of the case law and other authorities involving publication and the protection of architectural plans is contained in the opinion of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in Edgar H. Wood Associates, Inc. v. Skene, 197 N.E. 2d 686 (1964). It concluded that the required filing of plans with a building department or other government office is a "limited" rather than a "general" publication, and that since a structure is the result of plans but not a copy of them, the construction and opening of a building is not a publication of the plans.

Registration

There were also several interesting decisions dealing with copyright registration and its effects. The principle, now quite well established, that a certificate of registration constitutes prima facie evidence of the validity of the copyright itself was reiterated in Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. v. Brown, 223 F. Supp. 219 (E.D.N.Y. 1963), Hedgesman Products Corp. v. Tap-Rite Products Corp., 228 F. Supp. 630 (D.N.J. 1964), and Drop Dead Co. v. S. C. Johnson, 395 F. 2d 87 (9th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 377 U.S. 907 (1964). The court in the Drop Dead case, in this connection, rejected defendant's arguments that "the Copyright Office is a mere depository," and that "there is no discretion in the Copyright Office, as there is in the Patent Office, as to what is copyrightable and what is not."

In Ross Products, Inc. v. New York Merchandise Co., 141 U.S.P.Q. 652 (S.D. N.Y. 1964), a preliminary injunction was refused on two grounds, one of which was the possibility of "fraud and intent to deceive and misrepresent" by the omission of "certain relevant information . . . in the copyright registration form." The court noted that "plaintiff did not fill in any answer to the question concerning possible publication abroad, an answer which might have caused the Copyright Office to reject his application," and stated that "surely this unexplained omission of a material fact . . . casts doubt on the validity of the registration itself."

Renewal and Ownership of Copyright

A problem that the Copyright Office has encountered more than once in renewal examining was involved in Heywood v. Robbins Music Corp., 142 U.S.P.Q. 53 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1964). This is the so-called "cut-in deal," a practice under which an orchestra leader or performer is incorrectly credited on the copies of a song and in the records of the Copyright Office as one of the authors. Although the court in the Heywood case agreed that "Paul Whiteman as a non-composer of the music and as a non-author of the lyrics had no rights whatever" in the renewal term, it refused to grant summary judgment on the ground that, because payment of royalties continued after renewal, plaintiff may be estopped to deny Whiteman's authorship.

The question in T. B. Harms Co. v. Eliscu, 226 F. Supp. 337 (S.D.N.Y. 1964), was whether, in a dispute over ownership of a renewal copyright, any "infringement" (that is, "any act which uses, violates or threatens the copyrights") had taken place that would justify Federal jurisdiction. The court held that neither a State court action to establish ownership nor the sending of letters claiming royalties constituted infringement. It also held that it was not infringement for defendant to make an assignment of his renewal claim or to record the assignment in the Copyright Office, despite plaintiff's argument that this act placed a cloud upon its title; the court added that the New York Supreme Court "has jurisdiction of the question of title and, if the facts warrant it, power to compel Eliscu to execute an assignment of his interest and a cancellation of the assign-
Infringement and the Scope of Copyright Protection

Undoubtedly, the most entertaining and well-publicized decision of the year was that of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in Berlin v. E. C. Publications, Inc., 329 F. 2d 541 (1964), cert. denied, 379 U.S. 822 (1964), which held that publication in Mad Magazine of "satiric parody lyrics" of copyrighted songs was fair use rather than infringement since the parodies had "neither the intent nor the effect of fulfilling the demand for the original" and since there was no substantial appropriation. Another musical infringement case, Nom Music, Inc. v. Kaslin, 227 F. Supp. 922 (S.D.N.Y. 1964), contains a painstaking and interesting comparison of the music and lyrics of two rock-and-roll songs.

The special problems of proof arising in cases involving infringement of copyrighted catalogs were dealt with in Hedeman Products Corp. v. Tap-Rite Products Corp., 228 F. Supp. 630 (D.N.J. 1964), and PIC Design Corp. v. Sterling Precision Corp., 231 F. Supp. 106 (S.D.N.Y. 1964). In the Hedeman case the defendant argued that copying must be "material and substantial" in order to constitute an infringement and that, since defendant had copied less than 1 percent of the total page area of plaintiff's catalog, no infringement had been established. The court held, however, that "the 'material and substantial' test is not . . . to be applied to plaintiff's entire catalog but to each component part [i.e., each illustration] which has been infringed." The court in the PIC case noted that copyright in a catalog protects the illustrations but not the products illustrated, but that "sufficient latitude exists in the draftsman's art of illustration to make suspect any drawing exactly reproducing one in a prior circulated catalog." While acknowledging that it would ordinarily be impossible to prove infringement of a table of figures in the public domain, the court
held that, where “the same errors (or ‘printer’s traps’) appear in an earlier and later publication, it is fair and reasonable . . . to infer copying.”

Three fabric design decisions reported during the year—Manes Fabric Co. v. The Acadia Co., 139 U.S.P.Q. 339 (S.D.N.Y. 1960), Clarion Textile Corp. v. Slijka, 223 F. Supp. 950 (S.D.N.Y. 1961), and Condotti, Inc. v. Slijka, 223 F. Supp. 412 (S.D. N.Y. 1963)—all involved cases in which there were strong similarities between plaintiff’s and defendant’s designs, the color schemes were the same, and a degree of copying could be inferred. In each instance, however, the court ruled in favor of the defendant on the ground that he had “not passed the bounds of idea appropriation.” As stated by the court in the Manes case: “There is an important difference between a slavish copy which alters a few details and an independent work executed in similar colors and in a similar style.”

A novel question concerning the extent of protection under a copyright arose in Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. v. Brown, 223 F. Supp. 219 (E.D.N.Y. 1963): whether publication of answers to problems published in physics textbooks constituted infringement rather than fair use. The court suggested that the conversion of plaintiff’s verbalisms into symbols, sign conventions, equations, and graphical representations might actually be considered an unauthorized “translation,” and held that their publication constituted an infringement since the solutions were specifically keyed in with the questions, included studied paraphrases, and had no independent viability.

Two cases during the year dealt with the important question of what constitutes a “public performance for profit” of a copyrighted musical composition. In Lerner v. Schectman, 228 F. Supp. 354 (D. Minn. 1964), the performance in “a bona fide membership club,” not open to the general public, was held to be a “public performance for profit” on grounds that “there were no meaningful qualifications for membership” and that “the membership served no function in relation to the organization or operation of the club.” Chappell & Co. v. Middletown Farmers Market & Auction Co., 334 F. 2d 303 (3d Cir. 1964), dealt with performances from recordings of copyrighted music played in the central office of a large merchandise mart and transmitted over a system of 58 loudspeakers located throughout the defendant’s premises and parking lot. The Court of Appeals ruled this an infringement, holding that the ownership of lawfully made records does not carry with it the right to perform them publicly for profit, and that, whether or not the playing of the records was connected with their sales promotion, their performance was an infringement since “it was commercially beneficial to the Mart to have an attractive shopping atmosphere.”

The widespread problem of “fake-books” (unauthorized compilations of the melody lines of hundreds of popular songs) reached the courts in Shapiro, Bernstein & Co. v. Bleecker, 224 F. Supp. 595 (S.D. Cal. 1963), which held a retail vendor liable on grounds that the copyright law gives “not only the exclusive right to copy, but also to vend the copyrighted work.”

Practical problems of procedure in infringement actions were involved in Electronic Publishing Co. v. Zabytron Tube Corp., 226 F. Supp. 760 (S.D.N.Y. 1964), and Leo Feist, Inc. v. Debmar Publishing Co., 232 F. Supp. 623 (E.D. Pa. 1964). The Electronic case involved a catalog which plaintiff had prepared for a corporation not a party to the action. Defendants moved to dismiss for failure to join an indispensable party, but the court denied the motion. The Feist case involved the alleged infringement of “In a Little Spanish
Town" by "Why," a question previously litigated in England by the same parties. The defendants contended that the matter was res judicata since the English court had found that there had been no copying. The court ruled for defendants, holding that although the principle of res judicata was not applicable because the English and American suits were brought under different statutes and for different acts of infringement, the doctrine of collateral estoppel would apply to a fact litigated in a foreign court.

Remedies for Infringement

One of the most unsettled areas in the copyright law is that dealing with the statutory remedies for copyright infringement: damages, profits, injunctions, attorneys' fees, etc. One of the most important decisions on these questions in recent years was rendered by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in Peter Pan Fabrics, Inc. v. Jobela Fabrics, Inc., 329 F. 2d 194 (1964), which held that recovery under the copyright law is "cumulative," encompassing both net profits of the infringer and damages of the copyright holder," rather than "alternative," allowing either profits or damages, whichever is greater." Moreover, even though only actual profits had been proved, the court held that a higher award under the statutory damages provision was permissible. In Fruit of the Loom, Inc. v. Andris Fabrics, Inc., 227 F. Supp. 977 (S.D.N.Y. 1963), an award of actual damages based on estimated loss of potential sales of 75,000 yards was upheld, even though plaintiff's unsold inventory consisted of less than 10,000 yards, on the ground that "defendant's actions destroyed a substantial and promising market."

The confused question of how many infringements there are in a case for purposes of computing statutory damages arose in Hedeman Products Corp. v. Tap-Rite Products Corp., 228 F. Supp. 630 (D.N.J. 1964), and in Shapiro, Bernstein & Co. v. Bleecker, 140 U.S.P.Q. 111 (S.D. Cal. 1963). In the Hedeman case the court held that "each copying by defendant of an illustration, which had been separately prepared by plaintiff, was a separate infringement." In contrast, where the defendant's "fake-book" in the Shapiro, Bernstein case contained 1,000 songs, 12 of which were copyrighted by the plaintiff, the court considered it "obvious" that a recovery of either $250,000 or $3,000 would be unjust and required proof of actual damages and profits. Mailer v. RKO Teleradio Pictures, Inc., 332 F. 2d 747 (2d Cir. 1964), was an action by Norman Mailer for infringement of copyright in The Naked and the Dead, based on a clause in his contract with the defendant film company under which motion picture rights were to revert to him if production of the film were not completed within a specified period. The Court of Appeals held that the picture was substantially completed within the time provided and upheld the award against Mailer of $5,000 as counsel fees on the ground that "this sort of litigiousness cannot be condoned." Universal Pictures Co. v. Schaeffer, 140 U.S.P.Q. 17 (E.D. Pa. 1963), was one of the rare reported decisions dealing with the seizure and impounding provisions of the law; the court held that defendant was guilty of civil contempt when he concealed or withheld from the Federal marshal copies covered by a seizure order and that fines for contempt are payable to plaintiffs. In the "Beatle doll" case, Remco Industries, Inc. v. Goldberger Doll Mfg. Co., 141 U.S.P.Q. 898 (E.D.N.Y. 1964), the court granted a preliminary injunction because "the promotional nature of the copyrighted dolls has a life span which may be extraordinarily short," but required plaintiff to post security of $25,000.
Unfair Competition and Copyright

On March 9, 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down two decisions, Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co., 376 U.S. 225, and Compco Corp. v. Day-Brite Lighting, Inc., 376 U.S. 234, which promise to have a fundamental effect on the future of the copyright law and, indeed, of the entire field of intellectual and industrial property. Holding, in the words of Justice Black, "that when an article is unprotected by a patent or a copyright, state law may not forbid others to copy that article," the decisions appear to restrict the scope of protection under theories of unfair competition and common law copyright, and to lend greater importance to statutory patent and copyright law.

Like many another landmark case, Sears and Compco succeeded in raising more questions than they settled. It seemed clear from the decisions, for example, that if a work comes within the subject matter of the copyright statute and has been published, the States are preempted from giving it protection equivalent to copyright. This conclusion is supported by the decisions in Duplex Straw Dispenser Co. v. Harold Leonard & Co., 229 F. Supp. 401 (S.D. Cal. 1964); Mastro Plastics Corp. v. Emenee Industries, Inc., 141 U.S.P.Q. 311 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1964); and Wolf and Vine, Inc. v. Pioneer Display Fixture Co., 142 U.S.P.Q. 112 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1964). The New York Supreme Court, however, in Flamingo Telefilm Sales, Inc. v. United Artists Corp., 141 U.S.P.Q. 461 (1964), seems to reach a different result. It held, in an action involving the unauthorized exploitation, distribution, and exhibition of a television program incorporating a "substantial segment" of plaintiff's uncopyrighted motion picture, that the rule of Sears and Compco is limited to cases involving "copying," and is "to be distinguished from the instant case where the complaint, essentially, is of an appropriation of the very item licensed . . . " the use of the identical product for the profit of another."

Another question involves the status of unpublished works: Are the States now preempted from protecting them if they come within the subject matter of copyright? The decision in CBS v. Documentaries Unlimited, 248 N.Y.S. 2d 809 (Sup. Ct. 1964), suggests that the preemption doctrine of the Sears and Compco decisions does not extend to unpublished works, and the decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, in Edgar H. Wood Associates, Inc. v. Skene, 197 N.E. 2d 886 (1964), contains a specific holding to that effect. A far more difficult question is whether the States may continue to offer the equivalent of copyright protection to published works (such as recorded performances and industrial designs) that may be "writings" within the Constitution but do not come within the scope of the present copyright statute. In Capitol Records, Inc. v. Greatest Records, Inc., 142 U.S.P.Q. 109 (1964), the New York Supreme Court followed its "appropriation-copying" distinction in the earlier Flamingo case and held that the "law of this jurisdiction is still . . . that, where the originator . . . of records of performances by musical artists puts those records on public sale, his act does not constitute a dedication of the right to copy and sell the records." The ultimate answers to these and other fundamental questions—for example, whether the States can decide what is published and what is unpublished, and whether the Federal Government itself can give protection equivalent to copyright under trademark or other statutes—remain for the courts to evolve in the months and years to come.

Antitrust Action

The ASCAP consent decree was judicially interpreted in United States v. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 331 F. 2d 117 (2d Cir. 1964), an
appeal from a judgment denying petitions by local television stations for the fixing of new "blanket license" and "per program" fees. The court affirmed the judgment on the ground that the consent decree does not require the granting of the kinds of licenses requested.

International Developments

The international protection of intellectual property passed another milestone in 1964 with the coming into force of the Neighboring Rights Convention (the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms, and Broadcasting Organizations), signed at Rome on October 26, 1961. In accordance with its terms, the convention came into effect on May 18, 1964, 3 months after the sixth country had deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, or accession. Three countries—Congo (Brazzaville), Sweden, and Niger—had previously deposited their instruments, and deposits were made by the United Kingdom on October 30, 1963, Ecuador on December 19, 1963, and Mexico on February 17, 1964. Later in the year, Czechoslovakia acceded to the convention subject to reservations, and Congo (Brazzaville) filed notification that it was also making its accession subject to reservations.

Additional adherences to the Universal Copyright Convention by Greece, Peru, and New Zealand brought the membership to a total of 48 countries, and Mexico ratified the Buenos Aires Copyright Convention of 1910. During the year the Universal Copyright Convention was made applicable to the Falkland Islands, Kenya, St. Helena, and Seychelles. Kenya became independent, however, on December 12, 1963, and Zanzibar, to which the United Kingdom previously had declared the Universal Copyright Convention applied, gained independence on December 10, 1963. North Borneo and Sarawak, to which the convention had also been declared applicable, are now members of the new state of Malaysia, as is Singapore, with which the United States had copyright relations by virtue of a proclamation. The problems arising from the lack of copyright relations between the United States and the many newly formed countries that have been created from former dependencies continue to increase; the table below attempts to show all of the independent countries of the world and the basis of their copyright relations, if any, with the United States.
International Copyright Relations of the United States as of November 1, 1964

This table shows the status of United States copyright relations with the 123 other sovereign independent countries of the world.

The following code is used:

- **UCC**: Party to the Universal Copyright Convention, as is the United States.
- **BAC**: Party to the Buenos Aires Convention of 1910, as is the United States.
- **Bilateral**: Bilateral copyright relations with the United States by virtue of a proclamation or treaty.
- **Unclear**: Became independent since 1945. Has not established copyright relations with the United States, but may be honoring obligations incurred under former political status.
- **None**: No copyright relations with the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of Copyright Relations</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of Copyright Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bilateral; UCC with German Federal Republic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>UCC, BAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>UCC, BAC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Bilateral.</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>UCC, BAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Holy See (Vatican City)</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>BAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>BAC.</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>UCC, BAC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>UCC, BAC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>BAC.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>UCC, BAC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>BAC.</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>UCC, BAC.</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Bilateral by virtue of Mexico City Convention, 1902.</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>UCC, BAC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Unclear.</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>UCC, Bilateral.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the year there were three important international copyright meetings: the African Study Meeting in Brazzaville, Congo, August 5–10, 1963; the Meeting of a Committee of Experts on the Stockholm Conference of Revision of the Berne Union in Geneva, Switzerland, in November 1963; and the Fifth Joint Meeting of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee and the Berne Permanent Committee in New Delhi, India, in December 1963. The African Study Meeting was organized by UNESCO and the United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property (Brip) to consider adoption by the new African nations of domestic copyright legislation and their adherence to one or more of the international copyright conventions. Twenty-three of the 30 countries invited to the meeting attended, as did several observers including the U.S. Register of Copyrights. It is evident that the countries attending the meeting are clearly interested in adopting domestic legislation and in developing international copyright relations but are not prepared to operate under a copyright system similar to those in Western European countries. They asked UNESCO and Brip to draft a model law designed for their needs, and another meeting will probably be held to consider the resulting draft.

The Geneva meeting of the Committee of Experts discussed proposals for amendment of the Berne Convention, in preparation for a Revision Conference scheduled for Stockholm in 1967. Sixteen Berne countries were invited to send experts, and 12 did so. The United States was invited to attend as an observer and was repre-
sented by the Register. A variety of substantive and technical points were considered; those concerning motion pictures, particularly the question of whether the convention should include a system of presumptions concerning the ownership of certain rights in a film, were the most important and difficult issues discussed. Failure of the Geneva meeting to resolve the presumption question led to a later suggestion that Burt convene a Committee of Governmental Experts before the Stockholm Conference.

The joint meeting in New Delhi, at which the United States was also represented by the Register, considered reports on the exploitation of musical scores, the photographic reproduction of copyrighted works by libraries, relations between the Rome Neighboring Rights Convention and the European Agreement on the Protection of Television Broadcasts, and the use of criminal proceedings in cases of copyright infringement. The growth in membership of the Universal Copyright Convention has raised a problem of representation on the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee, and consideration is being given to plans enabling broader and more formal participation by countries not members of the committee. Proposals for introducing translation provisions into the Berne Convention and for introducing compulsory licenses to reproduce copyrighted works for educational purposes into both conventions were noted for study and report at the next joint session, which may take place in 1965.

Respectfully submitted,

ABRAHAM L. KAMINSTEIN
Register of Copyrights

October 27, 1964
## Registration by Subject Matter Classes for the Fiscal Years 1960–64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Subject matter of copyright</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Books (including pamphlets, leaflets, etc.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufactured in the United States</td>
<td>55,713</td>
<td>57,794</td>
<td>61,787</td>
<td>63,936</td>
<td>66,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufactured abroad (except those registered for ad interim copyright)</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>4,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registered for ad interim copyright</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>60,034</td>
<td>62,415</td>
<td>66,571</td>
<td>68,445</td>
<td>71,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Periodicals (issues)</td>
<td>64,204</td>
<td>66,251</td>
<td>67,523</td>
<td>69,682</td>
<td>74,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(BB) Contributions to newspapers and periodicals</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>3,398</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>2,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lectures, sermons, addresses</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dramatic or dramatico-musical compositions</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>3,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Musical compositions</td>
<td>65,518</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>67,612</td>
<td>72,583</td>
<td>75,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Works of art, models, or designs</td>
<td>5,271</td>
<td>5,557</td>
<td>6,043</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>5,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Reproductions of works of art</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>3,726</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>4,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Drawings or plastic works of a scientific or technical character</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Prints and pictorial illustrations</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>3,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(KK) Commercial prints and labels</td>
<td>8,142</td>
<td>7,564</td>
<td>7,167</td>
<td>7,318</td>
<td>7,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Motion picture photoplays</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>3,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Motion pictures not photoplays</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Renewals of all classes</td>
<td>21,393</td>
<td>18,194</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>20,164</td>
<td>22,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>243,926</td>
<td>247,014</td>
<td>254,776</td>
<td>264,845</td>
<td>278,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Statement of Gross Cash Receipts, Yearly Fees, Number of Registrations, etc., for the Fiscal Years 1960–64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Gross receipts $</th>
<th>Yearly fees applied $</th>
<th>Number of registrations</th>
<th>Increase in registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,035,563.55</td>
<td>974,113.05</td>
<td>243,926</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,078,991.90</td>
<td>1,009,679.04</td>
<td>247,014</td>
<td>3,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1,111,705.76</td>
<td>1,043,587.75</td>
<td>254,776</td>
<td>7,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1,123,598.21</td>
<td>1,077,747.79</td>
<td>264,845</td>
<td>10,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1,206,453.60</td>
<td>1,133,546.57</td>
<td>278,987</td>
<td>14,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,554,313.02</td>
<td>5,238,674.18</td>
<td>1,289,548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Articles Deposited During the Fiscal Years 1960–64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Subject matter of copyright</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Books (including pamphlets, leaflets, etc.):</td>
<td>111,425</td>
<td>115,588</td>
<td>123,574</td>
<td>127,872</td>
<td>133,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufactured in the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufactured abroad (except those registered for ad interim copyright)</td>
<td>6,549</td>
<td>6,698</td>
<td>6,985</td>
<td>6,533</td>
<td>6,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registered for ad interim copyright</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>118,761</td>
<td>123,265</td>
<td>131,522</td>
<td>135,324</td>
<td>141,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Periodicals (issues)</td>
<td>128,328</td>
<td>132,410</td>
<td>134,928</td>
<td>138,827</td>
<td>149,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(BB) Contributions to newspapers and periodicals</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>3,398</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>5,070</td>
<td>5,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lectures, sermons, addresses</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dramatic or dramatico-musical compositions</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>3,203</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Musical compositions</td>
<td>83,005</td>
<td>83,723</td>
<td>85,325</td>
<td>92,223</td>
<td>95,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>3,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Works of art, models, or designs</td>
<td>9,273</td>
<td>9,599</td>
<td>10,534</td>
<td>10,993</td>
<td>10,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Reproductions of works of art</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>8,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Drawings or plastic works of a scientific or technical character</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>1,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K &amp; K</td>
<td>Prints, labels, and pictorial illustrations</td>
<td>22,965</td>
<td>21,038</td>
<td>20,112</td>
<td>19,820</td>
<td>20,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Motion picture photoplays</td>
<td>5,498</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>5,352</td>
<td>6,338</td>
<td>5,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Motion pictures not photoplays</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>2,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>387,172</td>
<td>399,526</td>
<td>410,669</td>
<td>428,767</td>
<td>449,359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF COPYRIGHT BUSINESS, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Balance on hand July 1963 ................................................... $256,661.80
Gross receipts July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964 ............................ 1,206,453.60

Total to be accounted for .................................................... 1,463,115.40

Refunded ................................................................. $42,982.16
Checks returned unpaid ................................................... 2,918.75
Deposited as earned fees .................................................. 1,122,195.17

Balance carried over July 1, 1964:
Fees earned in June 1964 but not deposited until July 1964 .............. 295,019.32
Unfinished business balance .............................................. 1,463,115.40
Deposit accounts balance ................................................. 94,522.70
Card service ............................................................. 44,615.34

Deposit accounts balance ................................................. 151,540.09
Card service ............................................................. 4,341.19

7,013 registrations for prints and labels at $6.00 each .................. 42,078.00
174,748 registrations for published domestic works at $4.00 each .... 698,992.00
3,073 registrations for published foreign works at $4.00 each ......... 12,292.00
60,390 registrations for unpublished works at $4.00 each ............ 241,560.00
22,574 registrations for renewals at $2.00 each ......................... 45,148.00

267,798 total number of registrations* ................................ 1,040,070.00

Fees for registrations ...................................................... $27,658.50
Fees for recording assignments .......................................... 17,987.50
Fees for indexing transfers of proprietorship ........................... 13,178.50
Fees for notices of use recorded ......................................... 3,109.00
Fees for certified documents ............................................. 22,599.00
Card service ............................................................. 8,944.07

Total fees earned .......................................................... 1,133,546.57

*Excludes 11,189 made under provisions of law permitting registration without payment of fee for certain work of foreign origin.
Priced Copyright Office publications which may be obtained from Government Printing Office

Orders for all the publications listed below should be addressed and remittances made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402.


COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION, PART 3—Preliminary Draft for Revised U.S. Copyright Law and Discussions and Comments on the Draft. House Committee Print. 457 pages, September 1964, $1.25

CATALOG OF COPYRIGHT ENTRIES. Paper. Each part of the catalog is published in semiannual numbers containing the claims of copyright registered during the periods January-June and July-December. The prices given below are for the year. Semiannual numbers are available at one-half the annual price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Books and Pamphlets Including Serials and Contributions to Periodicals</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Dramas and Works Prepared for Oral Delivery</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maps and Atlases</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11A</td>
<td>Works of Art, Reproductions of Works of Art, Scientific and Technical Drawings, Photographic Works, Prints and Pictorial Illustrations</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>Commercial Prints and Labels</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>Motion Pictures and Filmstrips</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Subscription Price, all parts</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These catalogs are usually available 6 months after the close of a registration period. Although orders should be addressed to the Superintendent of Documents, the Copyright Office will furnish information on catalogs prior to 1961 upon request.

Catalog of Copyright Entries, Cumulative Series

MOTION PICTURES 1894-1912. Identified from the records of the United States Copyright Office by Howard Lamarre Walls. 92 pages. 1953. Buckram, $2.00.


These four volumes list a total of nearly one hundred thousand motion pictures produced since the beginning of the motion picture industry.
REPORT OF THE REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS, 1964

Copyright Law Revision Studies

COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION. Studies prepared for the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate. Committee prints published by the Senate Committee, the preparation of which was supervised by the Copyright Office.

First committee print; Studies 1–4:
1. The History of U.S.A. Copyright Law Revision from 1901 to 1954
2. Size of the Copyright Industries
3. The Meaning of "Writings" in the Copyright Clause of the Constitution
4. The Moral Right of the Author.
142 pages, 1960, 40 cents.

Second committee print; Studies 5 and 6:
5. The Compulsory License Provisions of the U.S. Copyright Law
6. The Economic Aspects of the Compulsory License.
125 pages, 1960, 35 cents.

Third committee print; Studies 7–10:
7. Notice of Copyright
8. Commercial Use of the Copyright Notice
9. Use of the Copyright Notice by Libraries
10. False Use of Copyright Notice.
125 pages, 1960, 35 cents.

Fourth committee print; Studies 11–13:
11. Divisibility of Copyrights
12. Joint Ownership of Copyrights
13. Works Made for Hire and on Commission.
155 pages, 1960, 45 cents.

Fifth committee print; Studies 14–16:
14. Fair Use of Copyrighted Works
15. Photoduplication of Copyrighted Material by Libraries
16. Limitations on Performing Rights.
135 pages, 1960, 35 cents.

Sixth committee print; Studies 17–19:
17. The Registration of Copyright
18. Authority of the Register of Copyrights to Reject Applications for Registration
19. The Recordation of Copyright Assignments and Licenses.
135 pages, 1960, 40 cents.

Seventh committee print; Studies 20 and 21:
20. Deposit of Copyrighted Works
21. The Catalog of Copyright Entries.

Eighth committee print; Studies 22–25:
22. The Damage Provisions of the Copyright Law
24. Remedies Other Than Damages for Copyright Infringement
25. Liability of Innocent Infringers of Copyright.
169 pages, 1960, 45 cents.

Ninth committee print; Studies 26–28:
26. The Unauthorized Duplication of Sound Recordings
27. Copyright in Architectural Works
28. Copyright in Choreographic Works.
116 pages, 1961, 35 cents.

Tenth committee print; Studies 29–31:
29. Protection of Unpublished Works
30. Duration of Copyright
31. Renewal of Copyright.
237 pages, 1961, 60 cents.

Eleventh committee print; Studies 32–34:
32. Protection of Works of Foreign Origin
33. Copyright in Government Publications
34. Copyright in Territories and Possessions of the United States.

Subject Index to Studies 1–34.
38 pages, 1961, 15 cents.

---

**Bulletins**

**DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS INVOLVING COPYRIGHT.** The series contains substantially all copyright cases, as well as many involving related subjects which have been decided by the Federal and State courts. Cloth.

1909–14 (Bull. No. 17) $1.75 1943–48 (Bull. No. 26) $1.75
1914–17 (Bull. No. 18) 2.50 1949–50 (Bull. No. 27) 2.75
1918–24 (Bull. No. 39) 2.75 1951–52 (Bull. No. 28) 2.75
1924–35 (Bull. No. 20) 3.75 1953–54 (Bull. No. 29) 2.50
1935–37 (Bull. No. 21) .75 1955–56 (Bull. No. 30) 2.75
1938–39 (Bull. No. 22) 2.00 1957–58 (Bull. No. 31) 2.75
1939–40 (Bull. No. 23) 2.75 1959–60 (Bull. No. 32) 3.00
1941–42 (Bull. No. 24) 2.75 1961–62 (Bull. No. 33) 2.75
1944–45 (Bull. No. 25) 2.75 1963–64 (Bull. 34) In process.

Cumulative Index, 1909–1954 (Bulletins 17–29) $1.75

Complete set, including Index $45.25.

Prices are subject to change.