which would appropriately contour the reproduction curve for a particular make of record during a particular period.

In re-recording today, this work of the McIntosh engineers is still available through the information which has been preserved, even though the units then made for the purpose are no longer on the market. As more universities set up archives, and more music libraries wish to have available the fruits of the first eighty years of sound recording in the best form, the more probable it will be that McIntosh Laboratories may be induced to assist in the development of similar apparatus and standards similarly applicable to all recordings of the past, and to collaborate in the establishment of overall standards for the future.

COMPUTER MACHINE-READABLE CATALOGING AT THE ARCHIVE OF FOLK SONG - LIBRARY OF CONGRESS*

Summary of Feasibility Study Report

by Joseph C. Hickerson, Library of Congress

In 1966 the Library of Congress received a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., for the purpose of ascertaining the economic feasibility of creating a machine-readable master catalog for the sound recording collection of the Archive of Folk Song, by means of computer technology. The specific task in the project has been to establish the kinds and forms of catalog entries which would be useful in a machine-readable master catalog, and to determine the amount and nature of work that would be required to process the entire archive.

A maximal list of data items was first compiled and listed on four separate worksheets: one for a whole collection (e.g.--Lomax, Louisiana, 1937) gives pertinent data common to all recordings in the collection; a second worksheet provides technical data on the original recording (e.g.--type, speed, etc.); a third on the performer (e.g.--ethnic and biographical data); and a fourth, the most elaborate, on each song (e.g.--title, first line, subjects, etc.). Time studies were made of the worksheet filling process, and also of abbreviated versions of the worksheets.

In order to avoid the prohibitive cost of programming a completely new format, a skeletal listing of 29 items of information was adapted to the then-existing MARC I format, permitting the running of information on five songs on the computer and producing an editing printout. The study was limited to English-language titles. The result of the time study favors the maximal listing, since the difference in time consumed between it and the abbreviated forms was not great.

Now that its feasibility has been demonstrated and its cost projected, a full catalog of the Archive is being planned. The procedure, developed during the pilot phase, will be as follows:

1. Typist fills in Collection Worksheet and passes it to folklorist-cataloger for completion.
2. Recording Worksheet filled out by typist and folklorist-cataloger.
3. Performer Worksheet filled out by technician-cataloger.

4. Item (title) Worksheet filled out by typist and folklorist-cataloger.
5. All worksheets merged by computer for retrieval by collections, titles, performers, subjects, recording data, etc.

It is estimated that we hope to complete the project in less than five years. It will be a valuable initial step toward the control of the Library's 300,000 uncataloged recordings of all types.

OWNERSHIP AND COPYRIGHT OF SOUND RECORDINGS

Transcript of Panel Discussion
UCLA ARSC Conference -- November 22, 1969

Panelists: Melville Nimmer, Professor of Law, UCLA
Stan Kenton, National Chairman - The National Committee for the Recording Arts
Norman L. Chalfin, Patent Agent - Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology
Elliott Schaum, Chief Counsel, Capitol Records
Carlos B. Hagen, 2nd Vice-President, ARSC; Head, Map Library, UCLA

Mr. Nimmer: To talk about the state of the copyright law with respect to phonograph or sound recordings could be done very quickly by simply saying there is no copyright protection for sound recordings -- period, remarkable as that may appear to be. There is however something more to be said about this; I will say it briefly. First of all we go back to prior to the time when the present copyright law was adopted. The present copyright law now enforced was adopted in 1909. Several years before that, there was a landmark case called, U.S. Supreme Court Case: Whitesmith vs. Apollo in which the issue there was whether someone who made a piano roll copy of a musical composition had infringed the copyright in that musical composition. And the court held per Mr. Justice Holmes, No. This piano roll copy which is as you may recall, a perforated paper or something of the sort, is not a copy of the music itself because it's only the part of a machine, a part of an instrument, that you have to put into the piano to make it play. And hence the copyright law, which protected against copying, was not violated, the court said, because this was not a copy, only part of a machine. Well, with that as a basis, when Congress adopted a new copyright law in 1909, they went along with this idea that a piano roll, and then by extension a phonograph record, is not a copy of the musical composition because you cannot read it with the eye. You pick up a phonograph record and you look at the grooves, you can't tell what it means. The only way you can know what it means is by putting it on the machine. And hence, making a phonograph record is not a copy of the musical composition. However, the Congress in 1909 did give some limited protection with respect to making of phonograph records, that is protecting the author of the musical composition. They provided