

and books, but could find little outlet for most of the material. And we have had to pay heavily for airmail delivery. Exchange agreements provide only for surface mail.

Of equal interest to the information industry is the possible effect on the Soviet practice of reprinting *en masse* foreign and scientific writings--textbooks, journals and abstracting and indexing material. If the Soviet government now discontinues its unauthorized reproduction of such works, McGraw-Hill, the American Chemical Society, and some others may receive a windfall.

I have been told that there is a pirated edition of *Current Contents* within the Soviet sphere. I have never seen a sample of it. The very small number of CC[®] subscriptions from so scientifically oriented a country leads me sometimes to conclude that there may be fact in the rumor. If so, Soviet observance of copyright may work to increase their purchase of *Current Contents* and *Science Citation Index*[®]. It will be interesting to see whether Soviet readers then demand coverage of more Russian journals. For some time we have been negotiating with the Soviet Union for the use of our CC and SCI[®] tapes on licence.

Our citation analyses have

shown that we may have gaps in our coverage of Russian material. They are probably no worse than in the case of some other countries. It has been claimed that our coverage of Soviet math journals is inadequate. So far, our citation analyses have not turned up anything significant. One would think that these "leading" Soviet math journals would be heavily cited in the *Doklady*, which we cover completely. In the near future, I'll report on this and related problems of math journal coverage. A math journal citation study is now in the works.

Addition of most Soviet journals unfortunately means new costs for translation and transliteration. Recently I wrote again to the President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR about the many Soviet journals that still don't even provide English abstracts or contents pages. After my visit to the Soviet Union in 1961, the Academy had agreed to include English contents pages in all its journals--if counterpart American journals would agree to publish a Russian contents page in theirs! You can imagine the response to this suggestion when I presented it to the American Chemical Society, among others.

More enterprising private publishers like Wiley-Interscience have

been including Russian abstracts in some journals for years, e.g., *J. Polymer Science*. As I pointed out recently², it is faster and more convenient to scan contents pages in one's own language. If Western publishers want to increase sales in the Soviet Union, this may well be a step they will have to consider.

The Soviet Union's announcement that it will become party to the copyright convention brings up again the age-old problem of copyright itself. On March 7, the United States Court of Claims heard arguments in appeal in the case of *Williams & Wilkins Company v. The United States*. Hopefully a prompt decision will be rendered. This case has generated a spate of emotional and partisan comment from the library community. Somehow, the American Library Association feels that the future of libraries is threatened should the Court decide in favor of *Williams & Wilkins*. The Special Libraries Association has taken a much more conciliatory stance. Most of its members work in private industry, where the concept of proprietary rights is more clearly understood.

In a future editorial, I should like to discuss this case in more detail, particularly some of the problems created by the technological revolution in copying and transmittal of information. My

deceased colleague and friend Ralph Shaw did a masterly piece on the W&W case just before he died.³ I am certain that all parties will eventually resolve the problem, but it is unfortunate that legal action was required when reasonable foresight and arbitration might have solved it long ago.

In any event, many leading Western scientists and their publishers may now benefit from Soviet editions of their works. The possibility of royalties may prompt aggressive marketing agents to encourage more use of as yet untranslated works. On the other hand, for-profit publishers of translated versions of Russian journals may now be required to pay royalties, whereas previously they paid for their "raw material" by exchange or other forms of *quid pro quo*. If ISI learns of a positive reaction to its renewed proposal for English contents pages and abstracts in all Soviet journals, you should see the effects in *Current Contents*.

1. *New York Times*, Sunday, March 18, 1973, p. 5.
2. Garfield, E. Variety is the spice of life--whether in people, language, or the contents pages in CC. *Current Contents*, No. 12, March 21, 1973, p. 5-6.
3. Shaw, R.R. A Review of the Commissioner's Report: *Williams & Wilkins v. the U.S.* *American Libraries* 3(9): 987-99, 1972.