

study core curriculum in health fields, from high school onward. The concept of a core curriculum—a set of courses common to all health professionals—is frequently talked about as one way of increasing occupational mobility, especially laterally. If the first-year program were identical for nutritionists and physical therapists, for example, it would require less additional education to switch from one to the other. A core curriculum would also increase the ability of various members of the health team to work together. The concept has been discussed for years, but a recent study by Robert Hawkins of the State University of New York at Stony Brook indicates that most schools that say they have a core curriculum really do not.

The failure of the allied health professions to attract enough talented personnel and to place them flexibly in jobs or educational programs commensurate with their experience is nowhere better illustrated than in the case of men leaving the armed forces medical departments. Studies indicate that many of these men would have liked to stay in health fields, but few do. The federal government—in a program without funds—is now trying to do something about it (see Box).

While the health professions are beginning to turn to the military medical departments for trained personnel, an ad hoc committee of the National Research Council (NRC) recommended last year that they might regard the armed forces medical departments as something of a model for utilization of allied personnel. "The committee believes that the educational techniques used for military corpsmen (medics), as well as the ways in which their skills are used, are worthy of consideration for the allied health professions in civilian life."

The committee felt that, in general, institutional and outpatient care provided by the military is as skillful as that in civilian institutions. The military has about 5 percent of the nation's population as potential customers and about 5 percent of the nation's health resources. But physicians, dentists, and registered nurses account for only 21 percent of the military medical personnel on active duty, compared with 31 percent for the nation as a whole in 1967.

These figures adduced by the NRC committee should not be taken too literally. The military, of course, can do certain things with its health person-

Suit Asks Photocopying Royalties

The first suit against the federal government for alleged copyright infringement as a result of the photocopying of scientific journal material is scheduled to go to trial on 9 September. Defendants in the case are the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and the library that serves the National Institutes of Health (NIH) intramural program.

The suit was filed 2 years ago (*Science*, 21 June 1968) by Williams & Wilkins Co. of Baltimore, a major publisher of medical and scientific books and journals. One of Williams & Wilkins' officers says that in bringing suit the firm "is not trying to stop photocopying, but to gain reimbursement for loss of sales."

The question of whether or not royalties should be paid for photocopies of scientific material has gained force in the decade or so since the use of Xerox and other photocopying processes has become virtually a reflex action among American scientists.

A change in the law in 1960 authorized suits against the government for copyright infringement, but observers say the issue was not taken into court, in part at least, because Congress appeared to be moving toward extensive revision of copyright law. The filing of the present suit was influenced by the fact that, although a Presidential commission is now studying the matter, there is no early prospect of legislative relief.

The case is being heard in the U.S. Court of Claims in the District of Columbia before a commissioner who will make a report on which a panel of judges will base a decision. Whatever the outcome, it is expected that the decision will be appealed to the Supreme Court. Attorneys for Williams & Wilkins decline to indicate the line of argument they will follow in court, but observers feel that the copyright owners must demonstrate damage to be successful in the case.

Objection to Journal Copying

The suit objects only to the copying of journal material, which, rather than books or monographs, is said to account for the greatest volume of copying. The target of the suit is not the "casual user" who makes a single copy of an article for his own use, but organizations that offer copying services involving formal records and numerous employees.

The situations at NLM and NIH differ, since NLM provides photocopies only under its interlibrary loan program while the NIH library serves scientists on the NIH Bethesda campus. Both libraries, however, impose similar restrictions on copying practices. NLM officials say that their rules forbid the copying of an entire work (a whole monograph, for example) or more than one article from an issue of a journal for one recipient. They also say they draw the line at copying material from current issues of journals that are widely available.

Williams & Wilkins officials say they resorted to the suit only after their efforts to discuss royalties had been consistently rebuffed by federal library officials. (A royalty of 2 cents a page is said to have been proposed.)

Federal officials say that administering a royalty system would drastically increase the cost of photocopying, which NLM now absorbs, and they question the propriety of a government agency's collecting royalties to benefit a commercial enterprise for the dissemination of scientific information which, in many cases, has been gained with federal research support.

The issue has complexities that have defeated congressional attempts at reform for at least a decade. What the courts must deal with is the dilemma created by technological advances in photocopying which make it harder than ever to ensure achievement of the dual purpose of the law—to protect the copyright holder and to promote science and the useful arts.—JOHN WALSH