

Published monthly  
Annual subscription:  
Sw.fr. 105.—  
Each monthly issue:  
Sw.fr. 12.—

# Copyright

17<sup>th</sup> year - No. 9  
**September 1981**

Monthly Review of the  
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

---

## Contents

### WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

- Second Continental Conference on Copyright (Buenos Aires, April 6 to 10, 1981) . . . . . 242

### NATIONAL LEGISLATION

- **Portugal.** Law No. 41/80. Protection Against the Unlawful Reproduction of Phonograms (of August 12, 1980) . . . . . 245
- **United States of America.** Public Law 96-517 (Copyright Law Amendment Regarding Computer Programs) (of December 12, 1980) . . . . . 247

### CORRESPONDENCE

- Letter from Czechoslovakia (**Karel Knap** and **Jiří Kordač**) . . . . . 248

### BOOK REVIEWS

- Copyright Revision Studies (Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada) . . . . . 262
- Copyright: Intellectual Property in the Information Age (**Edward W. Ploman** and **L. Clark Hamilton**) . . . . . 263

- CALENDAR OF MEETINGS . . . . . 264

---

© WIPO 1981

Any reproduction of official notes or reports, articles and translations of laws or agreements, published in this review, is authorized only with the prior consent of WIPO.

ISSN 0010-8626

---

## World Intellectual Property Organization

### Second Continental Conference on Copyright

(Buenos Aires, April 6 to 10, 1981)

From April 6 to 10, 1981, the Second Continental Conference on Copyright, organized by the Inter-American Copyright Institute and its Argentine Center, jointly with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), was held in Buenos Aires, continuing the work of the First Continental Conference on Copyright, organized in São Paulo, Brazil, in 1977.\*

This Conference, which was declared of national interest by a Decree of the Argentine Government, took place under the auspices of the Ministry of Justice, the Secretariat of State for Culture and the National Arts Fund. The meetings were held in the Law and Social Sciences Faculty of the University of Belgrano. More than 100 specialists from the following countries participated in the work: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela. WIPO was represented by Mr. Claude Masouyé, Director of the Public Information and Copyright Department, assisted by three experts invited by WIPO: Mr. Arcadio Plazas, a lawyer of Bogotá, Colombia, Mr. Carlos Arguedas, Parliamentary Adviser of the Legislative Assembly in San José, Costa Rica, and Mrs. Dina Herrera, Registrar at the Intellectual Property Registry in Santiago, Chile.

In addition, the Argentine Center of the IIDA had organized its first National Congress on Copyright, which held some meetings in common with the Continental Conference.

The opening ceremony took place in the presence of Mr. Daireaux, Under-Secretary of State for Justice, Mr. Duramoña y Vildia, Under-Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, Mr. Molmenti, Dean of the Private Law Institute of the University of Belgrano, Mr. Allende, Legal Adviser of the Ministry of Justice, Mr. Mendez Tronque, Director General of Copyright, and many other Argentine figures.

The deliberations were presided over by Professor Antonio Chaves, professor at the Law Faculty of São Paulo University and President of the Inter-American Copyright Institute (IIDA). The Secretariat was

provided by Mr. Carlos Villalba and Mr. Miguel Angel Emery, President and Secretary General, respectively, of the Argentine Center of the IIDA.

The agenda of the Conference, whose general theme was "civil and criminal offenses," contained the following points:

1. Plagiarism. False attribution of authorship of works (artistic, literary, dramatic, musical, scientific, educational, architectural, etc.). Forgery of works of art.
2. Infringement of the right of reproduction. Unauthorized total or partial reproduction of works as well as of the material carriers of intellectual works of whatever type, for example: books, works of art and posters, phonograms, copies of films, fixations of audiovisual works for television, etc. Reprography.
3. Reproduction of copies in excess of contractual limits (with regard to number, geographical area, and other limitations imposed in the original authorization). Importation of copies.
4. Infringement of rights of representation, recitation, public performance, radio or television broadcasting or communication to the public by any medium (by failing to obtain authorization or exceeding contractual limits).
5. Forgery and other alterations in detailed statements, liquidations, settlements of royalties in theatrical performances, editions of books, sub-editions, contracts for books and cinema performers, contracts for the distribution of books, cinematographic works and audiovisual works fixed for television.
6. Compensation as a consequence of civil and penal offenses. Methods of calculating damages. Actual damage, loss of profit and moral damage. Enrichment without cause.
7. Preventive measures.
8. Unfair competition and the upsetting of rights granted. Violation of exclusive rights of commercial representation and distribution.

\* See *Copyright*, 1977, p. 287.

A number of reports were submitted on these subjects by various Latin American specialists, as was an account of international relations in this subject area by the representative of the Director General of WIPO. Three working committees con-

tinued with discussions and drew up draft conclusions and recommendations. The text of these, which was adopted at a plenary meeting at the end of the Conference, is reproduced below.

#### **Recommendations Concerning the Classification of Punishable Acts and the Legislative Treatment of the Repression of Unlawful Practices**

1. It is recommended that action be taken to promote the study of the classification of punishable acts in relation to copyright and the adoption of such as are already recognized in legislative practice (for instance, plagiarism and counterfeiting (unlawful reproduction)).

2. It is considered necessary to study and promote the enactment of specific provisions and to put into operation machinery for the defense of copyright in the face of modern communication processes, especially reprography, computers, advertising and satellite communications.

3. It is considered necessary that national legislation adopt penal provisions that provide for the inclusion of intellectual works in data storage systems, and their subsequent use, without authorization for such storage or for the provision of the service having been obtained from the copyright owners concerned.

4. It is recommended that an effort be made to adapt the penal system so that acts affecting the two characteristic and fundamental aspects of copyright, namely the moral aspect and the economic aspect, are punished by specific provisions.

It is further recommended that all prior formal requirements for the grant of criminal and civil protection, such as

the requirement of registration of the intellectual work as a means of establishing rights, be removed.

5. It is recommended that bodies and enterprises that reproduce phonograms or videograms and produce copies for third parties render such services only to persons who provide proof that they are the owners of the copyright and/or of the neighboring rights or that they are authorized by such owners to seek that service, this being the sole means of avoiding their liability for participation in the perpetration of the unlawful act.

6. It is recommended that the national legislation concerned bring provisions into effect that complement the rule on seizure provided for in the Berne Convention, notably with respect to procedure and competence, in such a way that the application of actions to repress the fraudulent reproduction of copies is made effective.

7. It is recommended that administrative regulations be brought into effect so that officials of public bodies who are in any way involved in authorizing the dissemination or showing, by any means, of intellectual works are obliged to require that proof be duly provided of the authorization granted by the actual owners of the copyright and neighboring rights.

#### **Conclusions and Legislative Recommendations Concerning Monetary Indemnification as a Consequence of the Commission of Unlawful Acts Against Copyright and Neighboring and Associated Rights**

1. Monetary indemnification for unlawful acts concerning the protection of copyright or rights associated with or neighboring on copyright must be calculated according to the general principles in force governing legal redress for such acts, and especially that which embodies the principle of "total indemnification."

2. Such indemnification should specifically and separately cover:

- (a) a sufficient amount to restore that of which the rights owner or his successor in title was deprived;
- (b) a sufficient amount to cause that which was unlawfully obtained by the violator to revert to the property of the rights owner or his successor in title, with a minimum not lower than the optimum remuneration obtained under contracts lawfully entered into and implemented;
- (c) the amount necessary to make good the violation of the moral rights of the rights owner or his successor in title.

3. Those who in any way have been involved in the perpetration of the unlawful acts and also those who have derived an economic benefit from use of the protected immaterial property are jointly responsible for the amounts fixed.

4. In the specific cases where this is appropriate, the number of infringing copies — whether they have been disseminated or not — should be taken into account, and the amounts of indemnification should be graduated according to that number. If there is no definite number of copies, the criterion should be the maximum number agreed under the contract. The principles set forth above should, except where express legal provisions govern the institution specifically, apply to the unlawful appropriation of the creative elements that form part of and characterize an advertising campaign.

5. The legislators of the continent concerned should follow the trend of North American law according to which any person found responsible for illegal copying of a work is punished with a fine for each unlawfully reproduced copy, without prejudice to a personal penalty and indemnification for damages that might be appropriate.

The machinery, materials or implements and the unlawfully reproduced copies that have been confiscated by virtue of a measure ordered in the course of a civil or criminal proceeding brought against those who reproduced copies of a work without the authorization of the owners of rights therein should be kept at the disposal of the injured parties until the completion of the proceeding, and the final sentence should give them the option of accepting or not accepting those elements as part of the redress for the unlawful act.

### Recommendations Concerning Procedural Provisions and Especially Preventive Measures

1. It is recommended that national legislators incorporate in their procedural systems administrative and police provisions prior to judicial action against unlawful reproductions and communications of intellectual works, and that to that end specialized sections be created within police bodies for that type of action.

2. It is recommended that the governments of countries that do not include one in their legislation be encouraged to enact a procedural provision which, in cases of civil or criminal offenses that affect copyright or rights associated with or neighboring on copyright, allows the courts to order the confiscation of unlawfully produced copies.

3. In order that this measure may be ordered at the outset of a proceeding, it is further recommended that the provision involve the intervention of one or more experts, at the court's discretion, in the confiscation procedure, for confirmation, by immediate examination of the objects to be confiscated, that they do indeed constitute an unlawful reproduction of a protected work.

4. It is recommended:

(1) That the domestic legislation of States introduce specific preventive measures for copyright and rights neighboring on and associated with its exercise, specifying the procedures appropriate to the various basic situations with regard to particular methods of using intellectual works, without prejudice to the application of the measures provided for in the procedural laws of criminal character.

(2) That the domestic legislation of States, in addition to specific measures, provide for the grant to the courts of the right to order such generic preventive measures as the situation dictates where no specific measure exists in the law that meets the need to protect the subject matter at issue, due account being taken of the fact that the constant improvement of technical processes contributes to the more ready perpetration of offenses against copyright and rights neighboring on and associated with its exercise.

(3) That the domestic legislation of States provide for the following basic preventive measures:

- (a) the seizure or confiscation of objects by which the offense is committed;
- (b) the making of an inventory and description and the confiscation of one of the objects at issue, where not possible on account of its specific characteristics, may be replaced by photographs of the object from all the angles necessary for adequate identification, without prejudice to the assistance of experts during the implementation of the measure;
- (c) official notice to be served on the person who has those objects in his possession calling upon him to state: (i) the name and address of the person who entrusted, sold or delivered them to him and the date

on which this occurred, being evidenced by the order or invoice concerned; the number of units manufactured or sold and their price, evidenced by the invoice or sales ticket concerned; the identity of the persons to whom the objects concerned were sold or delivered; the official notice should be served with the warning that failure to provide the information specified, or the lack of business documents relating to the infringing objects, will give cause to presume that their possessor is party to the offense;

- (d) suspension of the show, exhibition or broadcast;
- (e) seizure of the proceeds collected;
- (f) an official request to show the written authorization of the author or of his successors in title or representatives;
- (g) the report of the use of the recording of all or part of the show or broadcast;
- (h) an official request to discontinue preventively the performance of the acts that gave rise to the action.

(4) That it be possible for the reports mentioned to be requested and made before a judicial or administrative authority.

(5) That provision be made in the domestic legislation of States, as a requirement for the grant of the authorization of the administrative authority to be considered for the holding of musical or theatrical shows, dance gatherings, etc., or for the grant of credit, subsidies, or benefits of whatever nature, for the submission of the written document evidencing the prior authorization of the author.

(6) That, in connection with the preventive measures in the field of copyright and rights neighboring on and associated with its exercise, and taking due account of the ease with which evidence of offenses may be removed and of the ephemeral nature of certain uses such as representation, recitation, musical performance and broadcasting, the domestic legislation of States introduce the presumption of risk in any delay; likewise that the genuineness of the right be evaluated according to a broad criterion in view of the inherent difficulties of the subject matter and the difficulty of conclusively proving authorship or the status of successor in title to the author, considering the use of works and performances that is constantly made beyond national frontiers, which is in keeping with their inherent vocation of universal dissemination.

(7) With regard to the guarantee or security that has to be put up as a condition for the grant of preventive measures, that the domestic legislation of States take into account that, when societies of authors or performers or owners of rights associated with the exercise of copyright, in their capacity as collecting societies, apply for such measures, they should not be required to put up guarantees by virtue of their presumed solvency.

### Recommendations to the IIDA and to the Argentine Center of the IIDA

1. It is recommended that the IIDA, through its international or local bodies or its associates, continue to impress upon all Latin American countries that are not party to the Convention establishing the Berne Union that they should accede to it.

2. The Conference declares its approval of the holding of the Piracy Forum, organized by WIPO, which took place in Geneva from March 25 to 27, 1981.

3. It is recommended that emphasis be placed on the need for all American countries that are not party to the

1971 Phonograms Convention to accede to it and to protect authors, performers and producers of phonograms against the unlawful duplication of their phonograms, by granting them the right to bring public and private action against such offenses, with severe penalties appropriate to the seriousness of the problem.

4. The Second Continental Conference on Copyright recommends to the Executive Council of the IIDA that, through its competent bodies, it revise its statutes in order to add academic attendance and the propagation of the dis-

cipline of unfair competition and other industrial property institutions, in so far as they concern copyright, to the objectives of the Institute.

5. It is recommended that domestic legislation introduce the compulsory mention, where there are contractual restrictions on the circulation of copies of an intellectual work in certain geographical areas, of the area in which the copies concerned may lawfully be circulated, which mention should be made in print and in a visible form and place. Also, until such time as legal systems have been adopted, it is recommended that authors' societies and bodies that represent the managers concerned be invited to enter into contracts of professional character for the purpose of the compulsory inclusion of the appropriate notice by way of contractual clauses in the contracts concerned, thereby giving the subject matter the character of a business practice in current use.

6. It is recommended that a communication be sent to WIPO, commending it for the publication of the Copyright Glossary, and that experts be advised to use it in order to avoid disagreements on matters of terminology.

7. The Conference's congratulations are addressed to the Government of the Republic of Brazil for the enactment of Criminal Law No. 6895, ensuring effective repression of phonographic piracy.

8. Action should be taken to ensure that those concerned effect registration of their works in all cases, as a means of providing proof in the case of offenses.

9. It is suggested that the next Continental Conference of the IIDA should deal with the subject "modern communication processes and copyright," in order that the problems existing in broadcasting, television, computers, satellites and advertising, among others, may be discussed.

10. It is recommended that sufficient exposure be given to the concept whereby copies reproduced in a country where the work is not protected or is in the public domain become unlawful on being introduced into a country where the work does enjoy protection, so that the corresponding civil and criminal actions can be instituted there, as can preventive measures to forestall the distribution of such copies.

11. It is recommended that the idea be promoted of standardizing terms of copyright protection in America, extending their duration to the longest currently existing.

12. It is further recommended that steps should be taken to promote the inclusion in any graphic material of a notice concerning the limitations on lawful reprography, with a mention of the penal provisions applicable to infringers.

13. The Argentine Center of the IIDA is requested to negotiate with the Ministry of Justice of the National Executive of the Argentine Republic for the appointment of an expert commission to draw up a report on accumulated experience of the practice of reprography in the country and in foreign countries that have modernized their legislation, including recommendations formulated at the international level, and to draft legislation on the subject.

#### Recommendations Concerning the Teaching of Copyright

1. It is suggested that action be taken to promote the creation of copyright departments and the holding of copyright courses in all the law faculties of America.

2. Action should further be taken to hold special courses on the fundamental elements of copyright, and to draw up

and distribute information material that is easy to read and understand at secondary and undergraduate (university or otherwise) levels, for the use of staff engaged in reprographic work and other types of bulk data supply, in libraries and documentation and information centers.

## National Legislation

### PORTUGAL

#### Law No. 41/80

#### Protection Against the Unlawful Reproduction of Phonograms

(of August 12, 1980) \*

*Article 1.* For the purposes of this Law,

(a) "phonogram" means the exclusively aural fixation of sounds of a performance or of other sounds;

(b) "producer of phonograms" means the person who, or the legal entity which, first fixes the sounds of a performance or any other sounds;

(c) "fixation" means the embodiment of sounds in a material form sufficiently permanent or stable to permit them to be heard, reproduced

\* Published in the *Diario da Republica*, 1<sup>a</sup> série, No. 185, of August 12, 1980. — WIPO translation.

or otherwise communicated during a period of more than transitory duration;

- (d) "duplicate" means an article which contains sounds taken directly or indirectly from a phonogram and which embodies all or a quantitative or qualitative part of the sounds fixed in that phonogram;
- (e) "distribution or distribution to the public" means the act by which duplicates of a phonogram are offered, directly or indirectly, to the general public or any section thereof;
- (f) "publication" means the offering of duplicates of a phonogram to the public in reasonable quantity;
- (g) "reproduction" means the making of a duplicate or duplicates of a fixation or a quantitatively or qualitatively significant part of that fixation.

*Article 2.* The following acts shall require the authorization of the producer of the phonogram or of the exclusive licensee:

- (a) reproduction made with a view to distributing duplicates to the public;
- (b) importing duplicates for the same purpose;
- (c) distribution of duplicates to the public.

*Article 3.* (1) Article 2 shall not apply where the acts referred to are done for the purpose of:

- (a) private use, that is to say the making of a single duplicate intended for the personal use of the person making it;
- (b) reporting by the information media of current events, provided that only short excerpts of a phonogram be used;
- (c) quotations taking the form of short excerpts of a phonogram, provided that such quotations be justified by the sole purpose of information or criticism;
- (d) use solely for the purposes of teaching or scientific research.

(2) Where the phonogram has been produced specifically for the purposes of teaching, the authorization of the producer under Article 2 shall be required.

*Article 4.* The authorization provided for in Article 2 shall be required for the acts referred to that take place within a period of fifty years as from the end of the year of first publication of the phonogram.

*Article 5.* (1) Subject to paragraph (3) of this Article, it shall be a condition of protection of producers of phonograms under this Law that all the authorized duplicates of the phonogram distributed to the public or their containers bear a notice consist-

ing of the symbol © (letter P within a circle) accompanied by the year date of the first publication, placed in such a manner as to give reasonable notice of claim of protection.

(2) Where the duplicates or their containers do not identify the producer, his representative or his exclusive licensee, by carrying his name, trademark or other appropriate designation, the notice referred to in the preceding paragraph shall also include such identification.

(3) The condition of protection laid down by this Article shall apply only to those duplicates of any fixations distributed to the public ninety days after the entry into force of this Law.

*Article 6.* (1) This Law shall apply in each case where the first fixation, first publication or simultaneous publication takes place in Portugal or where the producer is a Portuguese national.

(2) Simultaneous publication shall mean publication taking place in the country within a period of thirty days from the original publication.

*Article 7.* (1) Anyone who, without the authorization of the producer, reproduces a phonogram with a view to distributing duplicates to the public or who imports unauthorized duplicates for such purposes, or who distributes unauthorized duplicates to the public, shall be liable to imprisonment of up to one year and a fine of between 5,000 and 50,000 escudos, which may be doubled for a second or further offense, without prejudice to any greater sanction under general law and shall also have civil liability towards the producer or his representative, or his exclusive licensee, for any damages he has caused.

(2) Accomplices and receivers shall also be punished but shall be entitled to attenuating circumstances under the general provisions of criminal law.

*Article 8.* (1) Unauthorized duplicates and their containers shall be seized as shall the material, machines and other instruments or documents suspected of having been used or intended to commit the infringement.

(2) A decision on what shall be done with the objects seized shall not be taken until the final sentence is given, irrespective of any other prior petition on the part of the accused person or of any other person.

(3) The unauthorized duplicates seized and their containers, together with the material, machines, apparatus and other instruments or documents seized which, under the final sentence, prove to be intended or used for the infringement shall be deemed lost to

the benefit of the State and the duplicates shall be destroyed.

(4) The seizure and the destruction referred to in the preceding paragraphs shall not give any entitlement to compensation.

(5) In cases of flagrant delict, all police authorities shall be competent to effect seizure, particularly the judicial police, the public safety police, the republican national guard and the fiscal guard.

*Article 9.* The protection laid down by this Law shall in no way affect the protection provided by the legislation on unfair competition nor that afforded to the rights of authors in their literary, musical or artistic works fixed on a phonogram, or the rights of performers who performed such works.

*Article 10.* This Law shall enter into force on the day of its publication.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### Public Law 96-517

(of December 12, 1980)

#### (Copyright Law Amendment Regarding Computer Programs)

*Section 10(a).* Section 101 of title 17<sup>1</sup> of the United States Code is amended to add at the end thereof the following new language:

“A ‘computer program’ is a set of statements or instructions to be used directly or indirectly in a computer in order to bring about a certain result.”

(b) Section 117 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

**“§ 117. Limitations on exclusive rights: Computer programs**

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 106, it is not an infringement for the owner of a copy of a computer program to make or authorize the making of another copy or adaptation of that computer program provided:

- (1) that such a new copy or adaptation is created as an essential step in the utilization of the computer program in conjunction with a machine and that it is used in no other manner, or
- (2) that such new copy or adaptation is for archival purposes only and that all archival copies are destroyed in the event that continued possession of the computer program should cease to be rightful.

Any exact copies prepared in accordance with the provisions of this section may be leased, sold, or otherwise transferred, along with the copy from which such copies were prepared, only as part of the lease, sale, or other transfer of all rights in the program. Adaptations so prepared may be transferred only with the authorization of the copyright owner.”

<sup>1</sup> See *Copyright, 1977*, pp. 151 *et seq.*

## Correspondence

### Letter from Czechoslovakia

Karel KNAP \* and Jiří KORDAČ \*\*



























## Book Reviews

**Copyright Revision Studies.** Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada, Ottawa, 1980.

A series of studies, prepared for the Research and International Affairs Branch, Bureau of Corporate Affairs, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada, was started during the last year. The studies were initiated to provide a better understanding of some important problems and issues involved in the revision of the Canadian Copyright Act. The analysis and conclusions of these studies are those of the authors themselves and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Corporate Affairs.

The following three studies appeared in 1980:

*Copyright Obligations for Cable Television: Pros and Cons*, by S.J. Liebowitz;

*The Mechanical Reproduction of Musical Works in Canada*, by Mike Berthiaume and Jim Keon;

*A Performing Right for Sound Recordings: An Analysis*, by Jim Keon.

In the first study, the author finds that, contrary to the widely-held belief that Community Antenna Television (CATV), or cable operators, decrease advertising revenues of over-the-air broadcasters, they in fact help to increase such revenues. For this reason, according to him, there is no

economic justification for imposing copyright payments on cable operators. He concludes by stating that, if cable operators should be required to pay copyright fees, then other arguments for such payment must be presented.

The major conclusions of the second study include the following:

- (a) a compulsory licensing system should be maintained;
- (b) literary, dramatic and audio-video works incorporating musical works should not be subject to the compulsory license;
- (c) the calculation of the rate should be on a per tune basis and the rate itself should be amended to reflect current industry practice in Canada;
- (d) a system for providing for increases in the rate is recommended;
- (e) a scheme for directly funding Canadian composers and lyricists in addition to the rewards provided in the Copyright Act is put forth.

In the third study it is stated that a performing right for sound recordings would not only be unwarranted but that it would have a net negative effect on some of the major participants in the recording industry in Canada, namely composers, publishers and the small independent producers. Moreover, by establishing such a right only for Canadian recordings of Canadian record producers, as suggested in an earlier study, Canada would violate "at least the spirit if not the legal obligations" under the international conventions to which it is a party.

As can be seen from this summarized reference to the essential conclusions reached, the answers given to some topical questions are not always in harmony with the tendencies prevailing in other countries or at the international level. Nevertheless, the reading of the above-mentioned studies is certainly of interest to copyright experts, especially in the countries where a revision of the existing copyright law is being or going to be undertaken.

**Copyright: Intellectual Property in the Information Age**, by Edward W. Ploman and L. Clark Hamilton. One volume of VIII-248 pages. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston and Henley, 1980.

According to the introduction to this book, copyright is expected to provide answers to the following two questions:

How can intellectual creativity best be promoted? How is the livelihood of the author and artist best ensured and how is he integrated into social and economic life? Different societies have given different answers to these questions and "there is nothing universal about copyright."

The authors are of the opinion that the reasons for the current difficulties in intellectual property rights are many and varied; they include the impact of new technology and new methods for the production, duplication, storage and dissemination of information and cultural materials. The pressure on the traditional concepts is also shown in the need to adopt rules to cover an increasing number of special cases (archives, official documents, anonymous works such as folklore, public lending right, etc.).

In one of the central chapters, the "outer limits" of copyright are explored in detail, including the "fair use" doctrine and its application in practice. In this connection, it is stated that many analysts (and probably the authors of the book themselves) believe that the system of obligatory permission of the author is out-of-date, except in some particular obvious situations (books, performance in theaters). After having mentioned the compulsory or legal licenses and the generalized use of collecting societies as possible means of replacing the exercise of exclusive rights according to the traditional patterns, the authors emphasize that copyright is only one of the means for protecting the economic interests of the author and that there are other means such as public subsidies, prizes, funds, taxes on hardware, salaries and patronage. It is, however, regrettable that they did not examine more closely various implications of such solutions, including for instance their effect on the moral rights and the freedom of literary and artistic creation.

A chapter is devoted to international agreements and structures; it contains summarized information on practically all the existing conventions in the field of copyright and neighboring rights, including the Berne Convention in general and the special provisions in favor of developing countries adopted at the latest revision conference in Paris in 1971. As far as the international organizations are concerned, the authors consider that, contrary to the general practice in the context of the United Nations and its agencies, where nongovernmental entities play a minor role, the situation is different where copyright is concerned, particularly in the context of WIPO. M. S.

## Calendar

### WIPO Meetings

(Not all WIPO meetings are listed. Dates are subject to possible change.)

#### 1981

**September 24 and 25 (Nairobi) — Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol — Diplomatic Conference**

**September 28 to October 24 (Nairobi) — Revision of the Paris Convention — Diplomatic Conference**

**October 14 to 16 (Bogotá) — Committee of Experts on Means of Implementation of Model Provisions for National Laws on Intellectual Property Aspects of the Protection of Expressions of Folklore in the Latin-American and Caribbean States (convened jointly with Unesco)**

**October 19 to 23 (Kingston) — Regional Seminar on Copyright for English-speaking Caribbean States (convened jointly with Unesco)**

**November 4 to 6 (Belgrade) — International Conference — Inventive Activity as a Factor for Development of Technology in the Developing Countries** (organized by the Yugoslav Association of Innovators and Authors of Technical Improvements with the assistance of WIPO)

**November 9 to 13 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee for Patent Information (PCPI) and PCT Committee for Technical Cooperation**

**November 11 to 13 (Geneva) — Rome Convention — Intergovernmental Committee** (convened jointly with ILO and Unesco)

**November 16 to 24 (Geneva) — Governing Bodies (WIPO General Assembly, Conference and Coordination Committee, Assemblies of the Paris, Madrid, Hague, Nice, Lisbon, Locarno, IPC, PCT, Budapest, TRT and Berne Unions; Conferences of Representatives of the Paris, Hague, Nice and Berne Unions; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions; Committee of Directors of the Madrid Union; Council of the Lisbon Union)**

**November 26 to 28 (New Delhi) — Regional Seminar on Copyright for Asian and Pacific States** (convened jointly with Unesco)

**November 30 to December 7 (New Delhi) — Berne Union — Executive Committee — Extraordinary Session** (sitting together, for the discussion of certain items, with the Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention)

**December 7 to 11 (Geneva) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Committee of Experts**

## 1982

**February 22 to 24 (Colombo) — Symposium on the Use and Usefulness of Trademarks in the Countries of the Asian and Pacific Region**

**September 27 to October 5 (Geneva) — Governing Bodies (WIPO Coordination Committee; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions)**

## UPOV Meetings

### 1981

**October 6 to 8 (Antibes) — Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants**

**October 12 to 14 (Geneva) — Administrative and Legal Committee**

**October 14 to 16 (Geneva) — Technical Committee**

**November 9 (Geneva) — Consultative Committee**

**November 10 (Geneva) — 1981 Symposium**

**November 10 to 12 (Geneva) — Council**

## Other Meetings in the Field of Copyright and/or Neighboring Rights

### Non-Governmental Organizations

#### 1981

**Internationale Gesellschaft für Urheberrecht (INTERGU)**

Congress — September 21 to 25 (Toronto)

**International Federation of Actors (FIA)**

Executive Committee — September 23 to 25 (Copenhagen)

#### 1982

**International Literary and Artistic Association (ALAD)**

Study Session — April 26 to 30 (Amsterdam)