Photocopying future in doubt
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at 1.1 million "rapid-prints" are made on the ten five-cent SCM machines and on the ten copies on the Xerox that are open to the public.

How much of Microlab's photocopying is copyrighted material is anybody's guess, and the same is true of Graphic Arts which does let users make academic copying. According to Vice-Dean Wallace, Assistant Director of Graphic Arts, most academic copying handled by Graphic Arts is done at two major and two minor copycenters which churn out a total of roughly 9 million copies per year through three separate processes and an additional 10.6 million more on offset-type systems.

Graphic Arts does a total business of $500,000 per year. While no statistics exist on how many duplicates are made from copyrighted material, the four copy center supervisors estimate that 15 percent of their output consists of books, and another 25-35 percent concerns periodicals.

In addition to Graphic Arts and Microlab, nine departments maintain their own photocopying machines, each of which can churn out 30,000 copies overnight, according to Vice-President for Fiscal Relations Paul V. Cusick. These departments and centers -- Chemical Engineering, Biology, Nutrition and Food Science, Earth and Planetary Science, Research Lab for Electronics, the Center for Material Science and Engineering, Electrical Engineering, and the Center for International Studies rent their own machines to avoid waiting in line at Graphic Arts.

The rental of machines from Xerox by these departments is the largest item in the $750,000 total photocopying budget -- contracts with Xerox for renting, maintenance, and occasional purchase ran to $152,200 last year, with an additional $70,000 going to SCM, IBM, and 3M. In
terms of capacity, it is this independent copying sector which may be affected most by any increase in fees proposed by the publisher.

While Graphic Arts and Microlab run a largely break-even business requiring only small subsidies (their renting costs covered in their own budgets and are not included in the cost figures quoted above) the independent photocopying facilities are heavily subsidized by departmental budgets.

Several departments dropped their photocopying contracts after a budget freeze was imposed three years ago, and Cusick said that any extra photocopying costs "would have an effect" on the remaining nine departments' retention of their own machines.

While the departments claim that running their own machines is less expensive than using Graphic Arts, Cusick thinks that these departments are not including the full labor cost of using their own facilities. While there is no question that the machines still in departments perform a service for faculty, Cusick said that the machines were losing "towards the luxu-ruary side of the fence rather than towards austerity."

Beyond the problem of photocopying, MIT Library personnel see the bill as attacking libraries in general. Scott of Microlab said that most advanced technology explored by libraries, such as microfilm and computer storage of book-ab-stracts and article-summaries, are infringement of copyright. Scott said he had recommended to publishers last year that the publishing industry adopt these new methods for itself, but instead the publishers have chosen to "entrench and hope for a strict enforcement of the copy-right statute."

What college women are being pinned with.