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INTRODUCTION

References contained herein are to articles and other materials which discuss the issue of software patentability either exclusively, or at least as the main topic of interest. Articles devoted to analyzing other forms of protection for programs—copyright, trade secret, or contract—are generally omitted from this list. Further, only articles in the English language are included.

Each entry has been checked and double-checked to insure accuracy. Obscure references have been located and several unpublished works have been tracked down. Numerous authors were personally contacted to obtain the correct citations to their articles, or to references cited in their articles. Yet, despite all precautions, it is possible that there are errors and omissions in this listing. Because this issue will be supplemented on an annual basis, it is requested that any corrections or additions be sent to Michael D. Scott, Esq., c/o Smaltz & Neelley, 523 West Sixth Street, Suite 440, Los Angeles, California 90014. (If the reference is to a publication not generally available in university libraries, it would be of substantial assistance if a copy of the article, or the table of contents of the book or periodical containing the article, were included.)

ORGANIZATION

The entries in the Bibliography are subdivided into four sections. This was done to enable the user who is looking for specific types of materials, e.g., law review articles, newspaper articles, etc. to more quickly locate those references.

The first grouping contains references to all articles printed in legal publications. The second contains all “Notes” and “Comments” done by law students. The third collects all legal materials which do not fall...
within the first two categories. The last section contains references to non-legal materials, i.e., articles contained in electronics, computer or business journals, and in newspapers and magazines of general circulation.

LEGAL—ARTICLES


Bigelow, *Supreme Court Again Ducks Software Patentability Decision*,


Falk & Popper, *Computer Programs and Nonstatutory Subject Matter in Canada*, 4 R. Bigelow, Computer L. Serv. § 9-4, art. 2.


BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jacobs, Computer Technology (Hardware and Software): Some Legal Implications for Antitrust, Copyright and Patents, 1 Rutgers J. Computers & L. 50-69 (Fall 1970).
Kirby & Curphey, Drift Away from the "Vendible Product" Doctrine in Canada, 11 Indus. Prop. 213 (1972).


Lawlor, *Benson and Beyond*, in 3 R. Bigelow, *Computer L. Serv.* § 4-2, art. 3.


Spaeth, High Court Seen Likely to Reject Patents, 5 L. & Computer Tech. 50 (1972).


LEGAL—STUDENT WORKS


Comment, Computer Programs are Patentable, 1 Seton Hall L. Rev. 113 (1970).


Comment, Patents: Proposed Guidelines to Examination of Programs, 4 Tulsa L.J. 258 (1967).


Note, Patents—Patentability—A Process Performable on an Analog Computer Which Also Reads Upon a General Purpose Digital Computer Does Not Necessarily Fall Within the "Mental Steps" Exclusion and May Be Patentable If the Specificity Requirements of Section 112 Are Fulfilled, 48 Tex. L. Rev. 971 (1970).


LEGAL—Other


BIBLIOGRAPHY


Applicant Unwilling to Disclose Computer Program Must Show It's Within Skill of Art, 146 PAT., T.M. & COPYRIGHT J. (BNA), at A-3 (Sep. 27, 1973).
Attempts to Obtain Computer Program Patents, 141 U.S.P.Q. ADVANCE SHEETS, May 1964, at III & IV.


Supreme Court Called Upon Again to Determine Fate of Computer Programs, 354 PAT., T.M. & COPYRIGHT J. (BNA), at A-1, D-1 (Nov. 17, 1977).


Non-Legal


Banzhaf, Legal Protection for Computer Programs, 6 DATA PROCESSING MAGAZINE, July 1964, at 8.


Bigelow, *The Patentability of Software*, 5 Modern Data, June 1972, at 34.


Ferguson, *Software Inventor Challenges His Challenger’s Statements*, Computerworld, Apr. 16, 1969, at 8, col. 3.


Jacobs, Legal Protection for Computer Programs, 8 COMPUTER J. 290 (1966).


Jones, Programs and Software Should Be Patentable—Statement Submitted February 1, 1968, to the Senate Committee on Patents and Copyrights, 17 COMPUTERS & AUTOMATION, Mar. 1968, at 11.


Kurtz, Patents and Data Processing, 6 DATA PROCESSING MAGAZINE, Nov. 1964, at 9.


Leavitt, Computer Program Patented As An Apparatus, Computerworld, Oct. 9, 1974, at 1, col. 2.


Lundell, Supreme Court Rules Against Program Patent, Computerworld, Nov. 29, 1972, at 1, col. 3.


McOustra, Software: Copyright and Other Kinds of Control, 8 THE COMPUTER BULL. 96 (1964).


*MINISTRY INT'L TRADE & INDUS.*, *A Registration and Certification Type of System to Protect Computer Programs*, reprinted in 4 R. Bigelow, *Computer L. Serv.* § 9-4, art. 3.


*Appeal Court Upsets Ban on Granting Patents for Computer Programs*, BUS. WEEK, Nov. 30, 1968, at 46.
*First Patent is Issued for Software; Full Implications Are Not Yet Known*, Computerworld, June 19, 1968, at 1, col. 1.
*High Court Denies Computer Patent for Programming*, N.Y. Times, Nov. 21, 1972, at 1, col. 5.
Interest Grows in Pursuit of Software Patents and Copyrights, 12 Datamation, June 1966, at 85.
Mainframe Makers Hail High Court Rule, Electronic News, Nov. 27, 1972, at 28, col. 4.
The Prater & Wei Rehearing Ended As Many People Showed Concern, Computerworld, Mar. 19, 1969, at 1, col. 4.
Programmers Get the Nod, Bus. Week, Aug. 23, 1969, at 34.
Registration System Called Inadequate, Computerworld, Mar. 26, 1969, at 1, col. 1.
Rehearing is Set in Computer Case, N.Y. Times, Jan. 17, 1969, at 43, col. 3.
2nd 'Software' Patent Granted Despite Ban, Computerworld, Feb. 12, 1969, at 1, col. 3.
Software Classification Undertaken As Pilot Project, Computerworld, Nov. 5, 1969, at 2, col. 1.
Software Writing Called 5% Inspiration and 95% Perspiration by IBM Attorney, Computerworld, Aug. 6, 1969, at 7, col. 1.
Two Software Groups Unite in Legal Fight for Program Patents, Computerworld, Apr. 12, 1972, at 29, col. 2.
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