

Science alone can't really answer the question, What's a wild salmon? It's a pity, in Jenkins's view, that the debate over the future of Maine's salmon has to be conducted under the terms of the Endangered Species Act, which excludes consideration of anything but

science. As the Maine case shows, other concerns—about economic impact, local autonomy, and environmentalism—have a way of being covertly inserted into “scientific” arguments and further muddying the waters. Better to consider them openly.

## *Reproductive Tourism*

“Reproductive Tourism in Europe: Infertility and Human Rights” by Ruth Deech, in *Global Governance* (Oct. 2003), William S. Hein & Co., 1285 Main St., Buffalo, N.Y. 14209.

To the long list of conundrums caused by the rise of new biological technologies, add another: “reproductive tourism.” People who find their home country's rules on infertility treatments inconvenient, for example, are shopping around elsewhere for what they want. Does your national government bar you from choosing the sex of your baby? Maybe it's time for a little getaway to Rome, where the law won't stand in your way.

More serious problems are posed by the international trade in sperm. To reduce the risk of unknowing incest by offspring, for example, France allows sperm donors to “father” only five children. But Denmark allows 25 offspring from a single donor. If they import Danish sperm, the French must therefore accept the Danish risk level. Britain's sperm donors are anonymous, but women who conceive a child with donated Swedish sperm are told the biological father's identity.

Such problems are especially ticklish in Europe, where national laws and the emerging European Union law are full of potential conflicts, writes Deech, principal of St. Anne's College at Oxford University.

In Britain, for example, a young woman named Diane Blood, planning to conceive a child through artificial insemination, persuaded doctors to extract sperm from her comatose husband before he died. Under British law, the husband's lack of consent rendered her plan illegal. But Belgian law posed no such obstacle, and Mrs. Blood sought to export the sperm there. In the tangle of court cases that followed, British laws were weighed against European statutes limiting restrictions on trade among member nations and protecting the human rights of people such as the late Mr. Blood. In the end, the case was decided against Mrs. Blood on the narrow ground that exporting sperm merely to avoid national law was impermissible.

But the bigger issues won't go away, Deech warns, nor will the pressure driving “national standards toward the regional lowest common denominator.” International treaties setting standards in Europe and other regions could help, but “if regional arrangements are deemed unduly constraining, people can simply go farther afield.”

## *The High Price of Knowledge*

“The Promise and Peril of ‘Open Access’ ” by Lila Guterman, in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Jan. 30, 2004), 1255 23rd St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Think you spend a lot on magazines? Imagine if subscriptions cost you as much as some scientific journals cost university libraries. *Brain Research*, which is among the most expensive, costs more than \$21,000 per year; at least 19 journals are priced at more than \$10,000 yearly. Rising fees and budget cuts have caused some libraries to drop as

many as one-third of their subscriptions. But many journals are indispensable to scientists—a fact, some librarians complain, that corporate publishers often exploit in setting subscription rates.

Last fall, librarians spotted a potential savior: “open-access” journals that publish original, full-text academic articles at no cost on the

Web. But open access is not as “open” as it appears, and it raises a host of new questions for universities, libraries, and publishers.

The big question, reports Guterman, a *Chronicle* science writer, is, Who will pay the bills? Unlike traditional publications, open-access journals ask their authors to pay a publication fee of as much as \$1,500. But more often than not this money comes from universities—and university libraries—not the author. Eventually, some critics say, this could cost schools—especially big research institutions—more than journal subscriptions ever did.

Open-access journals are already seeking new sources of financial support. One of the first organizations to advocate open access, the Public Library of Science (PLOS), founded by Nobel laureate Harold Varmus, imitates public radio, inviting frequent readers to become “members” by pledging their support. Another journal is experimenting with modified open access, keeping some work private, but allowing

researchers who want their work “open” to pay an author fee (so far, only one in five authors has opted to pay).

For the time being, open access has complicated things for almost everyone. It seems to have allowed some libraries to negotiate with publishers for lower subscription rates, but libraries are now faced with paying author fees *and* maintaining expensive subscriptions. Researchers have shown interest in open-access journals, but many end up submitting elsewhere for fear that the journals may not last or that they lack enough prestige to help in the battle for tenure.

Yet in its first eight hours online last October, the inaugural edition of PLOS’s flagship journal, *PLoS Biology*, received a surprising 500,000 hits—and many supporters would suggest that the “movement” has not yet reached critical mass. Journal subscriptions will probably never be free, but even in its nascent state, open access is shaking up the \$3.5 billion journal publishing industry.

## ARTS & LETTERS

### *The Sweetest Sounds*

“Richard Rodgers: Enigma Variations” by Stefan Kanfer, in *City Journal* (Autumn 2003),  
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Richard Rodgers (1902–79) wrote some of the most melodic and inventive popular music of the 20th century, but nothing in his personality would have made you think him capable of that. The man who gave so much pleasure to others had little in his own life, and that remains the great puzzle about him. A lifelong hypochondriac, he was a dour and unhappy fellow, despite his great success and the riches it brought. He drank too much and was depressed too often. “No one in the [Rodgers] family (or out of it, for that matter) had ever seen the composer sit at the piano and play for sheer enjoyment,” writes Kanfer, a former editor of *Time* and the author of several novels and social histories. The piano was for business, the business was mostly Broadway, and “Broadway was his life.”

Some people are lucky in their friends. Rodgers was lucky in his collaborators. He found Lorenz Hart and Oscar Hammerstein II at key points in his career, and with the two

lyricists he ruled Broadway from the 1920s through the 1950s, fashioning songs that, on the basis of performances and record sales, are even today, Kanfer reports, the world’s most popular. The melodies still enchant, and the words delight (“Manhattan”), enthrall (“Oh, What a Beautiful Morning”), inspire (“You’ll Never Walk Alone”).

So Rodgers was a team player, but always the name *before* the conjunction. There was a Rodgers and Hart phase to his career and a Rodgers and Hammerstein phase (and a lesser phase with several other collaborators after Hammerstein’s death in 1960, including, just once, Stephen Sondheim). The first team gave the world smart, sassy, glittering, and bittersweet stuff, such as—in a single show, the 1937 *Babes in Arms*—“Where or When,” “My Funny Valentine,” “The Lady Is a Tramp,” and “I Wish I Were in Love Again.” For a single show of their own, *South Pacific* in 1949, the second team produced “Some