

Brief of Minutes, Association of Research Libraries, July 6-7, 1951, Chicago

The 37th meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held in Burton-Judson Courts, University of Chicago Campus, beginning on Friday, July 6 and continuing through Saturday, July 7.

FIRST SESSION

Farmington Plan

Mr. Metcalf reviewed briefly the history of the expansion of the Farmington Plan until it had now come to embrace all of western Europe, except Great Britain and Ireland, and also four Latin American countries and Australia.

He then introduced a considerable discussion of the difficult problem of coverage and observed that some attempts, notably at the University of Pennsylvania and at the Library of Congress, had been made through a study of receipts to determine how nearly complete coverage has been. He spoke particularly of the more thorough study which is now being made of receipts from Switzerland for the year 1949 by Professor Reuben Peiss of the University of California School of Librarianship and a group of collaborators. It is hoped that the results of the Peiss study will be available this autumn. Some dissatisfaction was expressed as to current coverage, notably with respect to France. Mr. Metcalf acknowledged that there were grounds for dissatisfaction respecting French coverage, but he said that the Bibliothèque Nationale had now agreed to supply us with a checked copy of the *Bibliographie de la France* which would show exactly what had been sent and so prepare the way for any necessary correction.

A tabulation of costs of Farmington receipts distributed by Mr. Williams showed that the total for 1950 (6,123 pieces) had been \$12,512. A question was raised as to whether costs had not been considerably less than originally anticipated; but Mr. Metcalf pointed out that France and Germany were

not included in Mr. Williams' tabulation and expressed the view that costs were running about as forecast and expected; he thought the cost of 1951 receipts would be about \$25,000. There was no doubt in his mind that, in spite of difficulties, the Plan was proving very much worth while.

The differing attitudes of libraries participating in the Farmington Plan were discussed at some length. It was pointed out that some welcomed the Plan as offering an opportunity to build strong collections in chosen fields whereas others accepted the Plan with little satisfaction as a kind of national (not a local) obligation or responsibility. So far as Minnesota was concerned Mr. McDiarmid observed that its receipts under the Plan (Scandinavian history and literature) consisted of materials which would have been acquired in any case in the carrying out of the library's local responsibility. He said that his acquisitions staff felt that they could have done almost as good a job of coverage without Farmington and that they could have avoided a certain amount of duplication and confusion which they had experienced under the Plan. Mr. Metcalf said that if all subjects were being covered as well by all Farmington libraries as, for instance, medicine was by Army Medical Library and Scandinavian history and literature were by Minnesota, he would be quite willing to give up the Plan and rely exclusively on the efforts of individual libraries. Mr. McDiarmid wondered whether it might be practicable to permit individual libraries to accept responsibility for complete coverage of subjects of this sort and then to have full coverage for all remaining fields sent to the Library of Congress.

Mr. Metcalf then directed the discussion to the problem of a simplification of Farmington classification. He suggested that it might be possible to divide all publications in "minor languages," without regard to fields, among a

half dozen libraries; or it might be possible to concentrate all fields into about 50 classes and assign them among some 25 of our largest libraries; or, it might be possible to be even more drastic and assign all fields to the Library of Congress, to certain regional libraries, and to a few other places. Mr. Babb said it would appear from the Williams' tabulation that seven major libraries account for about half of the total acquisitions under the Plan. Mr. Metcalf said that twenty libraries are receiving about 85% of the total. Mr. David suggested that these twenty libraries might be reimbursed or subsidized for acquiring the remaining 15% and that the other libraries in the Plan might then be permitted to drop out. Mr. Warner Rice said that it would be easier for some libraries (presumably in state institutions) to contribute services than to pay a direct subsidy.

On the basis of the foregoing discussion of classification, Mr. Metcalf said that he felt that he could now go ahead and prepare a simplified scheme of classification, starting from libraries rather than from subjects. This he undertook to do; and he said he hoped that he might get the Library of Congress or regional libraries to take over the 15% or so which might be left over after most of the Farmington fields had been assigned to some twenty libraries. Mr. Lacy warned that in any such simplification of the Plan, it should be kept in mind that a copy of a book in the Library of Congress is not an adequate substitute for a copy in a library specializing in the subject field.

The discussion then turned to the acquisition of serials. Mr. Metcalf recalled that Farmington agents have been requested to supply sample copies of all new periodicals as they appear, and he passed around a selection of samples of such periodicals which had been turned down by libraries collecting in the pertinent field as not acceptable. Surprise was expressed at the apparently excellent quality of some of the periodicals which had been rejected. It was agreed that a list of the rejections should be circulated in order to determine definitely which ones were not coming into the country, and that these should then be evaluated.

Questions were raised about the possibility of reduced book funds and the effect of such reductions on Farmington participation.

Seven libraries reported cuts, but twelve others reported increases.

The suggested selection of Farmington material from trade bibliographies in this country rather than by dealers abroad, which had been under discussion at the last meeting, was again brought forward. Mr. Metcalf acknowledged that he was at a loss as to how this plan might be carried out and who would undertake the checking. Mr. Williams felt that the Peiss report might give guidance with respect to such a plan. It was voted to delay action on this matter until the next meeting of the Association.

SECOND SESSION

The Use of Manuscripts by Visiting Scholars

Mr. James T. Babb, chairman of the committee on this subject, presented a report which had been circulated to the membership in advance of the meeting.

Briefly, the report dealt with general policy (acquisitions, preservation, and use), reading room rules, freedom of access, and rights of publication. Mr. Babb held that the report was a middle-of-the-road statement, leaning somewhat to the liberal side. He said that it did not attempt to answer all the questions and that it was offered as a general policy guide, not as a code to be meticulously followed in all cases.

There was some discussion of the dangers of supplying film copy of manuscripts and the possibility of loss of control thereby. Mr. Babb pointed out that all films supplied should bear at the beginning and at the end a statement that permission must be asked prior to publication of the material contained therein.

Mr. Babb drew attention to the two separate rights that are involved in the publication of manuscript material, namely the common law literary proprietorship which belongs to the author, his heirs, and assigns and the physical ownership of the manuscript. Mr. David observed that if we are not to turn illiberal in matters of this sort, considerable reliance must be placed on the ordinary moral code which is usually pretty well respected by scholars, and that it ought not to be necessary to exact a lot of special promises not to reproduce without permission—promises which are afterwards difficult to administer.

It was finally moved and duly voted that the Association approve the report as submitted and that it be recommended to member libraries for guidance in drawing up their own codes, as a means of promoting greater uniformity of practice. At Mr. Babb's request, authorization was given for the report to be published at an early date, presumably in *College and Research Libraries*.¹

Library Privileges and Fees

Mr. Metcalf, chairman of the committee, opened the discussion by reporting an increase from \$5.00 to \$10.00 in fees at Harvard for the use of the library by local outsiders and by visiting scholars. No charge is made for the use of catalogues and reference works on the open shelves. There is also a free two-week courtesy period for visitors. Mr. White reported that Columbia's fee is now \$20.00 per semester and serves also as a screening device.

There was considerable discussion of the disadvantages of such fee systems, namely bad publicity, restrictions on scholarship, attitude of donors, etc. On the other hand Mr. Boyd noted that local communities, such as Princeton, have often seriously neglected their own public libraries (libraries which they could well afford to support adequately) simply because they had a generous university library on which to draw.

Mr. David pointed out that uniformity of charges would be extremely difficult to establish because of differences existing between one institution and another. There were at Pennsylvania, for example, legal obstacles in the way of imposing fees.

Publication and Distribution of Dissertations

Mr. Ellsworth, chairman of the committee on this subject, presented a report which had been circulated to the membership in advance. The report detailed the need for more uniform university and library procedure to make dissertations available to scholars, and for a more complete and expeditious bibliographical recording of dissertations. Specific recommendations were, briefly and in part, as follows:

(1) that ARL endeavor to persuade universities offering the Doctor's degree to duplicate doctoral dissertations by one of several

¹ Included at end of this report.

appropriate methods, as set down by the committee.

(2) that it undertake negotiations with University Microfilms, Inc., to determine the feasibility of expanding *Microfilm Abstracts*, so as to include doctoral dissertations not now duplicated through that organization.

(3) that the publication, *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities* be continued provisionally, but that an attempt be made to persuade universities offering the doctorate to send catalog copy for their dissertations to Library of Congress for inclusion in the *Author Catalog* and in the *Subject Catalog*.

After a brief discussion and some amendment, the report was approved.

Protection of Resources in Event of War

Mr. Lacy reported that little or no Federal action had so far been taken and that the possibility of Federal help for the protection of collections was presently slight. Several member libraries reported plans for action in case of an emergency, and it was the general opinion that the initiative in this matter must rest with individual libraries, although the Association should be ready to present its views if a new situation should arise.

Reproduction of Bibliographical and Reference Works

Mr. David reported that the joint ARL-ACRL committee on this subject is still actively at work, and that Mr. Keller (ARL representative and chairman) had, as a result of the questionnaire that had been circulated, been able to compile a list of works for which reproduction was most wanted. Mr. Keller is also in touch with the ALA Committee on Out-of-Print Books. It was suggested that Mr. Keller investigate the activities of the American Association of Theological Libraries where consideration is being given to reproductions on microcards.

THIRD SESSION

Committee on National Needs in Time of Crisis

Mr. David, the deputy chairman of the committee in the absence of Mr. Coney, presented a progress report, copies of which had been circulated previously to the membership.

The report outlined the background of the formation of the committee and the scope of its responsibility, namely the adequacy of the research resources of the American library system in terms of content and of availability to meet contemporary needs. The report also summarized discussions at the first meeting of the committee in the Library of Congress on May 10 and 11, dealing with such topics as library support of science; adequate, high-speed bibliographical service for government research; compensation for the burdens imposed on libraries by federal research contracts; area study programs and their support; medical and agricultural library service; public documents; and engineering.

It was emphasized that the work of the committee was still in the preliminary stage and that no important conclusions would be reached before the next meeting in October. Working papers in the various subjects were to be prepared by the Library of Congress and other institutions, and it was hoped that outlines of projects will be available for consideration at the midwinter meeting of the Association.

Restrictions on Exports to Russia and Russian Dominated Countries

Mr. Clapp led an important discussion on the subject of the export restrictions which have seriously affected exchanges of library materials between libraries in this country and in Russia, and other foreign countries which fall within the Russian sphere of influence. They have been imposed by the Department of Commerce under the Export Control Act of 1949, and later amendments. Since an important amelioration of the situation appears to be in prospect, further elaboration of this difficult subject is here omitted.

Cooperative Acquisitions of Non-trade Publications

Mr. Lacy, on behalf of the Library of Congress, presented a report outlining a plan for the cooperative acquisition of non-trade publications, particularly foreign publications. Briefly, it called for a program to be worked out jointly by a sub-committee of the Farmington Plan and the United States Book Exchange, whereby all significant non-trade publications of foreign origin not now being received would be made available to American

research libraries. Financial support for the program would be provided through contributions from cooperating institutions, such contributions to be scaled in each case to the number of publications received.

In the discussion which followed, Mr. Clapp explained that the Farmington Plan and the Kipp report on foreign exchanges were the parents of the plan now proposed. Mr. Metcalf, chairman of the Farmington Plan Committee, said he approved of expanding the Farmington Plan into the non-trade publications field, and would also like to see the U.S.B.E. possibilities explored. It was evident that there were misgivings, and that the Association was not yet ready to accept the plan as outlined, with its large dependence on U.S.B.E.

After some further discussion, it was moved and voted that the Farmington Plan Committee explore non-trade publications as a possible next field of expansion, and that it look into the use of U.S.B.E. in this connection, and report.

Cooperative Action in the Preservation Microfilming of Research Materials

Mr. David summarized a progress report received from Mr. B. E. Powell, chairman of a sub-committee of the ALA Board on Resources, which had been studying this subject. Mr. Powell's report indicated that proposals for a large and important microfilming program were now being criticized and put in final form, and that copies would soon be made available. The proposals deal with the need of general agreement on technical standards; the price of film; its free availability; the interlibrary lending of positive copies; and the dissemination of useful information about film projects. The sub-committee is agreed that its principal, immediate assignment must be the promotion of the filming of perishable materials, notably wood pulp newspapers and disintegrating periodicals.

In connection with Mr. Powell's report, Mr. Lacy distributed a supporting document from the Library of Congress, dealing with microfilming projects in several foreign countries now in progress under the auspices of the Library of Congress, and urging American libraries to cooperate in some general, cooperative plan of preservation microphotography. The help of the Library of Congress

in making available information, reports, and past experience was also promised.

Newspapers on Microfilm

The Executive Secretary was authorized to arrange for a new edition.

Interlibrary Lending of Microfilm

Mr. Lyle presented a brief statement urging the adoption of a general code for the guidance of libraries in the extension of interlibrary loan privileges to microfilm.

After some discussion, it was voted that a committee, with Mr. Lyle as chairman, be appointed to study the matter.

FOURTH SESSION

Quintennial Checking of the List of Periodicals Abstracted by Chemical Abstracts

Mr. McCarthy laid before the meeting a letter, dated June 8, which he had addressed to members of the Association. The letter enumerated the difficulties under which libraries have been struggling in checking the *List of Periodicals Abstracted by Chemical Abstracts*, these difficulties arising largely from the unique arrangement of the *List*. Mr. McCarthy felt that the problems arising in connection with this checking were of sufficient importance to warrant the appointment of an ARL committee to investigate them and to make such recommendations as may be desirable and feasible, before the next *List* is issued.

There was agreement in the ensuing discussion that reforms were needed. Mr. Ellsworth suggested that Mr. McCarthy's motion to appoint a committee to study the subject be altered, and that the matter be referred to the already existing Committee on Bibliography (formerly the Committee on Indexing and Abstracting), of which Mr. Shaw is chairman. After a brief discussion, it was so voted.

Committee on Serials in Research Fields

Mr. Brown, chairman of this committee, presented a report dealing with the rising costs of serials. The report recommended that dealers be required to give prices in the currency of their own countries, as well as in dollars, and also be required to state the rates of exchange which they were using.

Filming of United Nations Mimeographed Documents

Mr. David read a letter from Robert Claus, Chief, Archives Sections, United Nations, which contained the information that the United Nations Archives is now engaged in the preparation of a 16 mm microfilm set of all United Nations mimeographed and printed documents bearing official symbols, in all languages, for the years 1946 through 1950. Positive microfilm copies will be furnished at cost whenever possible—i.e., when the film rolls do not contain restricted matter. In addition, the World Peace Foundation is preparing for sale microfilm copies of those non-restricted documents which are included in restricted rolls. The Executive Secretary further reported that a list of materials offered by the World Peace Foundation can be obtained by addressing Mr. Robert K. Turner, Documents Service, World Peace Foundation.

Beginning with 1951, the United Nations plans to issue restricted documents on quite separate rolls, so that the World Peace Foundation will not have to continue its program beyond the end of 1950.

The question was raised of the possible duplication on film of printed material already being received by some libraries. Mr. David undertook to investigate the possibility of separate film subscriptions for mimeograph material by libraries which regularly receive the original printed material.

Serial Developments at the Library of Congress

The Library of Congress reported on its new publication, *Serial Titles Newly Received*. More subscriptions and possibly an increase in price would be necessary if this publication is to continue. The proposed project for union catalog of serials on punched cards is temporarily at a standstill, except for new serials and the work being done on the new publication. The estimated sum required to start the punched card union list has been put at \$500,000. Apart from the problem of costs, several points still remain to be cleared, including approval of the new rules of entry, provision of a staff and equipment, and agreement by participating libraries with respect to the necessary reporting and checking.

Reproduction of the National Union Catalog

The Library of Congress presented a report on the various techniques which might be employed in reproducing the National Union Catalog, and the costs involved. The report pointed out the great need for editing the Catalog before publication, the cost of this editing alone being estimated at \$200,000.

Grounds of Federal Support for Research Libraries

The Library of Congress presented a report setting forth two possible grounds for Federal support of research libraries, namely that such libraries render service to agencies of the Federal government and that the research resources of the country as held by such libraries constitute a national resource which it is in the national interest to sustain and develop. The report implied, however, that at the present time the possibility of legislation by Congress for any general contribution to the support of research libraries was hardly to be expected. Rather, support would have to come through more specific channels, such as sharing in the overhead allowance to be paid to universities under Federal research contracts, separate contracts between universi-

ties and Federal contracting agencies to cover bibliographical services, fees charged to industrial laboratories working on Federal projects, etc.

In the discussion which followed, it was pointed out that the question of the library's share in overhead under government research contracts was one to be settled directly between the library and its university administration. It was pointed out that much more printed material will be involved in the forthcoming area study contracts than in the sciences. A documents room and extensive book resources are also frequently required.

Reconstitution of Membership of the Association

The Executive Secretary, acting on instructions from the Advisory Committee, laid before the meeting a motion calling for the reconstitution of the membership during the remainder of 1951, by a process of election similar to that which was followed in the re-constitution of 1945-46, the new membership being limited to forty-five institutions.

After discussion, the motion was passed unanimously.—*Charles W. David, Executive Secretary.*

Report of the Committee on the Use of Manuscripts by Visiting Scholars Set up by the Association of Research Libraries

Your committee was asked to formulate a proposed policy on the preservation and use of unpublished manuscripts, the raw material of scholarship. In our deliberations, we have considered the problem in relation to three types of libraries; 1. Public Libraries, federal state and local; 2. University and College Libraries; and 3. Independent privately endowed semi-public Libraries such as the Huntington Library and the Morgan Library. Your chairman wrote to thirteen libraries in these categories and asked the Librarians to comment on the problem and send copies of all their forms and policy statements regarding the use of manuscripts in their libraries. The excellent report on "the arrangement and use of recent large manuscript collections" of an ad hoc committee set up by the American Historical Association was made available to us by the committee chairman, Thomas

C. Cochran, of the University of Pennsylvania. All this material was circulated to your committee and we met Saturday, December 30, 1950 at the Yale Club in New York City. Unfortunately two of our committee, Conyers Read and Julian P. Boyd, were unable to be present. The following policies were formulated.

General Policy; Acquisition, Preservation and Use

It is the duty of every librarian to encourage the proper use and publication of manuscripts under his care. It is his responsibility to make them (or photographic reproductions of them) easily available to qualified investigators, and to take such steps as are necessary to insure their physical safety and to preserve them in as nearly a pristine condition as possible for the use of scholars

now and in the future. He should be alive to opportunities to acquire manuscripts, remembering, however, that selfish competition between libraries may encourage the owner to have a fanciful idea as to the monetary value of his manuscripts and thus defeat the common cause of preservation for use, as is the case when an integral collection is broken up at sale and scattered to the four winds. The cause of scholarship is best served by the Librarian building on strength in his own institution, and directing to their proper home manuscripts which would fit into or supplement strong collections in other institutions. The librarian should make every effort to discourage restrictions being placed on the use of manuscripts, such as are sometimes requested by former owners, and in any case require a terminal date for restrictions, and wherever possible he should acquire publication rights along with physical possession.

Reading Room Rules

Some rules are necessary to regulate access to manuscripts and all investigators should be made acquainted with them. Most scholars are perfectly aware of the reasonable regulations and in sympathy with them. The following excellent reading room rules are largely adopted from the report of the Cochran Committee.

1. No smoking.
2. Use of ink shall be discouraged.
3. No marking of manuscripts and no writing of notes on top of manuscripts.
4. Existing order of manuscripts shall be carefully preserved.
5. Curator shall be notified of any manuscript apparently misplaced.
6. Extreme care shall be exercised in handling fragile material. (In the case of certain fragile or unusually precious manuscripts, the librarian should be able to satisfy many investigators with photographic reproductions.)

With reference to the qualifications of prospective users, the librarian must be satisfied that they are trustworthy, intend to use the material for scholarly purposes, and are sufficiently trained to do so.

Freedom of Access

Librarians should give all qualified investigators complete freedom of access to manu-

scripts. Freedom of access includes the privileges of studying the manuscript or collection of manuscripts, of taking notes, of copying and of ordering photographic reproductions. Freedom of access does not include the right to publish. If a scholar requests the photographic reproduction of a large collection of manuscripts, such a request should be granted only when it comes with the sponsorship of another library, and the reproduction should be sent to that library with the understanding that it will take the responsibility of supervising the use of the reproductions, permitting freedom of access but referring requests to publish to the original library. All requests for photographic reproductions must be specific; if there is a question of selection and judgment as to what is to be reproduced the investigator must make his own selection or employ some one to do it, and not expect that service from the staff of the Library. The scholar must be prepared to pay complete photographic costs, but these should be established on a reasonable cost basis. When the investigator plans to visit a library to study manuscripts, he should give the institution advance notice of his visit and his needs.

Each library should keep a complete record of the users of its manuscripts, the manuscripts used, and the purpose of each use. The primary object of this record is for the protection of scholars by enabling the librarian to inform them of other projects in their field, with a view to preventing two men working on the same project at the same time, with ultimate conflicts on publication plans. When questions of analogous use arise the librarian should make every effort to bring the scholars together in the belief that a conference or correspondence will cause apparent conflicts to disappear.

Right of Publication

Freedom of access does not include the right of publication. Publication is defined as:

1. Printing the text verbatim in whole or in such a substantial part as in effect to constitute the whole.
2. Paraphrasing the text to such an extent as to disclose the essential content of the manuscript.

There are two types of property rights in manuscripts:

1. *Common law literary property*, which vests in the author or his heirs or assigns. It is the obligation of the scholar or publisher and not the library to secure permission to publish from the owner of this right, and to assume any liabilities if it cannot be cleared.
2. *Physical possession*, which resides in the owner of the manuscript. It is only this latter right which a library usually has at its disposal.

The right to publish must be specially requested from the librarian stating in specific terms the nature of the use, the name of the intended publisher, and place of publication. If possible, it is courteous of the author to present to the library a copy of his publication.

The right of publication should be granted by the librarian without reservation. The committee recognizes that university and college libraries have a special responsibility to their faculty and students, and acquire manuscript material for publication by a faculty member or a student working for the doctor's degree, and will therefore be obliged in ex-

ceptional circumstances to assign priorities in the publication of the manuscripts. The exceptional need for exclusive publication rights should be carefully considered and limited in duration (not more than three years), because priorities contravene the principles of liberal publication which the committee endorses.

The committee recognizes that independent semi-public libraries operating on endowment income have a pre-eminent concern that their manuscript material shall be given expert scholarly treatment and adequate publication, and may predicate their authorization for publication on these considerations.

It should be emphasized that restrictions on publication must not interfere with freedom of access, which should be, in effect, unlimited.

James T. Babb, Chairman
 Frederick B. Adams, Jr.
 Fredson Bowers
 Julian P. Boyd
 Robert A. Miller
 Conyers Read

Yearbook of the United Nations, 1950

During 1950, the United Nations was faced with crucial problems, and the actions taken toward their solution have affected the lives of men, women and children in all parts of the world. The *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1950* (1951, 1068 p., \$12.50), has been designed to present a faithful and complete review of the history of the United Nations during this important period. It is a volume which reference librarians and others concerned with international affairs will find constantly useful.

The *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1950*, is the fourth in a series of volumes produced by the United Nations Department of Public Information to provide a detailed account of the work and achievements of the United Nations and its related specialized agencies.

The 1950 *Yearbook* follows the method of presentation established in the third volume but surveys the work of the calendar year, rather than the organizational year. It opens with a brief account of the origins and evolution of the United Nations and a review of the major events in its history from 1946 to the end of 1949. The *Yearbook* proceeds to a full section devoted to the functions, structure and organizational questions connected with each of the major organs.

Part II of the *Yearbook*, as in previous years, contains a full discussion of the organization, functions and work of each of the specialized agencies.

The previous volumes in this series, for the years 1946-47, 1947-48 and 1948-49 are still available from the Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y.