

Letters

Editor's note:

Last year, *College & Research Libraries* reviewed and accepted for publication a paper entitled "Longitudinal Study of Scientific Journal Prices in a Research Library," by Kenneth E. Marks, Steven P. Nielsen, H. Craig Petersen, and Peter E. Wagner. The authors signed copyright forms dated 7/20/90 through 8/3/90. The copyright agreement represents that the work is original and "does not infringe any subsisting copyrights." The paper subsequently appeared in the March issue of *C&RL*.

Shortly after its publication, one of the editors of "The Future of Serials: Proceedings of the North American Serials Interest Group, Inc." (volume 19, nos. 3/4 of the *Serials Librarian*) forwarded a copy of it to me and suggested that I compare the Marks and Nielsen article with the one in *C&RL*. The comparison showed the articles to be virtually the same. The NASIG editor has copyright forms dated 6/8/90.

After discussing the matter with the Board of *C&RL*, the NASIG leadership, and the ACRL Publications Committee, I sent a letter from the *C&RL* Board to Marks and Nielsen. Marks' reply is printed below.

For the publishing record, the American Library Association does not own copyright for the *C&RL* article cited above. Scholars seeking reproduction of it should apply to Haworth Press.

To the editor:

Your letter of May 8, 1991, has caused both Mr. Nielsen and me considerable concern since we received it. Neither of us, at any time, contemplated or considered that we might be creating a copyright conflict or violation when we made the presentation to the NASIG annual meeting in June 1990. We believe we told the NASIG attendees that the findings of our study had been submitted to *C&RL* and, we hoped, would be accepted and published. At the time of the presentation to NASIG, we believed that we were offering a paper that was sufficiently different from that which had been submitted to *C&RL* and was undergoing continued review and refinement.

That we should have acknowledged in the *C&RL* article that the findings of the study had been presented at the NASIG meeting and were to be published in their proceedings is true. There is little to excuse that oversight. Suffice it to say, we should have been concentrating not only on making the requested editorial adjustments in the manuscript of the article but ascertaining that it conformed to the specifications of the *C&RL* instructions to authors. You have our public apology for that.

The commitment that we can make relates to the careful avoidance of any noncompliance with all instructions to authors, the letter and spirit of copyright. As concerned as we have been about other aspects of copyright, it is embarrassing to find ourselves in this situation.

DR. KENNETH E. MARKS,
 Director of Academic Library Services,
 East Carolina University

To the Editor:

The *Choice* Editorial Board and the editors approved a request from the Commission on Preservation and Access, in the spring of 1989, that *Choice* include acid-free paper information in the bibliographic entries that head our reviews. *Choice* uses the abbreviation "afp" for acid-free paper and prints this indicator before the ISBN.

In reporting whether the book that is sent out for review is printed on alkaline paper, *Choice* relies on information provided by the publishers. The information comes from the published version of the book itself. *Choice* will not physically test book paper for a pH value.

Robert Cohen, associate editor, Book News, Inc., in his letter to the editor (*C&RL*, May 1991) called on *Choice* to indicate acid-free paper in our reviews. We do. I hope this sets the record straight.

PATRICIA E. SABOSIK
Editor & Publisher,
Choice

To the Editor:

Marcia J. Myers and Paula T. Kaufman ("ARL Directors: Two Decades of Change" (*C&RL* May 1991)) have carefully and clearly documented the impressive rise of women to the ranks of ARL directors. But after completing their article, I was struck by the lack of consideration given to questions of race and ethnicity. Are there any minority ARL directors now? Were there any in 1970? That these questions were not even asked is unfortunate, especially at a time when diversity is such a broadly stated concern. This lapse is a clear reminder of how far the profession has to go before it can truly represent our society and its institutions of higher learning.

DAVID W. LEWIS
Head of Research and Information Services,
University of Connecticut