The Role and Responsibility of the Library in Preservation and Conservation

INTRODUCTION

This institute has been a fine learning experience for me. It has offered a valuable mix of preservation topics. It is an important link in the chain of relatively recent meetings about a subject receiving increasing attention. Admittedly, no program can expect to be all things to all people, but this one has offered much to many. In two and a half days we have briefly dipped into the past, spent considerable time on the present and tried to focus on the future. Many questions have been asked, some have been answered and some directions have been established. It is to be hoped that each person will leave this institute with some valuable information, a greater awareness of the magnitude of the problem, a renewed determination to find answers to his/her library’s preservation needs, or at least a desire to contribute to the resolution of the problems still facing us in this multifaceted and challenging field.

Those preceding me have shared valuable insights into this complex and important matter. These insights come from pioneers as well as from recent entrants in the field. Preservation of library materials literature dates back several years but becomes substantial during the 1970s and is proliferating now. The field is so new that terminology is still being defined, a philosophy is still emerging, a rationale is still developing, approaches are still being sought, and library administrators are still seeking ways to fund library preservation programs. In fact, this library administrator is still wondering why he was even invited to participate in this program with such notables. Perhaps my contribution stems from experience in research libraries generally, and from almost two years of involvement with a
rapidly developing conservation program at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIUC) specifically, neither of which qualifies me as an expert no matter how you define the word. However, with excellent help from some of those who have spoken earlier and from my own conservation colleagues, especially Carolyn Morrow, I shall launch into what I see as the role and responsibility of the library in preservation and conservation.

While reading a 1977 article by Terry Belanger,¹ who is involved in conservation from a rare books point of view, I was struck by the question he seemed to be asking: "Why do we acquire for our libraries that for which we cannot care?" A simple question, but one for which there is no simple answer. On the one hand, we weakly argue that we don't intend to keep for long periods of time much of what is acquired for our libraries. On the other hand, we boast that we acquire research materials to support long-standing academic programs knowing that they will exist for many years. We proudly point out that we acquire materials for new and developing fields of knowledge. No matter how you look at it, we are building library collections for the future. Though we discard some material along the way, we purposefully keep, for as long as possible, the majority of our material because it contains information which supports the research and curricular needs of our institution.

We spend thousands of dollars to install security systems and pay people to sit at library exits to "insure" that materials are properly charged so they will be returned for future use. We also identify many of our resources as noncirculating because of their value. Now the obvious paradox: we acquire for the future, and build in elaborate and extremely expensive tracking (circulation control) and security systems, yet pay little attention to the quality of the vehicle in which the information is carried (paper, film, etc.), the manner in which it is handled, and the environment in which it is stored. We will subject the information carrier to adverse humidity, light, temperature and pollutant levels in its storage place; rough handling by unconcerned or untrained staff; book returns which could double as trash compactors; stressful shelving positions; and environments vulnerable to water, fire, insect, and rodent damage. A comprehensive library preservation program would address all of these issues as well as disaster preparedness and appropriate binding, repair, and restoration practices.

To do the job right would be too costly, right? I would argue that to do the job poorly is even more costly. This statement may be an oversimplification, but let's take a closer look. Basically, we have two challenges. The first is how to cope with the resources and facilities we presently have or, to state it another way, how to cure the ailments caused by so many past mistakes. The second challenge is to insure that steps are taken to prevent
the same mistakes from happening again. In other words, we are faced with impedng the deterioration of our present collections on one hand and with preventing deterioration of future collections on the other. The first challenge is probably the most expensive and overwhelming. The second is more manageable. I dare say that every library could begin today, at little or no cost, to apply preventive measures which would save considerable future "cure" money.

WHERE TO BEGIN

To begin with, before progress can be made, those who are responsible for the decision making and policy setting in the library must become aware of the need for a comprehensive conservation program. This awareness is increasing in the profession as a result of the relatively recent literature blitz, programs such as this which have been held over the past decade, the emphasis placed on it in the American Library Association (ALA), the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) project, and many other state and nationally funded activities.

Once administration is convinced of the need, the next step is to establish the need in the minds of library staff at all levels. Robert H. Patterson suggests the use of a well-chosen committee to insure a broad-based approach. I agree with Patterson that:

It is vital that conservation be viewed from a systems approach involving the entire library context in which materials are selected, processed, housed, utilized, and cared for. To concentrate upon only one of these elements is to lose sight of many important factors in the life-cycle of materials and the ways in which they are used.

The committee approach has several advantages. Patterson continues:

if the committee membership is broadly and thoughtfully constituted, conservation education is disseminated widely through the library, into areas where this heightened awareness is most useful and applicable. This approach also insures a broad base of support for conservation programs, creating a general interest rather than a narrow-based concern coming from only one department or division. It is important...that all areas within the library with real or potential conservation responsibilities be involved in the committee.

It is so important to have broad staff interest and support early on that I'd like to spend a few moments on this. Preservation and conservation are generally viewed by staff as costly add-ons to existing demands on their time and budget, instead of as valuable processes which, if interspersed through all aspects of their jobs, will result in better service to the library user as well as in dollar savings. Like most changes, if conservation and
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preservation are viewed as being imposed from the top or as being the concern of only a small number in the organization, the program is in for a rocky future. Conversely, problems will appear if the preservation program is too heavily dependent upon committee efforts. Strong support from the top is also needed for a successful preservation program.

To strike a balance, then, between a top- and grassroots-implemented program is the goal. This balance will insure strong support and commitment at all levels for the program. Leadership at the top is needed to train, direct, listen, design, set resource support parameters and evaluate, while staff is needed to engender enthusiasm, carry out the plans, give initial feedback, educate the library user, and make program modification suggestions. A program, especially a new one, will function much more smoothly and will have a greater chance of success if this kind of teamwork is evident.

Let me illustrate. A smoothly functioning organization might be visualized as a sphere rolling along at a comfortable pace. All parts of the organization are interacting with a single purpose. Then one day, someone suggests an idea which necessitates change in the organization. This change causes stress because it requires adjustments in schedules, relocation of parts of the organization, additional training, and changes in thought patterns, routines, and working partners. The change (in this case, the addition of a conservation program) requires additional funds, people, supplies, and equipment, or a reallocation of such. The stress becomes more severe in those parts of the organization from which resources are being siphoned. As this siphoning occurs, stress increases and the organization takes on the shape of a sphere with a bulge on its surface. The bulge represents the part of the organization into which the dollar and human resources, including considerable human energies, are being directed. We all know how difficult it is to handle a ball containing a bulge. This is the period in the life of the organization which is most
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crucial. The goal is to round out the sphere and to get all parts of the organization readjusted and working smoothly together again. This can be done more quickly when leadership and staff are together at the genesis of the change. When they are together, stress is minimal, resistance to the change low, commitment high, and the program successful. The organizational sphere adjusts, the bulge deflates and it is rolling smoothly once again. An organization, like a human body, has a way of either severing or incorporating an appendage. If the appendage (bulge) is seen as unnecessary, it is rejected. Conversely, if the appendage is seen as helpful, it will be accepted and willingly incorporated. A comprehensive preservation program, if handled well, will be accepted by most staff and become not only a valuable, but essential, part of the operation of the library.

Let's return to the topic of where to begin. Once a committee has been selected, the next task is to assess the conservation needs in some detail. Some outside help may be necessary at this stage unless the organization presently has a knowledgeable person in this area. This process is the critical one. This is the stage at which broad understanding and realization throughout the organization is necessary. The more people involved in identifying and agreeing upon the needs at the outset, the more cooperation will be realized at time of implementation. During the needs assessment time, the following will be evaluated:

1. the physical plant in which the materials are stored, including lights, temperature, humidity, cleanliness, filtration systems, potential water leakage and fire hazards, and building security;
2. the manner in which books are presently handled, including number packed on the shelf, how they are placed on the shelf, manner in which they are bound, style of book returns and drop boxes, manner in which books are handled during photocopying of pages, how books are transported, adequate shelf size for varying book sizes, manner in which materials are packed for shipping and mailing, and even what types of materials are best suited for circulating as against those which ought not circulate;
3. the physical condition of the books presently on the library shelves, paying particular attention to dirt, brittleness, disrepair, evidence of fungal growth, insect or rodent damage, fading, etc.

After the needs have been firmly established, priorities must be set. The needs assessment study will likely leave the staff feeling overwhelmed. The universe must now be broken into manageable units and then placed in order of approach. Unfortunately, items needing the most attention may not be affordable for some time. List them, however, and see that they begin to appear in future planning statements. I speak of items such as changing
the environment in the building, securing the building, changing or modifying lighting systems, and conservation treatment of valuable books, maps, and manuscripts. Placing these items in planning statements will likely influence allocation of supporting funds from the parent institution. It is important to express these needs in such a manner as to influence the parent institution to include these same items as institutional needs. Institutional needs are carefully reviewed by governing bodies such as boards of trustees. The ultimate goal is to have these needs reach legislative bodies which allocate funds. While seeking funding for long-term programs, short-term goals can be accomplished.

As priorities and order of approach begin to sort out, the framework for a conservation policy will evolve and procedures will begin to take shape. Both of these should be codified to be used to implement the program. Carolyn Morrow has created a “mock” policy statement “designed to provide logical guidelines and outline optimum conditions for the conservation of a research library collection.”

**ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

If a committee is used in the beginning stages for assessing needs, establishing priorities and drafting policy statements, at some point a determination must be made as to what the eventual organizational structure for the conservation program will be. Size of budget, collection, and staff as well as complexity and degree of need are all factors important to this matter.

Under some circumstances such as during dire financial times, a committee might be the appropriate long-term approach for operating a conservation program. The best approach, however, is to hire a trained conservation person and to provide staff support to carry out the program. Perhaps a combination of these two approaches might work.

Regardless of the approach, some important factors should be considered. The reporting relationship is critical. Ideally, the committee chair-person or the conservation librarian should be responsible to the individual in the organization who has stewardship over all the areas which will be touched by the conservation program. This is important for a number of reasons.

1. Budget allocation should be administered to include the entire program. It would be unfortunate if more than one fiscal officer were involved since there is a potential for competition for money and an imbalance in the program.
2. When conflicts arise, judgment must be exercised which reflects the entire program, not just a portion.
3. It is usually preferable for policy to be enforced by the person overseeing the entire program.
4. The higher up the administrative ladder the person responsible for the program is, the more clout that can be exerted.
5. Staff perception of the value of the conservation program is always influenced by the level of administrative support.
6. A unified conservation program will most likely develop when a single administrator is responsible for it.
7. It eliminates the possibility of conservation being perceived by staff as a stepchild to other programs.

The placement of the conservation program in the organization has another dimension: the functions it should incorporate. Some candidates for inclusion under the conservation umbrella include materials preparation; in-house repair and maintenance, and protective encasement; preparation of items for contract binding; stack maintenance (shelving, shelf-reading, cleaning, etc.); and perhaps a full-scale conservation treatment laboratory. Again, the specific needs of individual libraries will help answer this question.

Another aspect of administrative structure is whether the conservation librarian should be in a staff or line position. Acting in a staff relationship to an administrator provides mobility about the organization but does not allow authority to be exercised by the conservation librarian. Lack of clout can slow progress. In this configuration, the administrator would, of necessity, need to be more directly involved in conservation matters. I believe it preferable to place the conservation person in a line position so that authority and responsibility can be fixed. The position also ought to be at a high enough level so the person can comfortably interact and carry weight with others also holding responsible positions. Darling and Ogden point out that actual organizational patterns varied considerably among some of the libraries which were pioneers in establishing preservation programs, and in every case but one, "the person charged with responsibility for the program was placed in a line rather than staff position and given specific authority to develop and implement programs."5

PLANNING

With the needs assessment completed, priorities established and administrative structure determined, it is time to forge ahead, to lay plans for
implementation. It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves how important it is to plan any program carefully. Conservation is no exception. It is vital to involve all people in the early stages of planning whose areas of responsibility are going to be affected by the conservation program. Change will be more readily accepted and more strongly supported if these individuals have an opportunity to influence the program at the outset.

Planning will involve several facets. The literature contains some helpful suggestions on ways to approach planning. Darling states it succinctly:

The concrete steps to be taken to turn priorities from paper plans into concrete programs should be set forth in specific terms, with realistic target dates. This may involve further analysis of existing resources (staff, space, equipment, and money), and should lead directly into the organizational modifications that will, usually, be the first step of plan implementation.⁶

FINANCIAL BACKING

In terms of financial support, as far as I can tell, Patterson’s observation in 1979 still stands: “Conservation is so new a subject of national concern that no one has addressed in the literature the question of funding sources. Each library must simply strive to identify agencies, organizations, and individuals potentially offering support.”⁷ Start-up funds provided by granting agencies are helpful but in the final analysis, those institutions which provide their own funds will be the most successful.

By and large, those libraries which have forged ahead have done so out of dogged determination and have made inroads into this massive problem. They have usually reallocated funds in addition to the normal binding budget to begin in a small way to make an impact on the beginnings of a more comprehensive conservation program.

The size of a library’s commitment to conservation can best be measured by the percentage of its budget allocated to conservation. How much is enough for an adequate conservation program? I am told that Newberry spends 10 percent of its total budget on conservation. At a recent conference, it was reported that Jim Haas asked, “Why doesn’t every research library take ten percent of its money for new acquisitions and put it into preservation?”⁸ At the same meeting Rudy Rogers reported that Yale puts “$800,000 a year into conservation as against a $3,000,000 acquisitions expenditure.”⁹ This represents 26.6 percent of the acquisition budget. SIUC put 12.6 percent of its acquisitions budget into the conservation program last year. At the University of Utah where Paul Foulger is the
conservation officer, 10 percent of the library's acquisitions budget is committed to this effort.

Deciding how much of the budget should go into conservation is difficult. But the decision must be made. Ironically, the decision to support binding of library materials was made years ago. Today it is a given. Binding costs are considered an integral part of a library's acquisitions budget. Somehow, we have to broaden our thinking. The responsibility of the library is to decide where conservation fits in its program and service priorities, then to support it with dollars and administrative clout. Frankly, I am not prepared to recommend a percentage-of-budget figure that a library should put toward conservation; however, I would recommend that this would be an appropriate topic for discussion in individual libraries and also at the state and national levels within ALA's Preservation of Library Materials Section, Association of Research Libraries, and other forums. Perhaps the Northeast Document Conservation Center or the Western States Conservation Congress have considered this and could share their thinking about it.

We have a responsibility to provide funding to support conservation beyond the library binding level. The following are positive steps which can be taken by library administrators to help the situation:

1. Encourage and participate in preparing proposals to outside funding agencies for assistance.
2. Work with other library administrators in the state and region to raise the awareness of conservation needs on the part of legislators.
3. Seek special funding from the administrative person(s) to whom the library administrator reports, e.g., the vice-president for academic affairs.
4. Reallocate funds internally to support the program. One idea is to watch student wage expenditures during the year and shift unused wages to specific preplanned conservation or preservation projects. End-of-year wage money could be used in any number of ways, e.g., leather book treatment, encapsulation, etc.
5. Change existing policies, procedures, and staffing to allow for immediate implementation of low-cost procedures.
6. Identify environmental and building matters which need modification and bring these to the attention of those on campus who have responsibility for these concerns.

Most of these steps require time; however, something can be done on each almost immediately. If a start on each of these steps was accomplished today, a decided difference would be recognized a year from now, considerable change would be evident three years away, and great strides would be
made in five years. I firmly believe that there are very few institutions which couldn’t find the money to begin a conservation program. With a firm commitment and resolve to begin a program, it can be done over time.

The two conservation programs of which I am most aware, those of University of Utah (UU) and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, had different beginnings. At Utah, Kem Newby, a biology professor emeritus who worked as a volunteer in the library for several years, can be given partial credit for the conservation program currently underway. Part of this professor’s voluntary work was done in the special collections area where he helped protect and treat rare or brittle manuscripts. The importance of this professor’s self-initiated work came to the attention of the library administration. Seeds for a comprehensive conservation program had thus been planted. After plans had been laid to launch an expanded conservation program, the administration reallocated internal positions and funding. The money from an appropriate vacant position was used to hire Paul Foulger as conservator and support costs were gathered over a period of time from other areas by consolidating procedures, reducing or eliminating some services, and by maintaining flat budgets in some lines in order to use small budget increases for conservation. As the emerging conservation program took shape, the University of Utah became aware of the availability of the equipment which had been a part of the conservation laboratory of Colton and Nancy Storm, formerly of the Newberry Library. Further reallocation of funds made it possible for the Marriott Library at UU to acquire the equipment.

At SIUC, an idea conceived by the Special Collections Librarian of an expanded conservation program generated a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) challenge grant. This paid off by realizing funds from four sources. These combined dollars were used to hire Carolyn Clark Morrow, create a modest laboratory, and treat the John Dewey Papers. Three years later the program was shifted to state funds by receiving a base budget increase to pay the conservator’s salary, and some internal reallocation of funds to support the rest of the operation. Some CETA positions were also successfully sought and became part of the program for about a year.

These two approaches were considerably different but both were workable and certainly successful. Both started about the same time, both have had some funding challenge over the years and both had their genesis in special collections departments. Both programs are strong and will continue. They have proven their worth. Both programs deserve more financial backing because there is so much to do. But, again, other programs must also be supported.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

The control of the library environment is the responsibility of the library administration and is the single, most important aspect of materials' preservation. If a library could be designed to address the environmental needs of library collections it might contain at the minimum the following facilities and features.

—The building materials used and the construction would be as earthquake and fire resistant as possible.
—It would be built on ground which would not be easily flooded or would be designed so that collections would not be endangered by heavy rains, flash floods, etc.
—The roof would be pitched and designed to insure against pooling of water.
—The insulation would be of such quality that temperature and humidity could be maintained at consistent levels and at levels conducive to storing the type of materials housed in the library.
—The heating, cooling and humidity controls would allow for differences to be established in various parts of the building, thus tailoring the air for the requirements of special materials.
—Filtering systems would be installed to eliminate, as far as possible, such gases as sulfur dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, and just plain dirt and dust.
—Building systems, including water pipes, would be located well away from stack areas and would not be on the roof directly above library storage areas.
—The building would be constructed in such a way to insure against encroachment by rodents and insects. If rooms are to be used for eating or food preparation, they would be far removed from areas where collections were to be housed.
—Windows would be screened to filter out ultraviolet rays in sunlight.
—Lights installed would be incandescent or, if fluorescent, would be screened to filter out ultraviolet energy.
—Fire extinguishing systems would operate specific to the area of the fire.
—Stacks installed would be of heavy construction and would accommodate shelves of sufficient size to hold adequately different-sized books without their hanging over the edge. Shelves would be tied together by braces across the top to reduce the possibility of tipping and would not contain rough or sharp edges or surfaces which could cut or snag books.
—Book return systems would be designed to lessen the distance that books must drop, reduce the amount of rough jamming together, and mitigate deep stacking of books.
—An adequate fire and burglar alarm system would be installed as an early warning system.
COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

I would like to close by emphasizing an important element of the library conservation program which was touched on earlier by Mr. Patterson and others but which warrants repeating: preservation through collection development.

A significant part of a library budget (second only to salaries and wages) is allocated for the acquisition of materials for the collection. These large sums of money are being expended for books and other materials which, if they are not subjected to some form of disaster during their lifetime, are destined to deteriorate in a relatively few years. We enhance our collections by the addition of appropriate information which is wrapped in different packages or is carried on different vehicles. We can often acquire the intellectual content at different prices based upon the information carrier. (Parenthetically, I recognize that we do acquire some information because of the package in which it is wrapped.) Of prime importance when considering the acquisition of material is user convenience. Quick access to the information is an important consideration which relates directly to the format in which the information is packaged. I believe that we should add another dimension to our acquisitions consideration. This dimension is longevity. This is not to suggest that we should acquire everything on acid-free paper or on silver halide microform. It is to suggest, however, that we project our thinking to include the dimension of access in 100 or more years from the time of acquisition. When this dimension is added to the acquisition decision process, a more usable collection will result.

Some factors to be considered, once it has been determined that the information should be acquired for the collection, are:

1. whether the information is printed on acid-free paper;
2. whether it is in a hard- or soft-bound cover;
3. if it is in paperback, whether it ought to be bound before it is put into the hands of the user;
4. if it is to be bound, whether it should be bound in-house using less expensive materials or be sent to a library bindery;
5. whether or not it is available in a format other than paper, such as microform (if it available in microform, whether it would be more desirable to acquire in that format);
6. if microform is selected, whether it is of a type, such as silver halide, for which longevity standards exist (it is important to remember, however, that film is only archival if it is processed and stored in archival conditions);
7. whether or not the item will circulate, be used in the library, or be used only under supervision;
8. the condition of retrospective materials. If possible, it should be determined before purchase whether the material contains mold or insects, or whether it is in disrepair.

Considering these matters before acquisition can realize long-term benefits in both user convenience and dollar savings.

Ongoing development of a library collection includes adding, withdrawing, relocating, reformatting, and replacing materials. Among the materials added to the collection are periodicals. Most of these arrive in paper cover format. These single issues are generally placed on the shelves for public use and at the end of the year are gathered and bound together to form a new physical volume to add to the continuing run. Based on the collection development policy and user needs, careful consideration should be given to whether retrospective volumes of some of the titles would be more suitable in microfilm or microfiche. There are several advantages to receiving the current issues in paper and the annual output in microform, not the least of which are: (1) space savings; (2) elimination of the need to seek replacement copies before being bound; (3) elimination of the need to retrieve, sort, process and package for binding; (4) the ability to use some of the money earmarked for binding for the purchase of microform periodicals; and (5) being able to keep the film longer than the paper if it is maintained properly.

When an item is determined to be in a condition where it is physically no longer usable, the following options are open: withdraw it from the collection and discard it; replace it with the exact edition, a reprint edition, or a book with similar content; replace it by reformatting, e.g., microform; or place it where it can’t be used except on rare occasions.

Factors such as those mentioned above are generally not considered part of the collection development program of a library. Under a comprehensive preservation program, however, they are an important part of collection development. Administrators should take steps to educate staff responsible for strengthening library collections to make preservation through collection development an integral part of the overall collection development program.

CONCLUSION

Now that we know where to begin, what the administrative structure should be, how to support financially the beginnings of a preservation program, and what constitutes the components of a comprehensive preser-
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Let's go back to our libraries and either start or improve the program.

NOTES

3. Ibid., p. 1117.
9. Ibid., p. 3.

DISCUSSION

Richard H. Kaige (Illinois State Library, Normal): Do you have a person on your staff who does retrospective bibliography?

Dale Cluff: I see that encompassed under our present program in the brittle books program (e.g., looking at the disrepair of volumes on the shelf). There is a systematic program of going to the shelf by those individuals in conservation to identify the brittle books. That was the area that I talked about in the presentation which is causing us a little anxiety. Once that is done, then, the subject librarian or the subject bibliographer is asked whether it is important to retain that item in the collection. If so, then the conservation staff determines in which way it would be best to replace it.

Andrew L. Makuch (University of Arizona Library, Tucson): Are there separate funds for the replacement of books administered by the preservation people? Do you know of any situation where funds are in existence for replacement?

Cluff: Yes. But it's not at our institution and that is one of the areas, I think, we could look at. Let's see, who of those here with conservation programs have a separate budget for the replacement of books? One—that institution is Texas A&M.
Gerald Lundeen (Graduate School of Library Science, University of Hawaii, Honolulu): I'd like to add one additional task to the list that you gave us for the preservation officer—that is, education of staff and, perhaps, patrons. Along that line I have to say I am somewhat sympathetic to the subject experts if they are not provided with some guidance in making the decisions about the proper way to go with brittle books.

Cluff: I appreciate that—that's a good comment.

Karen L. Sampson (University of Nebraska at Omaha): How did your commitment to preservation as a library administrator develop, and what suggestions do you have for us to develop awareness and commitment in administrators?

Cluff: I really can't point to a particular day or time or article or person which developed my thinking or developed the level of commitment that I have. I suppose that it was just a gradual working in various aspects of the overall library which caused that. Certainly meeting people and associating with others like people attending this conference also contributed. A lot of the credit goes to Carolyn Morrow, Paul Foulger, and other conservators who share the same commitment.

As to how to convince or help influence library administrators, I feel strongly that in those areas where library staff know the most about preservation—e.g., serials, binding, local mending and repair persons, persons who work with special collections, rare books, manuscripts and archives—these persons will be pounding on the desk of the administrator in a kind and tactful way for the cause of preservation. I think that any open administrator, trying to do a job for the overall good of the organizational operation of the library, will eventually become tuned in. In our own library, I ask for a planning statement from every area. Every year, these planning statements should have an area built into them asking for comments and rationale for a comprehensive preservation program.

Carolyn Clark Morrow (Southern Illinois University at Carbondale): I'd like to add two things to what Dale said, and that is, first, tell the administrator it's really going to save money in the long run, and, next, you say that everybody else is doing it. If we don't do it, we're going to look bad.

Gerald Gibson (Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.): How many libraries which have conservation programs are involved, in any way, with actively conserving newspaper materials? (Editors' note: There was a show of hands from librarians from six such libraries.) Second question, you spoke of budget in general. Is there any active thought at all in applying a portion of this budget to nonpaper conservation? Do you have any thoughts on that?
Cluff: If you are asking about our specific institution, we hope that our overall conservation program includes those materials. One of the problems that we have at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale is the level at which the conservation program reports. Conservation reports to me through the head of the serials department. However, that excludes a large portion of the overall organization, the Learning Resources Services on campus, which is housed in the same building as the library. Learning Resources Services does not report to me but to the Dean of Library Affairs.

Recognizing that there is a need for conserving nonpaper materials, the conservation individuals are aware of and sympathetic to these needs and as we meet in administrative council, they discuss those needs at that level. Here is the very thing that I brought up in my paper—the need for the conservation individuals reporting to the highest level in the overall program. My budget is not used in the Learning Resources Services area. However, we do have a lot of nonprint materials in Library Services. If we are talking about the overall environment which is monitored constantly by our conservation people and if we are talking about using nonprint materials for the replacement of brittle books, yes, we are allocating budget as part of the conservation budget to nonpaper preservation.

Gibson: Do you really consider that simply the accident of application of a portion of your budget to preservation of nonpaper materials, because they happen to be in the same building where you are keeping a basic temperature and humidity level, is an adequate justification of preservation of nonpaper any more than it is an adequate justification of preservation of paper materials?

Cluff: Let me indicate from my past experience and education that I consider myself a print and nonprint individual. I understand what you are saying; however, we are not sorting out paper and nonpaper. We are hoping to involve the whole program.

Morrow: We don't make that distinction in the Morris Library of SIUC. We have nonprint materials in Library Services, and I would remind Dale [Cluff] that we've spent hundreds and hundreds of dollars on better protective encasement for our phonograph records, for example. That was not questioned. We had a whole procedure for improving the storage of those materials and I don't think that anyone considered the bias—print/nonprint—the phonograph records were just part of the collection.

Cluff: When, about a year ago, the request for additional funds for supplies to support that program came across my desk, I did not weigh it as to whether it was paper/nonpaper. I approved it.