



National Planning For Resource Development

JAMES E. SKIPPER

NATIONAL PLANNING FOR LIBRARY resource development is a relatively new concept whose evolution owes more to opportunism than to a master plan or grand design. It is true that the increased availability of published materials has always been the Polar star which has guided efforts of libraries in improving service, but, lacking the potential for realistic funding, planning has been limited to programs which were reasonably obtainable, rather than those which would afford optimum results.

Library service to scholarship and research before World War II was reasonably adequate. An examination of the titles of doctoral dissertations accepted twenty-five years ago will reveal almost total concern with Western culture and the classical areas of science. However, within the past twenty years we have experienced the often-described "explosion" in scientific research with its consequent effect on the amount of publication. The \$16 billion which the Federal government will spend on research and development this year is as much as the entire national budget before Pearl Harbor. Having become a dominant world power, the national interest of the United States requires detailed knowledge of areas of the world which were little more than geographical expressions several generations ago.

In responding to these social changes the library community has recognized that local self-sufficiency, while necessary to meet the basic information needs of teaching and research, could not possibly meet the national information needs of the future. Supplemental programs for resource availability had to be developed on the national level.

Until recently, there was little opportunity for Federal support. Foundations feared that they might be approaching a bottomless pit, and libraries knew that ultimate solutions were beyond their individ-

James E. Skipper is Executive Secretary, Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.

ual or collective financial competence. For these reasons, self-supporting programs were limited by financial realities and Federal-supported efforts resulted from amendments being added to other legislation.

However, by keeping the major objectives in focus, the library community has constructed a series of national plans which are well coordinated, but need supplemental development. Limited examples of programs for the improvement of access to resources include the Association of Research Libraries' Current Foreign Newspaper Microfilming Project, the Foreign Gazettes Microfilming Program at the New York Public Library, and the activities of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. The most significant national efforts, however, concern the development of the Farmington Plan, the Public Law 480 Program, and the recently enacted Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Farmington Plan

The Farmington Plan can be considered as the first nationally cooperative effort to improve the availability of library resources. It is a well recognized social phenomenon that institutional changes occur most rapidly under conditions of crisis. With the invasion of Poland by Germany in 1939, it became obvious to American scholars that access to the treasures of European libraries would be restricted in the foreseeable future, and that these resources were indeed threatened by wholesale destruction. Subsequent American involvement in the war placed unprecedented demands for information on our libraries. Where are the railroad tunnels in Northern Italy, or the reefs surrounding Tarawa? What is the ball-bearing production of Germany? These concurrent concerns for the needs of the scholarly community and the national defense effort resulted in a reassessment of our methods for developing library resources.

Beginning in 1939, exploratory efforts were made to design an improved mechanism for resource development by the Library of Congress, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, the Board on Resources of American Libraries, and the Association of Research Libraries. Early deliberations considered a variety of possible programs. It was suggested that library organizations and learned societies compile lists of retrospective essential material to be acquired by the Library of Congress or to be microfilmed abroad. The merits of regional development versus a national approach were discussed, as well as the necessity for completing the

National Planning for Resource Development

National Union Catalog as a national focus for bibliographic control.

On October 9, 1942, the Executive Committee of the Librarian's Council of the Library of Congress met in Farmington, Connecticut, the place from which the present plan was to take its name. The conclusions reached at this meeting established a system based on the comprehensive collection of currently published materials with individual libraries accepting cooperative responsibility based on subject divisions.

Following the basic objectives formulated at the Farmington meeting, a working paper entitled *Proposal for a Division of Responsibility among American Libraries in the Acquisition and Recording of Library Materials*¹ was produced and circulated to the library community. This draft was refined in December, 1942, limiting the scope of the program to books and pamphlets in the regular trade "which might reasonably be expected to have interest to a research worker in America." Participating libraries were expected to place direct orders or rely on dealers for blanket selection. The paper also stated that, "It may prove to be wise to arrange for centralized cataloging of some books, particularly those in minor languages." Minority arguments were made in favor of the Library of Congress doing the entire job, and suggestions were made again that the regional approach would be more manageable than a national effort. The inherent lack of selectivity in the plan was also subject to objection.

The revised *Proposal* was endorsed in principle by the library associations in February, 1943, and funds for the operation of the Plan were solicited from the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, both of which refused support. This impasse was resolved at the Twenty-First Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries on March 1-2, 1944, in New York City, where it was voted that Messrs. Julian Bold, Keyes Metcalf, and Archibald MacLeish be appointed as members of a committee to pursue the objectives of the *Proposal*.² At this point the Farmington Plan became a responsibility of the Association of Research Libraries. Complete documentation of the evolution of the Farmington Plan will be found in the *Farmington Plan Handbook*.³

It is appropriate at this point to relate the development of a complementary program for cooperative resource development which originated from the initial discussions of the Farmington Plan. At the meeting of the Association of Research Libraries on January 31, 1943, when the *Proposal* was first discussed, Keyes Metcalf suggested the

desirability for cooperative action in obtaining materials from Europe after the end of the war.⁴ A committee was appointed to develop a program and, after receiving the endorsement of the State Department, the Library of Congress accepted responsibility for establishing a mission to collect materials in Europe. When the program terminated in September, 1948, 800,000 volumes had been distributed to the hundred and thirteen participating libraries.

Edwin Williams, editor of the *Farmington Plan Handbook*, has suggested several reasons why this effort to collect war-years' publications from Europe was related to the Farmington Plan. First, it was a cooperative effort for national resource development. Secondly, assignments for participating libraries were based on a modified division of the Library of Congress *Classification Schedule*, originally drawn up as the basis for participation in the Farmington Plan. In the third place, when libraries were asked to make Farmington Plan commitments in 1947, they found that "experience with the Mission had . . . demonstrated that fatal results need not follow an agreement to accept large quantities of material that had not been specifically selected and ordered."⁵

The concept of the Farmington Plan at the time of its inception contained a number of unique features. In the national interest, participating libraries agreed to accept assignments for collecting materials which were not individually selected. It was realized that some of the materials acquired would be of marginal, or of no interest to the recipient, but that the national needs of scholarship and research required that at least one copy of all currently published materials of scholarly interest should be available. Furthermore, the Plan anticipated that each participant would quickly catalog Farmington receipts and send copy to the National Union Catalog to serve as a national system of bibliographic control and location. It was also accepted that libraries would make Farmington receipts available on interlibrary loan.

Plans for implementing the Farmington Plan were developed in 1947. The Library of Congress *Classification Schedule* was divided into one hundred and eleven sections as the basis for assignments of subject responsibilities. It should be realized that although designations were based primarily on existing strengths of individual collections, it did not imply that assignments indicated the strongest collection in the country.

National Planning for Resource Development

Recognition should also be given to the limitations of the Plan. While it is true that the earlier reports refer to emphasis on books in Latin languages, the scope of coverage quickly moved to other areas of the world. The fact that the program was to be self-funded limited its initial coverage to countries with an organized book trade where dealers could be assigned for blanket selection. Thus, the Plan was most productive in Western Europe. Certain categories of materials were eliminated because of budgetary, mechanical, or substantive reasons. The Plan was restricted to currently published books, thus eliminating all retrospective titles, as well as serials, government publications, monographs published in a numbered series, juveniles, newspapers, textbooks, reprints, sheet maps, sheet music, and translations from one modern language to another. Although dealers were encouraged to supply all books of scholarly interest, it was recognized that they would not be able to provide complete coverage for "non-trade" publications. As it was assumed that libraries were already providing sufficient coverage of current British publications, Great Britain was not included in the Plan.

In January, 1948, it was announced that the Carnegie Corporation had granted \$15,000 for the developmental and operational aspects of the Plan, and the program was initiated for current publications issued in France, Sweden, and Switzerland. Representatives of the Farmington Plan Committee toured Europe to establish a network of dealers in other countries. Originally, all Farmington receipts were sent to the New York Public Library where they were distributed by subject category to participating libraries; this system was subsequently modified so that dealers sent their selections directly.

In 1949, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, and Norway were added, and the following year Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru were included in the Plan. Australia, Austria, Germany, Portugal, and Spain were added in 1951, with Harvard accepting responsibility for the comprehensive collection of all currently published Irish materials. The German agent agreed to supply as many East Zone publications as possible. A modification of the subject basis for assignment was suggested in 1952, when it was recommended that libraries accept total responsibility for publications issued by a given country or area not presently covered by the Plan. Thus, the Caribbean area was accepted by the University of Florida, and studies were made concerning the feasibility of including such areas as Finland, Greece, Yugo-

slavia, and other countries. Berkeley announced that it would attempt to cover Korea, and Northwestern agreed to accept responsibility for many areas of Africa.

In 1952, fifty-seven libraries acquired 17,508 volumes from the major twelve countries involved in the Farmington Plan at a total cost of \$37,914. Statistics are not available for the receipts from the additional countries and areas covered. The cost per institution ranged from \$3 to \$4,824. The statistics for receipts during 1965 indicate that fifty-two libraries received 22,419 volumes from fourteen countries at a total cost of \$107,438, in addition to area assignment receipts.

From its inception until 1951, the Farmington Plan was managed by an office in the New York Public Library, after which it was moved to Harvard. With the establishment of a Secretariat for the Association of Research Libraries in 1963, the Farmington office was transferred from Harvard. *The Farmington Plan Letter*, first published in 1949 to establish the mechanics of the new program, has been developed into a focal source of information concerning all projects designed to improve the availability of materials published in foreign countries.⁶

Following eight years of experience, the Association of Research Libraries voted in 1957 to re-examine the Farmington Plan in an effort to assess past performance and plans for future improvement. With a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Robert Vosper and Robert Talmadge, then at the University of Kansas, made the study and reported to the Association in January, 1959.⁷

It would be impossible to consider the report in detail at this time. However, several major recommendations should be mentioned. The report deplored the popular conception of the Farmington Plan as only concerned with Western Europe. Indeed, it has continually expanded its scope to include other areas of the world. The report also strongly recommended that the Association of Research Libraries continue its support of the Plan by strengthening the organizational position of the Farmington Plan Committee, by creating effective liaison with the learned societies, and by adopting a more flexible procurement policy, rather than depending exclusively on blanket order selections from assigned dealers. Today, the Farmington Plan Committee is composed of Subcommittees on Western Europe, Africa, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, Latin America, and South Asia.

National Planning for Resource Development

Public Law 480

In extending the Farmington Plan into areas of the world which had no adequate book trade or national bibliography, it was recognized that satisfactory coverage would be problematical. Libraries accepting these assignments relied on a variety of techniques including assistance from local consular staff, available bookstores, and the peripatetic efforts of roving faculty and librarians. At best, these endeavors were of marginal effectiveness in providing comprehensive coverage as the costs involved were simply too large to be undertaken by libraries collectively or individually.

Mortimer Graves of the American Council of Learned Societies had the perception to visualize a solution to the problem of collecting library materials from "developing" countries. For several years the United States had been selling surplus agricultural products to some forty countries under authorization of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (PL 83-480). Foreign countries were allowed to pay for these commodities with local currencies, or counterpart funds, as they lacked U.S. dollars. Thus, in a number of countries, the United States was developing considerable credits which were not needed for diplomatic or military expenditures.

Following a concerted effort on the part of ACLS and the Association of Research Libraries, Congressman John Dingell of Michigan introduced an amendment to PL 480, which would authorize the use of counterpart funds for the purchase of library materials in countries where the U.S. Treasury had declared funds to be surplus. In 1958 the amendment was incorporated into PL 480 as Section 104n which authorized the Library of Congress, within the appropriations specified, to acquire, index, abstract, and deposit library materials from designated countries.

At the time, eight to ten countries had surplus currencies and the Library of Congress requested authorization to use funds in all of them. The Congress refused this program in fiscal year 1959 and again in 1960. In 1961, the Library of Congress reduced its request to include only India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic. Congress approved this approach and authorized \$36,500 in U.S. currency and \$363,500 in foreign currency, or a total of \$400,000, to initiate the program. Table 1 illustrates the development of the program to date.

With the advice of the P.L. 480 Advisory Committee, the Library of Congress selected the libraries which would be invited to partici-

TABLE I
Development of The Public Law 480 Program, 1962-66

Year (FY)	Budget		Total	Countries	Total Items	Libraries
	U. S.	Foreign				
1962	\$ 36,500	\$ 363,500	\$ 400,000	UAR	60,160	LC, UCLA, Columbia, Harvard, Hartford Seminary ^A , Michigan, NYPL, Portland State ^A , Princeton, Utah, Virginia, Indiana
1963	\$ 49,900	\$ 630,000	\$ 679,900	India/Pakistan	338,913	LC, Cal-B, Chicago, Cornell, Duke, Hawaii, Minnesota, Penn, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Yale
				UAR	184,548	^B Poston College, Brandeis, Chicago, Hoover, Kentucky, U. of S. Cal., Syracuse, Yale
1964	\$ 80,000	\$ 898,000	\$ 978,000	India/Pakistan	813,328	^B Columbia, Illinois, Michigan, NYPL, Syracuse, Virginia
				UAR	289,436	Same ^F and Portland State
				India/Pakistan	846,286	Same
				Indonesia	37,135	Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, NYPL, Wisconsin, Yale
				Israel	57,343	Brandeis, UCLA, Dropsie, Harvard, Hebrew Union, Indiana, College of Jewish Studies, NYPL, Texas, Yale, Yeshiva
				Burma	^D —	Berkeley, Columbia, Cornell, Duke, Hawaii, Illinois, Mich., NYPL, N. Illinois, Penn., Yale

National Planning for Resource Development

1965	\$124,500	\$1,417,000	\$1,541,500	UAR	316,185	Same
				India/Pakistan	840,067	Same
				Indonesia	167,068	Same
				Israel	208,425	^B Columbia, Portland State, Princeton, Syracuse, Utah, Wayne, Virginia ^C , Michigan ^D
				Burma	E —	
1966	\$150,900	\$1,694,000	\$1,844,900	UAR		Same and Illinois
				India/Pakistan		Same
				Indonesia		Same
				Israel		Same and Boston Public, Jewish Theological Seminary, U. of S. Cal., Yeshiva ^G
				Burma	E —	Same

^A Shared a set.

^B Added.

^C Transfer from Dropsie.

^D Transfer from Yeshiva.

^E Program frustrated by local political problems.

^F Brandeis switched to Israel.

^G Yeshiva reinstated.

pate. As the Congress had insisted that libraries contribute a token sum for materials received, it was agreed that \$500 would be paid to the U.S. Treasury annually by each participant.

It was obvious that this venture would involve libraries in unique and difficult cataloging problems. Not only would they be dealing with dozens of languages and hundreds of dialects, but there was also a serious lack of uniform authority files for authors' names and transliteration schedules for some languages. The Subcommittee on the National Union Catalog under the Chairmanship of Gordon Williams took the initiative in developing one of the first and perhaps the best example of a centralized cataloging effort to follow the card distribution service started by the Library of Congress in 1901. Each participant in the Indic program agreed to pay the Library of Congress \$7,750 per year for cataloging; the Arabic cataloging cost \$1,111, with Princeton paying for its "share" by providing copy for approximately 50 percent of the accessions. Total annual costs for Indic were \$131,750, and for Arabic \$18,887.

The definitive history of the P.L. 480 Program has yet to be written, although basic facts can be obtained from the Annual Reports of the P.L. 480 Coordinator in the Library of Congress⁸ and the *P.L.-480 Newsletter*.⁹ These sources give a general account of the tremendous effort and imagination that were required on the part of the Library of Congress staff to establish initial programs in Cairo, Karachi, and New Delhi. Beginning in 1962, in three countries with total shipments of 820,000 items, the program grew to include operations in six countries by 1965, when 1,531,745 items were sent to American libraries. Efforts were made in the first session of the 89th Congress to extend the program to Poland, Yugoslavia, and Brazil. As the extension was not authorized, the Library of Congress has asked the second session to consider admitting Poland and Yugoslavia, in addition to Tunisia, Ceylon, and Guinea.

Compared with the complexities of obtaining materials in the countries involved, the mechanics of the P.L. 480 Program are relatively simple. The selection teams acquire local publications and ship them to the participating libraries. Accessions lists are published and distributed to a large number of libraries in this country to provide identification and control for national access. The program is subject to continuing analysis of the quality of selection, and several changes have been made to avoid the inclusion of too much marginal material, such as Indic vernacular fiction.

National Planning for Resource Development

In addition to direct distribution of books and periodicals, the program has started a microfilming program for newspapers. Initially, the lack of technical competence and the inability to purchase raw film with local currencies prevented the filming of Indian newspapers in New Delhi. The originals were shipped to the Library of Congress for filming until technicians could be trained and arrangements made for the Library of Congress to supply the raw film. The local newspaper microfilming program in India was scheduled to start January 1, 1966 and will include newspapers from Pakistan. Foreign gazettes from the countries involved have been incorporated into the microfilming program at the New York Public Library.

Sets of English language materials have been assembled for distribution to some three hundred American colleges, in addition to the participating libraries. Initially confined to serial publications from India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic, the program has subsequently provided monographic materials.

Higher Education Act of 1965

The potential of the P.L. 480 Program is obviously dependent on the continued availability of surplus counterpart currencies in the various developing countries of the world. While it has provided an invaluable extension of the Farmington Plan, the program has definite limitations. For example, with the exception of the United Arab Republic and possibly Tunisia, not one of the more than fifty countries in Africa has surplus counterpart funds. The Far East presents a similar problem. This condition left our libraries with no national support for resource development in these areas while, at the same time, African and Far Eastern area studies programs were being developed on an increasing number of campuses. A potential solution to the problem came from the concern of the Association of Research Libraries with the lack of centrally produced cataloging copy for use in adding books to our libraries.

Without sufficient cataloging staff, and suffering from an inadequate book budget, the Library of Congress had long been able to supply catalog copy for only about 50 percent of the titles added to our larger libraries. The lack of catalog copy for foreign books was especially critical, with ARL libraries reporting that Library of Congress copy was available for only some 5 percent of Farmington Plan receipts at the time the books were processed. The Higher Education Act, introduced into the first session of the 89th Congress, contained

JAMES E. SKIPPER

Title II, which authorized \$50 million for the development of library collections.

The Shared Cataloging Committee of the Association of Research Libraries, with William S. Dix as Chairman, testified before the House and Senate Education Committees suggesting that the potential of the \$50 million authorization for resource development would be seriously eroded by the present inefficiencies in our national cataloging system. An amendment was offered which would provide funds to the Commissioner of Education for transfer to the Librarian of Congress, with authorization for the Library of Congress to collect every current publication of scholarly interest issued in all countries of the world and provide catalog copy within three to four weeks of receipt.¹⁰ Testimony also indicated that the amendment would make a material improvement in manpower availability, especially with regard to linguistic competence, and would serve as a base for automation of bibliographic information. The amendment was accepted by both houses of the Congress and became Part C of Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965. A total of \$19 million was authorized over the next three years for implementation.

While the basic orientation of Title II-C was to improve the cataloging situation, it has considerable implications in the development of resource availability. In the first place, the Library of Congress will ultimately double its present rate of accessions, and this increase will take place primarily in foreign language publications. With centralized cataloging at the Library of Congress, the element of identification and location will satisfy another condition for national improvement. However, national needs require more than just the one copy at the Library of Congress, and this desideratum leads to the next phase in national planning for resource availability.

Future Possibilities

The evolution of national plans for the more adequate collection of currently published materials has been noted in the development of the Farmington Plan, the Public Law 480 Program, and most recently, the authorization under Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for the Library of Congress to develop a globally comprehensive procurement program. Bibliographic control on the national level provides the second leg of the stool. The third leg, now being fashioned, is designed to increase the availability of the material itself.

To execute its responsibilities, the Library of Congress must not

National Planning for Resource Development

only maintain its present P.L. 480 field staff, but also establish regional collecting offices in such countries as Africa and the Far East. With intelligent planning and supplemental funding, it is logical to assume that all of these procurement centers could collect multiple copies of current materials for institutions other than the Library of Congress or those designated as P.L. 480 depositories.

The Association of Research Libraries is presently organizing a Materials Development Program to complement the basic projects for acquisitions and bibliographic control noted above. This Program, of national scope, is directed to the problem of increased availability of materials, both current and retrospective. It is designed to supplement the titles obtainable from commercial sources such as reprint or microfilm editions, and is specifically oriented to those types of publications not needed in a sufficient number of copies to attract commercial action. To provide adequate national access to some types of materials from developing countries, a master microfilm negative is sufficient. Other titles may require a loan microfilm positive, or a sales positive, while a fourth category might justify offset reprinting. In addition, it is anticipated that the Materials Development Program would have sufficient capital to support the compilation and publication of ancillary bibliographical tools required for the effective use of these materials. If found to be desirable, a translation project could also be considered as part of the Program.

There is no question that each library must become self-sufficient in meeting the basic needs of the teaching and research programs which it supports. However, with the inefficiencies of our present system of interlibrary loan, individual libraries are forced to collect far beyond reasonable anticipation of need. It is probable that there are definable categories of materials which, if collected comprehensively by a national agency and made available at low cost and within acceptable time limits, could afford a material saving at the local level. Examples of these categories are microfilms of newspapers and the contents of foreign archives, trade catalogs and directories, superseded textbooks, translations, publications from developing countries, government publications, and perhaps a current periodicals lending service. The population to be served need not only be that associated with universities, but might also include faculty at smaller colleges wishing to continue their research without being subject to the constraints of a smaller library collection.

Most libraries have experienced increased difficulty in the past

decade in borrowing journals from other institutions, especially science periodicals. Accelerated local demand, rather than unwillingness to share resources, has been responsible for this trend. A national facility for resource development and service for specified categories would supplement interlibrary loan and would help to relieve the inequitable costs now assumed by the large libraries in attempting to meet national information needs without reciprocal compensation.

Although the precise system for future improvement of resource availability is not known, the problems and general objectives are reasonably clear. Our largest libraries are the first to admit that they cannot hope to acquire a comprehensive collection of all types of library materials. The task for the immediate future is to design supplementary systems and programs which will complement and extend the capability of our present library structure to afford greater access to information.

References

1. U.S. Library of Congress. Metcalf-Boyd-MacLeish Committee. *Proposal for a Division of Responsibility among American Libraries in the Acquisition and Recording of Library Materials*. (Mimeographed)
2. Association of Research Libraries. *Minutes of the Twenty-first Meeting*. New York, March 1-2, 1944, p. 3.
3. Williams, Edwin E. *Farmington Plan Handbook*. Cambridge, Mass., Association of Research Libraries, 1953, pp. 9-60.
4. Association of Research Libraries. *Minutes of the Twentieth Meeting*. Chicago, January 31, 1943, p. 2.
5. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
6. *Farmington Plan Letter*, No. 1. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Library, March 29, 1949.
7. Vosper, Robert. *The Farmington Plan Survey: A Summary of the Separate Studies of 1957-1961* (University of Illinois Library School Occasional Papers No. 77). Urbana, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1965.
8. U.S. Library of Congress. Public Law 480 Office. *Annual Report*. Washington, D.C., 1962-63. (Multilithed.)
9. U.S. Library of Congress. *P.L.-480 Newsletter*, No. 1. Washington, D.C., October 16, 1961.
10. U.S. Congress. 89th Cong., 1st Sess., P.L. 89-329. *Higher Education Act of 1965*, Title II, Part C.