The International Relations Program of the American Library Association

PEGGY SULLIVAN

There have been several historical reviews of the international relations program and interests of the American Library Association. Customarily, they open with reference to the long-standing welcome ALA has accorded to foreign librarians, to the tradition of American attendance at conferences of the Library Association of the United Kingdom, to active leadership in the origin and development of the International Federation of Library Associations, and to direct and indirect assistance provided by the association to library programs in other countries. When that has all been said, there remains the cold fact that the association's leaders who have sought international involvement have often done so with ill-informed and casual support or, in stormier times, with outright hostility and suspicion from the membership. Explaining and defending an international program is never an easy task. When the program competes with others more visible to the membership, the explanation and defense become heavy burdens indeed.

The character of the leadership in the association has commanded the respect and the trust of the membership. When, over several generations, men of the caliber and prestige of Herbert Putnam, Ernest C. Richardson, Louis Round Wilson, William Warner Bishop, and Carl H. Milam encouraged interest in international library development, they were not always entirely understood or appreciated, but their enthusiasm and experience carried ALA into such enterprises as the American Library in Paris, the American influence in the development of the Vatican Library, and assistance to libraries in areas devastated by World War II.

During World War II, the number of ALA staff engaged in the inter-
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national relations program probably reached an all-time high, because in that period when American foundations and government agencies were just beginning to develop programs of overseas assistance, the ALA was an energetic association eager to assist in the administration of programs of assistance. The two major areas of assistance served to (1) provide materials to be made available to scholarly and research libraries in war areas, and (2) develop plans for acquisition of materials published abroad during the war but needed for U.S. collections. At that time, as often since, ALA's actual dollar investment was small, but its administration of foundation and government funds was the basis for its program. In recent years, when the association has been challenged by membership on the spending of its funds, this distinction has been equally true, but seldom understood by those who look at totals without being able to distinguish sources.

That brief view of ALA before and during World War II is necessary in this study of what the association's leadership has done in international relations since then. The philosophy and direction of the International Relations Office have been determined by the terms of the financial grants which provided for its operation. The office's lean times have been caused by the gap in understanding which seems always to have existed between the association's leadership and its member-critics. Sometimes this has been further complicated by the priorities set in international programs of major interest to some divisions within the association. These have fallen within the purview of the International Relations Office and the International Relations Committee, which have attempted to correlate such activities with an overall program for the association. This they have done with varying degrees of success. Still another dimension has been added by the International Relations Round Table, an informal membership group within the association which includes among its members many librarians who have had or who desire overseas library experience. Its three-fold statement of purpose relates to the development of libraries' interest in international library relations, the maintenance of communications and advice with the International Relations Committee and the ALA membership, and the provision of hospitality and information for foreign visitors.

It is probably inevitable that the regions of the world which have received the most emphasis from ALA have shifted as the U.S. governmental and cultural spheres of influence abroad have shifted. In the Rooseveltian Good Neighbor days of the 1940s, South America was prominent. Since World War II, concern for developing countries has meant that, except for participation in the International Federation of
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Library Associations (IFLA) and its links with European library leadership, the ALA has tended to focus on the nations of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. One of the offbeat forays was the provision of, first, an observer, and later, funds and technical assistance when the floods of 1966 wrought great damage to the libraries of Florence, Italy. Lester Asheim’s perceptive and persuasive Librarianship in the Developing Countries, based on his Phineas L. Windsor lectures at the University of Illinois, is a highly readable statement of the ALA’s concerns and expectations for the areas with which it has been most concerned in recent years.

To approach the program of international relations within ALA on a somewhat chronological basis, one might note the report of the International Relations Board (the equivalent of the later International Relations Committee) of 1946-47. The coming year, 1948, was seen as one “when A.L.A. international activities will be comparatively free from the overwhelming details of such well-received and worth-while, but possibly self-confusing projects—a year in which we may more definitely determine the place of A.L.A. in international librarianship in relation to UNESCO, I.F.L.A., F.I.D., and new concepts of education and mass communication.” It was recognized that new policies and attitudes would be essential in the post-World War II era, and for that reason, the board had requested a major study by Ralph Shaw. As a librarian with special expertise in management and policy making, but with an outsider’s view of the International Relations Office (IRO) as it then existed, he was uniquely qualified for the task. His major recommendation was that “the primary long-range functions of the International Relations Office should be advisory and planning.”

The International Relations Board, in implementing such a recommendation, became a critic and gadfly for other programs relating to library development abroad. It endorsed the establishment of U.S. information libraries abroad, noting in words that were to be remembered in the McCarthy era just a few years later, that their objective should be “a broad, honest, non-propagandistic interpretation of United States life and thought.” The $2,500 grant which the board received from the Carnegie Corporation in 1948 funded the seminar on international library work at Williamstown, Massachusetts, where the International Relations Round Table was begun by the fifty-eight participants, many of them fresh from their first overseas experiences in World War II.

As the wartime programs for provision of books and periodical subscriptions were phased out, interest in exchange of personnel was
aroused, but these exchanges tended to be conducted on an informal basis. Rosters of interested personnel were complex and expensive to maintain, and the short time available when persons were needed in other countries often meant that availability became a criterion as significant as competence. Advice in the area of personnel also comes from various units of the ALA, so that responsibility for it is not limited to the staff or committee most concerned with international relations.

It was with the U.S. Army that the association worked in making recommendations, establishing, and conducting a library school in Japan during the period of occupation. Robert B. Downs visited Japan in 1950 to assess the situation and to recommend a site. The problems of language, selection of students, rapport with universities and the army loomed larger as the project developed. The school, which was finally located at Keio, was extended from a fifteen-month project by a four-year Rockefeller Foundation grant, and by 1956, Robert L. Gitler, who directed the school, could report to the ALA executive board that “the philosophy of librarianship has been difficult to get across but that has been overcome to a certain extent and good persons are being graduated and placed in desirable jobs.” The success of the school no doubt was related to the fact that at the same executive board meeting where Gitler's report was presented, ALA President John Richards and Executive Secretary David H. Clift reported on an informal and confidential meeting with a representative of the Rockefeller Foundation. The foundation expressed an interest in having ALA add staff “to study and make investigations in several areas of the world concerning the need for library schools.”

This reasonably specific commitment to an international relations office as an aid to the establishment of library schools abroad characterized the first office, as established by a Rockefeller grant, which was announced at the Miami Beach ALA conference of 1956, where it was also announced that Jack Dalton of the University of Virginia would serve as its director. The office's primary concern was to be education for librarianship, and its major areas of interest were to be Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa. The arrangement for exchanges of personnel was specified as the concern of the International Relations Round Table, rather than the foundation-funded office.

ALA's relationship with the Rockefeller Foundation had extended over several decades and throughout several arms of the foundation. Besides the foundation's major grants, chiefly for books and materials, during World War II, the Japan Library School was an ALA-Rockefeller activity, as was the Ankara Library School in Turkey. The initial partic-[ 580 ]
The careful planning and site selection in Japan were not followed in the Turkish school, and, as the International Relations Committee reported, much of its time "has been spent in consultation and negotiation with the Foundation in efforts to achieve more realistic support for the Institute." There were problems enough in Japan; in Turkey, almost every one of these was magnified. The reports from the library school directors and the observations of committee members and IRO staff who visited the schools point up the difficulties at the Turkish school and, at the same time, dramatize the need for effective participation in pre-planning and initial stages of the work.

The annual budget proposed for the IRO was $37,959 over a three-year period. Ten years would be the limit of extensions. By providing for a small staff but extensive travel, the proposal stressed the need for the director to develop as "a valuable source of advice, independent and unofficial, for foundations, Government agencies, and library groups concerned with assistance to foreign countries."

From this point on, the travel diaries of the directors and, later, the assistant directors of the IRO provide kaleidoscopic, sometimes varying, sometimes converging views of what was really going on, not only in American programs related to library development overseas, but also in the internal development of the countries, and in some other programs, such as the UNESCO programs. As Luther Evans, former Librarian of Congress, had outlined it in 1955, UNESCO's program included three kinds of projects: continuing projects, conducted from headquarters or regional offices, such as clearinghouse projects; planned projects, intended to achieve specific aims within a limited period, such as special seminars or conferences; and, third, projects to aid member nations in response to their expressed needs and priorities.

A major task of the IRO staff was to be well informed about the various interests of such agencies, in order to be able to recommend projects to the appropriate agency and to give the best advice to persons drafting proposals for grants in other countries. There were many potential and real overlaps, but these could be minimized by thoughtful planning and counsel. Added to this complex responsibility was the necessity for an awareness of the political and social problems of various countries, which profoundly affected the nature and extent of library development. Obvious examples of these would be the need to understand how permanent the establishment of the Nationalist Chinese gov-
ernment on Taiwan would be or how patterns of educational and government agencies might shift with a change of governments or with the setting of new priorities within a country.

The travel diaries mentioned above were intended as on-the-spot commentaries for the members of the International Relations Committee and as reminders for the IRO staff about necessary follow-ups for action or correspondence after their tours of observation had been concluded. The diaries are confidential documents housed at ALA headquarters, but they have been made available to this writer. Some themes that come through the diaries are striking for their repetition: concern at evidence of much unintelligent American giving, notably in book drives organized in response to appeals which indicated that anything at all would be useful; the growing problem of how to advise the numbers of working librarians who wished to study or travel in the United States, and who often considered a library degree more essential than programs of education, travel, and work experience which might have been more individually tailored to their interests and needs for the future; apprehension at the attitude of some personnel responsible for programs of library development who seemed assured that money could solve all problems; and, finally, a fascinating view of the varieties of competence and attitudes represented by Americans abroad engaged in library programs, including Peace Corps volunteers, United States Information Service personnel, consultants for specific programs, and others. Jack Dalton may not have coined the word, "outpostitis," but in expressing his concern for "how long a person can remain away from the States and still keep in touch with things," he was foreshadowing a problem that arose repeatedly as IRO staff sometimes found themselves working at cross purposes with U.S. librarians who had been in longer residence in the foreign countries, but who were also somewhat out of touch with recent library developments in the U.S.

The establishment of the IRO on a firm basis of 1956 doubtless gave impetus to general ALA interest in international relations. In an enthusiastic and well-informed statement rare for an ALA president, Lucile Morsch, in her inaugural speech at the Kansas City ALA conference of 1957, stressed international relations. With her own professional background in cataloging, an area which had benefited from international cooperation perhaps longer and more directly than any other, Morsch was an effective spokesman. She stressed the need for interest and support from individual members and for broad interpretation of library and international programs, pointing out that libraries should be included in the itineraries of foreign visitors who represented other spe-
cialties, and that alert American librarians could be effective in getting International Cooperation Agency contracts to include libraries as units of universities that should receive technical assistance. She also noted that, although foundation and other grants had provided initiative for ALA's international program before, it was time for the association to stimulate support for services known to be needed.

A cooperative program of the U.S. Department of State, the Special Libraries Association, and the ALA was set up that same year, 1957. As Verner Clapp noted, the program differed from earlier ones in being focused on individuals rather than groups and on employment in U.S. libraries rather than on travel or formal study. Foreign service officers abroad were to publicize the program, and participating libraries were to provide employment for foreign librarians for eleven months, paying an untaxable grant of ten dollars a day.

As exchange programs on an individual basis flourished during the 1950s when the U.S. went through a period of severe shortage of librarians, many libraries and some other groups, such as the New York Library Association, developed their own machinery for recruiting and employing librarians from other countries. While the number of persons assisted by ALA remained sizable, it probably represented a smaller proportion of those interested, since other channels of information and assistance were open to them. Also, throughout the reporting of ALA's international relations program, there is an on-again-off-again attitude toward the responsibility for exchange programs for personnel. It was probably inevitable that the IRO directors' visits would lead to their being engaged in offering some assistance in placement, and the multi-national program administered by the IRO under the sponsorship of the State Department was certainly a facet of an exchange program, but it was one which was always shared with a cooperating library education program, and which has since been removed from the ALA program entirely. William L. Williamson's account of the 1967 program at the University of Wisconsin indicates the nature of the program and the particular administrative and instructional problems encountered in planning and conducting it. As of 1970, these workshops or seminars are being conducted for the State Department by the Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences of the University of Pittsburgh.

In Dalton's tenure as IRO director, the proposal for assistance to the University of Rangoon, Burma, was drafted for funding by the Ford Foundation. A significant feature of this plan was that the effort to improve the library was related to the creation of a new faculty (or, to
use the U.S. term more comparable, a new department) of social sciences. It was recognized that new instructional techniques and interdepartmental emphases to be introduced would mean little unless the library's program was geared to them. This appeared to be an opportunity to assist in university library development at a time when the university's organization and administration were ready and able to relate U.S. concepts of library service for students and faculty to the new programs. In a separate project, also administered by the ALA, the University of Mandalay engaged in the improvement of its library. Joseph Reason, in his account of the projects which came to an abrupt end in late 1962 when the Burmese embassy notified the Ford Foundation that it wanted to finance all Burmese scholars studying abroad, commented on some of the accomplishments at the two universities. Three American librarians, including Reason himself, had served as experts; nine Burmese had attended library schools in the U.S.; almost three times as many Burmese had received on-the-job training in clerical and subprofessional tasks; modern library equipment had been installed in both universities; thousands of books and periodicals had been added to the collections; and the existing libraries had been made more accessible by cataloging.15 Ironically, these projects were prevented from becoming memorable successes because political events led to the decision of the Burmese government to withdraw from participation. It was a dramatic example of the fact that no association's or other American agency's programs or plans could be implemented in isolation from the nation's overall program of international relations.

Another accomplishment of the Dalton years was the establishment of the ALA panel on UNESCO, intended "to provide a channel through which every member of ALA can reach Unesco with all the ideas and suggestions, big and little, that they may have."16 As an advisory subcommittee to the ALA International Relations Committee, this group still functions.

In July 1959, Raynard C. Swank succeeded Dalton as IRO director. He, too, spent most of his time in travel, and had little or no staff assistance, although it began to be recognized that the follow-up work required more attention. Also, there was need to centralize some of the activities related to the ALA's international relations program within the ALA headquarters. Even before that was achieved, however, the continuity and the consistency of IRO policy and practice were established, as Swank built on the work of Dalton. In Latin America, where there was a fairly long tradition of association with the U.S. in library development, he noted: "Let no number of failures cloud the truth that
everywhere . . . the founders of modern librarianship are almost without exception U.S. trained and inspired . . . The human and intellectual qualities are far more important [than the ability of American librarians to speak Spanish or Portuguese]." Swank's ability to form long-range recommendations based on his observations showed in a memorandum he prepared in December 1959 on the kinds of library assistance that might be most constructive for Latin America. This, with its emphasis on institutions of higher education, also indicated the shifting of focus to other areas of library development, in addition to library education.

Swank, in this memorandum and elsewhere, stressed the need for demonstration or pilot public libraries, for stimulation of faculty interest and understanding of the library's potential, for translation of library literature from the U.S., and for the establishment of library science libraries. Here it might be noted that although the history of the ALA's international relations programs follows that of its successfully funded projects, there is a shadow-history of the might-have-been, the projects which did not receive funds and which were never implemented. Often, these were survey or demonstration projects such as Swank envisioned.

Swank saw the job of the IRO director as that of "a kind of cultural relationist who travels abroad to study library conditions and needs and to promote programs of library assistance, especially in library education." Like other IRO directors before and since, Swank appreciated the fact that itineraries had to include offices of publishing programs, agencies to encourage literacy, and bookstores, as well as libraries, government and foundation offices, and other U.S. representatives abroad. When the five-year report was prepared for IRO in 1961, a dozen or more non-governmental agencies were listed as those with which rapport was maintained, and, in referring to the several different U.S. government agencies, it was noted that IRO had had more direct personal contact with United States Information Service libraries overseas than had United States Information Agency headquarters in Washington. Seventy-four specific programs in which IRO was to some extent participating included thirteen for library training overseas, sixteen for technical assistance, eleven for training of foreign librarians in the U.S., seven for visits to the U.S. by foreign librarians, and twenty-seven for general library development.

One attention-getting activity in that period was the group exchange program for delegations from the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. In November 1959 an agreement for such an exchange was signed in Washington,
D.C. Four members of the Soviet delegation toured the U.S. from April 5 to May 2, 1961, and seven U.S. librarians traveled through the Soviet Union in May and June of the same year. Even before the book-length report of these travels appeared, the Americans presented highlights of their experiences at the ALA conference in Cleveland in July. Swank led the U.S. delegation, and also accompanied the Soviet visitors on their U.S. trip. The anticipated increase in such exchanges did not materialize, but there have been reunions of the delegations at IFLA meetings, and, of course, a number of U.S. librarians attended the Moscow meeting of IFLA in 1970 and had opportunity to travel and visit Soviet libraries.

With the perspective and tolerance which time provides, it is interesting to note the report of two of the Soviet visitors, which in some respects complements American reactions to Soviet libraries by judging U.S. libraries according to Soviet objectives. In other ways, it might serve as the American reaction to Soviet libraries, with only the descriptive national adjectives changed, as in the comment on the collections’ suffering from “extreme tendentiousness. . . . They are surfeit with literature eulogizing the American way of life and American ‘democracy,’ anti-Communist and anti-Soviet literature. . . . The attention of readers was everywhere deliberately directed to slanderous books distorting Soviet reality.” They noted that lists of recommended books in public libraries “serve to bring to the reader extreme reactionary literature causing the American inhabitant to fear the ‘Communist threat’ allegedly threatening the USA from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.”

In the last months of his directorship, in another example of his long-term recommendations based on experience, Swank talked to a meeting of the Association of American Library Schools on the problems of educating foreign students in U.S. library schools. He pointed out differences in the social backgrounds of librarianship in various countries; differences in the content and scope of library collections which affect selection and cataloging practices; differences in the customary methods of instruction; and, finally, the variation in preparation of students for library education. He dismissed an oft-discussed and controversial topic by declaring, “There can probably be no such thing as a truly international library school curriculum.” But he did offer seven specific and still-relevant suggestions for making the education of foreign students in U.S. library schools as consistent with the schools’ standards, yet as individualized and helpful to the student, as possible.

In the fall of 1961, Lester E. Asheim was appointed director of IRO
for the next five years. The Rockefeller Foundation grant was extended at the same time to provide $175,560 through September 30, 1966, and to make two separate grants of $38,850 to develop a library training program at National Taiwan University, and $56,795 to assist in the establishment of a graduate program in library science at the University of the Philippines. Major continuing projects still included the Turkish and Japanese library schools and the two projects in Burma at Rangoon and Mandalay. The increased support for the office allowed for the employment of an assistant director at ALA headquarters, and Joseph F. Shubert filled that position. A grant from the Council on Library Resources supplemented the Rockefeller funds.

With increased staff, IRO participated more actively in the preparation of itineraries for foreign librarians visiting the U.S., and served somewhat as a clearinghouse, rather than a placement service, for libraries interested in receiving applications from foreign librarians. In an April 1964 memorandum, Asheim categorized IRO activity for the International Relations Committee as field activities and home office activities. The former included general overview visits which increased the "considerable reservoir of knowledge and expertise about librarianship abroad," visits to ongoing projects, visits to contemplated projects, consultation and advice overseas, visits to give talks or speeches, and finally, trips to report to foundations and other agencies. Work at the home office included assistance with travel arrangements, management of certain small projects, handling of American applications for British Library Association internships, assistance in the education of foreign librarians in the U.S., and preparation of such materials as book lists. Planning for the future, Asheim noted the need for continuity of program, a shift of emphasis toward more intensive work on specific projects and away from overview or random visits, a need to investigate more about the role of U.S. government agencies and trends in U.S. librarianship, and, as possibilities, the need to take a more active role in obtaining desirable grants for overseas projects and the extension of the geographic limits of the IRO's area of responsibility.

Some months later, Asheim noted that IRO's relationship to ALA often helped to focus the interest of foreign library leaders on ALA as a model for the library associations of other countries. He was conscious of ALA member-critics who felt they did not get enough information about the work of IRO, and he pointed out the need for secrecy in some instances, and discretion in all instances, of negotiations or reporting on various international projects or activities. In another review of IRO activities prepared for the 1965 IFLA General Council
meeting in Helsinki, Finland, Asheim commented on the kinds of agencies with which the office worked, including the ALA Panel on UNESCO, the Special Intergovernmental Committee for the International Standardization of Statistics Relating to Book Production and Periodicals, the ALA Statistics Coordinating Project, the Children's Services Division of ALA in its listing of American children's books recommended for translation, the International Conference on Cataloging Principles, and others.25 Included in his account are several other groups within ALA itself which, perhaps because they are handled on a kind of intramural basis, have not always been formally linked with the overall program of IRO.

Of these groups within ALA, the Children's Services Division (CSD) probably has the strongest tradition of international interests since World War II. Its predecessor organization before ALA's 1956 reorganization was the Division of Libraries for Children and Young People, which had been active in stimulating and maintaining the interest of the Rockefeller Foundation in the International Youth Library in Munich, Germany, and which participated in several programs to encourage exchange and translation of children's books between the U.S. and other countries. More recently, after some attempt to form a group with major interest in school libraries within IFLA, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) has taken the lead in the formation of an international school library organization under the aegis of the World Conference of Organizations of the Teaching Profession. Besides AASL and CSD, two other of ALA's fourteen divisions have international relations subcommittees which work in liaison with the ALA International Relations Committee and the specific division. The other two are the Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries and the Resources and Technical Services Division.

One of the IRO tasks which was a logical outcome of Swank's talk to AASL was reported to the same group by Shubert in January 1965. The office had written to heads of accredited library schools to ask whether special conditions for admission were possible for exceptionally able students from other countries where higher education requirements were different. Shubert noted such problems as the difficulty of establishing an equivalent for the U.S. baccalaureate degree, the difficulty of judging proficiency in English, and problems in personal, cultural, and instructional adjustments.26 It was clear that the problems identified by Swank and others were far from solution.

As the ten-year limit for Rockefeller Foundation funds for the support of IRO neared, the association prepared proposals for other possi-
ble sources for funds, and Clift, as executive director, called a meeting in March 1965, of representatives from the Asia Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, and Council on Library Resources. Topics for discussion were related to evaluation of the office, such as whether there was evidence that its activities had contributed to the attainment of foundations' goals, which activities were most useful and which least useful, what ways there might be to improve existing services, and whether there were services that ALA might undertake to serve better the overseas programs of the foundations. There was hope that one or more of the agencies invited would continue the IRO, but instead there were lean financial times.

After Asheim's five-year appointment was concluded, Thomas R. Buckman served as consultant on international programs for IRO from November 1, 1966, through May 31, 1967. He reported to the ALA executive board that two areas of international opportunity complemented each other: the development of American resources in support of international education at all levels and overseas library development. He energetically prepared proposals in these areas, but without success. Finally, it was in a contract with the Agency for International Development (AID) that the IRO found means for survival in the fall of 1967. In an open-ended contract, as described by Ralph Esterquest, IRO director for a one-year period, AID was to provide funds for two staff members who were to be responsible for setting up machinery to perform tasks in international library development. It was recognized that IRO ran the risk of becoming "a tool of government policy," but that risk was taken. For the first time, ALA put a significant portion of its own funds into its international program, instead of getting full support from foundation and government grants. Nevertheless, Esterquest and his successor, David G. Donovan, have probably encountered the close scrutiny and severe criticism as a result of this reliance on association funds, for, as noted earlier, the association's membership is probably more generous with both scrutiny and criticism than even the most tightly controlled foundation or other agency.

The link with AID meant that the emphasis on developing countries was greater than before. However, the background work which Buckman had done on a major program of cooperation with Japanese libraries concluded with a joint conference held in 1969, with the Japan Library Association on the role of libraries in higher education and research, and almost immediately a follow-up meeting was being planned.
Other projects were related to AID programs for secondary school libraries and universities in Colombia.

As it happens, the reliance of the IRO on ALA funds coincided with a time when association funds were extremely limited, when program demands in other areas were heavy, and when movements to reorganize ALA and to place more emphasis on assistance to the library profession and on U.S. social and cultural problems were gaining in strength. These have drastically affected the sense of continuity which Asheim and others have recognized as essential for the IRO, as well as for the overall international relations program of the association. As this is written, the future is, to say the least, uncertain, and experience indicates that, unpromising as the prospects for continued support are now, they could indeed worsen.

One of the unfortunate results of the scramble for funds in recent years is the feeling that the association might tailor its program to make it more appealing to a potential donor; and, to some extent, this has happened. It may be that the need to reevaluate and reconsider, occasioned by the exigencies of budget, could lead to a more cogent program of international relations for the association, and that one aspect of it would be a continuing effort to make the membership and, beyond them, the library community of the U.S. more cognizant of the real and potential impact that the program could have on them.

Swank, in a statesmanlike paper presented at the Cornell Library Conference in October 1962, noted six characteristics valuable for export from the U.S.: the concept of the library as an organized collection of books, the evolution of a library profession, the attitude of service, the function of the library as an educational institution, the role of the library in the advancement of intellectual freedom, and the conception of organized information as a public resource and responsibility. He recognized that not all were specifically or exclusively American, and that Americans needed to remind themselves of the contributions of other countries and other cultures to librarianship.

At the best, the outcome of this period when ALA membership activity and attention have been drawn toward more limited organizational interests may be a clearer recognition of what the association is and can offer. From that recognition might come a more thoughtfully conceived and more clearly defined international relations program which would have as a major aspect the development of a greater sense of internationalism within the ALA membership and the American library profession.
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