by R. Peter Milroy, Director, University of British Columbia Press

The following is from the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) presidential address delivered at the AAUP Annual Meeting in St. Petersburg, Florida, on June 29, 2002.¹

"yes I said yes I will Yes."

That triumphant YES is, of course, the climax of Molly Bloom’s soliloquy and the finale of James Joyce’s Ulysses. For those of you who remember, that’s also the answer to the subtle little literary quiz that Bill Sisler [Director, Harvard University Press] left us with at the end of his presidential address last year. He exhorted us to use it as our mantra.

I have thought about Molly Bloom’s words more than a few times this past year when it has seemed that a resounding NO was more the order of things.

In case anyone has failed to figure it out yet, I am Canadian. My country’s intellectual sport for the past hundred and thirty-five years has been the search for a national identity—all we have been able to agree on is that we are not American. As you can see, we are polite. We don’t carp that the inhabitants of the middle bit of the continent have taken the name “American” even though Canada covers by far the largest landmass in the Americas.

The horror of the events of September 11 was gut-wrenching, unimaginable, unspeakable. Like everyone in this room, the exact time and place that I first saw those images is etched on my brain forever.

I was at my family’s summer place in eastern Ontario.

It has been my sanctuary since childhood.

It was a little after nine o’clock on a perfect morning with a clear sky. The lake was sparkling and perfectly cooling as my wife and I swam in the bay. As I climbed out of the water I said, “You know, I have never felt better in my life. I wish we could just stay here.” The phone rang and I ran to get it; my brother’s voice said “Turn on the TV."

Some people in this room were in New York or Washington that day. I can’t imagine what they experienced. The rest of us shared in that terrible television voyeurism—watching, then looking away because it was too awful to contemplate, leaving the room and being drawn back again. I feel differently about the world as a result of what I watched and heard that day. I find myself asking not “why did that event matter so much?”, but “what is wrong with me that all the other conflict and death that has gone on in the world on a colossal scale in the last decade has meant so little to me?”

Your country—with mine trundling along obediently behind—is in an undeclared state of war with an array of undefined targets. It is a time when those of us who publish have to contemplate the inevitable conflict between those unhappy bedfellows, “truth” and “war.”

I have had a long and intimate relationship with the United States. Like the majority of Canadians I live less than 50 miles from the U.S. border. Three of my father’s four brothers were Americans and the highlight of my childhood summers was a trip across the border to visit my prosperous relatives and to shop. As a child I could watch three U.S. television stations but only one Canadian channel. I think it is safe to say that I know your country better than you know mine.

I probably know it better than I really want to because living beside the U.S. is like trying to carry
on a conversation in a small room with a television turned on—no matter how hard you try—you can’t entirely ignore it. Living next door to the most powerful entity in the history of the world is a bit awkward. We have a free trade treaty but whenever someone sneezes in Georgia it has an impact on a resource community in British Columbia. The universal healthcare system that two generations of Canadians have struggled to develop—the centrepiece of a caring society—was kept off the free trade table along with cultural industries when we negotiated that agreement a decade ago. But universal public health care seems destined to collapse under attack by supply-side economists and free traders who believe that Canada has to become more like the U.S. in order to be competitive. Canadian cultural industries—books, magazines, film, television, and music—account for a minuscule market share in their own country and without public policy interventions will have only a fraction of that, if they can exist at all. U.S. trade negotiators made it clear in the last round of WTO negotiations that they considered any exemption for cultural industries an affront to American interests.

I am almost as distrustful of nationalism as I am of religious fundamentalism, but like most Canadian publishers, I describe myself as a cultural nationalist. Is there a contradiction in my being here? No. I have always felt comfortable in this very civilized company. I feel less comfortable about the role of the American State.

The momentum of American ambition is awesome; the power of American anger is a terrible thing. America lives with one set of illusions about itself, but the rest of the world notes cautiously that the only nation that has used an atomic weapon has never repudiated its first strike policy. For an outsider, the semiotics of your nationalism can be as discomforting as any other demonstration of fundamentalism. Looking in from the outside, we are anxious to find signs that someone is asking a few questions.

Many of my heroes are Americans. At 55, I find myself thinking back to my teens and early 20s. I think about the dissenters—those who challenged institutionalized racism or refused to have their ethics and identities submerged by the tidal surge of a nation marching to profit or war. King, Chavez, Malcolm X, Angela Davis, the Chicago Seven, Ralph Nader. On a more personal scale, other Americans were my heroes, too—kids my age who resisted the Vietnam War by exiling themselves and becoming part of my community and my circle of friends. Some of their reputations have been tarnished severely 40 years on; it is hard to live up to the brave moments of youth. As I get older, I find myself being more forgiving.

American dissenters gave me hope then—and they continue to do so.

Only Americans can change U.S. public policy; only Americans can police the world’s policeman.

American university presses give me great hope.

You too are dissenters, dissenters against the mainstream forces that are so inexorably dumbing down public discourse. When I watch the principled resistance of Doug Armato to an onslaught from the religious right, I know that you are still making heroes here.

One of the most insidious forces we face is convergence. Beyond the financial and political power that comes with the corporate side of convergence, there is something even more insidious—a kind of intellectual convergence. The temple of convergence is CNN, which has positioned itself as the official soundtrack to life on the planet. It provides the play-by-play for every major news event as well as for the minor ones it discovers to fill dead air time. Its interpretive simplification of events is an ever-present political force. The lines have blurred between entertainment and journalism. CNN is intricately linked spiritually as well as corporately to its cousins at AOL Time Warner. Their narrative techniques are the same; at times it seems that the fictional villains and the real ones are interchangeable. Violence is the principal leitmotif and we watch it again and again until numbed to it. Bad guys are bad because they are against us. And when they are really bad, the inevitable conclusion is that you need Rambo.

In the midst of the dark days last fall that were so dominated by that repetitive play-by-play, Books for Understanding was a beacon [see accompanying article]. For thinking Americans, there was somewhere to look to for real understanding of what lay behind September 11 and what might lie ahead. Thank you, Sandy Thatcher [Director, Pennsylvania State University Press] and Brenna McLaughlin [Communications Manager, AAUP], for the idea and for pulling it all together so quickly and so well—thank you, Peter Givler [Executive Director, AAUP] and the rest of the staff, for steering a straight course when your city was in turmoil and thank you, AAUP presses, for having already published that extraordinary body of rich complex interpretative
By the very nature of what we publish, whatever its political perspective, we are dissenters against the simplification of the CNNs—against the dumbing down of life.

—Copyright © 2002 R. Peter Milroy

1 The full speech is available in the AAUP newsletter The Exchange (Summer/Fall 2002) and on the Web <http://www.aauap.org/programs/annualmeeting/2002pres.html>.

2 Douglas Armato is Director of the University of Minnesota Press, which recently published a controversial book, Harmful to Minors: The Perils of Protecting Children from Sex, by Judith Levine. For an overview of the controversy, see <http://www.upress.umn.edu/Books/L/levine_harmful.html>.

AAUP’s Books for Understanding Project

In the immediate aftermath of the tragedies of September 11, 2001, the not-for-profit scholarly publishers of AAUP compiled the first Books for Understanding list. This bibliography was intended to direct teachers, scholars, journalists, librarians, booksellers, and others to desperately needed research and information about the background of those tragic events. The list, still available and still very relevant, grew to comprise more than 650 books on topics ranging from the history of Afghanistan, to United States foreign policy, to the operations of New York’s World Trade Center. It was and is a welcome and well-used resource.

While that particular bibliography answers a very particular need, it also underscores an abiding commitment of university press publishing: to publish top research and scholarship in all necessary fields regardless of immediate commercial potential. Often the deep background to breaking news stories is contained only in books from the scholarly presses that are committed to the public interest.

Books for Understanding is now an ongoing project to identify for the public those university press books that are relevant to the news of the day. For example, the project recently compiled a bibliography on Iraq, which cites sources about Iraq’s history, culture, and military power as well U.S. and international policy towards Iraq. Another recent list points to sources on business ethics, bankruptcy, energy policy, and other topics related to the collapse of Enron. The Books for Understanding lists are available on the AAUP Web site <http://www.aauap.org/booksforunderstanding.html>.

The speaker is Syme, the lexicographer who became a non-person—the book, 1984.

Its author, Eric Blair (who wrote as George Orwell), was one of the greatest of all modern dissenters; next year will be the 100th anniversary of his birth. We have foolishly consigned this great work and its author to the intellectual remainder bin, but he has a lot to say to us today. It is stupidly convenient to think that his surveillance society was Russia and that the danger has passed along with the year 1984. I am sure Orwell would see the potential in a name like The Office of Homeland Security. And as for Newspeak—turn on your radio.

Some people think that dissent takes the form of a NO, but I’m with Molly Bloom, and Bill Sisler and John Lennon—I believe that it is a resounding YES.
U.S. SUPREME COURT HEARS CHALLENGE TO 1998 COPYRIGHT TERM EXTENSION ACT
by Amy Masciola, ARL Policy Analyst

On October 9, 2002, four years after Congress passed the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act (CTEA), the U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments in a challenge to the Act's constitutionality. Lawrence Lessig, noted legal scholar with the Stanford Law School Center for Internet & Society, represented petitioners in Eric Eldred v. John Ashcroft.¹

The nation's first copyright law, passed in 1790, gave creators copyright protection for 14 years with the possibility of a 14-year renewal. Passed in October 1998, the CTEA retrospectively extended copyright protection of existing works by 20 years, from the life of the author plus 50 years (as mandated by the 1976 Copyright Act) to life of the author plus 70 years. The Act prospectively added 20 years of copyright protection to future works. For works made for hire, the term of protection was extended from 75 to 95 years, thus allowing major corporations such as Disney an additional 20 years of control over their works.²

In May 2002, ARL joined others in the library, archival, historical, and musical communities in an amici curiae, or friends of the court, brief. The brief argued that, by passing the CTEA, Congress exceeded the limits on copyright protection authorized by the U.S. Constitution's Copyright Clause. According to amici, the CTEA upset the delicate balance between limited copyright protection for creators and the promotion of "progress [in] science and useful arts" through the growth of a vibrant public domain. According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution, "the Congress shall have power...to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing...to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries" (my emphasis). Congress has extended the term of copyright protection 11 times over the last 40 years, and petitioners argued that repeated extensions create, in practice, an unlimited term of copyright protection. Furthermore, petitioners argued there is a substantial harm to the public in perpetually keeping works under copyright protection, and lawmakers did not adequately consider those harms before enacting the legislation.

According to the brief, which was submitted by attorneys Arnold Lutzker and Carl Settlemyer of Lutzker & Lutzker on behalf of amici, the "CTEA gratuitously confers private gains on owners of copyrights in older works, imposes substantial, unexamined burdens on the public at large, and delays by decades the entry of substantial numbers of works into the public domain." The brief described the profound and negative effect the CTEA has had on non-copyright owners such as librarians, curators, archivists, historians, and other scholars, by prohibiting the republication and dissemination of older works that have no commercial value, yet are of strong interest to the scholarly community. Thus, the public's access to these older works of art, literature, music, and other forms of intellectual property is severely limited by significant fees for access and prohibitions on research, teaching, and the creation of new works based upon older works.

The brief cited examples of projects that preserve and provide access to historically significant works. Documenting the American South (DAS) is a project based at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. DAS comprises more than 1,000 publications and manuscripts including slave narratives, Southern literature, and Confederate imprints. According to the brief, this project would be almost impossible without the existence of the public domain. The documents are scanned and proofed and then made available on the Internet free of charge; many are unavailable in any other research collection. Prior to the digitization of these primary materials, less than a dozen researchers per year used them. Now that they are available on the Internet, more than 5,000 people access them every year. This important project is limited,
however: almost all of the documents in DAS are dated prior to 1923, despite the historical importance of later works, because of the high costs associated with identifying and obtaining permissions from copyright owners.\footnote{The Library of Congress has encountered similar difficulties in its efforts to digitize and provide access to its collections through the American Memory project. The electronic collection currently contains more than seven million items available to users for free through the Library's Web site. The richest parts of the collection date from before 1920 because of copyright restrictions. See Amici Brief, 19–21.}

As the brief explains, the CTEA imposes enormous burdens on scholars and teachers who use works with extended copyright terms, thus “new works cannot extensively quote primary sources, and scholarship and the public understanding of our history suffers.” For example, the University of Washington’s Ethnic & Community Press project has grappled with these burdens as it tries to provide faculty and students access to its electronic collection of ethnic and community newspapers. The items in this important collection were selected in order to complement a popular course in the history of mass communication at the University. Though the collection is also of wide interest to scholars, the strain on library resources associated with identifying the rights of journalists, photographers, and newspaper owners has inhibited the development of the project as well as its use in the classroom.

The retroactive nature of the CTEA was of particular concern to petitioners and amici. They pointed out that, according to the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in Feist v. Rural Telephone Services, the Constitution requires that, for a work to receive copyright protection, it must reflect creative expression or originality.\footnote{Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Services, 499 U.S. 340 (1991).} In addition, amici noted that the framers of the Clause intended to make copyright protection a stimulus to creativity by rewarding creators a limited monopoly on the proceeds of their work. Thus, according to James Madison, copyright protection should be understood as “a compensation for a benefit actually gained to the community as a purchase of property which the owner otherwise might withhold from public use.” Amici argued that, by retroactively extending copyright protection to existing works, Congress did not meet the originality requirement or add any “extra incentive” to spur creativity. Instead, Congress “conferred a windfall of income principally upon the heirs and corporate successors-in-interest of authors, in exchange for no direct social benefit.”

During oral arguments before the U.S. Supreme Court on October 9, Lessig claimed that the Copyright Clause is the most clearly worded limit on Congress’s power in Article I of the Constitution—the only clause to specify both its ends, “to promote science and useful arts,” and its means, “by securing for limited times exclusive rights.”\footnote{Linda Greenhouse, “Justices Hear Arguments in Challenge to Copyrights,” New York Times, Oct. 10, 2002. See also transcript of oral arguments, <http://www.arl.org/info/fm/copy/extension.html>.} According to Lessig, “this case is about limits to an enumerated power” in the Copyright Clause, and if the CTEA is allowed to stand, there will be “no limit” on Congress’s power to perpetually extend copyright. Some of the Justices agreed that the passage of the CTEA was bad public policy. Justice O’Connor said, “I can find a lot of fault with what Congress did here, [but] it’s very difficult to find the basis in the Constitution” for taking the power to set such limits away from Congress. The Justices also expressed concern that overturning the CTEA would lead to “chaos” because it would call into question previous copyright extensions. However, both Justices Breyer and Scalia suggested the CTEA violates the “limited times” portion of the Copyright Clause. Justice Breyer asked if there is a difference between repeated limited extensions and “permanent copyright.”\footnote{Brief for Petitioners, Eric Eldred, et al., v. John D. Ashcroft, 01-618 (2002), <http://eldred.cc/legal/supremecourt.html>.}

According to Solicitor General Theodore B. Olson, who argued on behalf of the U.S. government, the CTEA protects copyright holders from the growing threat of Internet piracy. When pressed by the Justices on why Congress should not be limited to extending copyright terms to future works, he said the Constitution gives Congress, not the Courts, the power to make such decisions. He also argued that the CTEA brings U.S. copyright law in line with European copyright laws (a goal amici argue is “dubious...as a legal matter and overstated as a factual matter”). According to Olson, extending copyright protection by another 20 years encourages copyright holders to restore and disseminate their works using new technologies.

The U.S. Supreme Court is expected to issue its decision some time during the spring of 2003.

For more information on the Copyright Term Extension Act of 1998, please visit the ARL Federal Relations CTEA Web site at <http://www.arl.org/info/fm/copy/extension.html>. The site includes links to all of the amici curiae briefs submitted in Eldred v. Ashcroft, as well as a primer on the CTEA’s impact on the library community.

If you need information about the Federal Relations and Information Policy program, please contact Prue Adler <prue@arl.org> or Amy Masciola <amy@arl.org>. 
Mass Deacidification in 2002 and the University of Michigan Experience

by Shannon Zachary, Head of Conservation Services, Preservation Division, University of Michigan Library

Editor’s note: The following paper was presented at “Redefining Preservation, Shaping New Solutions, Forging New Partnerships,” a conference cosponsored by the University of Michigan Library and ARL and held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, March 7–8, 2002. See <http://www.lib.umich.edu/conferences/preservation/presconfnotes2.html>.

Alum-rosin sizing for paper came into commercial use in 1835, ground-wood fiber in 1869. Their effect on the longevity of paper sparked concern and protest in libraries and government archives in the 1890s, 1880s, and even earlier. So why revisit this topic yet again in 2002? Because the brittle books problem hasn’t gone away.

Indeed, after 130 years the effects of acidic paper on research collections face us daily. A survey at the University of Michigan in 1997 estimated that about 25% of the books in the general collections (nearly 1.5 million volumes) are now brittle. In addition, 59% (3.5 million volumes) are printed on acidic paper but are not brittle (yet). These numbers are similar to findings of surveys in other research libraries.

Our predecessors of a century ago proposed a suite of solutions to the acid paper problem: (1) encourage paper mills to produce permanent paper; (2) encourage publishers to select and use permanent paper; and (3) encourage scientists to find a way to rectify the problem after the fact. Remarkably, each of these strategies still remains an active topic of debate today. The past decade, however, has seen some of the most dramatic changes yet in all of these areas. In the limited space of this paper I will attempt to: review major developments in paper, publishing, and mass deacidification over the past decade; outline our experience starting a mass deacidification program at the University of Michigan; and summarize the status of mass deacidification for research libraries today.

A Decade of Developments in the Paper and Publishing Industries

Ideally, at least from the viewpoint of those who manage research libraries, all books would come into the collection printed on durable, permanent paper. Several standards for permanent paper were written and approved in the 1980s and early 1990s, including the familiar American National Standards Institute Z39.48, approved in 1984 and revised in 1992. Thirteen years ago, in March 1989, “Commitment Day” was celebrated at the New York Public Library, when 40 publishers and a host of prominent authors pledged support for the use of permanent paper in hardcover first editions. In October 1990 the U.S. Congressional Joint Resolution to Establish a National Policy on Permanent Paper was signed into law.

But the big mover towards production of alkaline paper in this country has been the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). EPA regulations governing the amount and kinds of effluent that paper mills can discharge created an impetus for mills to convert from acid to alkaline paper manufacture. Similar regulations have changed the way paper is made over large portions of the world.

I recently conducted a survey of new acquisitions at the University of Michigan’s University Library. In a random sample of 400 titles selected from the more than 95,000 book-format monographs cataloged in 2000, 13% were printed on acidic paper and 86% were printed on alkaline paper, as indicated by a simple spot test with chlorophenol red. I also found that 24% of the sample, or slightly less than one third of the books printed on alkaline paper, indicated by some sort of notice that the paper was either permanent or acid-free; 12% of the newly acquired monographs (about 10,500 volumes) would qualify for mass deacidification under our current criteria.

The percentage of new acquisitions on alkaline paper identified in this study (86%) is significantly higher than that found in similar surveys in other research collections in the early 1990s, which record percentages from 50% to 70%—and those numbers had risen dramatically from the 1980s. The rate at which books on acidic paper are being added to the collections is dropping, a trend which seems consistent now for over a decade. While neutral or alkaline pH does not necessarily mean the paper has all of the desirable qualities to make it both durable and permanent, this trend is good news for library collections.

In this same decade, however, pressures on the publisher have become more complex. During my survey of new acquisitions, I came across a statement in several recent Cornell University Press books, showing that the needs of libraries are not the only demands being made on that poor soul in the publishing house who selects book paper. On the copyright page is the statement:

Cornell University Press strives to use environmentally responsible suppliers and materials to the fullest extent possible in the publishing of its books. Such materials include vegetable-based, low-VOC inks and acid-free papers that are recycled, totally chlorine-free, or partly composed of nonwood fibers. Books that bear the logo of the FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) use paper taken from forests that have been inspected and
certified as meeting the highest standards for environmental and social responsibility. For further information, visit our Web site at www.cornellpress.cornell.edu.

And this statement doesn’t even mention aesthetics, machine compatibility, or cost. At the press’s Web site I could find no links to information about the virtues of acid-free paper or paper permanence. The good world citizen in me commends the effort to use our natural resources more efficiently; the conservator trembles at the potential disasters some of this experimentation will inevitably produce.

Developments in Mass Deacidification over the Past Decade

Ten years ago, three technologies dominated the attention of American research libraries as they watched anxiously for a viable method of mass deacidification:

- The diethyl zinc process (DEZ), developed by conservation scientists at the Library of Congress and licensed to Texas Alkyls, later Akzo, had been through several pilot runs and was starting larger trials at a new plant near Houston.8

- A Wei T'o system, using a process originally researched in the 1970s by Richard Smith, had been developed in the Public Archives of Canada and went into production in the National Library of Canada in 1981; in the early 1990s the system reached peak production at over 200,000 volumes a year.9

- The FMC-MG3 process, developed by the Lithium Division of the FMC Corporation in North Carolina, had performed test runs for a number of libraries.10

By the mid 1990s two significant events completely changed the picture. In December 1993, Akzo announced that it was closing down their DEZ plant.11 Although scientists had corrected many of the problems that had dogged the process through its early experimentation, Akzo did not see a viable business future for the plant. In December 1995, use of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) was banned under the Montreal Protocol. Both the Wei T'o and FMC processes had been developed using CFCs as a carrier for the deacidification agent and were left scrambling to find alternatives. Major evaluative reports published in the early 1990s became outdated almost as soon as they were published.12 Efforts in 1993 by ARL to create a critical mass of libraries engaging in large-scale deacidification were checked.13 Many libraries that had taken a “wait and see” attitude were confirmed by these events in their motivation to do nothing.

At the same time, two new deacidification technologies—one in the U.S. and one in Germany—were quietly working their way from lab to pilot to production.

With funding from the German National Library, the Battelle Institute began research in 1987 to develop an effective deacidification system.14 After progress through several pilot phases, the Battelle process transferred to the Zentrum für Buch-Erhaltung (ZfB) in 1997 to develop as a commercial service for libraries.15 ZfB has been in operation in Leipzig for over three years, serving a number of European libraries by offering the Battelle deacidification process.

Even earlier in the 1980s the Koppers Company of North Carolina experimented with deacidification of paper. When Koppers decided there was no commercial future in mass deacidification and opted out in 1987, Richard Spatz took over the patent for what is now the Bookkeeper process. He founded Preservation Technologies Inc., now Preservation Technologies, L.P. (PTLP), located near Pittsburgh.16 After testing, the Library of Congress began a pilot project working with PTLP in 1995 and has recently awarded them a major multi-year contract. In the latter part of the decade, other research libraries also started projects: University of Pennsylvania, University of Notre Dame, University of Maryland, Northwestern University, and Johns Hopkins, to name some that have shared their experiences in presentations and print.

It is not accidental that two of today’s most successful mass deacidification operations were able to scale up gradually, as businesses. Both offer deacidification as a service rather than as machinery. The plant for both systems is capable of being replicated in multiple locations, possibly on site at a library or incorporated with a suite of related services. I am encouraged by ZfB’s recent exploration into establishing services in the United States and by PTLP’s purchase in January 2002 of its European licensee for the Bookkeeper process in the Netherlands. Libraries that were reluctant in the early 1990s can now get their feet wet with very small pilot programs, developing logistics and building confidence on limited budgets. These two companies are turning around that repeated verdict of “no business future for mass deacidification” of a decade ago.

Bookkeeper and Battelle—and Others

Is Battelle or Bookkeeper the better process? My personal jury is still out on that question. Most mass deacidification systems consist primarily of an alkaline earth metal compound—the neutralizing agent—and a carrier that delivers that neutralizing agent into the intimate depths of the felted paper fibers. The carrier may be a liquid or a gas; a few systems dispense with a carrier altogether.

30th Battelle and Bookkeeper are liquid-phase deacidification processes. Both have established a good
record of effectiveness and reliability. Both neutralize acids in paper and leave an alkaline buffer to combat future acid attacks. 17

The Battelle process delivers the deacidification agent in solution and can deposit a finer, more integrated buffer onto the paper fiber. The carrier is an organic silicon compound, which can change the feel of the paper slightly, and a solvent, which may cause problems with some inks. The flammability of the solvent is an operating concern. Titanium compounds, which form part of the residual buffer on the paper, absorb ultraviolet light; it is still uncertain whether this will cause problems to the paper fiber long-term or will do so any more than other alkaline buffers.

The Bookkeeper process is perhaps gentler. The carrier is inherently a very poor solvent and so has exceptionally good compatibility with inks and other book components. The neutralizing agent, magnesium oxide, is deposited among the paper fibers as a finely divided solid rather than in solution. The magnesium oxide buffer can give the paper a chalky feel that many people find unpleasant.

In both technologies the carrier is recovered and reused, making the processes economical and environmentally sound.

While Bookkeeper and Battelle are most prominent in the literature in the U.S. today, there are other mass deacidification technologies in development or in operation around the world. Both the Wei T’o and FMC systems have identified better, environmentally friendly carriers. 18 Operations or research in mass deacidification is being conducted in France, China, and Japan, just to name some. All of this research is better informing our understanding of acid deterioration and remediation. As long ago as 1990, Peter Sparks warned in a Commission on Preservation and Access study that “no existing or future mass process will be perfect.” 19 None is perfect but, with several alternatives available, libraries can select what best suits a particular need.

The University of Michigan Experience: Start-up and Maintenance of a Mass Deacidification Program

The University Library at the University of Michigan embarked on a pilot project to have Preservation Technologies (PTLP) deacidify 1,000 books by the Bookkeeper process in the spring of 1998. Since then the library has shipped 5,000–7,000 volumes each year—over 24,000 volumes to date—from Michigan to Pennsylvania for treatment.

Funding for the pilot program was found by reallocating $15,000 towards the project from within the preservation budget. The ongoing operations since have drawn on both base and one-time funding, with the active support of the director and collection man-

agers. A 1998 endowment to the library included a portion especially earmarked for mass deacidification.

Most of our projects have been retrospective and collections-based. The 1998 pilot project treated materials relating to Vietnam. Between 1998 and 2001 we treated mathematics monographs—mathematics is one of the University of Michigan’s comprehensive collections. Since completing the three-year retrospective project we have maintained commitment to the mathematics collection by treating new acquisitions. Currently the library is also deacidifying materials relating to the Philippines; this effort contributes part of the library’s cost-share for a National Endowment for the Humanities grant project—the first time NEH has allowed mass deacidification as cost share. To date, the University of Michigan has not treated materials from the rare and special collections.

The technology imposes some limitations on which materials can or cannot be treated. The physical capacity of the racks limits size, shape, and weight. Clay-coated papers are not good candidates: the clay coating is already alkaline and is dense enough to resist penetration by the deacidification agent. Almost no pre-selecting for sensitive inks or cover materials has proved necessary. Books already on alkaline paper don’t need deacidification. Books already brittle are rejected from the workflow. Our definition of “brittle,” however, has tightened. While in the past we would call any item brittle if the pages broke within two double folds, now we consider a book too brittle to select for deacidification only if the paper breaks within the first doublefold. The aim is to let the preservation reformating program concentrate on the most brittle of the brittle while buying more time for marginal materials.

An unintended effect of the deacidification program has been whole collection/whole book preservation of the target collections. Books with torn pages or damaged bindings are repaired or rebound before treatment. Brittle books are identified for review for reformating.

All together a book is off the shelf for four to six weeks to undergo treatment. Shipments average 275 books and are sent out every other week. Library staff time for selection and processing the books out and checking them back in averages 2.25 minutes per book. The treatment cost, including vendor, shipping, and library staff, is currently about $16 per volume. Vendor costs for the University of Michigan have been negotiated jointly by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) consortium of Midwestern research libraries on the basis of their collective level of commitment to mass deacidification services from PTLP.

Good Sides and Downsides of Mass Deacidification

After the initial effort to get the routines up and running, the mass deacidification program at the University of Michigan has generally run smoothly. Maintaining the
program is no more difficult or complex than maintaining a program for commercial binding—and is often less so. But there are limitations and downsides to mass deacidification. Obvious considerations are cost, staff, and operations space. There is the time the book is off the shelf. There are risks in transit and processing, as there always are when books are handled in mass, including occasional physical damage or books lost.

A tested mass deacidification technology today can, with fair consistency and reliability, be expected to neutralize existing acids in paper and to leave an alkaline buffer. Paper so treated shows, in laboratory stress tests, better long-term retention of flexibility and strength. Experience has shown that the chemistry of raising the pH of paper is relatively easy; the devil is in the side effects. Current technologies have achieved good results in reducing the quantity and severity of the side effects, but some remain.

Conclusion

In sum I have observed that:

- The proportion of acidic paper in retrospective collections is high.
- Over the last decade there has been a significant drop in the rate at which acidic materials are being added to collections; other trends in papermaking may create new challenges to paper durability and permanence over time.
- At present there is one vendor, PTLP, for mass deacidification services in the U.S.; but there is promising potential for more providers and/or more plants, as well as vendors of supplies or equipment.
- Selection and routing of materials for deacidification treatment are no more difficult than other operations libraries routinely manage.
- Understanding of the mechanisms of paper deterioration gradually improves. There is no perfect mass deacidification process and it is unlikely that there ever will be.

Research libraries still have to make important decisions about their collections, weighing costs, risks, and potential gains. Mass deacidification is not the solution to all book deterioration problems. It has a place in a comprehensive preservation program, but it is not the whole program.

—Copyright © 2002 Shannon Zachary

1 This survey excluded materials held in Special Collections.
5 The numbers do not add up to 100% because of a few oddities and missing volumes. This survey did not examine serials or special collections materials.
8 [Ellen McCrady], “Update on LC’s Deacidification Program,” The Abbey Newsletter 17, no. 2 (Sept. 1993).
11 [Ellen McCrady], “Akzo Decides to Drop DEZ,” The Abbey Newsletter 17, no. 6 (Nov. 1993).
MIT President Calls on Libraries to Accelerate the Open Sharing of Knowledge
by Judith Matz, ARL Communications Officer

Addressing the membership of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), Chuck M. Vest, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), described steps underway at MIT to accelerate the movement toward the open sharing of knowledge. Defining research libraries as stewards of accessible knowledge, he urged them to take on a major role within their institutions to use educational technology for promoting open access and shared resources.

Dr. Vest spoke of two new MIT initiatives, involving faculty and librarians, to manage and share knowledge and promote accessibility. OpenCourseWare (OCW) <http://ocw.mit.edu/> taps the power of the Internet to make MIT’s educational materials available anywhere, at any time, and with no cost. By openly sharing course materials, MIT hopes to create a global web of knowledge that will enhance the quality of learning worldwide.

MIT has also developed DSpace <http://www.dspace.org/>, a durable digital depository that offers a uniform mechanism to preserve, collect, and distribute the intellectual property of the university. By providing software that supports a simple submission process for faculty and excellent search mechanisms, DSpace hopes to create a federation of university libraries. DSpace will make available the collective intellectual resources of research universities and also enable small colleges to run repositories using their existing resources.

Acknowledging that these new initiatives might raise concerns among commercial publishers, Dr. Vest pointed out, “We respect the rights of others and the copyright law, but we hope to accelerate the movement toward open sharing of knowledge.” In the search for equitable solutions, Dr. Vest turned to ARL members: “The expertise of research librarians in issues of copyright and intellectual property is an extraordinary asset and must be shared broadly.”

“Today’s stewardship of accessible knowledge is inherently interdisciplinary and necessarily connects the full range of activities from archiving to publishing. University research librarians,” Vest concluded, “are central to managing this complex range of activities and can play a major role in accelerating efforts toward the open sharing of knowledge.”

Dr. Vest’s remarks were made October 17 at the 141st ARL Membership Meeting in Washington, D.C. The receptive audience was comprised of the dean or director of the research libraries from the larger research institutions in the United States and Canada. The meeting presentations—including Dr. Vest’s—are on the ARL Web site at <http://www.arl.org/arl/proceedings/141/>.

ARL Celebrates 70 Years and Looks to the Future
by Judith Matz, ARL Communications Officer

One hundred and twelve member institutions were represented at ARL’s 141st Membership Meeting, held in Washington, D.C., on October 16–17. More than 40 former ARL directors and guests joined the celebration as the Association marked its 70th anniversary. Digital preservation strategies and the open sharing of knowledge were the major themes of the meeting.

Anniversary Celebration
The meeting began with a special program to commemorate ARL’s 70th anniversary. ARL President Paula Kaufman (Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) welcomed the Association’s newest member, the University of Louisville, represented by Hannelore Rader. Four new ARL directors were introduced: Wendy Lougee (Minnesota), Randy Olsen (Brigham Young), Deborah Carver (Oregon), and Peter Young (National Agricultural Library). Merrily Taylor (Brown) was recognized for her 20 years of continuous service as an ARL director, and members saluted retiring director, Don Bosseau (Miami).

ARL Executive Director Duane Webster introduced the former ARL directors and announced that the most senior of those at the meeting was Robert Blackburn (Toronto) who attended his first ARL Membership Meeting in 1948. William Crowe (Kansas) delivered a celebratory address, “The End of History? Reflections on a Decade,” highlighting the trends that epitomize the past decade of ARL activities. James Neal (Columbia) then discussed “Turnover Trends: ARL Library Directors, 1948–2002,” analyzing the levels and patterns of turnover among research library directors and exploring the impact and reasons for this turnover.

Digital Preservation Strategies
Nancy Gwinn (Smithsonian Institution), chair of the ARL Preservation Committee, convened a program on “Emerging Digital Preservation Strategies.” Dale Fleckner (Harvard) spoke of his university’s e-journal archiving study, and Kevin Guthrie, President of JSTOR, discussed the organizational challenges of building an electronic archive and the relationship of the e-archive to JSTOR’s print archive. Ms. Gwinn also paid tribute to Jan Merrill-Oldham (Harvard) for 15 years of service as consultant to the Preservation Committee.

Open Sharing of Knowledge
Chuck M. Vest, President of MIT, was the featured speaker for a program session on “Universities in the Digital Age.” He described two new MIT initiatives, OpenCourseWare and DSpace, designed to manage and share knowledge and promote accessibility. Defining research libraries as the stewards of accessible knowledge, he called on the
ARL membership to assume major roles within their institutions to accelerate the open sharing of intellectual resources.

At the Federal Relations lunch, Rick Weingarten, Director of the American Library Association Office for Information Technology Policy, spoke about a subject of increasing interest and importance to ARL members: digital rights management and copyright. After a spirited question-and-answer period, members chose among three concurrent discussion groups:

- "Future Needs for Cyber Infrastructure: Recommendations of the NSF Blue Ribbon Panel," led by Dan Atkins (University of Michigan)
- "ARL Input for the ACRL Task Force on the Future," led by Shirley Baker (Washington University in St. Louis)
- "Building an Affordable E-Journal Archive and Preservation System: LOCKSS," led by Vicky Reich (Stanford University)

**ARL Business Meeting**

At the ARL Business Meeting, members elected three new ARL Board members: Rush Miller (Pittsburgh), Sherrie Schmidt (Arizona State), and Paul Willis (South Carolina). President Paula Kaufman announced that the Board elected Sarah Thomas (Cornell) as Vice President/President Elect. At the conclusion of the meeting, Ms. Kaufman presented the gavel to Fred Heath (Texas A&M), who began his year as ARL president.

Background papers, slides, and summaries of the meeting presentations appear on the ARL Web site at <http://www.arl.org/arl/proceedings/141/>.  

**INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES EXAMINED IN NORTH AMERICA AND EUROPE**

_by Alison Buckholtz, SPARC Associate Enterprise Director_

SPARC and SPARC Europe cosponsored two meetings in October to encourage the development of institutional repositories. The Washington workshop, "Institutional Repositories: A Workshop on Creating an Infrastructure for Faculty-Library Partnerships" (also sponsored by ARL and CNI) took place October 18. The goal was to help academic and research library and information technology directors and their senior staffs begin planning for the implementation of repositories designed to house faculty works, such as articles, data sets, images, video, and courseware.

SPARC's position paper, "The Case for Institutional Repositories," and the new "Institutional Repository Checklist & Resource Guide" set the stage for the workshop. With over 250 participants, including a large number of library directors, the workshop both educated and energized the community. To follow up, SPARC created an online discussion list where individuals interested in institutional repositories can ask questions, share best practices and debate relevant issues. To sign up, go to <https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-IR/>.

Speakers included Paul Ginsparg, Professor of Physics and Computer Science, Cornell University; James Neal, Vice President and University Librarian, Columbia University; Joseph Branin, Director of Libraries, Ohio State University; Ann Wolpert, Director of Libraries, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Marc Mayerson, Associate Dean of Social Sciences, University of California, Los Angeles; and many others. Presentations are available at <http://www.arl.org/IR_agenda.html>.

A parallel workshop, held at the CERN Library in Geneva, Switzerland, on October 17–19, covered related ground for the European community. SPARC cosponsored this "Second Workshop on the Open Archives Initiative: Gaining Independence with E-Prints Archives and OAI." Other sponsors included the European Science Foundation, the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC), the Open Society Institute (OSI), LIBER, and the CERN Library.

The Geneva workshop guided its 135 participants through the process of conceiving, implementing, and maintaining an e-print archive or OAI-compliant repository. The focus was equally on the technical and organizational aspects of creating such repositories. Both institutional repositories and discipline-oriented servers were discussed in detail.

Speakers included Jean-Claude Guedon, University of Montreal; Herbert von de Sompel, Los Alamos National Laboratory and OAI; John Ober, California Digital Library; Fred Friend, University College London; Elizabeth Cherhal, Mathdoc/Grenoble; and many others. To view video and slides of the presentations, please see <http://documents.cern.ch/AGE/current/fullAgenda.php?id=a02333>.

A third workshop, "Research Innovation and Scholarship: The Role of Open Access Publishing," is scheduled for November 21–22 in Ottawa, Ontario. This event, sponsored by the Canadian Association of Research Libraries, will focus on e-prints, institutional repositories, and the OAI. For more information, visit <http://www.carl-abrc.ca/>.
ARL Calendar 2003

January 20–24  Web Development with XML: Design and Applications
Tucson, Arizona

February 6–7  ARL Board Meeting
Washington, D.C.

February 25–28  Library Management Skills Institute II: The Organization
Tempe, Arizona

February 26–28  Advanced Licensing Workshop
San Diego, California

March 11–12  Culture of Assessment Institute
Denver, Colorado

April 10  New Ways of Listening to Users: LibQUAL+™
Charlotte, North Carolina

April 28–29  CNI Spring Task Force Meeting
Washington, D.C.

May 6–7  Library Management Skills Institute I: The Manager
Location to be announced

May 12–16  Service Quality
Evaluation Academy
San Antonio, Texas

May 13–16  ARL Board and Membership Meeting
Lexington, Kentucky

July 28–29  ARL Board Meeting
Washington, D.C.

September 16–18  Facilitation Skills Institute
Location to be announced

September 23–25  Library Leadership for New Managers Program
Location to be announced

October 7–8  Leading Change
Washington, D.C.

October 14–17  ARL Board and Membership Meeting
Washington, D.C.

November 4–6  Library Management Skills Institute I: The Manager
Location to be announced

December 8–9  CNI Fall Task Force Meeting
Portland, Oregon

ONLINE LYCEUM
Can't make it to our in-person events? Take a look at our Online Lyceum Web-based course offerings at <http://www.arl.org/training/lyceum.html>.