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Keyes Metcalf and the Founding of
The Harvard Library Bulletin

Dennis Carrigan

In Random Recollections of an Anachronism, the first volume of his autobiography, Keyes Metcalf has told how he came to head the Harvard Library. In 1913 he had joined the New York Public Library, and had expected to work there until retirement. One day early in 1936, however, he was summoned to the office of his superior, Harry Miller Lydenberg, and there introduced to James Bryant Conant, the President of Harvard, who was in New York to discuss with Mr. Lydenberg a candidate to be Librarian of Harvard College, a position that was expected to lead to that of Director of the University Library.

Ostensibly, Metcalf was not the candidate, but Lydenberg turned to Metcalf because of his familiarity with the nominal candidate. As it turned out, however, within a week President Conant offered Metcalf the position, and suggested that before making his decision, he visit Cambridge and Robert Blake, University Librarian, who had made known his desire to return to teaching. Metcalf made the visit, but he declined the offer. Later that year, however, he did prepare a statement, “Why Harvard Should Have a Trained, Professional Librarian,” at the request of Dr. Frederick Keppel, President of the Carnegie Corporation, which Dr. Keppel forwarded to President Conant.

Matters did not rest there, and in April of the next year Dr. Blake appeared at Metcalf's desk in New York to inform him that he was resigning as Director of the Harvard University Library the end of August, and was authorized to offer Metcalf the position at the salary of a full professor. After another visit to Cambridge, and considering the matter very carefully, Metcalf accepted, and assumed his duties at Harvard 1 September 1937.¹

Metcalf also recounts in Random Recollections his two research efforts during his years at the New York Public Library,² one of which resulted in a contribution to the Bulletin of the New York Public Library.³ In his twenty-four year tenure at the Library, it
was his only article in the Bulletin, a journal which presumably would have been quite receptive to contributions from someone in his position. Volume 1, Number 1 of the monthly Bulletin had appeared in January 1897, and contained an “Introductory Statement” which had the following to say concerning the Bulletin: “The publication of the Library Bulletin will, it is hoped, afford much practical information to those who desire to use the Libraries.” Moreover, in “Progress of the New York Public Library, 1896-1906,” the Report of the Executive Committee to the Board of Trustees, reference was made to “The publication of a monthly ‘Bulletin’ for the Reference Department,” which “has proved itself a useful instrument for the announcement of the activities and resources of the Library. . . .” Metcalf was appointed head of the reference department 1 January 1928, and remained in that position until his departure for Harvard more than nine and a half years later.

My purpose in discussing Metcalf’s meager publishing record in the Bulletin of the New York Public Library is to show the marked contrast between that record and the publishing record he established in another library journal, the Harvard Library Bulletin, which, Peter Hernon has written, was “patterned after” the Bulletin of the New York Public Library, and which came into being early in 1947, while Metcalf was in his tenth year at Harvard. Conceived by Metcalf, its birth was argued against by Edwin Williams, who later wrote that, on that issue, Metcalf had been right and he, Williams, had been mistaken. Williams had joined the staff of the Harvard Library in 1940, and rose to be Associate University Librarian. He was associate editor of the Bulletin in 1966-67, and in 1968 became editor. Williams was Metcalf’s frequent co-author in the pages of the Bulletin.

In a “Foreword” in the first issue of the Bulletin, Metcalf traced the history of serial publication undertaken by the Harvard Library, which had begun in 1876 with the appearance of the Harvard College Library Bulletin No. 1. Metcalf pointed out, however, that the Library had had no serial publication since 1911, other than the Annual Reports, the Reports of Accessions of The Houghton Library, and the unofficial Harvard Library Notes, published between 1920 and 1942.

In setting forth the reasons for the new Bulletin, as well as what articles in the Bulletin would deal with, Metcalf first made clear what the journal would not include. Except in rare cases, the
Bulletin would not concern itself with new accessions, or with collections previously acquired. It would not cover general University matters, and it was not to be a Library house organ. On the other hand, Metcalf continued, "it is published in the belief that one of the great libraries of the world cannot meet in full the responsibilities inherent in its position unless it has a regular publication which will make known to the Harvard community and to the scholarly world in general its collections, its experience, and its ideas."11

Metcalf went on to enumerate the "broad fields" which would be dealt with in articles which would appear in the Bulletin. There would be "articles of productive research," descriptions of "important sections of the Library’s collections," discussions of "the various libraries in general," as well as of problems of the Harvard University Library in particular, and, finally, simply news of the Harvard Library.12

Having discussed the nature and purpose of the Bulletin, Metcalf thought it might be appropriate to include a statement about the intended audience for the new journal:

First of all, it is hoped that the Bulletin will be of value to the Harvard community, providing Faculty and students not only with information as to specific material but also with an understanding of Library problems and purposes which will enable them to prosecute their teaching, studies, and research under the most favorable circumstances.13

Metcalf did not limit his intended audience to the Harvard community. Having cited the members of that community "First of all," he then went on to include "the scholarly world in general," librarians, bibliographers and collectors, Friends of Harvard Library, alumni, and interested members of the public.14 One has but to examine the tables of contents of several issues of the Bulletin to see that, indeed, the journal contains material certain to be of interest to all of the enumerated audience. At the same time, however, a reading of Metcalf’s numerous Bulletin articles15 shows that, to him, the Harvard community was, indeed, "First of all."

The sheer volume of Metcalf’s Bulletin articles is impressive, especially in contrast to his publishing record in the Bulletin of the New York Public Library. Between the founding of the Harvard Library Bulletin in 1947 and Metcalf’s retirement as Director of the
Harvard Library in 1955, some twenty-six issues of the journal were published, and over that extended period Metcalf contributed, on average, one article per issue. Beyond their volume, however, is the matter of the articles' content. Although Metcalf nowhere makes it explicit, one nevertheless comes away from a careful reading of his Bulletin essays with the thought that he hoped they would contribute, in a particular and important way, to his work as Director. Metcalf believed that the Harvard Library confronted issues whose satisfactory resolution would require a judicious combination of additional resources and a willingness to consider new ways of doing things, for both of which he would need the support of important members of the Harvard community beyond the Library. Having founded the Bulletin, he then set out to use its pages as a means of garnering that support through his articles.

Among the issues which the Harvard Library confronted at the time of Metcalf’s appointment as Director, none was more pressing than space, and he lost little time before addressing that subject in the pages of the new Bulletin. The second issue contained his article, “Spatial Growth in University Libraries,” which was the first of a set of three essays which he wrote on the topic. Metcalf pointed out that spatial growth in universities, and especially in American universities, was a characteristic of the institution, but he took pains to distinguish the space problems of university libraries from the general space problems of their parent institutions. What set libraries’ problems apart, he suggested, was that “University libraries have not made a practice of discarding their books.” As a consequence, “Library collections seem to continue to grow by geometric progression,” doubling on average every sixteen years, according to the conclusions which Freemont Rider arrived at in his study, which Metcalf reviewed at some length.

Concerning the matter of space, Metcalf discussed several measures which might alleviate the chronic problem. He turned first to weeding, about the likelihood of which he was not optimistic. “Weeding is always difficult to accomplish,” for a number of reasons, he admitted, perhaps not least of which, “it is not always apparent to a librarian that to store books indefinitely is expensive.” He made it clear that he favored weeding, especially “whenever retention of all holdings will necessitate a new building or expensive additions to an old one.” Moreover, he also cited the
value of cooperative acquisitions among libraries, as well as the use of inexpensive storage of less-used materials.  

In the second of his three library space articles, Metcalf addressed the problem at his institution. He pointed out that the collections at Harvard essentially doubled in the seventeen year period 1917-34, just one year off the rate Freemont Rider had determined. Of greater significance, however, when Metcalf arrived at Harvard in September 1937, he found Widener Library nearly at capacity, though at the time of its opening in 1915 it was thought the building would be adequate for fifty years. As a consequence of the space situation at Widener, Metcalf wrote that almost immediately upon taking over as Harvard Librarian he was asked by President Conant to address the issue of the Harvard Library’s future space needs, which he did.

In his autobiography, President Conant discusses the issue as well. He writes of being confronted with the news, upon assuming the presidency in 1933, of the impending inadequacy of Widener, and of the belief of the Library Director, Metcalf’s predecessor, that “we should start planning at once for another large library alongside of Widener—perhaps a tower of glass...” But Conant writes further that before the Harvard Corporation was faced with the problem of designing a new building, he had persuaded Metcalf to come to Harvard. Once there, he immediately concerned himself with the future of the Library, and “presented a plan by which the building of another large library edifice was avoided—perhaps forever.” Moreover, President Conant tells of his reaction to Metcalf’s proposal: “With a great sense of relief, I welcomed it and encouraged its implementation... The nightmare of a vast new building in the Harvard Yard had disappeared.”

In his Bulletin article, Metcalf incorporated a portion of his annual report for 1939-40, in which he discussed his solution in detail. It contained four parts, two of which could be said to be radical departures. The two components which did not represent departures were a new building, to the east of Widener, to house rare books, and which became reality as the Houghton Library; and underground stacks in the southeast corner of the Yard, linked by tunnel to Widener, and in effect a subterranean addition to that facility.

The third part of Metcalf’s plan—one of two departures—was to be a central library for undergraduates, which was built as the
Lamont Library, in the southeast corner of Harvard Yard. The fourth element, representing the greater departure, was to be an off-campus storage facility for less-used books, to be a cooperative enterprise among Harvard and other research libraries in the region, and which came into being as the New England Deposit Library. 24

Metcalf believed strongly that, in allocating space to books, a distinction be made on the basis of demand for the materials, with little-used books going to lower-cost facilities; and he made that point repeatedly in the pages of the Bulletin. Moreover, the distinction should be made not only after books have been lodged in the main library for a period, but also in the case of newly acquired volumes. In discussing the situation at Harvard, he pointed out that thirty percent of the new additions to the main Harvard College Library collection went directly to the New England Deposit Library. 25

The plan that its Director developed for the Harvard Library, and which had been so welcomed by President Conant, was to accommodate the needs of the institution at least through 1970. 26 And beyond that? Here Metcalf proposed what we might think of as the double heresy. For the future, he believed first and foremost, the rate of acquisitions should be slowed. To accomplish that, selection of materials had to be improved. To buttress his contentions in those regards—contentions that we may assume were not the sort of thing his Harvard constituencies received with equanimity—Metcalf cited the study of the Mt. Holyoke College Library conducted by Flora Ludington, as a result of which she concluded that some thirty percent of the collection's 150,000 volumes apparently had never been used. Metcalf expressed the belief that in a much larger university library the proportion of never used books "is probably considerably greater," and concluded: "Indeed, it would not be rash to state that half of the books in most of our great university libraries not only never have been used, but never will be used; in the case of the larger libraries, this figure may well be increased from one half to two-thirds." 27

Although in his earlier articles in the Bulletin Metcalf had been chipping away at Harvard's library problems—had been using the pages of the Bulletin as a platform from which to make the case to his various constituencies that, in the words of Emerson, "New occasions teach new duties"—nevertheless in an essay in the
journal’s third year, he presented, in one place, a discussion of all of the problems, with measures for their mitigation.28

As Metcalf saw them, the “great library problems” had to do with such issues as book selection and cataloguing policy, housing and financing collections that were growing geometrically, and securing competent library administrators;29 and he pointed out two of the problems’ most salient features. They are highly interdependent, and “No one of them will ever be completely, or permanently, solved.” Moreover, he repeated the point he had made before, that the growth of research libraries was unusual in that the rate of growth is not mitigated by attrition. As a consequence of this, libraries tend to claim an ever larger percentage of the total resources available to their parent institutions.30

Turning first to the issue of space, Metcalf stated that when he arrived in Cambridge, the Harvard Library space problem was acute, and “The first decision to be made was whether or not to plan on the construction of a new central library for the University.” And he then made the interesting point: “This, let us say, would have been the conservative thing to do. It would have followed standard practice. . . .”31 Metcalf, however, rejected “standard practice,” and, no doubt because he had the support of President Conant, was able to implement a novel solution containing four elements, the most unusual of which was off-campus storage of less-used books in the New England Deposit Library.

Turning to the issue of acquisitions, Metcalf was categorical in his assessment: “Speaking in general terms, I believe that research libraries do a poorer job in book selection than public or even college libraries.” With regard to his own institution, “Harvard Library must be more selective in the future than it has been in the past. . . .” And he made explicit the link that is easily overlooked: The true cost of a book to a library is not merely its purchase cost, but also the cost to catalogue and store it, resulting in an aggregate cost that made it especially expensive to acquire books that were not used. Viewing these aggregate costs, Metcalf stated his conviction that “. . . we shall not be extravagant if we spend a larger percentage of our funds on book selection.” He was arguing, of course, not only that Harvard Library should spend more in order to improve its book selection process, but also that such an increase in spending should be viewed as an investment, on which
the Library—and ultimately the university—would realize a return.

Improved book selection was to be accomplished through three steps. "A leading part" in selection would be played by library staff. In addition, gifts of books, while encouraged, would henceforth be accepted "without strings attached, so that they may be scrutinized and weeded out carefully." Finally, interlibrary cooperation "in New England and throughout the country should be our watchword. . . ." Of the three proposals, almost certainly the most interesting was the first—greater involvement of library staff in book selection—and perhaps to his twin heresies of a reduced rate of acquisitions and more careful selection of materials, Metcalf was adding a third.

Metcalf turned next to the issue of cataloguing, and here he was blunt: "Even after accepting the excuses of cataloguing departments that much of their time is spent on other things, and after considering the claims of some reference librarians that cataloguing should be more detailed rather than more sketchy, we believe that cataloguing costs are inexcusably high in most libraries." Finally, Metcalf turned to "what underlies all the library problems—the financial situation," which, he reminded the reader, was an inevitable problem, because the library tends to grow more rapidly than other parts of its parent institution, giving rise to the library's claim on an ever-growing portion of the parent's resources. In an effort to mitigate this problem, Metcalf was firmly committed to greater resource sharing and cooperation among libraries, and stated he "wholeheartedly approved of the Farmington Plan." He repeated what was a central feature of his program: Little-used materials were to go to low-cost storage, "nearly as rapidly as we add new material." And he concluded his comments about the Harvard Library's financial situation with the observation that:

We do not believe at Harvard that our Library financial problem will ever be completely resolved, but it should be possible to mitigate it considerably . . . and thus place it on the same level as similar problems of the other parts of the University, instead of continuing it, to use President Conant's phrase, as 'a very special headache.'

Metcalf obviously was convinced that the acquisitions policy at the Harvard Library, as elsewhere, needed to be improved, and he
devoted a series of articles to that important issue. Moreover, as he had done in writing about other matters he felt to be significant, he first discussed the acquisitions issue in general, and in subsequent articles focused on the issue at Harvard.

Once again, Metcalf introduced his subject in a categorical fashion: Problems of acquisitions policy are in many ways the most important confronting administration of university libraries. This, unfortunately, does not mean that these problems have never been dodged; many of the difficulties now besetting great research libraries at Harvard and elsewhere result from failure to face such problems squarely.36

Metcalf suggested that, with regard to acquisitions, the advantage of faculty selection which a university has may be more apparent than real,37 and in that regard he set forth the conclusion reached by Douglas Waples and Harold Lasswell in their study of acquisitions of foreign publications in the social sciences at New York Public Library and five other research libraries—four of them university research libraries—that New York Public Library, with no faculty involvement in selections, did a better job.38 With that conclusion in mind Metcalf asked: "Should even a university library employ some subject specialists of its own?" Clearly, he believed it should.39

With Edwin Williams, Metcalf undertook "to define the acquisitions policies of the Harvard University Library, and to indicate the objectives on which they are based. . . ."40 In that regard, he made two noteworthy observations. Concerning the Library’s pattern of strengths and weaknesses he concluded, "Though it is a product of past policies, this present situation has not, at least for the most part, been the result of policies explicitly formulated by librarians, faculty committees, or other administrative authorities." Moreover—and this is his second point—"Donors of collections and of book funds have had a great deal to do with making the library what it is. . . ."41 In these observations, Metcalf was making the point that what the Harvard Library had become was, to a considerable degree, the result of accident, or at least of unplanned evolution that did not reflect due consideration for resource limitations. Clearly, Metcalf believed that future growth of the Library should reflect a considerably greater measure of explicit policy and sensitivity to the very real limitations of resources.

Having grappled with the issues surrounding acquisitions policy
in a university library, both in general and at Harvard in particular, Metcalf, with Williams, next discussed the all-important translation of policy into practice—actual book selection as a means of carrying out acquisitions policy. An obvious and thorny question had to do with who was to make selections, about which Metcalf commented, “There are, to be sure, some grounds for asserting that librarians ought normally to do nearly all the book selection, . . . but this would be a distinctly controversial statement.” “Indeed,” he conceded, “the methods of selection may be characterized as generally more debatable than its objectives.”

Commenting further on the matter of book selection, Metcalf asserted that “It follows that the library ought to select acquisitions from the gifts offered to it almost as carefully as it selects books that must be bought.” And in that regard he quoted with approval from the Report of the Visiting Committee:

If our loyal alumni had their way, Houghton could well be swamped by a myraid of ‘collectors’ items, fine library editions, first editions without interest except as ‘firsts’ and the manuscripts and correspondence of a host of minor poets.

In that regard, Metcalf urged that one person be added to the Library staff who could devote full time to book selection, arguing that “the full time of one person is certainly not too much to invest in an effort to secure the advice that is essential if . . . collections . . . are to be built up systematically.” Metcalf’s choice of the term “invest” was especially felicitous, for how else should the expenditure of money for such a library staff member be seen if not as an investment, on which a substantial return could be expected in the form of better book selection? His approach to this matter—indeed, his choice of the term “invest”—was consistent with and representative of Metcalf’s approach in general to his responsibilities as Harvard Librarian.

Once again working with his co-author, Edwin Williams, Metcalf in an early 1953 article outlined the administrative structure of the Harvard University Library, and followed that article with a companion piece having to do with the financial arrangement of the Library. He made it clear that the financial structure paralleled the decentralized administrative structure, and stated that “each of the libraries might be said to be a tub that
stands, if not on its own bottom, at least on the bottom of the part of the University to which it is attached. . . .” Metcalf saw twin virtues in the arrangement, and the second is especially noteworthy. “The advantage of this arrangement,” he argued, is that it “inhibits a too elaborate and expensive development, since funds for the library must compete with those for all other activities of the department concerned.” The suggestion that a library—any library, but especially a library at Harvard—could become “a too elaborate and expensive development” was further proof of Metcalf’s heretical views, as well as perhaps of his hope that others at Harvard would bear in mind that any investment in library resources, in order to be a wise investment, should be of a size appropriate to the uses to be made of the resources.

Having discussed the financial arrangements at the Harvard Library, Metcalf now turned to the financial problems facing university libraries in general, and he urged that those problems be discussed at a conference to be attended by university presidents and other administrators, scholars, and librarians. In calling for such a conference, Metcalf pointed out that certain library financial issues could be dealt with effectively only through the commitment and cooperation of the libraries’ parent institutions working in concert. “In order to slow down this growth [in library costs] without sacrificing the interests of scholarship it seems essential for institutions—not just their libraries—to work out plans for cooperative action.”

Metcalf repeated his call for restricted acquisitions programs on the part of university libraries. This he based on the “rational alternative [which] is specialization by agreement among institutions, for this could enable each library to economize by limiting its acquisitions of materials on subjects in which others have agreed to specialize.”

In this discussion Metcalf had introduced a very important point, and surely it was directed as much if not more at administrators and faculty at his own institution as it was at his readers beyond Harvard: A particular librarian in a particular institution at a particular time and circumstance had so much—and only so much—authority. To deal with certain problems in ways which Metcalf considered responsible and effective would require more authority than the librarian had. He thus confronted two alternatives. Either he could deal with the problems in a less-than-satisfactory manner, or he could gain the essential support of
his superiors to pursue satisfactory solutions.

If Metcalf believed that the "rational alternative" was a cooperative acquisitions program based on institutional specialization, he nevertheless saw such a program as being fraught with complications which transcended the library. To illustrate this vital point he cited the Farmington Plan, at the time six years old, "Whenever a participating library finds that it cannot buy books wanted by faculty members who are interested in fields not assigned to it under the plan, it will be under considerable pressure to abandon its Farmington responsibilities. . . . Ultimately, it is clear, . . . commitments will not be kept unless they are supported by the administrative authorities as well as by the librarian."53

The article in which he urged a conference to discuss financial problems of university libraries was not Metcalf's final contribution to the Harvard Library Bulletin, but it was near the last, and is a fitting essay with which to conclude this discussion. In it Metcalf made perhaps the most explicit statement of the themes whose importance to him was a major reason he founded the Bulletin. Those intertwined themes can be stated briefly. Because of the inescapable financial consequences of continuing to manage research libraries as had been the practice, new approaches simply had to be developed and implemented. To accomplish that, however, research library directors had to have support from beyond the library, and especially from their superiors within the parent institution.

How successful was Metcalf? An effort to answer that question adequately would take this essay to excessive lengths, but certain observations can be made. Moreover, in a series of Bulletin articles at the end of his tenure as Harvard Library Director, Metcalf seemed to grapple with that very issue. At one point he stated that "... in spite of cumulative growth and attendant demands, the Library's expenditures have not increased unduly during recent years relative to other parts of the University. . . ."54 Metcalf had, of course, been especially concerned that something be done to halt the rising relative share of total university expenditures required for the library. In that regard, perhaps he was suggesting he had achieved some success.

A reduction in the rate of library growth had been a major goal of Metcalf. With that goal in mind, no doubt, he reported that whereas during the eighteen-year period immediately preceding his tenure the central collection had grown by 68%, during his
eighteen years as director the central collection had increased by only 49%. Still, Edwin Williams has pointed out that during the Metcalf years more than 2,000,000 volumes and pamphlets were added to the Harvard University Library, "twice as many as were added during the eighteen years of Archibald Cary Coolidge's directorship, which is remembered as a golden age of collecting."

Another major goal of Metcalf was to secure relatively low-cost storage of less-used volumes, and to that end he played the major role in bringing about the New England Deposit Library, which was opened in 1942. Metcalf's account of the experience with the Deposit Library after thirteen years of operation makes a case for the soundness of that undertaking, though Metcalf himself was quick to add that "The New England Deposit Library is by no means to be advocated as a cure-all for the space problem."

Moreover, on the basis of more than a quarter-century of experience with the Deposit Library, Edwin Williams concluded that "the New England Deposit Library, while not a regrettable mistake, has been a disappointment."

Metcalf urged coordinated acquisitions among research libraries, and Williams has stated that "he did more than any other man of his time to persuade librarians that major research collections must function as interdependent parts of a national whole, and that no library ought to formulate its own acquisitions policy without taking into account the policies and collections of other institutions." In that regard, Williams has pointed out that the idea first found concrete expression at the national level in the Farmington Plan, in whose development Metcalf played a major role.

The real issue, however, may be less one of specific programs and more one of general approach and philosophy. Williams has written that, "at least in the recruiting of personnel, [Metcalf] inaugurated a revolution" by turning to personnel sources "almost completely new to Harvard," i.e., to sources other than Harvard. And Williams continues:

In a sense, it should be added, this revolution was inevitable; if Mr. Metcalf had not proceeded as he did the Library soon would have seriously deteriorated. The University's administration, moreover, by its appointment of Mr. Metcalf as Director of the University Library and Librarian of Harvard College, had taken the first step. His two
predecessors as Director, Archibald Cary Coolidge and Robert P. Blake, had both been Harvard professors; his sixty-five predecessors as Librarian had all been Harvard men, and none attended a library school. . . . In combining the positions of Director and Librarian and appointing an Oberlin man who was a trained librarian with long experience elsewhere, the University clearly indicated that fundamental changes were wanted.63

Perhaps it was not “the University,” but only President Conant, who hired Metcalf, who wanted fundamental changes, while not realizing the opposition that such changes would engender. But such is speculation. What is fact, however, is that when Metcalf retired in 1955, he was succeeded as Director and Librarian by Paul Buck, who was not a trained librarian, but who was a distinguished Harvard professor.64

It is also fact that as Director of the Harvard University Library Metcalf set about to introduce radically new ways to manage a major research library. He came to realize that in order to introduce those new ways, he would have to have the support of members of the Harvard community outside the Library; and it was in the hope of generating such support that, over a period of nine years, he contributed an impressive number of essays to the Harvard Library Bulletin.
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