

ACADEMIC LIBRARIES AMIDST CHANGING INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTIONS

William H. Carlson

The one word in the title of this Institute about which there can be no argument is "change." The environment in which our libraries function and the ends and purposes for which we as librarians, exist are altering before our very eyes. Cumulatively the changes have been tremendous, even within so short a period as my personal professional career.

I do not feel, as a participant for almost forty years now, that the transition has, as Ralph Ellsworth maintained in his University of Tennessee Library lecture of 1962, been violent.¹ It has been sustained, though, and it has accelerated and is accelerating on a rising curve. Change and transition have indeed been a way of life for Man in his persistent march to dominate his little planet. It is said that when Adam and Eve were fleeing Eden and the wrath of God, Adam whispered to Eve, "Darling, we are living in an age of transition."

Violent or not, change has been so substantial in our entire society, and particularly in our higher educational institutions and their libraries, that the library world of today is a vastly different place and profession than the one I entered in 1926. It is quite possible that librarians, and particularly the oldsters among them, like myself, may look back to the first half of the twentieth century, with its warm and attractive codex books, its proven methodology, and its clear sense of knowing what is important, as the Eden of their profession. Conceivably, they may murmur, regretfully one to another, as they flee the computers, we are living in an age of transition.

I hasten to add that I do not personally feel that the computers are going to drive us out of our Eden, and the codex book along with us. To most of the oldsters, however, I suspect that the promises and prospects of the future may seem a rather dismal departure from the happy days of individual empire building.

The manifestation of our modern society which the word "metropolitan" stands for is not easily defined or delimited. There can be many boundaries, varied responses and reactions, psychologically, aesthetically, spiritually. Certainly, metropolis is a child of our science and our technology. In the long, long view it may

William H. Carlson is Director of Library Services, State System of Higher Education, Oregon.

possibly, as Man multiplies and multiplies again, and again, really drive him out of his Eden. God, we know, has lots of time. The ultimate metropolis could be His long term way of inflicting the ultimate punishment.

We are already well on our way to the universal metropolis. As William Birenbaum has observed, "This country is now an urban-cultural nation." The great metropolitan areas already with us, where one city flows into another for miles on end with little if any diminution of congestion are the concrete proof of this observation. Our urbanization, says Birenbaum, follows inevitably from the flowering of science and technology.²

Because we are so increasingly urbacultural what I have to say here will be applicable, in varying degree, to academic libraries throughout the length and breadth of our land. Our means of communication have become so quick and convenient and our rates of travel so rapid that there are now very few academic institutions which are not rubbing shoulders with sister institutions, if not literally, then at least in a spirit of awareness and of similarity of problems and ways of coping with them.

From Washington, D. C., to Boston and further, we have city after city, cheek by jowl. Rhode Island is in effect a city-state. On the west coast it is predicted that we shall have, and in the not too distant future from the way things are going, a strip metropolitan area from San Diego to Vancouver, British Columbia. Even without such tight and rather frightening physical juxtaposition of communities, the annihilation of space which our technologies have brought us makes us all neighbors. And as neighbors we in the libraries of this continent share, and frequently closely share, the same kinds of problems and also, happily, the same kinds of challenges and opportunities.

I am not maintaining that our libraries are all alike or ever will be. Our history, however, shows our academic institutions, and their libraries, to be developing more and more points of resemblance. The separate land grant universities, for the most part founded as colleges, and the state supported liberal arts universities, illustrate the trend toward similarity. One of the least urban of the separate land-grant institutions is Washington State University at Pullman, Washington, a somewhat isolated community of about 15,000 people located in a rather sparsely settled region. Its sister institution, the University of Washington in Seattle, functions in a large metropolitan community.

Fifty years ago these Washington institutions were very different. Now their institutional directions are moving them more and more toward similarity, with a full-fledged liberal arts program at Pullman and more and more emphasis on the sciences and technology at Seattle. At both institutions there are lively on-going research

programs, federally funded and otherwise. Both universities face similar problems of construction of buildings to house what they do. Budgeting, student enrollment and housing, and curriculum and research development, these are all common problems requiring the same kind of confrontation and solution. Similar valid comparisons can be made, I believe, in every state with separate land-grant universities. Iowa and Iowa State, and Michigan and Michigan State are perhaps even more striking illustrations.

It is also true, I believe, that the urban universities in the sense of those institutions founded by municipalities and drawing their chief sustenance from them or even from private funds, are becoming more and more like the state universities. Some of these institutions now receive extensive financial support from their states. Some, like Wayne State University, have evolved into full-fledged state universities. In many of them, substantial research, some of it federally funded, goes on. Their problems and needs thereby become much like those of other universities, conditioned only in part by their metropolitan environment.

The four year colleges, and particularly those which are privately financed, exhibit less likeness, yet even they are more alike in programs, outlook, and philosophies of operation than they were a hundred years ago, or fifty, or even twenty-five. It is a safe assumption that if one of the pleasant and efficient new library buildings that are appearing in increasing numbers on the campuses of these colleges should, by the magician's wand, be dropped, with its books, on some other four-year campus of similar size, it would serve the receiving college nearly equally well.

With recognition of the urbacultural nature of the environment of nearly all our academic institutions, what of the academic library situation in our clearly metropolitan communities? A check of the American Library Directory of 1964 reveals, in selected areas, academic and academic-like libraries in the following numbers.

In the Los Angeles area there are thirty-three libraries containing about 6,000,000 books; of these sixteen have less than 50,000 volumes. The Berkeley-San Francisco area, exclusive of Stanford, has seventeen libraries containing some 5,000,000 volumes; eight of these report less than 50,000 volumes. In the immediate Chicago complex there are some twenty-six libraries owning around 9,000,000 books; seventeen of these libraries fall in the below 50,000 volume bracket. In the Boston-Cambridge area there are thirty-three academic libraries owning about 12,000,000 books; eighteen of the thirty-three own less than 50,000 volumes.

The various boroughs of New York City are, as we would expect, rich, very rich, in academic institutions and libraries. There we find some seventy-three academic libraries, more or less. Including the New York Public Library, which is an academic resource

of incalculable value, these libraries probably have by now 20,000,000 volumes. Twenty-two of them, however, own fewer than 50,000 volumes.

Representative of the smaller metropolitan areas of the country, there are in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area fourteen academic libraries. Only four of these fall in the less than 50,000 volume brackets.

I make no pretense about the above figures being precise. To achieve this there would need to be a careful delimitation of each of the areas and of what is an academic library. Nevertheless, this is a meaningful assemblage of library data, just as meaningful probably as if it had been arrived at by meticulous analysis.

Each of the areas is dominated by academic library giants, Columbia in New York City, Harvard in Cambridge, the University of Chicago, Crerar and Newberry in Chicago, and so on. To me, however, it is the number of smaller libraries in the 100,000 or under, or 50,000 or under, volume category which has been somewhat of a revelation. These smaller libraries deserve and need, it seems to me, more attention, and more help, in the aggregate, than they have heretofore had.

Those of us concerned with the larger academic libraries with their multi-millioned statistics need to be more aware of these small institutions and their libraries than many of us have been. There is, I am certain, a wide range among them. Some, even though in the heart of metropolis, may be more cloistered and remote than libraries in some rural settings. Others are in mid-stream of the city hurly-burly. Still others constitute specialized collections with unique subject strengths. Many of these institutions, perhaps most, provide personalized education, the lack of which threatens to be the Achilles' heel of the large universities.

Many library implications for the total metropolis surround these small institutions. Their students, and this certainly also applies to those of the large metropolitan universities, are often commuters. Many are part-time students, often with full-time jobs, who may not be on campus longer than to attend classes. As a result they must find their library resources elsewhere than in their own colleges.

Warren G. Haas³ reports that "most of New York's higher education students use, and use heavily, the wealth of library resources available to them in New York City to supplement, and no doubt, in some instances, to supplant, the libraries provided at their own schools." Students of the New York area operate, says Mr. Haas, on the extremely practical principle of using the closest accessible library, often a public or branch library, which can supply the books they need. He quotes one student as saying that the only drawback to using the Brooklyn Public Library on Sunday "is that

every student in Brooklyn is using the library on that day.”

Mr. Haas also says that it has been almost traditional for The New York Times to run pictures of hordes of students flooding the New York Public Library at Christmas time. This student influx is, however, only a peak load, perhaps somewhat similar to what academic libraries experience just before exams. The library continuously services large numbers of students.

The New York Public, for which I have unbounded admiration, has met this situation courageously, head-on. Jean Godfrey reports that the Library, alarmed at inroads made by students at the expense of other users, on the tremendous and irreplaceable collections in its Reference Department has purchased, with a private gift, a commercial building opposite the Main Library. On this site it will open, in 1966 or 1967, an Undergraduate Library equipped with 500,000 volumes. The City of New York will assume the costs of operating this library.⁴

All of us in academic library circles are familiar with the under graduate libraries which are being established in our larger universities. An Undergraduate Library, established by a public library—this, however, is something new. Nor is it being created on any niggardly basis. It is conceivable, indeed highly likely, it seems to me, that this library may be the prototype for similar libraries in other metropolitan areas, not only to relieve pressures and wear and tear on valuable research collections but, frankly and directly, as a convenience to working and commuting students. The progressive metropolis of the future may well have a series of such libraries supplementing its college and university libraries. In our affluent society, and with increasing Federal funding in prospect such use of money might bear richer and better fruits than some other expenditures.

There are many other ways in which the smaller metropolitan academic libraries, and indeed all the smaller colleges, can be and should be helped. It takes only a glance at the U.S. Office of Education statistics to see that many of these small libraries are impoverished, operating on budgets so miniscule and salaries so low that one wonders how they can open their doors for service, much less develop their collections. Often one finds in these places librarians so attached to the institution or library, (or held by other local ties) that they serve at salaries below the going rates for new library school graduates, sometimes even below present clerical rates. A program of grants, federal or otherwise, intelligently conceived so as not to destroy local initiative, directed toward upgrading these impoverished smaller institutions could do much to improve undergraduate higher education in metropolis and through our entire country. It could help, too, to relieve pressure on the very large institutions.

In addition to concern in the large academic libraries for, and

aid to, the very small libraries, a cooperative approach can do much to develop and strengthen the smaller college libraries. Under a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education to the Kansas City Regional Council on Higher Education, Robert Downs has conducted a survey of the potential for cooperation among ten undergraduate college libraries in the Kansas City area.⁵ Of these, seven are Protestant and three are Catholic. One is a Junior College. One is located 110 miles from Kansas City. This in itself illustrates the reach of metropolitan areas, as also does Mr. Downs' observation that there are 5,000,000 library volumes within a 130-mile radius of Kansas City.

Of the libraries in the Downs survey all but one are private institutions. Noting that all these institutions provide an exceedingly valuable educational function, Mr. Downs points out that inflation, increasing enrollments, exploding demands, require subsidization of them in many areas. For the libraries he proposes a Regional Library Authority which would be concerned with the acquisition of important materials, including specialized scholarly resources, cooperative storage and improvement of access to the existing library collections. Advisory services for the libraries, sponsoring of centralized processing and seeking additional finances are also suggested as activities of the Regional authority.

There is probably not a metropolitan area in the country where a Regional Library Authority such as this would not be constructively and fruitfully busy. As applied to the New York City area such an authority, or an integrated group of authorities could tremendously upgrade and improve the small academic libraries. It could, as one example, work closely with the new Undergraduate Library which the New York Public Library is establishing.

One metropolitan cooperative enterprise at a higher level which began bravely and constructively and did good things endured for only two years. Helen-Jean Moore reports the establishment, in 1947, by five higher educational institutions in Pittsburgh of a Committee on Coordination of Libraries.⁶ These five institutions are located within a half-hour drive of each other. They had, in 1962, an enrollment of 19,000 undergraduates and aggregate book holdings of 1,355,000 volumes. The Committee was active in establishing mutual borrowing privileges for students, liberalizing inter-library loans, making resources mutually available during vacations and in sponsoring continuance of a successful Union List of Serials. Under the pressures of expanding curricula and changing institutional directions, plans to delimit subject areas of acquisition did not endure. In 1948, under the rapidly changing situation, the Committee went out of existence. It should, Miss Moore believes, be reactivated. As in so many enterprises of this kind money, and the most precious commodities of all, time and initiative, have been lacking for full

capitalization and continuance of the original efforts. This languishing from brave beginnings is a story which has been repeated in numerous places in America.

Another promising example of cooperation with many implications for libraries is the recent establishment in Washington, D. C., by American University, George Washington University, Howard University, Catholic University of America and Georgetown University, of a joint Graduate Consortium.⁷ Under it graduate students of any one university may take courses and use the library facilities of all five institutions. Each university will retain autonomy at the graduate level. This is, if not a change in institutional directions, certainly a sensible cooperative effort to permit each institution better to attain its established goals.

Cooperative plans and programs of many kinds among higher educational institutions, all with library implications, could be identified in every part of the country. It seems sure that under the great surge of enrollment and increasing research and the certainty now of generous Federal funds many of the existing programs will be reinvigorated and new ones developed. It will be natural for many of these programs to head up in metropolitan areas. The academic librarians of our country at all levels, and in all places, need to be not only alert to these possibilities but also aggressive in bending them to the improvement of their libraries.

I fully expect the smaller undergraduate colleges of our country and their libraries to be substantially improved and upgraded in the years immediately ahead. This may well take place along pleasant and acceptable lines not significantly different from the present patterns. When we turn to library support of the tremendous research effort now going in our major universities and elsewhere, the handwriting on the wall indicates prospects for change which individual institutions and individual librarians may find neither inviting nor pleasant.

An attractive will-o'-the-wisp which academic librarians of the advanced institutions have eagerly sought to grasp over the years, with only limited success, is to have within their walls and on their shelves all the books their advanced students, faculty and researchers need. This philosophy, or desire, or ambition was, in 1963, given voice by J.N.L. Myres, President of the British Library Association and Bodley Librarian in this way.⁸

A great deal of nonsense, and dangerous nonsense, can be heard nowadays about the wastefulness of duplication and overlapping in the expenditure of book funds. It is of far greater importance that the right book should always be available when and where it is wanted than that a few pounds should be saved in order that it shall only be available in one place. It is of the utmost importance

that those who hold the purse strings . . . should not be deluded into supposing, from misguided notions of economy, that a university library can be created on any other principle than the physical possession, within its own walls, of its own copies of everything, old and new, which its members require for the promotion of their studies or the advancement of learning . . . any acceptance of compromise, however plausible on the grounds of economy, rational planning, saving of shelf space, or any other specious consideration, will be fatal to the ultimate achievement of the purpose in view.

I am convinced that the days when such ambitions can be realized, Mr. Myres and numerous other academic librarians to the contrary notwithstanding, are gone forever. They never have been here really, as witness the brisk inter-library loan transactions among even our greatest libraries.

From the University of California at Los Angeles comes another prestigious voice, that of Robert Vosper, along related lines.⁹ In his 1963-64 Annual Report, Mr. Vosper says, and with this I think no one will argue, that a "war on research library poverty" is needed. There has, he thinks, been a lot of "dangerous nonsense" bruited about recently concerning the expanding cost and size of research libraries. He maintains that some "near-hysterical" steps have been taken to inhibit library space and costs "all to the likely detriment of scholarship." Mr. Vosper, perhaps as a local telling observation, further observes that the cost of maintaining and developing research libraries does not approach the cost of medical education.

The implication of both the Myres and the Vosper statements is that there are no problems in research libraries that money will not solve. If the librarians of the advanced academic institution can only have enough dollars, or pounds, they can solve everything, for the most part right on their own campuses. Money will, of course help. Without it, and in generous quantity, we will have, and soon, chaos in control of the world's voluminous literature. The help and the solutions however will be along lines which neither Mr. Myres nor Mr. Vosper, nor, I suspect, most of us here, will welcome.

The days of individual empire building in which a single library can aspire to have physical possession, "within its own walls, of its own copies of everything, old and new, which its members require for promotion of their studies or the advancement of learning" these days, I emphasize once again, are gone forever. And with them, I suspect, goes the Eden of at least some of us old-school academic librarians.

This audience certainly does not need to have the facts of the tremendous explosion of knowledge paraded before it. All of us have been struggling with this outstanding phenomenon of the twentieth

century to the extent our means and our wit permit. It may be helpful, nevertheless, to think a bit about the explosion, and to cogitate about whether it will result eventually in a fall-out of bibliographical debris and dust or an ordered and disciplined control similar to that of the atomic reactors. I have no personal fears that controls will not be maintained, but clearly this will not be on the basis of any individual library or even limited groups of libraries such as, for instance, the Association of Research Libraries.

There has been some fun poked at Fremont Rider's estimates of some years ago that the catalog of the Yale Library would, of and by itself, eventually require eight acres of space.¹⁰ This estimate no doubt is classified as "dangerous nonsense" by some people. The fact remains, nevertheless, that the Yale Catalog, if maintained in traditional ways, as Mr. Rider assumed, would eventually need eight acres of space. Not only this, if Mr. Rider were around now to base new estimates on current growth rates and increases, he would arrive at even more acres.

Devouring of space by our libraries continues to be appalling to a country boy such as I am, who first knew a little rural school library of forty books. Even these, speaking of poverty, were bought with the proceeds of a "box social," an ante-diluvian means of raising money unfamiliar, I am certain, to the younger people here. I shall probably never be hardened enough, or shell-shocked enough, or whatever it takes, not to be impressed not only by the physical space required by our libraries but also the rising curve of it.

Mr. Vosper's lucid and readable annual report of 1963-64 referred to above, has these facts on library space consumption on his own campus: A new University Research Library occupied in the summer of 1964 even as plans were begun for a second unit, with a third and final unit to be undertaken in four years; completion of a three-stage remodeling of the old library into an undergraduate library; a doubling in size of the Bio-Medical Library in progress; new space for the Geology Library arranged; the Physics Library enlarged; more space for the Map Library; expansion of the Art Library underway; planning of new space for the Law Library, the University Elementary School Library, the Education-Psychology Library. All this space increase reported in a single annual report of a single university library. There cannot, one must believe, be much library poverty at UCLA.

Time was when a single library building erected within the professional career of an academic librarian was achievement enough. Those days too are gone, probably forever. It is a safe assumption that the new space created and in progress at UCLA in 1963-64 will not long suffice. It very likely will not see Bob Vosper comfortably through his years in the service of that university.

We could go to the campus of any major university to find similar logistics of space consumption. One place where on-going developments have impressed me is the University of Minnesota. There Ned Stanford records, in his smoothly flowing report of 1964-65, the planning and beginning of construction of a \$9,866,666 West Bank Library with space for 2,000,000 volumes and 2,700 readers.¹¹ This building augments, rather than replaces the Walter Library, not too many years ago the envy of many universities. But as at UCLA the University cannot rest, even momentarily, on the creation of a magnificent new building. It must, says Mr. Stanford, immediately be about the business of planning new facilities for the Engineering Library and an addition to the Agriculture Library to serve the expanded student body and new programs.

Buildings are, of course, only one of the consumers of library dollars and, over the years, not the major one. Mr. Stanford reports, with obvious and natural satisfaction an increase, in 1964-65, of \$260,000 in the annual book budget of his Library. We do not have to go back very far in the statistics of our libraries to reach the time when this quarter of a million dollars increase would equal the total acquisitional budget of even our largest universities.

The facts of accumulating and organizing the words and ideas of man into libraries lead inescapably to only one conclusion. The quantity is now so great that no library, not even a national library, can hope to encompass it all, and still remain an efficient, easily functioning, useful library. Even the most ardent bibliophile must, I would think, admit this. There is only one direction our libraries can go and that is toward sharing the burden. If the machine can significantly help in this, and the prospects seem to be improving, this will be a fact of life of our technological age, hopefully a pleasant fact.

Nor are our academic libraries unprepared for this. There have been, as we all know, extensive cooperative programs among us for most of this century, in preparing of union lists, organizing bibliographical centers, promoting the publication of the catalogs of some of the great libraries, and arranging regional depositories. One can surmise that there will necessarily be an intensification of such programs, much along established lines, culminating eventually in great regional reservoirs of less used materials micro-reduced and available for quick transmission and/or print-out for subscribing libraries. The difference between what we do now and will need to do in the future in the service of graduate programs and research may be that individual libraries will, less and less, emphasize and seek completeness, and rely more and more on the regional or national resources. In doing they will be more efficient and helpful in support of the scholarly processes. The price they will pay, and

it will from some viewpoints be high, will be a lessening of their individual prestige.

The most interesting and rewarding professional reading I have done over the years has been the annual reports of other academic librarians. These accountings, written for local administrators and faculty, have a directness and difference of tone, and quite often an urgency and frankness which we do not find in the professional journals.

There are in the reports of university librarians everywhere, I have felt, two universal themes characteristic of our times, of not enough and too much. The not enough predominates. Not enough staff, space, books, even in some instances not enough use, all in varying ways arriving at the same common denominator, not enough money. I have yet to read a report from any library where enough of any of the above has been admitted, or where the librarian has been content with what he has.

The too much in library reports, sometimes only implicit, is inextricably intertwined with the not enough. It is in fact a part of it. Too many books owned or recently acquired to be properly housed in existing space, too many students for available seating space, too many faculty members to be serviced by existing staff, too many good books being published or long since published, which cannot be acquired with available funds. More, more, more, and the need always for more, in continuing refrain, and muted but inescapable, too much, too much—these Siamese twins are found in the reports of academic librarians from everywhere.

Every librarian comments, usually with satisfaction, on the progress which has been made during the year. Nearly always this has been significant, and with increasing frequency it has been tremendous as in the UCLA and Minnesota reports above. Always it has been in response to institutional directions and commitments, often new. Entire new schools, new departments, new graduate majors, new branches of the university, these signs of changing institutional direction shine through the reports of university librarians, both in metropolis and out, almost universally and with increasing frequency.

There is one element or factor in our meticulous and, on the whole, highly successful management of knowledge which is now almost entirely missing from the literature but which will, I believe, receive increasing attention in the years ahead, perhaps in the immediate future. This will be the meaning of it all, the impact, value, and, yes, the desirability of all the knowledge we so carefully accumulate, organize, and make available mile upon mile.

There has of course been talk of too many books from the time of Ecclesiastes on. Voltaire maintained that books are making us ignorant, and so they are in relation to the amount of knowledge they contain which can be encompassed by a single mind. Washington

Irving trembled for posterity in the rising flood of print. Garrett Hardin in his fanciful piece, "The Last Canute" foresaw the complete suffocation of Man in his intellectual excreta.¹² Most of these and similar reactions have perhaps been only half-serious, if that.

The time is fast approaching, however, when we need to become dead serious about this business of too many books and too much knowledge. Harold Gores, who is in the business of giving away Foundation money has recently said that the current output of printed materials is becoming unmanageable.¹³ Referring to 60 million pages of technical reports being published annually he says that "some form of birth control for the storage of knowledge is required." When we multiply what is happening now in publication rates in a single year by decades and centuries, particularly the far centuries, it seems clear that Mr. Gores is right.

More important than the physical aspects of accumulating, organizing, and housing the world's knowledge, are the intellectual implications, a facet almost totally overlooked by librarians and machine enthusiasts in our struggles to keep abreast of the surging flood. William Birenbaum, cited at the beginning of this paper, comments on this in this way, "As the sheer bulk of what is known doubles with each decade, it is increasingly difficult to distill droplets of human wisdom from the swelling sea of human knowledge."¹⁴ This, says Birenbaum, threatens to do what the growth of population is doing to the cities of man. One, he thinks, results in slums and a congestion which stunts human life, the other debilitates the mind and spirit. I cannot agree that this needs to be so in either instance but it deserves pondering.

It is my belief that Yale's euphemistically titled, "Selective Retirement" of books is one of the most significant of the many excellent programs recently undertaken under the stimulus of Council on Library Resources dollars. Here, in this program, we have a harbinger of things to come, the kinds of things which will be essential to keep the world's store of knowledge manageable. It is entirely possible, and I say this seriously, that future academic librarians will report to their administrative authorities, with the same sense of accomplishment we now report additions, the hundreds of thousands of books they have been able to throw away in a given year. If this indeed happens it will require an order of intelligence and of wisdom not now among us.

I will comment on only one additional factor in the changing academic scene, and its implications for our libraries. Immediately after World War II, college and university students were criticised for their apathy about affairs and developments on campus, nationally, and throughout the world. They were accused, these postwar students, of being interested only in security for themselves and their families.

It is quite understandable that a generation which had just fought a bloody war should seek security above all other goods. Indeed a preponderance of the students on our campuses and in our libraries in those days of revival of national strength and spirit had personally done the fighting and killing. Small wonder that they should look forward to sitting secure and content before their own fireplaces.

Now, as we all know, the pendulum has swung to the far left. Student discontent, accompanied by demonstrations, and sometimes riots, has been widely spread among our universities and colleges, in metropolis and out. While the most dramatic events have centered on the academic giant of the West Coast, the University of California at Berkeley, there has been student unease and a "mood of rebellion" in many places, places as widely spread and diverse as Yale, Brooklyn College, the University of Kansas, Sarah Lawrence College, St. John's University and Alabama State College in Montgomery.

A survey conducted by Editorial Projects for Education found the student unrest to center around these things: bigness and impersonality of many academic institutions; excessive paternalism at some colleges, indifference at others; faculty neglect of undergraduate teaching "especially on campuses where research is emphasized and publication of results is a condition of faculty advancement"; academic pressures and preoccupation with grades; growing mobility of faculty and students with a loss of institutional loyalty; the "take-over mentality" of some students who feel a growing sense of power; a need to take part in some kind of community action; failure of many colleges to "establish a dialogue with the students."¹⁵

Running through all the unrest, said Editorial Projects, was discontent with college teaching and the tendency for the undergraduate to become the forgotten man in universities increasingly involved with research, and extensive preoccupation of faculty members with off-campus consulting services. This may or may not be the source of student discontent at Berkeley where unrest has been most acute. It is significant though, that most, if not all, the above factors are spectacularly in evidence there.

There are lessons for all our libraries in all of this. It is indeed easy for the undergraduate to be lost and neglected in a predominantly research library. The undergraduate libraries which have come on the scene at a good many large universities are a step, long overdue, toward answering the special library needs of the undergraduate. More such libraries are needed, and quickly.

Over and beyond this all our libraries can and should do much more to make their services to all their users and particularly to their undergraduates, friendly, courteous, concerned and outgoing. This, the warmly human element, is, I strongly feel, far more

important than having all the books on every subject within our walls. Our services and the general tone and atmosphere of our libraries should be of the kind which some years ago called forth the following statement from an alumna writing to her University Librarian: "remembering always the beloved Library where alone, on all the campus, I was entirely happy."

REFERENCES

1. Ellsworth, Ralph E. The University Library in Violent Transition. (Library Lecture No. 14, University of Tennessee Library. May 7, 1962). Knoxville, University of Tennessee, 1963.
2. Birenbaum, William. "The Urbacultural Opportunity," Library Trends, 10:452, April 1962.
3. Haas, Warren J. "Student Use of New York's Libraries," Library Trends, 10:529-540, April 1962.
4. Godfrey, Jean O. "Public Libraries in the New York Metropolitan Area," Library Trends, 14:99, July 1965.
5. Downs, Robert B. "Library Cooperation in Kansas City," College and Research Libraries, 25:380-384, September 1964.
6. Moore, Helen-Jean. "Library Cooperation in an Urban Setting: the Pittsburgh Story," Library Trends, 10:552-561, April 1962.
7. "Miscellany," College and Research Libraries, 25:216, May 1964.
8. "Bodley's Librarian Praises 'Great Academic Libraries' of U.S.," Library Journal, 88:3810, October 15, 1963.
9. University of California, Los Angeles. Report of the University Librarian to the Chancellor for the Year 1963-64. pp. 1-2.
10. Rider, Fremont. The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library; a Problem and its Solution. New York, Hadham Press, 1944, p. 12.
11. University of Minnesota Libraries. Annual Report to the President 1964-65.
12. Hardin, Garrett. "The Last Canute," Scientific Monthly, 63:203-208, September 1946.
13. Gores, Harold B. "Facilities for the Future," Liberal Education, 49:45, March 1963.

14. Birenbaum, op. cit., p. 454.

15. "Students Note Failure in College Prime Role," Portland Oregonian, March 21, 1965, p. 4F.