

# Letters

To the Editor:

The issue of March, 1970, carries an article by Virgil F. Massman and Kelly Patterson, "A Minimum Budget for Current Acquisitions," with whose statement ("The standards outlined by ACRL 'Standards for College Libraries' are no standards at all"), the undersigned are in hearty agreement. We also subscribe to the premise on which this article rests, "An academic library's holdings can be determined only by the quantity and range of the materials being published which are relevant to the academic programs it is supporting, not by the traditional number-of-students criterion."

We join with Miss Patterson and Mr. Massman in urging that ACRL face the

whole problem of establishing minimum standards for academic libraries.

As a step toward assembling the necessary data for setting such standards, the authors describe a method for estimating the . . . "annual cost to an academic library of keeping up with worthwhile current publications in various disciplines." This would be a useful figure, pertinent to any establishment of reasonable standards. However, by their methods, the authors have gone around Robin Hood's barn while ignoring the Blue Bird of Happiness in our own ACRL backyard (i.e. *Choice*).

By totaling the cost of titles reviewed in 71 arbitrarily chosen journals, representing the diversity of disciplines in the liberal

## FROM CHOICE 1967

Subject	No. of Titles	Cost
General	56	\$ 389.50
Humanities	57	352.15
Art	196	2,441.25
Lang. & Lit.	604	3,527.06
Music	56	508.82
Philosophy	105	636.24
Religion	189	982.53
Speech, Theater & Dance	100	666.20
Science	57	589.90
Astronautics & Astronomy	26	165.50
Biology	124	1,183.61
Chemistry	65	794.45
Earth Science	30	334.00
Engineering	52	557.27
Health	29	201.40
Mathematics	80	706.70
Physics	74	678.45
Social & Behavioral Sciences	121	762.90
Economics	244	1,854.49
Education	152	842.87
History, Geography & Travel	800	6,334.43
Political Science	248	1,478.89
Psychology	91	600.90
Sociology & Anthropology	131	885.01
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,687</b>	<b>\$27,505.72</b>
Average Cost \$7.46		

## FROM CHOICE 1969

Subject	No. of Titles	Cost
General	24	\$ 168.95
Humanities	54	396.95
Art	197	3,066.80
Lang. & Lit.	518	3,741.54
Music	58	545.40
Philosophy	81	628.70
Religion	164	1,178.35
Speech, Theater & Dance	104	858.80
Science	64	632.40
Astronautics & Astronomy	54	571.65
Biology	172	1,775.75
Chemistry	103	1,179.09
Earth Science	63	746.05
Engineering	108	1,451.05
Health	86	596.40
Mathematics	107	1,022.80
Physics	97	1,247.60
Social & Behavioral Sciences	167	1,429.48
Economics	320	2,954.60
Education	208	1,317.25
History, Geography & Travel	898	8,377.56
Political Science	249	1,737.95
Psychology	113	838.05
Sociology & Anthropology	214	1,581.30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,223</b>	<b>\$38,041.47</b>
Average Cost \$9.03		

arts, a count of 3,195 titles costing \$26,178.69 (average cost \$8.19) was produced for 1967.

Believing that *Choice* could offer a less laborious way of achieving these figures, we did a total of titles recommended by *Choice* reviews for the calendar year 1967 and produced the sum of 3,687 titles costing \$27,505.72 (average cost \$7.46). These figures seem close enough to those of the Patterson-Massman study to be useful.

As another check, a similar total of *Choice* reviews for the calendar year 1969 produced 4,223 titles costing \$38,041.47 (average cost \$9.03). The increase will surprise no one.

To be useful, these figures, giving the cost of current publications, should be produced every year. We suggest that *Choice* publish annually a tabulation of the number of titles recommended in each discipline and their cost. This would be one more use of the excellent evaluative work done by *Choice*.

If ACRL can implement the collecting of these annual figures, one segment of a minimum standard for an acquisition budget will have been produced.

This however is only one segment and not the whole. Some way must be devised to produce figures for continuations. Patterson and Massman estimate a minimum of \$3,250. Our own experience is that this figure should be tripled or quadrupled. Again, provision must be made for "popular" or browsing literature and other fringe areas. The largest segment untouched in this discussion is serials, current and backrun. This is probably the most difficult of all to assess.

We join with Miss Patterson and Mr. Massman in urging that ACRL face this whole problem of establishing minimum standards for academic libraries.

Mrs. Margaret Garner,  
Associate Librarian and  
Mrs. Peggy A. Overfield  
Assoc. Librarian, Acquisitions  
The State University College  
Potsdam, New York

To the Editor:

I was surprised to see that Dr. Mohammed M. Aman, in his article entitled "Bibli-

ographical Services in the Arab Countries" (*C&RL*, July 1970) made no mention of the monthly *Accessions List: Middle East*, which has been issued since 1962 by the Library of Congress PL-480 Office in Cairo. Although it makes no claim to cover current book production throughout the Middle East or the Arab world, it is generally recognized as the single most complete and most current listing of significant titles published in the United Arab Republic, the world's largest producer of Arabic books.

Since Dr. Aman's paper seems to point to the need for an Arab bibliographical center, I should think that he would be interested in the experience of the Library of Congress PL-480 Office in Cairo. Under the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, and with the necessary funding, this office or one similar to it but perhaps located elsewhere might well be able to achieve bibliographical coverage of the entire Arab world. Whether such a center could provide all the services envisioned by Dr. Aman in his article is another matter.

Donald F. Jay  
Chief of General Research  
Services  
The New York Public  
Library

To the Editor:

Mohammed M. Aman's article on Arab bibliographical services in your July issue was a useful introductory guide to what must be pretty much of a *terra incognita* to many of your readers. What a pity, then, to let it be printed with so many errors and inconsistencies; surely we can expect meticulous attention to detail in an article on bibliography appearing in a journal of academic librarianship.

Without correct accentuation, these words are not French: *Algérie, générale, conservés, légale, année, imprimés, préface*; these phrases (quoted from the article) are nonsense: *publications d'esposées, manuscrits arabes des Rabat, recapitulations des périodique officiels*. Not to capitalize *Anmerkungen* is a small enough fault, but to misspell *Litteratur* as *literature* and *Flügel* (a proper name) as *Flugel* is inexcusable.

I don't remember seeing the Arabic letter 'ayn transliterated anywhere else as "; but granted that that is the preferred trans-

literation in *College & Research Libraries*, surely *matbu'at* (printed materials, books) could have been rendered only as *matbu"at* and not also as *matbu "at* and *matbu" at*.

Typographical error was not confined to foreign words and phrases. The citations in note 9, page 259, one in English and the other in Italian, are affected: "Geography, Dept. of Research Papers, series no. 1" should read "Geography, Dept. of Research Papers series no. 1" even if only the

punctuation is corrected; and "Anno 1-42" is a misprint for "Anno 1-4, no. ½". "July" for "luglio" on the next line is also incorrect.

*College & Research Libraries* is, I suppose, a scholarly journal; perhaps some greater effort could be made to meet the formal standards of scholarship.

Michael J. Briggs  
African Studies Bibliographer  
The Memorial Library  
The University of Wisconsin

#### CORRECTION NOTICE

In Gilbert W. Fairholm's article "Essentials of Library Manpower Budgeting," in the September 1970 issue of *College & Research Libraries*, the first three lines in the right column, page 337, should correctly read:

"each class of library, i.e., I, agricultural and technical college; II, liberal arts college; and III, university. These ad-"