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Premises

The major premise on which this study is based is a theory of public library book selection: Public library holdings of biased books on controversial issues should consist of books balanced on opposing sides of the issue. This principle is implicit in the earliest announced objectives of the public library as an agency of adult education, (1) and in the nature of our democratic system. Controversy and consensus are a characteristic of democracies. The most intelligent consensus is gained through a proper knowledge of the alternatives. This situation obligates an adult education agency in a democracy to make these alternatives known. From this comes the principle of the balanced collection on controversial issues.

The principle of a balanced collection on controversial issues does not apply when an issue is not controversial. The point at which consensus is reached is beyond the scope of this study. However, it may be pointed out that war is a consensus, presenting a central issue of survival which most people do not consider debatable. At such times, the principle of balance may be held in abeyance. The evidence of the first World War even shows librarians zealously abetting censorship. (2) But with the cock crow of peace, balance again emerges as the true faith. It is explicit in the library literature of the '20's and '30's. In June 1948, the Council of the AIA reaffirmed the principles endorsed in 1939. (3) Article two of the 1948 "Library Bill of Rights" reads:

"There should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times, international, national, and local; and books or other reading matter of sound factual authority should not be proscribed or removed from library shelves because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval." (4)
The purpose of this study is to test the application of this theory by an investigation of public library holdings on a particular issue. The main procedural assumption, or minor premise, is: A checklist of books on Russia balanced according to bias will reveal the public library holdings of biased books on Russia. The checklist is restricted to books instead of the more general "reading matter" of the Council resolution because of the greater ease of determining bias in books than in the more general media of magazines and newspapers. The Russian issue is chosen because of the need for a long term issue. The function of the book ordinarily is to preserve the cultural heritage. The task of correlating the knowledge of the individual with a shifting environment is usually left to the more ephemeral newspaper, magazine, and radio commentator. However, with long term issues, the book can also enter the polemical lists. The Russian issue is a pertinent one because there is a record of American thought and action concerning Russia for a period of thirty years, during which time relations have varied between enmity and alliance.

Given these premises, A checklist of books on Russia balanced according to bias will reveal the balance that obtains in the public library holdings of books on opposing sides of the issue. Such a conclusion does not imply motive or intent on the part of the selecting officer; but it indicates the result of whatever selective forces have been at work.

The Checklist

The first step was to choose a list of biased books about Russia which a public library might buy and which were neither too new to prevent opportunity for purchase nor too old to remain in the collection of those libraries which pursue a vigorous weeding policy. As an aid in making the selection, the Book Review Digest annual volumes from 1944-7 and the cumulative issue of August 1948 were used. The checklist was restricted to items reviewed in the Book Review Digest because this tool is published for the special use of public libraries and the inclusion of reviews of a book would indicate that the libraries used in the study had had an opportunity to know about it. It was thought that 1944 publications would not yet be weeded out and that books mentioned in August 1948, after having been previously reviewed, would have a chance to be on the shelves by November 1948.

In the search for bias, controversial books that seemed to be of most interest to the general American public received the greatest attention. Books that dealt with diplomatic relations between Russia and a presumed equal (such as England), technical books, and books for which it was impossible to distinguish any bias from the reviews were omitted from the list. All the books listed under the subject heading of Russia in the indexes of the annual volumes and the cumulative issue were considered. These books dealt with history, religion, science, economics, politics, and social life in the Soviet Union. Of 128 books considered, a list of 25 friendly and 25 hostile books was drawn up to be checked against the holdings of libraries in the sample used in the investigation.

Three criteria were used for selecting hostile books. If the review indicated that the book was opposed to the present Russian government, or that the book belittled the Russian people, or that the book predicted the heightening of the conflict between the United States and Russia to the point of arms, the book was counted as hostile. On the other hand, no such clear cut criteria could be employed for determining books of friendly bias. Phrases from the reviews acted as indicators. If the review used such terms as "warm sympathy," "Soviet source," "favorable estimate," or "successful ethnic democracy," the book was counted as friendly. These indications may be of little help in determining the intensity of the bias, but they seem to be reasonable guides to the gross bias.

After drawing up the list of 25 friendly and 25 hostile books, the author submitted the list to Professor F. S. Rodkey of the University of Illinois History
Department, a specialist on Russian affairs, for his judgment. He agreed with the assignment of gross bias on all the titles, but pointed out the varying degrees of intensity and the various angles from which the problem was attacked.

Comparison of the prices of the hostile and friendly books after the list was completed showed that the friendly books averaged $2.97 per title and the hostile books averaged $3.04 per title. This difference is not great enough to affect the purchasing policy of the libraries involved. As pointed out, to guard against the choosing of obscure books about which the librarian of a small library might have little chance to learn, selection was restricted to titles in the Book Review Digest, with its slant toward books of popular interest. Apparently, the books were equally available.

The list was selected after consideration of all the books about Russia from the source used. According to the criteria applied, there were a few more friendly books published than hostile books. There were 33 that were considered friendly and 27 that were considered hostile. This is about half of the total of 128 books. An equal list of friendly and hostile books was used in order to facilitate comparison of holdings. This seems a large enough proportion of all the popular books published during the period to indicate any significant bias in library holdings.

The Sample

The checklist was mailed November 18, 1948, to 161 libraries divided into two groups. The first group was a national sample of municipal libraries in cities of 100,000 population or more. The second group consisted of 67 libraries with holdings of 25,000 volumes or more in Illinois and Indiana cities under 100,000 population. A covering letter explained the purpose of the investigation and asked librarians to check each title on the list that was included in the catalog of the main collection. They were not asked to indicate the number of copies, nor the branch holdings. Bias was not indicated on the list. All the replies used in the study were received in four weeks.

According to averages obtained from U.S. Office of Education statistics, the 94 large city libraries had in 1947 mean holdings of 452,000 volumes, 92,000 registered borrowers each, a mean circulation of 1,417,000 and mean expenditures (excluding capital outlay) of $423,000. This study makes use of replies from 86 of these libraries. In round figures they had in 1947 average holdings of 493,000 volumes, an average of 94,000 registered borrowers, an average circulation of 1,450,000, and average annual expenditures (excluding capital outlay) of $424,000.

There are 77 libraries in the second group. In 1945 they had average holdings of around 54,000 volumes, about 11,000 registered borrowers each, an average circulation of 160,000, and average expenditures for books and periodicals of about $4,500. This study is based on the checklist holdings of 60 libraries in this group. Approximately, their average total holdings in 1945 were 58,000 volumes, the average number of registered borrowers was 11,000, the average circulation 181,000, and the average yearly expenditure for books and periodicals $4,900. This is a widely diverging group, the populations of the cities and towns ranging from 1,400 to nearly 100,000, the holdings from 25,000 to 159,000, the registered borrowers from 1,000 to 35,000, the circulation from 12,000 to 685,000, and the annual expenditures for books from $800 to $17,600. This lack of homogeneity will be apparent in the analysis of the checklist holdings.
Findings

Six general conclusions are gained from the evidence gathered.

1. There is a significant difference in the total holdings of biased books on Russia published from 1944-8 between the national sample of large city libraries and the Illinois and Indiana libraries of smaller communities.

2. There is no significant bias in acquisitions of biased books on Russia published from 1944-8 in city libraries in cities of 100,000 or more.

3. There is no significant bias in acquisitions of the same books on Russia in libraries with holdings of 25,000 volumes or more in Illinois and Indiana cities under 100,000 in population.

4. Municipal libraries in cities over 100,000 in the Far West hold a significantly larger number of titles on the list than similar libraries in other sections of the country. Municipal libraries in cities over 100,000 in the South hold significantly less than the East, Midwest, or Far West. Differences in book funds may explain the Southern position, but not the Far Western.

5. There is no significant sectional difference in the amount of bias in library acquisitions of books on Russia published in the last five years. In so far as it is known, the bias in smaller communities similar to those in Illinois and Indiana would probably conform to the pattern of no significant bias of the city libraries in the 94 cities of 100,000 or more population.

5. Since the change in the role of Russia from that of a wartime ally to that of a diplomatic antagonist, there is no apparent effort on the part of public librarians of the United States to rid their collections of materials friendly to Russia. The evidence does not indicate that the buying of books has been balanced each year according to bias. Neither does it indicate that it has not. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suppose that a concerted attempt to rid the collections of friendly material would not leave fifty percent of the biased books (which are included in the study and in the library collections) friendly to Russia.

The Total Holdings of Biased Books

Municipal libraries in cities of 100,000 or more population will be referred to as large libraries. Public libraries in Illinois and Indiana communities under 100,000 in population and with holdings of 25,000 volumes or more will be referred to as small libraries. Table 1 shows the total list holdings and the hostile and friendly holdings of these two types of libraries and their combined holdings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
<th>Total List Holdings</th>
<th>List Holdings of Friendly Books</th>
<th>List Holdings of Hostile Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large libraries</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small libraries</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the average total holdings, the average friendly holdings, and the differences between the means of hostile and friendly holdings of the two types of libraries.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE LIST HOLDINGS OF THE TWO TYPES OF LIBRARIES OF BIASED BOOKS ABOUT RUSSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
<th>Average List Holdings of Friendly Books</th>
<th>Average List Holdings of Hostile Books</th>
<th>Difference Between Means of Friendly and Hostile Holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large libraries</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small libraries</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency polygon for the large community libraries is skewed to the left and shows the result of using a selected list of books for libraries that aim at a comprehensive collection of current popular literature. Two libraries held all the titles on the list; 16 held 46 or more titles; 32 held 41 or more. It is a unimodal distribution. The standard deviation is 5.45 and the standard error is .59.

The frequency polygon for the total list holdings of the 60 small libraries is bimodal and shows the lack of homogeneity of the group. This will be analyzed further in the discussion of the bias shown in the holdings. The standard deviation is 9.53 and the standard error is 1.23.

The mean holdings of the 86 large libraries are 36.8. The mean holdings of the 60 small libraries are 18.5. The difference between the means is 18.3. The standard error of this difference is 1.6. The critical ratio is 11.4. There is less than one chance in a million that such a difference would occur by sampling error. The most obvious explanation for this difference is the difference in the amount of money spent on books and periodicals in the two groups of libraries. In 1945, the average book and periodical fund was about $45,600 in the large libraries. According to the Indiana Yearbook and Illinois Libraries previously cited, the small libraries spend on the average about $4,900 for books and periodicals in 1945.

The Measurement of Bias

Table 2 shows the mean friendly and hostile holdings for each of the groups and for the total, and the differences between the means. For the total of 146 libraries, the standard deviation for the hostile titles is 4.05 and the standard error is .34. The standard deviation for the friendly titles is 4.7 and the standard error is .39. The standard error of the difference is .51. There is a difference between the means of hostile and friendly titles held of .1. According to the table of areas under the normal probability curve, this difference might occur through sampling error 85 times in a hundred.

Although both groups consist of public libraries, they are not strictly comparable. The large libraries are from all sections of the nation. The small libraries are restricted to two Midwestern states. The large libraries show a difference between the means of hostile and friendly holdings of .8, with a friendly bias. The small libraries show a difference between the means of hostile and friendly holdings of .9 with a hostile bias. These biases nearly erase each other when the groups are
combined. Neither the friendly bias of the large libraries nor the hostile bias of the small libraries is statistically significant, however.

The standard deviation of the friendly holdings of the 86 large libraries is 3.09. The standard error is .33. The standard deviation of the hostile holdings is 4.26. The standard error is .46. The difference between the means is .8. The standard error of the difference is .57. The critical ratio is 1.4. With such a difference and such an error, the chances that an equal difference might occur through pure chance in sampling are 16 in a hundred.

In the group of 60 small libraries, the standard deviation of the hostile titles is 4.1 and the standard error is .53. The standard deviation for the friendly titles is 4.03 and the standard error is .52. The difference between the means is .9. The standard error of this difference is .74. The critical ratio is 1.2. With such an error and such a difference, the chances that an equal difference might occur through error in sampling are 23 in a hundred.

The frequency polygon for the total list holdings of the small libraries reveals the lack of homogeneity in the group. This is bimodal, with modes at 18 and 33. Forty-four libraries, which we may designate as Group A, surround the lower mode. Sixteen libraries, designated as Group A, surround the lower mode. Sixteen libraries, designated as Group B, surround the higher. Table 3 shows the comparative holdings of these two groups.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Total List Holdings</th>
<th>List of Friendly Books</th>
<th>List of Hostile Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (44 libraries)</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (16 libraries)</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average total holdings and the mean hostile and friendly holdings point up the contrast in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (44 libraries)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (16 libraries)</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bias shown in the 16 libraries with larger average holdings is nil. However, the difference between the means of hostile and friendly books held in the 44 libraries in Group A is 1.3, with a hostile bias. The standard deviation for the hostile books is 2.74 and the standard error is .41. The standard deviation for the friendly titles is 2.38 and the standard error is .36. The standard error of the
difference between the means is .54. The critical ratio is 2.4. The chances of such a difference occurring through sampling error are 1.6 times in a hundred.

This group of libraries more nearly approaches a significant bias than any other yet considered. On a percentage basis, the hostile books are 54.8% of the list holdings. The friendly books are 45.2%. But the one per cent level of significance is not reached.

Sectional Differences in the National Sample

Ordinarily, divisions in as small a sample as 86 would be of no significance because of the smallness of the subgroups. However, there was in this instance a high percentage of returns from a total population of 94. Some significance may be assigned to the differences in total holdings to the sectional groups. Table 5 shows the percentage of returns from four sections of the nation.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF CHECKLISTS RETURNED FROM FOUR SECTIONS OF THE NATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>No. of Libraries</th>
<th>No. of Returns</th>
<th>Percentage of Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the small groups, because of the large percentage of population reporting, some significant differences in total list holdings are revealed in Table 6.

TABLE 6

LIST HOLDINGS OF DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE COUNTRY ON BIASED BOOKS ABOUT RUSSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Total List Holdings</th>
<th>Average List Holdings</th>
<th>Difference in Mean from Far West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if all the libraries not reporting held all the books on the list, none of the other sections of the nation could equal the Far West in average list holdings. If the single missing library from the South has all the titles on the list and the missing libraries from the East and Midwest have none of the titles, the Southern average can not equal the average holdings of the East and Midwest. If the missing libraries from the East hold less than the Eastern average, and if the missing libraries from the Midwest hold more, then the Midwestern average may be more than the Eastern average. Large libraries in the Far West hold significantly more titles than large libraries in other sections of the nation, and large libraries in the South hold significantly less.
The average expenditures for books and periodicals of the 86 libraries in 1945 do not explain this difference. Libraries in the Far West spent on the average about $44,900, in the East about $49,200, in the Midwest about $57,800, and in the South about $24,300. If one library with expenditures of $322,444 in 1945 were omitted from the Midwest, the average expenditures for that section would be about $46,300. The Far West with next to the lowest funds in 1945 has the largest average holdings of checklist books.

Of greater importance to this study than the question of sectional variations in total list holdings is the question of sectional variations in the amount of bias. Table 7 enables us to compare the difference.

TABLE 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Average Holdings of Friendly Books</th>
<th>Average Holdings of Hostile Books</th>
<th>Difference of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>+.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>+.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>-.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>+.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a slight friendly bias represented in the holdings of the libraries in cities of 100,000 or more population in each section of the nation. This bias is greatest in the libraries of the Far West, which submitted a complete report. Is this bias significant? The number of libraries in the Far Western group is too small for the technique of computing the standard error of the difference between the means of hostile and friendly holdings of checklist books. Looked at in another way, however, these libraries hold 488 of the biased books about Russia from a selected list of 50 titles. These titles were selected from one source and from a publication period of less than five years. The friendly holdings are 52.3% of the total, and the hostile holdings are 47.7%. The standard error of each percentage when the possible holdings of all the biased books about Russia are considered is 2.26. The critical ratio is 1.4. Such a difference might occur through sampling error 16 times in a hundred. Therefore, the bias can be explained as arising from chance.

Frequency with Which Titles Were Held

No title was held by all the libraries reporting. However, the title that was held most frequently, I Chose Freedom, by Victor Kravchenko, was held by all the large libraries and by 57 of the small libraries. Published by Scribner in 1946, this book is the account of a former Soviet official who fled Russia and renounced his allegiance to the country. It is bitterly hostile, but at the same time it has been a very popular book. Its presence in a library when balanced by a selection of friendly books cannot be interpreted as bias on the part of the library.

The friendly books most frequently held in both groups of libraries are Walter Duranty's USSR, Richard Lauterbach's These are the Russians, and Edgar Snow's Pattern of Soviet Power, all wartime books. None of these books is as intense as Kravchenko. Earl Browder's War or Peace With Russia, 1947, is 47th in popularity in the large libraries and 48th in the small libraries. Soviet Asia Mission, by Henry Wallace, 1946, ranked 22nd in the large libraries and 25th in the small libraries.

Every book was held in some library, but no small library held Red Miracle, a 1947 title by Edward Podolsky describing the achievements of Red medicine. The check-
When the number of large libraries and the number of small libraries holding each title are compared, the coefficient of correlation obtained by the product moment method is +.63. The standard error of the coefficient is .086. The t figure is 5.67. According to the table of t values, there is less than one chance in a thousand of this correlation resulting from sampling error. In general, it would seem that the small libraries follow a pattern of acquisition of biased books about Russia published in the last five years similar to that of the large libraries.

It must again be pointed out that the two groups are not strictly comparable, because the large libraries are in a national sample and the small libraries are a Midwestern sample. It has been shown that the small libraries have significantly less list holdings than the large libraries. The most obvious explanation for this difference in holdings is the large difference in book and periodical funds as reported in 1945. Might this just as well be correlated to a sectional difference, in view of the traditional isolationist attitude of the Midwest? Table 8 compares the average holdings of the 86 large libraries of the national sample with the average number of titles held for each $1,000 of the book and periodical fund as reported in 1945. From this, the true cause of the difference in total holdings appears to be financial, not sectional. However, before we could say that the 60 small Midwestern libraries are representative of the small libraries of the nation, we would have to know the holdings of the small libraries in other sections of the country. Of course, the figure .8 for the large libraries cannot be interpreted as a true indication of less interest, because the list was limited to 50 titles, less than three times the average small library holdings, while the funds of the large libraries were over nine times those of the small libraries.

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average List Holdings</th>
<th>Listed Titles Held per $1,000 Fund, 1945</th>
<th>Book and Periodical Fund, 1945</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large libraries</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>$45,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small libraries</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of this study show only that the holdings of the two groups show no significant bias in the acquisitions of books published between 1944-8. It cannot be held that the acquisitions of each year are balanced. There is no evidence to indicate the holdings of biased books published before 1944. It would be possible, in the course of fluctuating controversy, for the acquisitions of one year to cancel out the bias of another year because of the different nature of materials published in succeeding years. This is a negative element in the restriction of the free flow of materials which librarians in their task of acquiring works currently published are unable to avoid. The period in question has seen the status of Russia change with the American public from that of a wartime ally to that of a diplomatic and commercial antagonist. Table 9 shows the number of hostile and friendly titles on the list published during each year of the survey.
TABLE 9
HOSTILE AND FRIENDLY TITLES ON THE CHECKLIST
ACCORDING TO YEAR OF PUBLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hostile Titles on Checklist</th>
<th>Friendly Titles on Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The checklist does not show the date of acquisition of the books. But it is clear that any library with a policy of buying books immediately upon publication would show a friendly bias for 1945-6 and a hostile bias for 1947-8. In buying books, libraries have to buy what is published. However, there is another side to the question besides putting books on the shelves. That is taking books off the shelves. The results of the survey do indicate that since the change in the position of Russia from an ally to antagonist there has been no concerted effort on the part of librarians to remove books friendly to Russia from their catalogs. The balance over a period of five years is even, and a serious seeker for information can find books on opposing sides of the question of a fairly recent date in the public libraries of America.

Topics for Further Investigation

This investigation has been restricted to a truly controversial topic and no attention has been devoted to the obligations and activities of the library once a consensus has been reached. A study of library practice in the case of the conflict with Nazi Germany should reveal what happens to book collections when an issue has passed the stage of controversy.

The checklist was restricted in source and time, and to one issue where there is no apparent sectional variation in the handling of the bias. It would be worthwhile to investigate the whole collections of libraries for the determination of bias, and to investigate other issues, such as race relations and treatment of minority groups where national agreement cannot be expected.

The study has been restricted to the determination of whether or not titles were included in the library catalog. It is not necessary to have an equal number of titles to permit equal exposure to both sides of a dichotomous issue, nor does possession of a balanced collection of titles guarantee equal exposure. It would be worthwhile to study the number of copies of each title and the activities of the libraries in promoting the use of the books and other materials. It would be worthwhile to know the circulation of the titles as compared with circulation on other issues. A knowledge of date of acquisition of the titles as compared to public opinion trends would be pertinent. This might also reveal the degree to which librarians accede to or resist publishing trends.

The sample of small libraries was restricted to public libraries in Indiana and Illinois. Since there was some sectional variation in total holdings of the large public libraries, it would be worthwhile to study a national sample of small libraries to determine whether there are sectional differences among small libraries in handling this and other issues. The sample of small libraries was also characterized by a bimodal distribution. This distinction of libraries on the basis of total list holdings should be examined in an attempt to discover the reason for the lack of homogeneity.
In future study of the problem, the statistical method should be supplemented by other methods. In light of the interest shown, interviews with policy-making officers would seem to be a fruitful procedure. Further study might indicate other methods and other angles of attack.

FOOTNOTES

(4) Ibid., 42 (July-August, 1948), 285.
(a) First half of year only.

Checklist of Biased Books About Russia, 1944-8; Selected from the Book Review Digest

Information following the titles consists of: (1) Bias - H for hostile, F for friendly, (2) number of large libraries holding the title, and (3) number of small libraries holding the title.

1. Atkinson, OVER AT UNCLE JOE'S. (H, 71, 27)
2. Barmine, ONE WHO SURVIVED. (H, 74, 36)
3. Browder, WAR OR PEACE WITH RUSSIA. (F, 31, 1)
4. Bullitt, GREAT GLOBE ITSELF. (H, 81, 48)
5. Burnham, THE STRUGGLE FOR THE WORLD. (H, 78, 27)
6. Casey, RELIGION IN RUSSIA. (F, 64, 10)
8. Ciliberti, BACKSTAIRS MISSION TO MOSCOW. (H, 16, 1)
9. Dallin, THE BIG THREE. (H, 81, 46)
10. Dallin and Nicholaevsky, FORCED LABOR IN RUSSIA. (H, 70, 19)
11. Davis, BEHIND SOVIET POWER. (F, 43, 4)
12. Deane, THE STRANGE ALLIANCE. (H, 80, 26)
13. Duranty, USSR. (F, 84, 51)
14. Fischer, MY LIVES IN RUSSIA. (H, 83, 28)
15. Fisher, AMERICA AND RUSSIA IN THE WORLD COMMUNITY. (F, 30, 3)
17. Halpern, CONDUCTED TOUR. (H, 18, 1)
18. Heyman, WE CAN DO BUSINESS WITH RUSSIA. (F, 69, 16)
19. Johnson, SOVIET RUSSIA SINCE THE WAR. (F, 64, 11)
21. Kravchenko, I CHOSE FREEDOM. (H, 86, 57)
22. Kunitz, RUSSIA; THE GIANT THAT CAME LAST. (F, 47, 4)
24. Lamont, PEOPLES OF THE SOVIET UNION. (F, 79, 26)
25. Lane, I SAW POIANT BETRAYED. (H, 80, 34)
26. Lauterbach, THESE ARE THE RUSSIANS. (F, 82, 47)
27. Lehrman, RUSSIA'S EUROPE. (H, 56, 10)
28. Lucas, EAST OF THE IRON CURTIN. (H, 40, 6)
29. Manning, THE STORY OF THE UKRAINE. (H, 40, 4)
30. Mikhailov, RUSSIAN STORY. (F, 50, 6)
31. Norborg, OPERATIONS MOSCOW. (H, 42, 10)
32. Podolsky, RED MIRACLE. (F, 33, 0)
33. Sayers and Kahn, THE GREAT CONSPIRACY. (F, 77, 25)
34. Schuman, SOVIET POLITICS. (F, 81, 20)
35. Snow, PATTERN OF SOVIET POWER. (F, 84, 51)
36. ______, STALIN MUST HAVE PEACE. (F, 84, 35)
37. Sorokin, RUSSIA AND THE U.S. (F, 82, 29)
38. Stern and Smith, eds., UNDERSTANDING THE RUSSIANS. (F, 44, 13)
39. Sternberg, HOW TO STOP THE RUSSIANS WITHOUT WAR. (H, 64, 17)
40. Stevens, RUSSIA IS NO RIDDLE. (F, 77, 20)
41. Strohm, JUST TELL THE TRUTH. (F, 70, 23)
42. Strong, I SAW THE NEW POLAND. (F, 67, 28)
43. ______, PEOPLES OF THE USSR. (F, 72, 31)
44. Super, POLAND AND RUSSIA. by A. S. Cardwell. (H, 38, 3)
45. Utley, LOST ILLUSION. (H, 37, 11)
46. Wallace, SOVIET ASIA MISSION. (F, 72, 21)
47. White, REPORT ON THE RUSSIANS. (H, 81, 16)
48. Winter, I SAW THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE. (F, 76, 34)
49. Yakhontoff, USSR FOREIGN POLICY. (F, 58, 8)
50. Yesipov and Goncharov, "I Want To Be Like Stalin." (H, 50, 16)